

—Francis Parker Yockey—

The Enemy Of Europe

The Enemy Of Our Enemies

—Reville P. Oliver—

THE ENEMY OF OUR ENEMIES:
A Critique of Francis Parker Yockey's *The Enemy of Europe*

by Professor Revilo P. Oliver

(Published in one volume with Francis Parker Yockey's *The Enemy of Europe*, Liberty Bell Publications, November 1981)

DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY OF
THE FOUNDER OF THE FRANCIS PARKER YOCKEY SOCIETY
LOUIS T. BYERS



AN ARYAN OF THE ARYANS
WHO ALSO FOUGHT A GOOD FIGHT TO ITS TRAGIC END
22 OCTOBER 1981

CONTENTS

PART I

The Retroversion

Historionomy

Cyclical History

The Great Pseudo-Morphosis

Spengler vs. Yockey

PART II

One Europe

Overseas Europe

The Heartland

The Nutcracker

The Paradox

The Thrid Side of the Coin

At the Wailing Wall

Tod und Verklärung

The Dying and the Dead

The Epitaph

Epilogue, The Erinyes

THE ENEMY OF OUR ENEMIES

PART I



WHEN Francis Parker Yockey completed and published *Imperium* in 1948, he wrote a comparatively short sequel or pendant to his major work. This sequel, which he later entitled *The Enemy of Europe*, is now lost, but he had his manuscript with him when he was in Germany in 1953, and, after revising two passages to take account of events since 1948, he had it translated into German and printed at Frankfurt-am-Main in an edition of two hundred copies. Yockey's work displeased the Jews, who

accordingly ordered their henchmen to raid the printing plant, punish the printer, smash the types, and destroy all copies of the book. Yockey escaped and fortunately had already sent several copies abroad, and it is from a photocopy of one of these that Mr. Francis has tried to restore Yockey's English text, so far as possible.

The Enemy of Europe is a work of great philosophical, historical, and political significance because

1) In it Yockey applies to the contemporary situation of the world the philosophy of history that he elaborated in *Imperium*, much as Spengler in *Die Jahr der Entscheidung* applied to the world of 1933 the philosophical theory he had expounded in his *Untergang des Abendlandes*.

2) It is the earliest coherent expression of a political attitude in Europe which first became manifest to Americans in the late 1950s and which at the present time largely determines the conduct of the various European nations in their relations with the United States and the Soviet Union. This

attitude, which is generally misunderstood because, for the most part, Europeans cautiously use in public only equivocal or vague terms to intimate or disguise what Yockey said explicitly and without diplomatic subterfuge, was quickly imitated in other parts of the world and is commonly designated by such terms as 'neutralism,' 'uncommitted nations,' and 'The Third World.'

3) Yockey's analysis of the situation when he wrote poses today the most urgent question before intelligent Americans and, indeed, all other members of our race--a question of political fact that each of us must solve, at least provisionally, before he can estimate the chances that our species will survive on this globe.

It will be proper, therefore, to examine, as summarily as possible, each of these three aspects of *The Enemy of Europe*. Before we do so, however, it behooves us to say something about the only text in which Yockey's work is now available.

THE RETROVERSION

Yockey's manuscript, as I have said, has disappeared and must be presumed lost. (1) We may conjecture that it was in Frankfurt when the subjugated Germans' Thought Police (2) burned, as they thought, all copies of the German edition, and that they found and burned it at the same time. So far as I know, the identity of the translator, who did the work for a small fee, (3) is now unknown, possibly even to the Jews, who, despite the efficiency of their espionage service, which is by far the finest and most formidable in the entire world, seem not to have known that a few copies of *Der Feind Europas* escaped the destruction they had ordered.

(1. Yockey seems not to have made a carbon copy, an unfortunate omission. The distinguished foreign correspondent of the *Chicago Tribune*, Donald Day, wrote, on the basis of his own observations, a book, *Onward, Christian Soldiers*, to tell the truth about events in northern Europe during the years in which preparations were being made for the attack on Germany by the Jews' Aryan dupes in 1939. His typewritten manuscripts appears to have been destroyed in connection with the vicious persecution to which Day was subjected by the Jews' government in Washington, prevented him from ever returning to his own country. He kept a carbon copy, however, from which the greater part of his book was eventually published, first in a mimeographed transcription, and then in a printed volume. For the details, see *Liberty Bell*, January 1983, pp. 27-34. A Swedish translation of Day's book was published in 1944, from which chapters and sections missing in the incomplete edition of Day's book now in print were translated back into English by Paul Knutson and published in *Liberty Bell*, June 1984, pp. 1-40.)

(2. The raid was officially carried out by an agency of the nominally German government that was set up in the western part of the conquered territory and given "virtual sovereignty" in 1952, the Bundesnachrichtendienst Abteilung K-16, a counterpart (or subsidiary) of "our" C.I.A. Its official functions are to control the Communists, work in which it has been notoriously unsuccessful, to terrorize Germans who seem not to have learned that they must venerate the Jews, and to help God's People hunt down Germans who were loyal to their country before it was destroyed in 1945 and have failed subsequently to cringe before the Master Race to which Yahweh, by a famous Covenant (B'rith), deeded ownership of the entire world and all the lower animals in it, including, of course, the fatuous Aryans.)

(3. It is reported that a man, unnamed but identified as a German, was arrested in Frankfurt and punished as the translator of forbidden thought. Since, as I shall mention shortly, it is scarcely credible that the translator was a native German, we may conjecture that the man, who was perhaps caught with Yockey's manuscript in his possession, accepted the blame to shield the real translator (perhaps a woman), perhaps thereby facilitating Yockey's escape from Frankfurt. A memorandum in Yockey's handwriting indicates that when the book went to press, he still owed the translator \$45.00; from this it may be inferred that the total fee was not large, perhaps twice that amount. A man whose knowledge of Yockey's career far exceeds my own believes that the memorandum was disingenuous and that Yockey himself produced the German version, and supports his opinion by a stylistic analysis that does show that, in all probability, the translation was made by an American. Since he admits that the only evidence is "indirect and circumstantial," I elect to accept Yockey's memorandum at its face value here and leave the decision to Yockey's future biographer. The details of an author's life may be interesting in themselves, but are seldom relevant to the worth of a literary or philosophical work. As Flaubert said, "L'homme, c'est rien; l'oeuvre, c'est tout.")

The Jews are almost invariably accurate in statements of verifiable fact that they include in the data compiled for the use of the cowboys who ride herd on their Aryan cattle. I note that in one such compilation, dated May 1969, they boast that Yockey's "pamphlet for distribution in the United States" was evidently printed but "confiscated by the Federal authorities," and that the manuscript of his unfinished book, *The American Destiny*, was seized when he was arrested by their Federal Agents. (4) Then follows, in the list of writings of the hated *goy*, this odd entry:

Enemy of Europe (completed book but never published as manuscript was to be translated into German).

It would appear, therefore, that they were satisfied that all vestiges of the printed edition had been successfully effaced.

(4. Yockey, whose passport had been confiscated by the State Department to prevent him from returning to the United States, entered the country on a forged passport in San Francisco, where he was the guest of a Jew in whom he had, for some reason, placed confidence. He was arrested, thrown into prison, held under a vindictively exorbitant bail, and found dead in his cell, reportedly a suicide. The Jew in whose home he had stayed disappeared until after Yockey was dead, and was found to have sneaked into the United States under an assumed name with a fraudulent passport, but no one, surely, would be so "anti-Semitic" as to suppose that God's Own People are amenable to laws that are enforced against the lower races. You may be quite certain, of course, that the manuscript of *The American Destiny* will never be found, whether it was burned or is now in the files of the Federal Bureau of Intimidation. A short essay entitled "The Destiny of America," which may be an extract from the unfinished book, was mimeographed and distributed privately in 1955; by an audacious but not unprecedented plagiarism, a would-be "leader" of the American "right-wing" then published it, with additions, under his own name. The theme of Yockey's book may be deduced from an essay, "The World in Flames," that was published as a booklet by his friends in 1961, shortly after his death. Both essays are reproduced in the booklet, *Four Essays*, now available from Liberty Bell Publications.)

I remark in passing that American "Liberals" are wont to yap about "book burning," but that is merely characteristic hypocrisy. Everyone knows that well-conditioned "intellectuals," their little minds sodden with the degrading superstitions that are injected into white children in the public boob-hatcheries, like well-trained dogs, never bark when their masters have enjoined silence. It is hard to believe, however, that the "intellectuals," unlike the dogs, never perceive the inconsistency of their conduct--not even when they refrain from complaining about the total destruction of books that are disapproved by Jews.

From a photocopy of one surviving copy of the German book an attempt to restore Yockey's English text has been made by Mr. Francis whom I know only through some correspondence and conversations over the telephone. No one will expect the retroversion to be precisely what Yockey wrote, but we must specifically note that Mr. Francis has acquitted himself of a very difficult task.

All that remains of Yockey's original are five paragraphs that do not appear in the German translation. It seems that when he sent his book to press, he extracted those paragraphs from his own "Introductory Note" and planned to have them printed as a preface signed by a friend who was

going to contribute half of the cost of printing. (5) The friend evidently declined the honor: he may have been unwilling to expose himself to punishment by the Jews or he may have decided not to remit the \$210.00 that Yockey believed he had promised. (6) Mr. Francis has restored these paragraphs to their logical place in Yockey's introduction. For all the rest of the book, he had to work from the German translation.

(5. Yockey added, for the proposed preface, an introductory sentence, which he squeezed in at the top of the typewritten page. The clause in the first paragraph, "Having lived for several decades in America," was originally intended to refer to himself, being strictly true (he was born in Chicago, 18 September 1917) but designed to conceal the nationality of the author of *Imperium* and *Der Feind Europas*, which were published under the pseudonym Ulick Varange. In his introduction to the American edition of *Imperium*, Willis A. Carto explains the pseudonym thus: "Ulick is an Irish given name...and means 'reward of the mind.' Varange, of course, refers to the Varangians, that far-roving band of Norse heroes led by Rurick who...came to civilize Russia in the 9th Century....The name, therefore, drawn as it is from the Eastern and Western antipodes of Europe, signifies a Europe united 'from the rocky promontories of Galway to the Urals.'" Perhaps, but the Varangians are best known as the Norse mercenaries who formed the elite corps of Byzantine armies, and *Ulick* is the early Erse adaptation, from the Latin *Ulixes*, of the name of the great Aryan hero, celebrated for his courage and practical wisdom, who, at the very beginning of the epic, is described as having wandered for many years after the fall of the sacred city of Ilium, which his fellow Greeks destroyed, and having seen many foreign cities and observed the character of many tribes of men. Both names, therefore, connote a stranger in a strange land. Yockey felt himself a stranger in an America that had lost its early Western culture and become a colony ruled by its Jewish masters (see Part Two below). It would be otiose to speculate whether Yockey remembered the etymology of *Odysseus* in the epic (XIX, 407 sqq.) or had in mind the fact that the Byzantine Empire was inhabited by diverse and mostly mongrelized peoples and infested by Jews.)

(6. The facts could doubtless be ascertained, but they are irrelevant to the philosophical and political significance of Yockey's book, and I leave the task of ascertaining them to a future biographer.)

I cannot believe that German was the translator's native language. His occasional errors in syntax are not what one would expect of a young person whose education had been interrupted by the European catastrophe, and while some of the awkwardness of his version suggests the sloppiness of the worst German journalism, they correspond much more closely to the paraphrases and circumlocutions in which we indulge when we are speaking a foreign language in which we have not learned to think, cannot call to mind a precise equivalent of an English expression, and try to make our meaning clear as best we may. And we may be certain that Yockey's command of German was not adequate to enable him to revise and polish

a translation that is always pedestrian and sometimes worse. He could doubtless speak German sufficiently for ordinary conversation and to write short letters, but it is significant that he read and quoted Spengler in the English translation by Charles Francis Atkinson. It is true that Atkinson was a great translator whose versions from Spengler and Friedell accurately represent the German in English so impeccable, fluidly idiomatic, and, on occasion, eloquent that they set a standard that few translators from one language to another can hope to approach; but nevertheless, it is hard to believe that Yockey would not at least have read the original texts, had he felt at home in literary and philosophical German. That he did not do so may reasonably be inferred from the fact that, as Mr. Francis discovered, in the manuscript that Yockey gave to the German translator, he quoted Spengler in Atkinson's translation, and the translator, instead of supplying the corresponding text from Spengler's German, simply retranslated Atkinson's English into German, somewhat distorting the meaning in a way that gives us no high estimate in his competence in either language. (7)

(7. A good and probative example is the epigraph prefixed to Chapter 1, ch. 4 (p. 29 of the German edition), which is a rather loose translation of Atkinson's *The Hour of Decision*, p. 205, which is an accurate translation from Spengler's *Die Jahre der Entscheidung*, p. 148 in the first edition (1933). Even though Yockey's German translator was poorly paid, he can scarcely be forgiven such negligence, unless he had to work in great haste or under very adverse conditions.)

Mr. Francis's retroversion is the accomplishment of an arduous task. He had to decide where the German translator was content to approximate the meaning of the English before him rather than render it precisely or even altered a logical sequence of ideas to shirk the labor of transferring the argument from one language into another in which the normal order of words and clauses is quite different. A comparison of some passages of the retroversion with the corresponding German satisfies me that Mr. Francis has approximated Yockey's original as closely as is possible in the present circumstances. In what follows here, my reference will be to pages of his work.

HISTORIONOMY

I need not remark that the formulation, or the criticism, of a philosophy of history is a task suited only to the comparatively rare minds, probably found only in our race, who can attain a perfectly dispassionate and

relentless objective attitude of intellectual detachment from their personal wishes, sympathies, and even instinctive loyalties, at least during their consideration of the problems involved. Persons who have psychic fixations on gods or other praeternatural powers in whose existence they find it comforting to believe, or who feel an uncontrollable impulse to eulogize the "greatest nation on earth" or some ideological savior, or whose vanity must be salved by faith in the immortal excellence of their race, caste, or clique, should be advised not to disturb their glands with reading that cannot fail to affect adversely their equanimity and their blood pressure.

It is less obvious, perhaps, that every man who tries to elicit natural laws from the records of human history will *inevitably* make errors in matters of detail that need not impugn the validity of his general theory. A synoeretical view of human history or of the history of our race must be based in large part on secondary sources, since no man can learn all of the relevant languages or find time, in the short span of human life, to read and ponder all of the practically innumerable archaeological and philological reports and studies that may (or may not) in some way alter our understanding of the past. To demand of a vast theoretical and philosophical construction absolute accuracy in all details, as the little men who have long been barking at Spengler's heels would have us do, is as absurd as to demand that every square centimeter of St. Peter's in Rome or Westminster Abbey be finished with the accuracy of well-cut diamond. Even if a man is not betrayed, *humanitus*, by the lability of his own memory when it is charged with almost infinite details, he must, for a large part of his survey, depend on scholars who are reputed to be experts in the history of some particular region or culture and whose summaries and interpretations of data may not be endorsed by contemporaries of equal reputation in the same field, so that, as often as not, a man must acquire a very considerable knowledge of each subject before he can decide whose authority is to be trusted, even provisionally. Furthermore, in many areas of history and pre-history our knowledge is so fragmentary that the conclusions generally accepted today may become obsolete tomorrow as the result of some new discovery (as, for example, the discovery that solar radiation has fluctuated even so recently as during the past ten thousand years, which made it necessary to calibrate chronological determinations made from the radioactive isotope of carbon) or even detection of the spuriousness of evidence previously accepted (as in the example from *The Enemy of Europe* that I shall mention below). (8)

(8. Although it is not strictly relevant to a judgment of his work, we may, as a matter of human interest, remember that Yockey was an astonishingly young man, only thirty years old, when he settled down in Ireland to write *Imperium*, and only twenty-four when his studies were interrupted and he was hauled into the Army for service in Roosevelt's War.

When we consider the brilliance Yockey exhibited in his youth, we can only wonder what his incisive and versatile mind would have accomplished, had he lived in a happier age and been able to complete the long study and meditation requisite for the great intellectual task before him. We need not add that when he wrote in a hamlet on the lonely coast of the Irish Sea south of Dublin and Wicklow, he probably did not have at his disposal even the basic reference works that every serious writer keeps on his desk.)

When I reviewed the American edition of *Imperium* in 1963, I called attention to a startling slip of memory. Yockey says (p. 288):

'When Charles of Anjou beheaded Conradin, the last Hohenstaufen Emperor, in 1267 [*October 1268*], Germany disappeared from Western history, as a unit of political significance, for 500 years.... During these centuries, the high history of Europe was made by other powers mostly with their own blood. This meant that--in comparison with the vast expenditure of blood over the generations of the others--Germany was *spared*.'

Yockey, writing from memory (hence the trivial error in the date) and perceiving the significance of the eclipse of the Holy Roman Empire as a European power, made a sweeping generalization, forgetting at the moment the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648), in which, according to the best estimates of cautious historians, *two-thirds* of the population of Germany perished and much of the country was made a waste land over which Protestants and Catholics fought, each to exterminate the other for the glory of God and the profit of the Jews.

The Enemy of Europe contains (p. 80) a compound error that is both obvious and an excellent illustration of what I have said above.

'In the 16th century B.C., Northern [*nordische*] barbarians invaded the Egyptians culture-petrifact, to enact the chapter of history that is called the "Hyksos" era.'

Aside from the superficial reference to Egyptian culture as petrified, which could be defended only with reference to a much later period in Egypt's history, there are two errors. The first of these is clearly a slip of Yockey's memory: he has confused the successive invasions of Egypt in

the thirteenth century B.C. by the "Peoples of the Sea," who were predominantly Nordic (and who were defeated and expelled, finally by Ramses III in the following century), with the earlier take-over of Egypt in the seventeenth century (9) by the "Hyksos," who were predominantly Semitic--a confusion facilitated by the speculations of some historians who tried to reconcile conflicting evidence by postulating that the "Hyksos" were the Hittites, who were classified as Aryan (10) because they were ruled by an aristocracy (which evidently came from the east to invade and conquer the country) and their official language was based on Indo-European.

(9. Yockey's reference to the sixteenth century B.C. is to the recovery of Egyptian independence. The rule of the "Hyksos" lasted for a little more than a century. The dates here are fairly secure, although chronological precision in Egyptian history can be attained with certainty only with the Eighteenth Dynasty.)

(10. The word 'Aryan' is commonly avoided these days by writers who fear that the Jews will punish them for using it, but we do need a specific designation for our race and one that will permit us to restrict 'Indo-European' to use as a linguistic term, since, as everyone knows, race and language are quite different things, and language is not an indication of race or even nationality. (Jews are not Germans because many of them speak Yiddish, which is basically a corruption of a low dialect of German, and the Congoids residing in the United States are not Anglo-Saxon because their only language is a debased English.) The great pioneer in social anthropology, Vacher de Lapouge, would have us restrict the term 'Aryan' historically to the division of our race that conquered India and Persia and sooner or later destroyed itself by miscegenation with the aborigines they had subdued. (One has only to think of the mongrel population of modern Iran, of which the name, derived from *arya* through the Zend *Airyana*, means 'land of the Aryans'!) He would have us use the Linnaean biological classification, *Homo Europaeus* and *Homo Alpinus*, which correspond to 'Nordic' and 'Alpine' in the more common terminology; but the awkwardness of those terms is obvious. The Sanskrit *arya* is not only the designation by which conquerors of India and Persia identified themselves, but also a word meaning 'noble,' which designates the qualities of heroism, chivalry, and magnanimity for which our race has always had a characteristic and distinctive admiration, and is therefore better than any neologism we might devise. So long as we intend to consider objectively the phenomena of the real world, we should not be deterred by the threats of our biological enemies nor yet by the yapping of trained witlings of our own race.)

The second error in that statement was not an error in 1948 in the sense that Yockey's assumption that the "Hyksos" conquered Egypt could have been supported by references to the works of some of the most distinguished Egyptologists of the time, although grave misgivings about the supposed conquest had been accumulating since 1892 (and perhaps earlier), as the discrepancies between the one long-known account (the

late Egyptian historian, Manetho, as quoted and interpreted by Josephus) on the one hand and the Egyptian inscriptions and the archaeological evidence on the other became ever more glaring. It is now established that there was no conquest by force of arms--no sudden invasion by barbarians of any race. (11) What happened was that Asiatics, (12) most or all of whom bore Semitic names and came from the region in Asia Minor that is now called Palestine, by gradual immigration across the Sinai peninsula infiltrated Egypt and used, consciously or instinctively, the techniques of subversion, inciting or exacerbating class-warfare, regional differences, and the greed or ambition of discontented Egyptians until the nation was reduced to a revolutionary chaos, fragmented under numerous local rulers, many of whom were native Egyptian puppets, and then again consolidated under Semitic overlords to whom the various provinces paid tribute. The Asiatics ruled Egypt for more than a century until a native tributary dared to revolt, and the Egyptians called their Semitic masters, whom many Egyptians revered willingly and for profit, their 'alien rulers'--in the modern transliteration of hieroglyphics, which ignores unwritten vowels, the _____ [unable to render--Ed.] whence the long-misunderstood term 'Hyksos.' So much is now certain, although many details remain obscure, and we note the irony that Yockey, by a few years, missed an historical determination that would have been of the utmost value in the formulation of his own theory--the first clear example of conquest by immigration and subversion. (13)

(11. The facts, so far as they have now been ascertained, are well presented by Professor John Van Seter's *The Hyksos*, Yale University Press, 1966. Although the crucial data come from an Egyptian stele found in 1954 and a papyrus that was first published in the following year, the evidence from archaeological and epigraphical sources had been accumulating for the better part of a century, but a clear understanding of what is known as the Second Intermediate Period in Egyptian history was impossible so long as historians felt obligated to try to reconcile the evidence with the statements of Josephus, a Jew who wrote in the first century of our era and claimed he was quoting Manetho, a very late Egyptian priest, who wrote in Greek in the third century B.C. Josephus, who naturally wails about what his race now calls "anti-Semitism" (i.e., resistance to its covert dominion), says what he thinks will impose on the *goyim* and is, naturally, a forger and a liar. His statements about a military conquest of Egypt by valiant Jews must be disregarded.)

(12. The proletarian revolution is described in the *Admonitions of Ipuwer*, one of the best-known works of Egyptian literature, now dated to the period of social upheaval that preceded the open dominion of the "Hyksos." We do not know how numerous those Asiatics were, nor to what extent their subversion of Egypt was carried out by a conscious and concerted plan, as distinct from instinctive parasitism. It may be significant that some of them disguised themselves under Egyptian names, much as Jews now frequently masquerade under Anglo-Saxon names (e.g., Ashley Montagu!), and that the "Hyksos," although fanatical devotees of an Asiatic god of their own, often feigned

"conversion" to the native Egyptian cults. It is thus often difficult to tell whether some of the rulers subordinate to the Asiatic overlord were Asiatics masquerading under Egyptian names or Egyptian collaborators who profited from the exploitation of their own people. The Asiatics obviously promoted a "multi-racial" society as a means of destruction and perhaps even a kind of "anti-colonialism," since the Blacks of the Egyptian colony in Nubia became "independent," and, indeed, the Egyptian revolt against Asiatic domination succeeded only because the "liberated" Nubians failed to follow instructions from the "Hyksos" to attack the insurgent Egyptians in the rear. The policy of mongrelization was so successful that we even hear of one of the Asiatics' puppets, supposedly the legitimate heir of an Egyptian king, who was known as The Black. The genetic ruin of Egypt was thus begun, although Egypt, after the expulsion of "Hyksos" rulers (though many of the race doubtless remained in Egypt) knew a period of imperial greatness under the Eighteenth Dynasty until the accession in 1379 B.C. of a crazed religious fanatic, Akhenaten, who, although at least two of his grandparents were blond Aryans, was, as is obvious from his portraits, some kind of mongrel.)

(13. The Egyptians did not distinguish clearly between the various breeds of Asiatics, and therefore the available evidence does not authorize an inference that they were Jews or directed by Jews, tempting as that inference is. There is no historical identification of Jews at so early a date. Josephus tried to connect the "Hyksos" with the story of Joseph in the *Old Testament* (Gen. 39-50), which is, of course, just a folk-tale dated by allusions to a much later time. It is not impossible, however, that some actual events may have suggested the exemplary fiction about a Jew who got into Egypt, wormed his way to the top by adroit trickery (supposedly with the help of his tribal god), preyed on the good nature of an unnamed Egyptian king to import a swarm of his brethren, exploited the stupid king's superstitions with oneiromancy, got control of the whole nation, and, acting in the name of his royal dupe, cornered all the food and all the money in Egypt (see especially 47.14-21), and then starved the stupid *goyim* until they had to barter their cattle and their land for food and finally sell themselves into slavery, after which the wily Jew herded his biped cattle from their homes to other parts of the country to destroy what sense of community his slaves might have with their former neighbors.)

A philosophy of history is not invalidated by such oversights, any more than Copernican astronomy was invalidated by its author's inadequate and largely erroneous knowledge of planetary orbits.

The analogy incidentally reminds us that the English word most commonly applied to efforts to formulate laws of history, historiometry, is misleading, since it suggests a possibility of determinations and predictions as precise and certain as in astronomy. That is manifestly absurd, and the French term, *m, tahistoire*, with its implied analogy to the notoriously speculative and vaporous doctrines of metaphysics, is preferable, although it may conversely exaggerate the degree of uncertainty and insubstantiality. Whatever the name given to this comparatively new domain of inquiry, (14) it must be regarded as a philosophy, not as a science in the strict sense of that word. There is therefore a great difference between philosophical theory and practical

perception of contemporary realities, although the two are combined in the work of every writer on the subject. The theory is neither strengthened nor impaired by the accompanying view of contemporary events.

(14. For all practical purposes, it may be said to begin with Th,odore Funck-Brentano's *La civilisation et ses lois*, published in 1876. The study is now obsolete but should not be forgotten. Its author saw clearly the absurdity of many contemporary fictions, such as the notion that there are "human rights" (which is still used to make bird-brains cackle), and understood that nations inevitably rot when they fall under the dominace of peace-lubbers; and he even foresaw the extension of Russian power over the more civilized nations of Europe.)

The still great prestige of Spengler today does not depend on the morphology of history that he elaborated in *The Decline of the West*, for while it would be premature to make a final judgment before 2000 or even 2100, it is apparent that the course of our own civilization has drastically departed from what his theory predicted. (14a) Indeed, unless there is a total and epochal reversal of present tendencies in the next two decades, it will be possible to reconcile the facts to his theory only by claiming that Faustian civilization was, like the Inca culture of Peru, cut off and destroyed before it reached maturity--a claim excluded by Spengler's own analysis of historical forces. For the time being, at least, the Spenglerian theory seems to have been fallacious and to be memorable only as a vast intellectual construction, comparable to Kant's philosophy, respectable as a monument of intellectual power, though mistaken in its conclusions, and as prime datum concerning the historical period in which it was constructed. But even if we flatly reject Spengler's historionomy, we must nevertheless acknowledge and admire the sagacity of a mind that perceived contemporary realities much more clearly than did the reputedly wisest of his contemporaries, as is evidenced by numerous observations made *obiter* in his major work (15) and, above all, by *The Hour of Decision*, in which he, in 1932, saw, with a clarity and accuracy that is now indubitable, the grim realities of the world at that time and the imminent dangers to our civilization of which virtually no one was then aware. The essential accuracy of his prevision is made obvious by the disasters that have fallen so terribly upon us. (16)

(14a. Spengler's historionomy, as expounded in his major works and, indeed, everything that he published before his death in 1936, predicted that, as an *ineluctable* historical necessity, the coming war would be fought for hegemony of the west, and the many highly intelligent men who were convinced by his analysis confidently expected that that war would decide which nation of our civilization would become the analogue of Rome in the Classical world. When the war occurred, however, it was fought for the Suicide of

the West as a necessary preliminary to realization of the Jews' millennial dream of subjugating the entire world. In no published work did Spengler show the slightest awareness of the terrible power of the international race or anticipate the now unconcealed Jewish domination under which the West is being driven to the precipice over which nations and races disappear from history. Some of his admirers today point out that he did not overlook the power of the great predators of international finance, some of whom are Aryans who have assimilated Jewish attitudes toward their own race, but in 1921 he assured his contemporaries that they were living at "the moment when money is celebrating its last victories, and the Caesarism that is to succeed approaches with quiet, firm step" (Vol. II, p. 507). Today, more than half a century later, is there any indication that "Caesar's legions are returning to consciousness"? The present is obviously the result of forces that Spengler ignored, and whatever our problematic future may hold, events have shown that his "morphology of history" was, at least, radically defective. (Cf. pp. 23 ff. below.)

(15. E.g., his perception in 1921 (Vol. II, p. 457, n.2) that the Weimar Constitution would almost automatically lead to unlimited majority rule such as the Hitlerian regime after its consolidation in 1934-35.)

(16. *The Hour of Decision* is incomplete, and Spengler's understanding may have been more comprehensive than we now know. An unpleasant aspect of the Hitlerian regime was an atmosphere, perhaps inevitable in all mass movements, that prevented Spengler from publishing, and perhaps from writing, the projected second volume. There was no official hostility toward him, and his books remained in print constantly until the Jewish conquest in 1945, but an English reader can sufficiently perceive the essentials of the situation from the translation of *Spengler Letters, 1913-1936*, selected and drastically edited by Arthur Helps (London, 1966), to pages of which my parenthetical numbers will refer. Although sales of the first volume delighted his publisher (291) and certain bookstores filled their windows with his works (285), and although he had an evidently amicable interview with Hitler (290), his book was, as he said, "misunderstood by a section of the ruling party in Germany, and consequently attacked" (196), and, according to one of his friends, both the new book and the *Untergang* were attacked in an "unfounded, personally malicious, and rancorous way" by writers who were like vultures (300f.). Spengler officially protested to Dr. Goebbels the publication in one of the Party's organs, the *Kreuzzeitung*, of two articles "in which I was described, among other things, as a traitor to my country. It is impossible," he added, "to appear in public on behalf of Germany when at the same time articles of this kind appear. Personally they are a matter of indifference to me. For the last fifteen years I have endured so much abuse that I am sufficiently brazen-faced. But in regard to my efforts to work for Germany, they are a hindrance which must be got rid of" (290). Dr. Goebbels was apparently unable to suppress the attacks, which continued. There were rumors that he was an opponent of the regime (304) and unverifiable reports that the regime was opposed to him (297,308), and although the second volume was "anxiously awaited" (301, 308), it never appeared, and Spengler devoted his remaining years to studies in ancient history. That he wrote no more of the *Hour of Decision* than the published volume seems unlikely, but we cannot go beyond the affirmation of his niece and literary executrix, Dr. Hildegard Kornhardt, that no part of a second volume was found among the *Nachlässe* after his death.)

The theory of history that Yockey elaborated in *Imperium*, which is essentially a revision of Spengler in the light of subsequent events and his own reading and observations, is separable from his estimate of the world situation, and it is not impossible that his reputation in our problematical future will depend more on *The Enemy of Europe* than on his major work.

Although *The Enemy of Europe* is formally presented as a pendant to *Imperium*, we must be certain that Yockey's perception of the present was not deduced from historical theory. He was a man of acute and discerning mind, as he proved in an article published in 1939, when he was twenty-one. (17) At that early age he saw much that was hidden from virtually all of his contemporaries, however experienced or learned they were. He perceived that the so-called "Economic Depression," which so effectively scared the American and made them docile, had been contrived by our enemies by use of the Federal Reserve System, which had been foisted on this nation in a campaign engineered by a Warburg, imported from Germany in 1902, while his kin remained at home to ensure the defeat of that nation in the European war that began, no doubt on schedule, in 1914. He foresaw--and this, mind you, before hostilities began in Europe in 1939--that the "Depression," which was being cunningly prolonged to subjugate the American people, "break their spirits," and "make the greatest possible number dependent on the Government," would culminate in a planned war in which "American youth by the millions will be conscripted into armies to be sent to Asia and Europe to fight the battle of world Communism." (That, remember, was two and one-third years before our great War Criminal was able to stampede American cattle into the war that he and his masters had instigated in Europe.) Yockey understood--as many individuals do not, even today--that the gradual imposition of Communist slavery on the Americans began when Warburg, Baruch, and other Jewish herdsmen cozened the boobs into thrusting their necks into the yoke of the White Slave Act, officially called the Sixteenth Amendment, which imposed the admittedly Marxist device of an income tax. He perceived, as did few men of supposed financial acumen, that the bonds issued by the alien government in Washington were fraudulent and would never be redeemed for their face value in real money, although their owners might be given some counterfeit currency printed by the Treasury in Washington and progressively depreciated. And he also perceived that virtually the whole of the educational system had come under the control of typical American "educators" and "intellectuals," who will say anything for a fast buck, while the press, including both most of the newspapers and the popular periodicals, was even more directly controlled and often owned by the aliens, who were using it to defile and pervert the minds of the young and prepare them for use as expendable animals abroad or as obedient zombies at home.

(17. "The Tragedy of Youth" appeared, under the date of 21 August 1939, in *Social Justice*, a weekly periodical that was published by a Catholic ecclesiastic, Father Charles Coughlin, until the Jews bribed or frightened his venal superiors in the Church to suppress a publication that was making some of the serfs discontented. In the article, Yockey uses such terms as "a conservative, Christian view of life," perhaps as a courtesy to the editor. The term 'Christian' at that time and for decades thereafter was a convenient designation for the established traditions of our civilization as distinct from Jewish influences, which the word was thought to exclude, and it carried no necessary implication of religious beliefs.)

All that is obvious now--except to the verbosely "intellectual" parrots who learn from the *New York Times* and its subsidiaries what line of chatter will keep them fashionable and hopeful aspirants to *bakhshish* from their masters--but if we can recapture in our minds the climate of opinion when he wrote, we cannot but be mightily impressed by the perspicacity of an adolescent of twenty-one. I will frankly admit that in the summer of 1939, although I was older than Yockey and had carried my studies into many areas of human history that he never had the leisure to investigate, and although I had no illusions about the fetid mass of traitors, enemy aliens, and looters in Washington, I grossly underestimated the power and even the racial solidarity of the Jews. And I knew of no one who estimate our plight more accurately. Had I read Yockey's article when it was published, I should have dismissed it as an alarmed apprehension of unlikely future contingencies rather than a description of what had already happened.

For the acuity of perception that he then evinced, Yockey had no need of an historical theory. But since *The Enemy of Europe* is written in terms of history, it will be necessary briefly to examine that philosophical structure.

CYCLICAL HISTORY

Imperium, as I have said, is based on *The Decline of the West*. In large part, its premises are Spengler's conclusions. A critique of the philosophy of history that the two works have in common would require a large tome; it will suffice here to indicate some considerations that are crucial to an estimate of it.

That history is cyclical in the sense that nations and empires rise and fall by some strange fatality in constant succession, has been a commonplace since the first rational study of human societies and was specifically stated by Herodotus. The opinion that the fatality is quasi-biological--that civilized societies are themselves organisms that necessarily pass through the life-cycle of all living things, being born, growing to maturity, and ineluctably progressing to senility and death--is doubtless much older than

the elder Seneca, to whom we owe the first clear statement of it. (18)

(18. Most conveniently consulted in Peter's *Fragmenta historicorum Romanorum*; in the *editio minor* (Lipsiae, Teubner, 1883), pp. 292f.)

That the several human species have produced more than one civilization is indubitable. There have been numerous organized and powerful societies (e.g., the Huns) that we may classify as barbarous rather than civilized, but, no matter how strict our standards, we must at least recognize the cultures of Sumeria-Babylonia, Egypt, China, and India as civilizations in the full sense of that word, and also as civilizations separated from our own by an impassable abyss: we can observe their deeds, so far as the facts can be ascertained from written records or by archaeological research, and we can read what is preserved of their literatures, but we must observe those peoples from the outside, and the greater our knowledge of their cultures, the greater our awareness that we are studying the operation of minds and instincts fundamentally different from our own. (19) To be sure, we can observe their behavior and even account for it, as, *mutatis mutandis*, we study the behavior of elephants or baboons, but we can no more establish a rapport with the inner consciousness of those people than we can with the consciousness of the animals, except by such a flight of sentimental imagination as enabled James Oliver Curwood to report so vividly the thoughts of wolves.

(19. For a clear distinction between two kinds of mentality, each of which is fundamentally incomprehensible to the other, see the epochal work of Professor William S. Haas, *The Destiny of the Mind, East and West*, New York, 1956. See also the socio-psychological study by G.ryke Young, *Two Worlds, Not One*, London, 1969. The identification of two virtually antithetical types of mentality does not, of course, mean that there may not be other types, as numerous as civilizations or even more numerous. When we imagine that the minds of other races work in the same way as ours, we merely delude ourselves dangerously.)

Given the plurality of civilizations and the biological analogy, it remained for Spengler to identify a number of discrete civilizations and postulate that each went through a life-cycle that could be defined chronologically, just as we know with fair exactitude at what age a human being will become adolescent, will reach maturity, and will become senile. The synchronisms that Spengler established between the various civilizations have been the subject of endless discussion and controversy, but we need

consider here only the one of his premises on which the entire structure rests and by which that structure must stand or fall.

Spengler identifies as two entirely separate and discrete civilizations the Classical ("Apollonian"), c. 1100 B.C.--A.D. 300, and the Western ("Faustian"), c. A.D. 900--2200. These are the two for which we have the fullest information, and between them Spengler establishes some of his most brilliant synchronisms (e.g., Alexander the Great corresponds to Napoleon). Even a century ago, this dichotomy would have seemed almost mad, for everyone knew and took for granted that whatever might be true of alien cultures, our own was a continuation, or, at least, revival of the Classical. Spengler's denial of that continuity was the most radical and startling aspect of his historical synthesis, but so great has been his overshadowing influence that it has been accepted by a majority of the many subsequent writers on the philosophy of history, of whom we may mention here only Toynbee, Raven, Bagby, and Brown. (20) The Classical, we are told, was a civilization like the Egyptian, now dead and gone and with no organic connection with our own.

(20. Everyone knows the great work of Toynbee, *A Study of History*, and I trust that I need not again point out that the twelve volumes contain *two* distinguishable conceptions of the historical process, since the conceptions on which were based the first four volumes become uncertain and fluctuating in the fifth, after which his consideration of history takes a new direction, practically at right angles to the earlier one. The other works that I have cited here are less well known: Alexander Raven, *Civilisation as Divine Superman*, London, 1932; Philip Bagby, *Culture and History*, London, 1958; Lawrence A. Brown, *The Might of the West*, New York, 1963. I list these four works as particularly significant, since each takes its departure from Spengler and moves in a different direction. All historionomic studies after Spengler are either commentaries on his work or attempts to refute it, and a bare listing of the more important would require a dozen pages or more.)

Spengler (whom Brown especially follows in this respect) supports his drastic dichotomy by impressively contrasting Graeco-Roman mathematics and technology with our own; from that contrast he deduces differences in the perception of space and time, exhibited particularly in music, and reaches the conclusion that the Classical *Weltanschauung* was essentially static, desiring and recognizing only a strictly delimited and familiar world, whereas ours is dynamic and exhibits a passionate yearning for the infinite and the unknown. One can advance various objections to the generalizations I have so curtly and inadequately summarized (e.g., is the difference in outlook really greater than that between the "classical" literature of Eighteenth-Century Europe and the Romanticism of the following era?), but the crucial point is whether the

differences, which belong to the order that we must call spiritual for want of a better term, (21) are fundamental or epiphenomenal.

(21. It should be unnecessary to state explicitly that in discussions of cultures and historical events the word 'spiritual' is used to designate the determinants of human conduct that lie between the strictly physiological and the strictly rational, and therefore implies no belief in immortal souls or the mythology of any religion or comparable superstition. It must always be borne in mind that the spiritual components of individuals and hence of societies are biological, transmitted genetically in human as in other mammals, whether or not the innate instincts fully emerge into consciousness, and whether or not they are somewhat modified by circumstances or education before they determine action.)

The fortunate preservation of vestiges of Classical culture during the Dark and Middle Ages may be explained in various ways, but our Western culture today is admittedly the product of the Renaissance, which was so named because it was first believed to be a rebirth of the Classical. In all the civilized nations of Europe the best minds of our race *spontaneously* turned to Graeco-Roman antiquity for models in literature, the fine arts, politics, philosophy, and the art of living, (22) and sought to model the whole of European society on the great ages of Greece and Rome, so far as that was feasible without inciting the revolutionary violence of mass movements, which they instinctively feared. What is most significant is that their admiration and emulation was not indiscriminately directed toward the whole of the Classical in Spengler's loose use of that word as a synonym for the whole of Graeco-Roman history, but exclusively to the chronologically small part of that history which they esteemed as classical in the strict sense which they gave to that word: essentially the flowering of Athens in Greece, and of Rome in the last centuries of the Republic and the Augustan period, i.e., the periods in which the strictly pagan civilization of antiquity reached its apogee. For the great heaps of theological trash accumulated in both Greek and Latin before the fall of the Roman Empire, they had no real respect, and they likewise rejected the non-Christian works of the long decadence of the Roman Empire, except insofar as those ages of dwindling intelligence preserved fragments of, or information about, the great eras. In other words, the best minds of the Renaissance rejected the ages of Greek and Roman history in which the populations were mongrelized and the culture contaminated by the Orientals who became its representatives--and this rejection was an *instinctive* aversion, for I have found no indication that any scholar of the Renaissance was aware of the racial mutation in the populations of antiquity.

(22. Discussion of, and disputes about, the Renaissance are innumerable. For a fair evaluation, see R.R. Bolgar, *The Classical Heritage*, Cambridge, 1954. All recent discussions of the era take their departure from Jacob Burckhardt's *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* (1860), which is of great value, although it has been furiously criticized, especially by persons with ecclesiastical interests. (There are several English translations; Middlemore's, the only one I have spot-checked, is quite good.) Much of the tedious *disputaillerie* about the Renaissance could be avoided if it were remembered that most of the major Humanists held important positions in the Church or some government and therefore had to deal professionally with such matters as ecclesiastical politics and doctrines, whatever they privately believed, and also that they formed an intellectual aristocracy, had no concern for *hoi polloi* (however incomprehensible that may be to persons imbued with the mysticism about "democracy" that is in fashion at present) and, quite apart from considerations of prudence, had no wish to stir up the superstitions and blind emotions of the masses.)

So strong was this spontaneous esteem for the great ages of pagan antiquity that it prevailed over the opposition of both Church and secular rulers. The more alert ecclesiastics did not fail to perceive that the rebirth of pagan antiquity was bad for their business, but the wiser ones perceived that the intellectual enthusiasm could not be successfully repressed and elected to join what they could not defeat. Many rulers of the time were doubtless embarrassed. We can imagine the sentiments of the first Sforza, a peasant become a duke, as he watched comedies performed in Latin and pretended to appreciate humor that depended on linguistic subtleties. We owe a good phrase to the first James of England, who warned his sons that base-born men might speak better Latin, but no one could criticize the King's English. He thus differed from Lord Chesterfield, who complacently remarked to his son that gentlemen are apt to speak better Latin than professional scholars, for gentlemen study only the real classics, whereas the scholars must read large quantities of decadent stuff in search of historical information. So great, you see, was the attraction of the true classics, so great was the affinity that our race instinctively felt for the great ages of Antiquity, that for five centuries the greater part of the youth of all educated men was devoted to mastering the modalities of ancient thought so completely that they could write Latin verse and prose of classical purity and often Greek with equal facility and classical accuracy.

This devotion to the great ages of Greece and Rome produced, in spite of economic and religious considerations, a stupendous educational effort that is without precedent or parallel in the accumulated history of mankind, (23) and ended only with the fissuring of our civilization by recrudescent barbarism and cultural sabotage. All this, Spengler and Yockey would have us dismiss as "pseudo-morphosis," as a young civilization's respect for a predecessor--in sum, as an hallucination--an hallucination, furthermore, of an intensity and persistence that makes *unique* our civilization, no matter how it is explained.

(23. It must, of course, be distinguished from such entirely different phenomena as the preservation of a sacred language (e.g. Sanskrit in India, Hebrew in Jewry), the study of a contemporary foreign language (e.g. an educated Roman's knowledge of Greek or an educated Englishman's knowledge of French), religious interest in foreign heiratic texts (e.g. the study of Pali by some Chinese Buddhists and of Hebrew by European Protestants), and the influence of exotic literature and thought, usually through translations (e.g. the great influence of Greek philosophy on the Islamic *falasifa* or the influence of Russian novelists on English writers.)

My purpose here is merely to indicate a few cogent objections to the Spenglerian historionomy, not to propose solutions of the difficulties thus indicated, which would be tantamount to formulating a new philosophy of history. I turn therefore to other considerations that preclude, I think, an uncritical and merely enthusiastic acceptance of the cyclical hypothesis.

Spengler and Brown particularly insist on the deficiencies of ancient mathematics, which they both exaggerate, (24) but if there is a dominant characteristic of our civilization, it is the capacity (in good minds) for rigorously objective observation of nature and strictly rational inferences and deductions therefrom--the mentality that has made possible our science and technology. This is the type of mentality that Professor Haas, whom I mentioned above, calls 'philosophical' to distinguish it from other types, and if we look through recorded history and insist on something more than the invention of simple devices, such as wheels or bows and arrows or permanent buildings, we find the first manifestation of this mentality in the Ionian philosophers, who sought to explain the universe without invoking magic and a mythology about praeterhuman beings. That is the real substance of Graeco-Roman philosophy, and we should take especial notice of the New Academy, from which comes the basic method of modern science, which depends on a nice calculation of probabilities. If we look for this rational view of the world in other civilizations, we find no trace of it in the Egyptian or the Sumerian-Babylonian, for in both of these, so far as we know, the world was always thought of as the work of gods and its phenomena attributed to magic, not to the regularity of natural laws. In the Arabian ("Magian") civilization, we find only a few individuals, such as Averro%os and Ibn Khald□n, who, on the basis of a knowledge of Aristotle and other Greek authors, rise above the gross superstitions of Islam and appear as mere eccentrics in a culture on which they had no influence, and we have only to read them to see how far their mentality differs from the objective use of reason that distinguishes what we may, with Haas, call the philosophical mind. In India, we find the Lok yata, of which we know through scattered references in extant literature, but this rationalism seems to have flourished only briefly and during the

period before Aryan dominance was seriously threatened, after which the 'philousian' mentality so prevailed in the conglomerate population of India that the Hindus provide Haas with his neatest example of it, and faith in the supernatural made the physical world seem nugatory and even illusory. In China, although the nocturnes of Confucius and Mencius are relatively free of gross superstition, and the Fa Chia, a pragmatism confined to a ruling ,lite, considered society in implacably realistic terms, there is no evidence of a truly philosophical attempt to ascertain the laws of nature. We find, therefore, in our civilization a type of mentality paralleled only in Graeco-Roman antiquity, where, significantly, it is the mentality of men of our race.

(24. Greek mathematics (of which a convenient conspectus may be found in B.L. van der Waerden's *Science Awakening*, New York, 1963) sufficed to produce the machine for calculating planetary motions, often called a computer, that was found in the wreckage of an ancient ship off Anticythera, and of which everyone now knows, thanks to the scribblers of wonder-books, who think it helps them prove that the earth was colonized by "astronauts." On the mathematics requisite for the construction of ancient artillery and the calculation of trajectories, see the article by Werner Soedel and Vernard Foley in the *Scientific American*, CCXL, 3 (March 1979), pp. 150--160.)

The cardinal flaw in the historical theories of Spengler and Yockey is an almost perverse equivocation about the biological reality of race. Both strive to make race more or less independent of genetics, although they do not go so far as does Alexander Raven, who would reduce civilization to a "super-organic" idea. In *The Enemy of Europe* (p. 43), Yockey insists that "the idea of vertical [= linear, i.e., hereditary] race is dead.... The race one feels in oneself is everything, the anatomico-geographic group whence one comes means nothing," and he even deplors the racial policy of the National Socialist r,game as "an enormous tragedy." (25) It is true that Yockey, following Spengler, had the strange notion that the physical characteristics of race, such as the cephalic index, were determined by the landscape and soil, not by genes, in proof whereof "long-headed Jews from Sicily, and short-headed ones from Germany, produced offspring with the same average head measurement, the specifically American one." (26) Spengler was taken in by some of the propaganda for an American "melting pot" and especially by the hoax contrived by Franz Boas, a twisted little Jew, who popped into the United States, was, for undisclosed reasons, made Professor of Anthropology in Columbia University, and founded a school of fiction-writing called "social anthropology," (27) It is also true that Spengler and Yockey, unlike Raven, do not categorically deny that race in the accepted meaning of that word does determine the outlook of a people and hence the quality of their civilization, but they create some confusion by using 'race' and 'thoroughbred' to designate a

high degree of excellence in individuals who, it seems, are largely the product of the soil of the region in which they reside. They simply ignore the vast amount of scientific evidence that the potentiality of every individual is unalterably determined by his heredity, although obviously his development will be affected by nutrition and other environmental factors and, of course, by sheer accident, which may terminate his life at any stage.

(25. One hears that Yockey's opinion may have been determined by awareness of his mixed Irish and Spanish ancestry, but such speculations are nugatory. A novelist can know all the inner thoughts and motivations of his characters, but when we deal with living persons, the motives of their actions are usually obvious, but an attempt to ascertain by psychological analysis the source of *rationaly* expressed opinions will usually end in a quagmire of subtle hypotheses. *If* it can be shown that Yockey was in fact embarrassed by his ancestry, it will be necessary to determine the percentage of influence to be assigned to that sentiment and *also* to (a) the authority of Spengler, (b) the political doctrine of Moeller, whom I shall mention in the next note, or any one of a score of writers connected with the National Socialist movement, (c) one or more of a hundred other books touching on this subject that Yockey may have read, (d) what he was taught in his youth and took for granted, (e) lectures that he may have heard at some time, (f) conversations with one or more respected friends, (g) veneration for writers of genius, such as Spengler and Montaigne, whose ancestry was to some extent tainted, (h) affection for respected friends of comparable ancestry, (i) consideration of the practical political problem I shall mention in the next note, (j) fear lest a scientific ethnology, recognizing a multiplicity of sub-races, would produce a hopeless multiplicity of subdivisions of the population, comparable to the jungle of sub-castes in India, as was, for example, predicted by Dr. Guido Landra when he attacked the basic National Socialist conception of race in his lectures in the University of Berlin in 1939, where, under Hitler, he enjoyed a freedom of speech that is denied to American biologists, even at Yale and Harvard, which were once respectable universities, (k) a publicist's desire to minimize potential obstacles to the European unity he wanted to promote, and (l) other possible influences that do not occur to my mind at the moment of writing.)

(26. *Imperium*, p. 275; the information comes from *The Decline of the West*, Vol. II, p. 119. Spengler's belief that such spurious (and inherently preposterous) data had been empirically verified was probably crucial in his thought, but there were many other influences, particularly the doctrine that a man may belong "spiritually" to a race or sub-race to which he does not belong biologically--a belief held by many of his contemporaries, notable Moeller, whose *Das Dritte Reich* (Hamburg, 1923) was a major source of National Socialism; see also H.-J. Schwierskott, *Arthur Moeller van den Bruck und der revolution,,re Nationalismus in der Weimarer Republic* (G"ttingen, 1962). The urge to minimize or conceal biological and even cultural differences is related to the practical problem that has confronted every ruler and statesman since Sumerian times: the need to create a state (which is necessarily territorial) by inducing some cohesive unity among the more or less diverse peoples who are residing in that territory at the time and whom it is not expedient to expel. This was an acute problem throughout Europe, including Germany, where the proverbial differences in temperament between the typical Prussian and the typical Bavarian could seem as great as a difference between major races to a population that had, for the most part, little contact with non-Aryan races

except the chameleon-like Jews with their racial ability to simulate the manners of other races when it is profitable to do so.)

(27. A typical example is a "study" concocted by one of Boas's creations, Dr. Ruth Benedict, whose *Patterns of Culture* (1934) purported to contain an "anthropological investigation" of the Zuñi Indians, who were a model of the perfect society, uncompetitive, deeply religious, peace-loving, totally egalitarian, sexually adjusted, etc. - all this put out as an object-lesson for the vile white Americans, whose vices deprived them of such bliss. Gullible Americans put their common sense in cold storage when they saw that the preposterous tale was told by a Ph.D. from Columbia and labeled "scientific." Virtually every significant statement in the book was found to be false by responsible investigators who actually observed the Zuñi (Esther Goldfrank, Florence Hawley Ellis, J.M. Roberts, William Smith, Li An-che, Philipp Farb, et al.), although they politely pretended to believe that Mrs. Benedict, Ph.D., did "inadequate field work," i.e., that she would have told the truth, had she not been incompetent, feckless, and irresponsible. I need not say that *Patterns of Culture* was cunningly adjusted to the opinions and superstitions prevalent in the 1930s and designed to benumb the minds of its readers.)

This attempt to minimize the biological nature of men is paradoxical in writers who not only recognize that the greater part of human conduct is determined by instincts and tropisms that are largely subconscious, but so restrict the function of reason as to make it virtually without effect on the course of history. We are told--and the proposition is illustrated by examples drawn from the history of our race--that great men, who determine events rather than chatter or write about them, have a 'tact' or instinct that enables them to make correct decisions with so little reliance on their rational powers that they may not know why they took the action that made them victorious or successful in a given undertaking. Their strength comes, not from superior powers of cognition and cogitation, but from a faith in their own destiny. The psychological problem cannot be analyzed here, (28) but if we accept the claim that even the greatest men are basically irrational, we thereby attribute to heredity an absolute power over human conduct, of which it becomes the sole determinant, since it is beyond question that in all mammals, including men, instincts are innate and genetically transmitted. The logical conclusion to be drawn from Spengler's psychology, therefore, is that biological race is supremely important. Granting that "the race one feels in oneself" is what counts, what one feels (as distinct from what one may simulate) is genetically determined.

(28. A good example may be seen in generals who are credited with genius, such as Napoleon and George Patton, who seem to make strategic and tactical decisions by some instinctive feeling for the situation and to take risks that make their staffs turn pale, but

are victorious because they either sensed or calculated the enemy's reactions more accurately than their subordinates. Before we assume that such men act by a super-rational instinct, we must be certain that what is involved is not a phenomenal power to solve extremely complex problems quickly--a power comparable in its way to the mental operations of a "lightning calculator," who performs complex arithmetical and mathematical calculations with an ease and rapidly that startle us, but who certainly does not know the answer by instinct. Hitler's decision to send troops into the Rhineland in 1936 over the protests of all his diplomats and generals, who predicted certain disaster, was once regarded as a proof of mystically intuitive powers, but we can now see that he estimated the political situation in France more accurately than his experts. Even so shrewd a psychologist as Jung was deceived by what was probably a strictly rational operation by an extraordinarily lucid mind.)

Yockey's denunciation of "materialistic race-thinking" does have some basis in the lamentably elementary state of our present knowledge of racial genetics, which may be compared to the state of chemical science at the death of Lavoisier. The natural laws that determine the inheritance of physiological characteristics, such as color of eyes or olfactory sensitivity, are fairly well ascertained, but we are far from being able to identify *racial* genotypes. The problem is of enormous complexity, and is further complicated by the migratory and adventurous proclivities of our own race. Everyone knows, for example, that the Chinese are Mongolians, but few know that even as relatively late as the Fourth Century there was at least one Chinese Emperor (Ming) who was evidently a Nordic, having blue eyes, blond hair, and a flowing yellow beard. Even these distinctive traits are not necessarily united--everyone has seen persons with blue eyes and black hair, for example--and no one should be astonished that we find in China portraits of men in whom "the flat face is Mongoloid, but the wide open eyes are Europoid." (29) There are many hybrids and racial traits often inextricable confused--a fact which greatly impresses thoughtless "intellectuals," who, if they had lived in the time of Lavoisier, would doubtless have clamored for legislation to forbid discrimination on the grounds that the four recognized elements, earth, air, fire, and water, are not found in a pure state, whence it follows that it is wicked to recognize differences between them and to bathe in water rather than in mud or a bonfire.

(29. The phrase is from Professor Otto Mänchen-Helfen's *The World of the Huns* (Berkeley, 1973), p. 372, where other examples of racial mixture in China in the early centuries of our era may be found.)

Although we can, within limits, determine the transmission and inheritance of physical traits, and although we know that intellectual

capacity, as shown by intelligence tests, is genetically determined, we know virtually nothing about the biological mechanism that transmit the almost infinitely complex elements of human consciousness and subconscious being. In certain instances, at least, the psychic elements may be independent of the strictly physiological. No anthropologist or geneticist can explain the fact that there are Jews, members of Yahweh's Master Race, who exhibit the physical characteristics of other races. The Jews in China, for example, seem to Western eyes, at least, indistinguishable from the Mongolians among whom they reside, although they are spiritually and mentally full members of the Self-Chosen People. We must assume that the Jews, who have preserved their racial identity and cohesion through so many centuries, have an empirical knowledge of genetics much greater than our own, but *our* knowledge is so limited that we can neither confirm nor disprove Dr. Alfred Nossig's terrifying boast, "A single little drop of Jewish blood influences the mentality of entire families, even through a long series of generations." (30)

(30. Although Nossig's *Intergrales Judentum* was published simultaneously in Vienna, Berlin, and New York in 1922, it is now extremely rare and has never been translated into English. Nossig gives his fellow Jews eminently practical advice on the ways by which they can most expeditiously attain the goal and purpose which, as he says, is implicit in the teachings of Moses, i.e., the formation of One World under their dominion. Recognizing that his race controls both Capitalism and Socialism, he calls for a co-ordinated application of both forces to put the *goyim* in their place--which, of course, will be good for the stupid animals, if they are docile. The statement I have translated occurs on p. 76, where Dr. Nossig goes on to claim that the "drop" of Jewish heredity, once implanted in an ancestor, will affect the brain cells (Gehirnganglien) of his descendants through many subsequent generations and thus make them susceptible to Jewish ideas of internationalism and One World. Persons of that infected heredity, therefore, are *goyim* who can readily be mobilized as auxiliaries and used to subjugate their own race and the entire globe to its destined Masers. *Horresco referens*.)

There is one great difference between Spengler's concept of race and Yockey's. Although Spengler recognizes the Jews as a Magian people imbued with a Magian world-outlook and so instinctively different from us (and therefore at the limit incomprehensible to us), and although he knows that this alien body, this international nation, is today, as it was for centuries before the Christian Era, lodged in all the nations of the world that it can profitably exploit, he regards the natural antagonism between Jews and their hosts as basically not determined by biological race, but rather by the phase of civilization, the Jews representing a Magian culture that is much older than ours and now petrified. (Hence, of course, Toynbee's description of the Jews as a "fossil people," despite the absurdity of applying such a phrase to a species that is so active and powerful and, quite possibly, has a vitality much greater than our own.)

Spengler asked his readers to believe that the Jews are a dwindling and disintegrating people, a negligible force in world politics and the struggle for power. I have always thought the Jews' aspersions of Spengler's memory a good example of their habitual ingratitude toward their most effective apologists.

Yockey, educated by events that Spengler did not live to see, regards the Jews as the dominant force in the world of 1952. He has very little to say, however, about their unvarying activity through all the centuries since they first appear in history, and he focuses his attention entirely on the present. We must therefore postpone consideration of it to a later section, and conclude our discussion of historical theory with notice of one crucial deficiency in both writers.

THE GREAT PSEUDO-MORPHOSIS

It is odd that Spengler, and even odder that Yockey, has so little to say about the prime example of what they call "pseudo-morphosis," the acceptance of an alien element by a young culture, which accordingly strives to make its *Weltanschauung* conform to a pattern that is repugnant to its inner nature. As we noticed above, Spengler's dichotomy between the "Apollonian" and the "Faustian" cultures makes him consider our Renaissance an example of such a cultural delusion, but although he recognizes the "Magian" culture as totally alien to our own, he never investigates a far more startling pseudo-morphosis, the imposition of a Magian religion on a Faustian people. And of all the writers who follow the Spenglerian conception, only Lawrence Brown had the very great merit of having perceived the tragic consequences of the fact that the culture of modern Europe was, at its very beginning, infected by a Levantine religion, so that it became "a society whose inward convictions have been at hopeless variance with the outward professions the events of history have forced it to make," thus producing a spiritual tension that "has destroyed the peace of mind of every able man in the West for a thousand years."

It is true that the Christianity of the West differed drastically from all the early Christian cults, including, of course, the one that in the Fourth Century made a deal with the despotic government of the decaying Empire

that was still called Roman, although the Romans, for all practical purposes, had long been extinct. What Spengler calls the Faustian soul surcharged that squalid religion with its own vision of the world, incorporating in the cult its own concepts of heroism, personal honor, chivalry, esteem of womanhood, delight in visual beauty (whether in women, in architecture, or in the mimetic arts), and love of magnificent poetry, together with the racial will-to-power--all elements which were unknown to, or expressly negated by, the holy books that Europe inherited from the mongrel proletariat of the rotting ancient world. The real scriptures of Western Christianity are not the alien Bible but the *Chanson de Roland*, *Tristan and Isolde*, the *Christias*, *Gersusalemme liberata*, *Paradise Lost*, and the many other epics and romances of a great and surpassingly beautiful tradition that ends with Tennyson's *Morte d'Arthur* and *Idylls of the King*--any one of which would have induced apoplexy in Tertullian, Jerome, Augustine, and the other ranting or gabbling "Fathers of the Church." (31) And the religion, thus made at some points consonant with the Aryan ethos, was permitted to absorb and claim a monopoly of the antecedent and in some respects higher morality of our race, and for a millennium the cult so dominated our culture that the West was Christendom. But like the proverbial house built on sand, the lofty and ponderous structure could not survive the collapse of its foundations. (32)

(31. To anyone who has the patience and equanimity to read judiciously a fair sampling of the verbose screeds collected in the three hundred and eighty volumes of Migne's *Patrologia*, the veneration long accorded to that motley rout of shysters, crackpots, and *hallucin,s* will seem unbelievable. For a concise conspectus of the character and activity of the "Fathers," see Joseph Wheless's excellent *Forgery in Christianity* (New York, 1930). Lying for the Lord is a normal exercise of piety.)

(32. The disintegration of a long-established tradition is always perilous to a civilized society and may be disastrous. I expressed a last hope that something could be salvaged from the ruin of the religion in a booklet, *Christianity and the Survival of the West*, written in 1969; it is now available in a second edition (with a new postscript, but with no change in the text) published in 1978 by Howard Allen Enterprises, Cape Canaveral, Florida.)

Western Christianity, unfortunately, was saddled with its Bible, which could not be discarded or ignored because it was believed to be an historical record of actual events. Indeed, it is probable that the principal reason why our ignorant ancestors accepted the religion of the dying empire they invaded and dismembered was that the religion differed from all others known to them by its simulation of historicity in its holy book,

which purported to describe events that had taken place in known parts of the world at specific times and had been witnessed by many persons, including the supposed narrators. (33) And the belief the book was a record of historical events cannot but have greatly--and tragically--affected the course of our civilization.

(33. A complementary cause was the impression produced on the invaders by the sumptuous architecture, superb engineering, beautiful literature, polished art, and elaborate social organization that had survived from earlier times in the decadent empire. There were minor causes, especially the verbal dexterity of Christian missionaries, to which some added a manual dexterity, as did St. Poppo, who used a well-known vaudeville trick to perform a miracle for Harald Blastand ("Bluetooth"), King of Denmark, and thus bring the heathen to Christ. Charlemagne's ruthless conquest of the Saxons seemed to credulous persons evidence of the superiority of his religion rather than of the military resources of his large kingdom.)

The Bible was an incubus of which Western Christianity could not rid itself. The collection of tales that had been thrown together at the end of the Third Century by feckless evangelists, who had been too negligent to edit out even the most glaring contradictions between or even within the pieces they selected with an eye on immediate marketing of salvation, had been made canonical by imperial decrees and pitiless persecution of the numerous Christian sects that had other gospels. (34) By the time that the cult had been accepted by most of the Nordic peoples, copies of the Latin text of "God's word" had been disseminated throughout Europe, and it was much too late to expurgate and amend the tales, let alone to assemble or compose a holy book more consonant with our racial psyche. And there were limits to the ability of even the cleverest theologian to twist the texts into a more acceptable form, unless he went so far as to pretend that the texts do not mean what they say, but are instead a kind of cryptogram with a hidden meaning, and that God's revelation was really a kind of puzzle-contest with eternal life as the grand prize for solving his conundrums and eternal torment the penalty for submitting an incorrect answer--and that would have permitted anyone to read into the text whatever allegorical meaning or mystical *soprasenso* was suggested by his imagination or ambition. The best that could be done was to make the doctrine and practices of the religion depend, not on the embarrassing and irreconcilable texts, but on the decisions of a Vicar of God who had ecclesiastic authority over all Christendom, although even his power was straitly limited by vested interests and prevailing superstitions. This device had many shortcomings, but it made possible the development of Western Christianity.

(34. The Christian sect that shrewdly made a political deal with the despots of the decaying empire was one that brought with it the Jewish Old Testament, and it used the military power it thus acquired to extirpate all the competing Christian sects, including the many that rejected the Jewish compilation or logically identified Yahweh with Satan. To what extent the wily Jews actively contributed to the triumph of a sect that ensured them a privileged position in society and endless profit (plus a chance to continue their habitual wailing about "persecution") is unknown. We need not regret the suppression of the Christian sects that practiced homosexuality, promiscuity, incest, and sacred anthropophagy, but it was a disaster that the "orthodox" were able to exterminate the Marcionists, who, though less fanatical and aggressive, may have been the largest of the various sects before piety was augmented by fire and sword. Marcion, although superstitious, was sufficiently clear-headed to perceive the utter incompatibility between the Jewish book and the doctrines of even the gospels that have been included by the "orthodox" in the New Testament part of their holy book; he was also revolted by the barbarous notion that a supposedly good god would have his own son killed. There were many other sects that rejected the Jewish pretensions. The Marcionists survived underground until at least the Fifth Century, when an "orthodox" poetaster, Prudentius, laments that the government had not yet been able to butcher all of them. Had Christianity reached us in the form of Marcionism or of one of the similar sects, it would be unnecessary for some of our contemporaries to devise ingenious sophistries to argue that the protagonist of the New Testament was not a Jew. Scores of gospels that the victorious faction did not succeed in entirely destroying have come to light in the papyri, and while they give us no high opinion of the intelligence of their superstitious authors, many of them would have served our people better than the ones that were included in the "orthodox" compilation.)

So long as the Papacy had the political power to exterminate dissenters, (35) the religion gave Europe a needed cultural unity, but by the Sixteenth Century the Protestants became bold enough to challenge the Vicar's authority by alleging the meanings they found in selected passages of the supposed Word of God, and numerous enough to enlist the support of ambitious princes who had armies of their own. That was the beginning of the end. A century of intensive butchery produced only a conclusive demonstration that the Christians' fierce God had become senile or cynical. He had been Johnny-on-the-spot when the Jews wanted to grab the country of the Canaanites, and he had even stopped the sun in its quotidian course above the flat earth at an elevation of about thirty thousand feet--stopped it to help his Chosen Bandits slaughter all the men, slaughter all the women, slaughter all the children, slaughter all the oxen, slaughter all the sheep, and slaughter all the asses: "all these they slew with the edge of the sword." But when the Antichrist appeared in person in Rome--or in Germany--and gobbled up souls by the thousand, Yahweh didn't lift a finger or even despatch a single archangel, let alone tamper with the solar system, to help his True Believers exterminate the Catholic or Protestant Children of the Devil. At the same time, increasing knowledge of the real world made the Christian myths incredible and ridiculous. The religion slowly reverted to the proletarian squalor of its origins, despite the efforts of "conservatives" to shore-up a time-honored tradition that seemed indispensable to the preservation of a civilized

(35. Heretics appeared constantly throughout the Middle Ages, but in groups small enough to be disposed of conveniently in holy bonfires, and only the Albigenses were numerous and rich enough to call for a full-scale Crusade. An interesting attempt to patch up the religion is provided by the only surviving copy of the *De duobus principiis*, which was discovered and published too recently to be mentioned in the usual handbooks. The anonymous author was repelled by the gross immorality of the Old Testament and he also saw the absurdity of the conventional Christian claim that a god who lacked either the power or the will to squelch the Devil was both omnipotent and just; in the second half of his tractate, however, he tries to salvage the portions of the New Testament that were emotionally satisfying to him. Better minds were also found during the Middle Ages, as is proved by the fame of the treatise *De tribus impostoribus*, which was attributed to Frederick II. Hohenstaufen and others who might have written it, but they were content to smile at the passionate votaries of the three impostors (Moses, Jesus, Mahomet) with equal disdain or compassion, and they prudently refrained from denouncing what Mellin de Saint-Gelays called "la cr,ance et estude/de l'ingorante et sottte multitude.")

(36. *Vulgus vult decipi, ergo decipiatur*, is a Mediaeval aphorism that was doubtless repeated by many enlightened ecclesiastics before Cardinal Caraffa and by some for reasons that transcended professional interests, but only after the seismic shock of the French Revolution did concern for the maintenance of the social order become a major consideration in persuading educated men to give outward adhesion to a cult in which they could not believe. It seems impossible to determine whether, as a general rule, "revealed" religions inhibit by fear more crimes than they incite by fanaticism, but, given the state of our society in the Seventeenth Century, the celebrated Cardinal Dubois may have been right when he asserted that a god is an indispensable bogeyman that must be flourished to scare the masses into a semblance of civilized behavior. That question, however, cannot concern us here, where it is irrelevant. We are men of the West, who cannot believe, while rational, that facts can be ascertained by deciding what is more useful socially or most strongly tickles our fancy.)

Even at its best, however, Christianity powerfully and, indeed, immeasurably distorted our culture.

As all educated men know, Christianity is essentially a Judaized version of Zoroastrianism, as is, in fact, implied in one of the accepted legends about the nativity of its Saviour God, at which Zoroastrian priests (Magi) are said to have been in attendance. The Zoroastrian cult, reputedly founded by a Zarathustra, who, as is *de rigueur* for all Saviours, was born of a divinely fecundated virgin (or, what is slightly more miraculous, from several virgins simultaneously), was the archetype of all the "universal religions," of which only Toynbee seems to have perceived the importance as a force that constricts and deforms a people's native culture. It introduced some very peculiar and epochal notions that have been

profoundly deleterious to all races influenced by them. We need mention only two cardinal points.

Zoroastrianism (and, of course, the Christian *rifacimento* of it) is a dualism that posits the existence of two extremely powerful gods, each of whom would be omnipotent but for the power of the other: a good god (Ahuramazda, Jehovah), who is engaged in a continuous war for supreme power with an *evil* god (Ahriman, Satan), with the odd consequence that although the good god is backed up by his presumably mighty son (Mithras, Jesus) and commands legions of doughty archangels, and the evil god can marshal legions of valiant devils, including *all* the gods previously worshipped by men, both antagonists need to recruit reinforcements from the puny race of mortals and accordingly struggle for the possession of individual souls. The cosmic conflict between the two gods is a desperate one, a holy war waged with all their resources and causing infinite devastation and suffering on earth, although, strangely enough, the result is a foregone conclusion and everyone knows that the good god will triumph in the end and spend the rest of eternity in joyously tormenting his captive adversary and all of that monarch's wickedly loyal and luckless followers.

This paradoxical and amazing dualism has infected all the thinking of our Western civilization, both religious and secular. (37) It has inspired an endless series of holy wars, not only to exterminate Protestants, Catholics, or other religious agents of Satan, but also, with equally frantic religiosity, to annihilate or enslave Satanically evil nations (in the United States, successively Southerners, Spaniards, (38) and Germans). I need not remark that the dualism has survived the superstitions about the supernatural from which it came and inspires ostensibly non-religious cults, as in the Marxists' holy war against the diabolically evil Capitalists or Fascists; and it goes without saying that when the zombies swarm out of the cesspools of Harvard or Yale to howl at Professor Jensen or Professor Shockley and prevent him from talking sense to such sane men as may remain in the academic ruins, the ignorant creatures feel that they are fighting the Devil and only their native cowardice prevents them from rending the learned men limb from limb in the faith that the facts of nature can thus be altered. (39) And, on the other hand, everyone can see that the missionaries who were once sent abroad to annoy the natives of Asia and Africa and "save souls" have been replaced by the far more pernicious gangs of "do-gooders," who plunder us for the benefit of "underdeveloped nations" and, in so far as they are not mere racketeers, must be buoyed up by a belief that they are commending themselves to a Jehovah in whom they no longer believe.

(37. It is true that today many Christians, who either do not read their holy book or read it in an emotional fog, sincerely believe that their religion is a monotheism, having been so persuaded by adroit theologians who exploit the prevalent notion that a monotheism is, for some reason, a "higher" or "purer" cult than a polytheism, thus catering to the interests of the Jews, who have claimed to be monotheists ever since they perceived, in the second and first centuries B.C., the enormous advantages of impudently claiming that their tribal deity, Yahweh, was the Providence, or *animus mundi*, of Graeco-Roman Stoicism. When the Christians began to deny the existence of Jupiter, Mars, Venus, Isis, Tanit, and all the innumerable other gods of the past, and to regard them as mere myths or illusions, they rejected the explicit testimony of the "Fathers of the Church," and of their holy book, which they thus denounced as unreliable. The religion could probably have survived that amputation, but when the Christians killed off Satan to make their religion really monotheistic, they made it intrinsically incredible. The resulting bankruptcy of the cult was wittily adumbrated by a French theologian (J. Turmel), whose urbane treatise was translated into English under the title, *The Life of the Devil* (New York, 1930), and published under a pseudonym, "Louis Coulange.")

(38. Some of the promoters of the Spanish-American War doubtless had the rational purpose of seizing Cuba, Puerto Rico, and other Spanish possessions for American expansion and colonization, but enthusiasm for the war was whipped up by proclaiming a *jihad*, as had been done in the unconscionable war of aggression against the Southern states. Spaniards were described as diabolic monsters of cruelty, and at least one military man attained great popularity when the press reported that he had promised to slaughter so many of the human devils that only Spanish would be spoken in Hell for the next fifty years. The prompt defeat of our hopelessly weaker opponent averted satisfaction of the Christian fanaticism and blood-lust that had been excited by the propaganda, but professions of a high moral purpose led the United States foolishly to throw away part of the spoils of the war it had won by "liberating" Cuba to make the aggression seem altruistic.)

(39. In England, Professor Eysenck, while lecturing on a strictly scientific topic that displeases Jews, was assaulted and severely injured by a swarm of vermin hatched out in the University of London.)

The Zoroastrian dualism makes weak minds susceptible to hallucinations by which they identify their interests or wishes with the cause of the Good God and excite themselves with a blind and deadly hatred of their opponents or rivals (who may have the same hallucination about them) as the innately evil agents of the Bad God, to be driven by any means, fair or foul, to the perdition to which they are damned. And nothing basic is changed by replacing Ahuramazda/Jehovah with an abstraction, such as "democracy," and replacing Ahriman/Satan with another, such as "aristocracy." (40) Ironically enough, this poisonous dualism, which came to us through the Jews, now dominates the reaction against Jewish overlordship, for most of the Jews' antagonists identify them as "the Synagogue of Satan" etc. *ad nauseam*, while those who do not, usually

regard the Jews as an inherently and almost praeternaturally evil people, instead of regarding them rationally as a specialized race which, being a minority among all the peoples on whom it is parasitic, has learned that its will-to-power must be advanced by cunning rather than undisguised force of its own--a race, furthermore, which quite naturally regards its own interests and purposes as just and justified by either a covenant with a deity or its own intellectual superiority, much as our ancestors felt no compunction as they took a continent away from the aborigines, confident in their own manifest superiority, although some of them were foolish enough to think that the Indians must have been inspired by the Devil to try to retain possession of their own hunting grounds. So long as our minds are clouded by the Zoroastrian myth, we shall be incapable of rational thought for our own survival.

(40. This particular form of the superstition is implicit in innumerable writings that distort history to fit some pattern of "social progress," but the reader will find both amusing and instructive an especially clear specimen, Frederic Huidekoper, *Judaism at Rome*, New York, 5th ed., 1883. That account of a struggle between the evil "aristocrats" and the pure-hearted "improvement party" (which, of course, was inspired and led by God's Race) represents, so to speak, the virus in its pure state.)

A second epochal innovation of Zoroastrianism was the bizarre notion of religious "conversion," of which the import is clearly seen in the tradition that Zarathustra's first convert was a Turanian, i.e., a Turko-Mongolian was transformed by psychic magic into an Aryan and more than an Aryan. By the simple act of believing the stories Zoroaster told him, that alien joined the Army of God and attained an exalted position to which Aryans could attain only by believing the same stories, while Aryans who were less easily captivated by evangelical rant remained servants of Satan, the deadly foes of God, and should be exterminated as soon as possible by the Aryans, Turanians, Mongols, Semites, and others whose minds had been opened to the Gospel. The obvious effect of this superstition was to destroy awareness of the biological fact of race and replace it with a delusion that could only hasten the Aryans' racial suicide. (41)

(41. Hastened, not initiated, because the men of our race, wherever in the world they have established themselves, cannot keep their hands off women of the native races. This lascivious fatuity, to be sure, is as universal as masculine lust, and a superior race may even regard indulgence in it as evidence of their own superiority. The great Egyptian king of the Twelfth Dynasty, Sesostris III. (Khakaure), who established border patrols to prevent the infiltration into Egypt of Nubians from conquered territory, in the very inscriptions in which he points out the racial inferiority of Blacks, boasts that he "captured their women" and "carried them off," doubtless into Egypt as slaves, not

foreseeing the terrible consequences of the inevitable miscegenation.)

The nonsensical notion that any anthropoid can be miraculously "converted" to "righteousness" by being made to believe the dualistic myth logically engenders a mystic yearning for "One World," in which massive slaughter of the wicked Unbelievers will force the survivors of all races to unite in worship of Jesus or Democracy and thus live in a Heaven on Earth. The fatuous dream of a potential spiritual unification accounts for the current use of the term "all mankind," which is intelligible only as parallel to such classifications as "all marsupials" or "all carnivores," with a mystical connotation that inspires unthinking awe in many of our contemporaries, and since the fantasy is, of course, biologically impossible, (42) some childish minds, perturbed by a glimpse of reality, fester until they reach the state of the famous expert on "Mental Health," Brock Chisholm, whose diseased mind lusted for the extermination of white men so that the whole globe could be inhabited only by coffee-colored and mindless mongrels made righteous by their equality in squalor.

(42. No one should ever have been so credulous as to believe the claims of missionaries that they "saved souls" by transforming savages or Orientals into Christians. All that the holy men accomplished by harangues and bribery (supplemented by the incontestable superiority of our hated race which was made manifest in such things as repeating rifles and the disciplined courage of British regiments) was to induce an outward assent to statements that the native mind was innately incapable of comprehending and translated into ideas acceptable to brains of quite different formation from ours. It was natural and inevitable that when the savages saw our race become so lunatic as to surrender its colonial possessions, the "Christianity" of those who did not at once revert to their native cults became what they had always understood it to be, a special kind of mumbo-jumbo. For a convenient survey of those developments, see *Postchristianity in Africa*, by G.C. Oosthuizen, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1968. This "anthropological" study is the more instructive because it is written by a Christian, who naturally cannot understand the real causes of the events he describes.)

Belief in the psychic magic of "conversion, furthermore, opened the way for the Bolshevism that attained its fullest development in Christianity, the devastating notion that Faith--a faith that is as thoughtless and preferably as unconscious as the "faith" of a vegetable or a mustard seed--was what counted, so that an ignorant peasant, an illiterate fisherman, or the most scurvy proletarian could make himself the superior of the noblest, the bravest, and the wisest of men--and, secure in the favor of a god who so hates learning and reason that he will "make folly the wisdom of this world," the simpletons and morons, having become True Believers, can

look forward to the delights of seeing, when the last have been made first, their betters suffer the most atrocious torments forever and forever. No idea, no menticial poison, could be more effective in destroying the culture and even the sanity of the people in whom it has been injected. (43) And the poison, destructive of all social stability and hence of civilization itself, survived the mythology from which it sprang and persists today in the atheistic "Liberals" who bleat about the "underprivileged," fawn on savages, and demand an "open society" that is perpetually stirred up so that the dregs on the bottom may become the scum on the top.

(43. How alien this nonsense was to the mentality of our race is shown by the fact that, professing to believe it, they promptly began to reason about Faith and erected the vast intellectual structure of Scholasticism, "comme si raison et foi pouvaient trotter de concert," as Maurice Garçon sardonically comments. The final result, of course, was Nominalism and the labefaction of the Mediaeval *Weltanschauung* and eventually of the alien religion that had been incorporated in it.)

Having noticed these two cardinal elements of Zoroastrianism and the religions derived from it, we need not mention others, for the vital historical question is whether this pernicious cult was Aryan in its origins or a device of aliens. To be sure, it became the religion of the Persians. It was the religion of Darius the Great, who boasted that he was an "Aryan of the Aryans" and modestly attributed his victories to the help of Ahuramazda. It was the religion of his son, Xerxes, whose mind was so blighted by fanaticism that he boasted that he had destroyed the temples on the acropolis at Athens, where the Greeks worshipped nasty devils, and had commanded the benighted Greeks to worship his One True God. (44) It is also true that all the early legends about Zarathustra state or imply that he was an Aryan, although it may be significant that his miraculous nativity is said to have occurred in many different places, and that he is always described as an itinerant prophet who was not a native of the region in which he began to proclaim his gospel and salvage men's souls. What is even more remarkable, the only name that the Zoroastrian cultists gave themselves in the time of the Persian Empire, so far as we know, was *Airyavo danghavo*, words which literally mean "the Aryan peoples." That presumptuous appellation is obviously false in an ethnic sense, for it excludes the Aryan peoples of India, who were specifically damned as the worshippers of devils, and includes the many non-Aryans who elected to be Saved and join the Elect by believing or pretending to believe Zarathustra's evangels. If the term the Magi chose for their cult was not just an impudent falsehood, it must have originated in a calculated use of *arya* (45) in its non-racial sense, "noble, excellent": since worshippers of

the good god must be good people morally superior, they could be called "the excellent people." That would make the name comparable to the famous verbal trick by which the "Fathers of the Church," in a time of military supremacy, called their motley followers "soldiers of Christ," so that non-Christians could contemptuously be called "pagans" (pagani, "peasants, yokels"). (46)

(44. Xerxes does not specifically mention Athens, perhaps because the name might carry an impious suggestion that God must have been taking a nap when the Greeks, though hopelessly inferior in numbers and resources, destroyed his navy and sent him scuttling back across the Hellespont, but the allusion is unmistakable. The text of his inscription (transliterated from the cuneiform into Roman characters) may conveniently be found in Professor Roland G. Kent's *Old Persian*, New Haven, 1953.)

(45. I give the well-known Sanskrit form, whence comes our 'Aryan'; in Avestan, the dialect of the Zoroastrian holy book, the word becomes *airya*, as in the phrase I quoted above.)

(46. Originally a *paganus* was an inhabitant of a rural district (pagus) as distinct from a townsman at a time when all prosperous landowners in the countryside were citizens of a town, so that it had about the connotation of our 'rustic.' In the later part of the First Century it acquired the meaning of 'civilian, common man' (exclusive of persons of any social distinction) and was often contrasted with *miles* ('soldier'); in the later Empire, agents of the secret police, who disguised themselves as individuals of the lower classes, went about *pagano ritu*, i.e., as 'plainclothesmen.' But under the Dominate, the status of the countryfolk (pagani in the first sense of the word) progressively declined to serfdom, hence the particular force of the "Fathers' " propagandistic word. The trick is disguised by the Christian explanation that "pagan" beliefs lingered longest in the countryside, which does have a certain basis in fact (countryfolk, perforce, remain close to nature), but should not blind us to the origin of the religious meaning in clever propaganda.)

The Zoroastrian dualism was accepted by the Aryans of Persia, (47) who vehemently repudiated their own, presumably Vedic, gods, much as Christianity was accepted by the Nordic peoples of Europe, who repudiated Odin, Thor, and their other gods as evil agents of Satan. Christianity was, of course, an Oriental cult, and the analogy makes it difficult to believe that its Zoroastrian antecedent was natively Aryan.

(47. It would be interesting but futile to speculate about the use of hallucinatory drugs to spread the Gospel. The Zoroastrian *haoma* has been identified by R. Gordon Wasson

(Soma, Divine Mushroom of Immortality, The Hague, 1968) as a drink made from the *Amanita muscaria*, one of the mushrooms that are used throughout the world to produce religious experiences and visions of God. On its use when the early Christians symbolically ate the flesh of their god, see John Allegro, *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross*, New York, 1970--a most informative study, although etymologies from the Sumerian and later languages are probably overworked. In our own time, as it well known, drugs are used by the more enterprising evangelists to induce piety in the victims they collect in colonies of fanatical bands.)

There are many indications that it was not. Much of the evidence is too intricate to be discussed here, and it will suffice to mention a few essentials. The name of the Saviour, however it should be spelled (Zarathustra, *Zaratost*, *Zaratast*, etc.), is not readily explicable as Indo-European and may come from another language. There is reason to believe that the cult's holy book, the *Avesta* (a title which may not be Indo-European), was not composed in Persian, but was translated into a late Persian dialect from another, probably Semitic, language. (48) It is even possible that in the time of Darius the sacred language of the Zoroastrian scriptures and the liturgies recited by the Magi was Semitic, for the Persian Empire had three official languages, Old Persian, the native language of the rulers, Elamite, respected for its antiquity and still spoken at Susa, and Aramaic, the Semitic language which was most widely known throughout Persian territory and outside it, and which, accordingly, was the language commonly used by the Persians in the administration of their empire and in diplomatic correspondence with other nations. Before the extant text of the *Avesta* was written down, (49) the Greeks of the Hellenistic Age who interested themselves in the "Persian" religion found only texts in Aramaic, the language spoken by the Zoroastrian priests of their time, (50) and it is obviously possible that some of those texts were the originals, dating from the time of the Persian Empire, and not translations, as is generally supposed.

(48. This was known to Spengler (Vol. II, p. 168), who relies on scholars in the field who are cited in the article to which he refers in a footnote. The linguistic evidence is tangled, but Avestan, the dialect of the *Avesta*, is related to Old Persian, the language of the Persian emperors, much as the various Prakrits are related to Sanskrit, and the natural inference is that Avestan is a broken-down and late form of Old Persian, rather than an early dialect of some region (Bactria?) or an hypothetical brogue of the Medes. It does resemble the decadent Persian of the last days of the Empire, which, however, is centuries earlier than the date to which most scholars (e.g. Darmesteter in the concluding part of the introduction to the third volume of his version of the *Zend-Avesta*) assign the extant text of the *Avesta*. To my mind, that is conclusive. Granting that some of the *gathas* in the *Avesta* probably represent statements actually made by the prophet known as Zarathustra, it does not follow that the statements were made in Avestan. It is likely that many of the statements in the New Testament were actually made by one or another of the various Jesuses of whom the protagonist is a composite figure, but no one would

believe that those agitators spoke in Greek to the Jewish rabble.)

(49. In the First Century, according to Darmesteter, whom I cited above. Other scholars would place it in the first century B.C., i.e. at the *end* of the Hellenistic Age and, of course, later than the Greek authors in question.)

(50. See J. Bidez & F. Cumont, *Les Mages hellenis, s*, Paris, 1973 (=1938), especially pp. 35, 88-91; cf. pp. 34, 44. The English translation of Cumont's *Oriental Religions* now in print dates from 1911, and is naturally less complete than his fourth edition (Paris, 1929); in the translation, he notes that the Zoroastrian texts were in Aramaic, but by an odd slip he speaks in one passage as though the Aramaic-speaking evangelists were Persians, although he must know better. This is corrected in his fourth edition.)

There is one significant datum which seems not to have been given the emphasis it deserves. As everyone knows, Zoroastrian priest were always called Magi, but *Magi* was not originally a word of religious meaning: it was an ethnic term that designated a certain peculiar people who lived in Media but were in some way distinct from the ordinary Medes, and during the early centuries of Zoroastrianism *only* men of that peculiar tribe could be priests and their sacred office could be transmitted *only* by hereditary descent through females. (51) That fact is as startling as though in the Roman Catholic Church the *only* word for a priest was 'Irishman,' and during the Middle Ages *only* pure-blooded Irish (i.e., having an Irish mother as well as father) could perform sacraments. The word *Magi*, I believe, creates a very strong presumption that the propagators of the religion were not Aryans. (52) It may be only a coincidence that according to a tradition in the Jews' holy book (53) which seems to have an historical basis in events that took place before the time of Zarathustra, colonies of Jews had been planted "in the cities of Media." But since forgery and imposture have always been normal Jewish devices, no weight can be given to their claim that Zarathustra was a Jew and wrote in Hebrew. (54)

(51. Hence their famous custom of engendering offspring by sexual intercourse with their mothers or, if that was not possible, with sisters.)

(52. This must be distinguished, of course, from the custom, common among the Greeks, by which the priest of a local temple or shrine was a descendant of the family on whose land the sanctuary was built, and also from the formation of a caste of professional holy men, such as the Brahmanas of India.)

(53. 4 *Reg.* (= 2 *Kings*), 17.6 & 18.11.)

(54. See the texts translated from the Syriac by Bidez & Cumont, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 103-104, 129, 131, and the texts cited in their Vol. I, p. 50, nn. 3,4. At the date it was made, the Jews' claim that Zarathustra was a Jew was doubtless just a normal part of what the authors, apropos of an impudent attempt to appropriate the Etruscans, call "la propagande juive pour imposer aux paiens se croyances" (Vol. I, p. 238), although the purpose more commonly may have been to bamboozle ignorant *goyim* by making them believe in the vast superiority of Yahweh's Master Race. The Christians naturally forged ahead in much the same way and concocted "proof" that Zarathustra had been a prophet of the advent of their Jesus; see, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 118, 127, 130, 135.)

The really fundamental and cogent consideration is the enormous difference between the "universal" religion and the spirit of all the certainly Aryan religions of which we know, especially the Vedic, the Greek, and Norse, which we know in detail. The discrepancy is so great that even Toynbee felt obliged to conjecture that Zarathustra (whom he accepts as an Aryan) must have been instigated by a Jew. (55)

(55. *A Study of History*, Vol. I, p. 81, n. 1.)

The very idea of *evil* gods is alien and repugnant to the spirit of all authentically Aryan religions, which are never so irrational as to inject good and evil deities into a universe in which the very concepts of moral 'good' and moral 'evil' are indubitably created by human societies for their own purposes and correspond to nothing whatsoever in the world of nature. Wickedness can exist only within a given society of human beings and can be defined only in terms of the standards of morality that the society more or less instinctively applies to relationships among its own members. Only infantile minds can attribute moral iniquity to hurricanes, volcanoes, dynamite, and other natural phenomena that may be baneful to us; primitive peoples, ignorant of the causes, may superstitiously attribute such phenomena to supernatural forces and may imagine gods that are indifferent to human welfare or have been angered by some supposed offense, but so long as they have a vestige of rationality they will not imagine gods who are inherently evil and seeking to promote wickedness. A notion that species of animals (e.g. snakes, sharks, tigers) that defend

themselves against us or prey on us, or that species of human beings that pursue their own advantage to our detriment (e.g. Japanese, Jews) are wicked because they obey the universal law of life is simply irrational. And when a pack of fanatics claims that all persons who do not share their superstitions are diabolically evil, they are insane, prevalent as that form of insanity may be. The Zoroastrian dualism may fairly be called the most devastating mental disease that ever became epidemic on this planet.

The Aryan religions are not infected by that black delusion. (56) Their gods, like the forces of nature, are multiple and, as is only reasonable, are sometimes opposed to one another in their relations with mortals. Venus and Juno may each work against the other, just as every day the force of sexual attraction enters into conflict with the requirement of sexual fidelity that makes marriage an indispensable social institution. In the great epic of our race, the *Iliad*, which deals with a war to the death between the Achaeans and the Trojans, some of the Greek gods favor one nation while other Greek gods favor the enemies of the Greeks. No Greek was so irrational as to believe there was only one god and then say "Gott mit uns!" as Christians do when they embark on holy wars against one another. In the Norse religion, the Aesir and Vanir are united in Asgard, but often at odds with one another, as are the forces of nature to which mortals are subject. The Aryan mind could never, of its own accord, have conceived of so monstrous an inversion of religion as appears in the mad fanaticism of the Zoroastrians, who converted the Aryan gods of the Vedas into fiends, and of the Christians, who converted the gracious gods of the Graeco-Roman pantheon into malevolent devils.

(56. A conspectus of the basic concepts of Aryan religions may be found in the admirably concise work of Professor Hans G□nther, available in an English version by Vivian Bird and Roger Pearson, *The Religious Attitudes of the Indo-Europeans*, London, 1967. I am aware of the danger that we may identify as characteristically Aryan the qualities that we, as Aryans, admire, but a certain objectivity may be attained by considering what is admired in the great literatures of our race.)

The Aryan were not so foolish as to imagine that their gods were omnipotent; their gods are far more powerful than we, but they too are subject to Destiny, the impersonal force that is inherent in the structure of the physical world. They were not so credulous as to mistake the ravings of an *hallucin*, or the sophistries of a theologian for revelations of truth: they had no gospels, and every one knew that poets and skalds were free to invent or modify stories about the gods that might be no more or less truthful than folktales. The Aryans did not have the hatred of civilized life that inspires the dualists' notion of Faith, a blind belief in certain tales by

which ignorance and credulity are exalted above learning and reason. The Aryans respected the gods they imagined, but with a manly self-respect also; they did not cringe and cower before celestial despots, as do races with the slave-mentality and *Sklavenmoral* of the Near East.

The Aryan spirit is innately aristocratic and heroic. Aryan man, when he is most fully Aryan, is driven by a *spiritual* passion to excel, (57)--to realize, at whatever cost to himself, whatever capacity for greatness he may have within him. And while he rationally expects to find perfection in gods and men no more than in the world of physical reality, he has innately certain ideals of personal honor, fairness, and *manly* compassion that are incomprehensible to other races. (58) Both of these characteristics, however, although they are the source of all the greatness our race has attained, make Aryans vulnerable. The very superiority of men who approach our racial ideal makes it easy for a parasitic race or our own criminal elements to rouse against us the inferior's resentment of superiority and to excite envy and malice in proletarian herds, thus disrupting our society in what Ortega y Gasset calls, "the revolt of the underman." And artful appeals to our sense of fairness and compassion can excite, especially in females, the irrational sentimentality that ignores the fact that a cohesive society is an organism and, like all organisms, can live only by excreting its waste products--the grim fact that, by the unalterable laws of biology, we, like all mammals, bring to birth biological tares and misfits, which must be eliminated, if the species is not to degenerate to eventual extinction. And what the struggle for life does automatically for other mammals, our species, being capable of reason and purposeful social organization, must do deliberately--or perish.

(57. As in *Iliad*, VI. 208, perhaps the most memorable line of our great epic, which is repeated at XI. 784.)

(58. An excellent work, which will enable us to see ourselves as others see us, is Maurice Samuel's *You Gentiles* (New York, 1924; recently reprinted). Jews feel only contempt for a race so mentally inferior that its men prefer to meet their enemies in a fair fight instead of stabbing them in the back when off their guard or giving them a poisoned cup under the guise of friendship. And if we consider the matter objectively, they may be right: "c'est la sup,riorit, de ma race sur la v"tre: la v"tre mourra, la mienne durera." FarrŠre formulated the only biologically valid criterion of superiority. I remember an erudite Jewish professor who *could* not perceive that a chivalrous respect for valiant and honorable opponents differed from the pawkish notions about forgiveness set forth in some parts of the New Testament medley. Apropos of the hoax about the "six million" that the Jews are using to bleed the Germans whom we conquered for them, he said, with arrogant candor, "The stupid Christians forgive enemies, by WE exact vengeance to the last drop of their blood." Whether he is correct in his confidence in his race's superiority, the future will determine--probably the near future. The other races, needless to say, also

despise us for our indulgence toward them, each in terms of their own standards, and eagerly look forward to the ruin we seem determined to bring upon ourselves.)

The Christian version of the Zoroastrian dualism was Judaized, and Ahuramazda was replaced by the Jews' tribal god, Yahweh. As a result, our race lived for centuries in terror of the capricious and ferocious deity of the Old Testament, and no phrase is more common in the harangues of our holy men than "fear of God." Christians had to believe they were at the mercy of the supernatural monster who, for example, deliberately alienated the mind of an unnamed Egyptian king so that he would have an opportunity to afflict the whole of the obviously innocent population of Egypt with every imaginable disease, plague, and disaster, even murdering the Egyptians' children, so that his pet Jews could gloat over the torments of the *goyim*, who were evidently made so imbecile by their suffering that they permitted the Jews to "borrow" all their valuable property, gold, silver, jewels, and even wearing apparel, and then run away with the loot. Yahweh, naturally, repealed the law of gravity long enough to permit the swindlers to escape with the stolen property and to set a trap to destroy more *goyim*. And the terrible deity is credited with many similar exploits, all as vicious and immoral from every point of view, except, of course, that of the Jews who created him in their own image. And thoughtful Christians could derive little reassurance from their theologians' story that the savage god had finally repented of his blunder in picking the Jews as his pets, for a thoughtful man must quail before the appalling malevolence of the Jewish hymn of hate that closes the New Testament and is the Christians' favorite horror-story.

Thinking men were equally depressed to learn from that New Testament that Yahweh, having repented of one blunder and decided to let his erstwhile pets kill his son, bestowed his divine favors on the very dregs of a squalid, ignorant, and dirty population in Palestine to emphasize his new commands, which, quite logically, make Believing Christians dote on everything that is lowly, inferior, debased, diseased, deformed, and degenerate.

For Aryans, including, of course, the Germanic peoples who invaded the moribund Empire that had once been Roman, Christianity has been a deadly and perhaps fatal poison, a delusion that forced our people to act against the dictates of their own biological nature. (59) If ever in recorded history there was a cultural pseudo-morphosis, that was it.

(59. Christianity was also deleterious to our race biologically, but we cannot measure or even estimate its dysgenic effect. It certainly encouraged the preservation and

reproduction of the unfit, and, through both monasticism and the distribution of social rewards, it inhibited the reproduction of superior men and women. Having given the Jews a privileged position and enriched them, it facilitated Jewish penetration of our society by a common ruse: Aryan males were hooked by offering them smiling Jewesses with generous or lavish dowries; the Jewesses, although perfunctorily sprinkled with holy water, had naturally been taught by the inspiring examples of Esther and Judith that their loyalty was to their race, not to the *goy* whose bed they shared and whom they would manipulate in the interests of their kind. A Jewish strain, conceivably as potent as Dr. Nossig claimed (see note 30 above), was thus planted in many gentle, noble, and even royal families and may, as some believe, account for their decadence, both mental and physical, as frequently occurs when incompatible genetic strains are combined. But statistics on all these points are lacking, and if we had them, we should only face the impossible task of measuring what happened against what would have happened, if Europe under the Germanic peoples had adopted some other (what other?) religion or religions. Charles Renouvier's *Uchronie* (Paris, 1876) will sufficiently entertain and discourage those who *must* speculate about the incalculable.

An anonymous writer in *Instauration* (Aug. 1980) sought to explain psychologically one of the most drastic and puzzling effects of Christianity on our race and civilization. When our ancestors accepted the Magian cult, they believed themselves at the mercy of a capricious and ferocious god whom they had to appease and placate by observing absurd taboos and imposing on themselves unnatural conduct their racial instincts rejected. Thus they had a sense of guilt without consciously knowing why. By not sinning in the eyes of Yahweh, they were sinning against themselves. They were *biologically* guilty. From this inner conflict,--from the subconscious mind's reaction to the perpetual conflict between the innate nature of a healthy Aryan and the conduct his Christian or "Liberal" superstitions require of him,--comes the maddening sense of personal and racial guilt that has been for centuries and is today a black and monstrous incubus on the minds of our race. This explanation may well be right.)

SPENGLER VS. YOCKEY

I have tried above to exhibit briefly the magnitude of the cultural distortion that is overlooked by both Spengler and Yockey, although, according to their own doctrines, it was the imposition on the Faustian soul of a Magian ideology, the product of a totally alien civilization. Spengler, however, who goes almost as far as Toynbee in regarding the Jews as a "fossil people," can be defended on the grounds that he regards the Faustian culture of the West as one that arose, around the year 900, among the dominant peoples who then lived in Europe, regardless of ethnic diversities or innate racial characteristics, and that Christianity was simply an element that entered into that culture. From that standpoint, our culture, whether for better or worse, was as naturally and inevitably Christian as Napoleon was a Corsican. To ask what our civilization would have been like without Christianity is like asking what George

Washington would have become, had he been born of different parents. Our estimate of Spengler's historiography will therefore depend on our acceptance or rejection of (a) his conception of a culture as largely independent of biological race, and (b) his assumption that the Jews as such, have had no great influence over our history.

For Yockey, no such apology will serve. He follows Spengler, it is true, in his general doctrine of race, but he attributes to the Jews, whom he frequently designates as the "culture-distorters," a vast and decisive influence over our recent history, and since he does not claim that their baneful power is a recent phenomenon, he must logically believe that it has been exercised against us in earlier centuries. If he is to give us a philosophical comprehension of the historical process, he must explain the nature, origin, and development of that power--and obviously such an explanation must include consideration of the effects of Christianity on both our people and the Jews who, for purposes that Yockey recognizes as hostile, lived among them.

As I have said before, I come neither to praise nor to bury Yockey, but merely to evaluate his work. It is clear, I believe, that as an exegesis of historical causality, *Imperium* and, of course, its sequel are radically defective, even in terms of their own premises. They have other values. I have always believed that *Imperium* was enlightening and even inspiring reading for young men and women whose minds have not been irremediably blighted by the denaturing superstitions inculcated in the public schools. And both books are studies of politics, in the original and proper sense of that word, not as it is used in our great ochlocracy in reference to the periodic popularity-contests between Tweedledum and Tweedledee which many Americans find as exciting as baseball games.

PART II

ONE EUROPE

There is a modicum of truth in the frowsty verbiage about "One World" that used to excite women's clubs. It has always been obvious that there is

only one earth, (1) but although an educated Roman in the first century B.C. could dream of a day when the invincible legions would add even China to the Empire, (2) he could also think of the *oecumene*, the inhabited part of the globe, as consisting, for all practical purposes, of the Roman Empire and the territories bordering on it. He was secure in the confidence that whatever happened in more distant regions, such as China and India, could have no possible effect on *his* world, except, perhaps, on the importation of rare luxuries and curiosities.

(1. Since the very foundation of our rational thought is our perception of our place in the universe, it is worthy of note that only in 1978 did it become absolutely certain that the one earth is also unique. Fontenelle's *Entretiens sur la pluralit, des mondes* in 1686 made popular the romantic fancy, which had been entertained speculatively by some Greek philosophers of Antiquity, that there were many planets that were doubtless inhabited by beings like ourselves. With the advance of astronomical knowledge, the possibilities were reduced to two planets in our solar system, Venus and Mars, and it was only when the surfaces of both had been clearly photographed that we knew how terribly alone we are in the universe. Some of our tender-minded contemporaries now console themselves with speculations about hypothetical inhabitants of hypothetical planets that may circle about some stars. Quite aside from the practical considerations that a space-craft, such as landed men on the moon, could not reach the nearest star in less than 700,000 years, this is sheer phantasy. As was concisely stated by the distinguished Australian biologist, Sir John C. Eccles, "there is no evidence that life started more than once" in the entire universe, and "the chances of rational beings existing elsewhere in the universe are so remote as to be out of the question." This fact, as significant in its way as the Copernican revolution, will profoundly affect our whole Weltanschauung in coming decades.)

(2. E.g., Lucan, I. 19.)

The technological achievements of our race, which made us masters of the entire globe until we succumbed to a fit of suicidal mania, did produce, around the beginning of the Nineteenth Century, "one world," in the sense that events anywhere on the planet did affect in some way the interests of the great colonial empires of Britain, France, and Spain and might vitally concern some of the other Aryan nations, such as Germany and the United States. The peoples of other races were merely raw material; they occupied their territories on our sufferance, either because it would not be economically profitable for us to dispossess them or because the reciprocal jealousies of the colonial powers made a war between Aryan nations the price of annexing China or Morocco. And since our race seemed to be healthy, it was only reasonable to foresee that, with our continued progress and expansion, the lower races would, in the course of nature, become extinct. (3)

(3. Charles Darwin to W. Graham, 3 July 1881: "Remember what risk the nations of Europe ran, not so many centuries ago, of being overwhelmed by the Turks, and how ridiculous such an idea now is! The more civilised so-called Caucasian Races have beaten the Turkish hollow in the struggle for existence. Looking to the world at no very distant date, what an endless number of the lower races will have been eliminated by the higher civilised races throughout the world.")

Until 1914, no fact was more obvious than that the power-structure of the world, after the decline of Spain, depended on the three great nations of Europe, Britain, France, and Germany, with two outlying states, Russia and the United States, available as auxiliaries to one or the other of the three. It is true that beneath this structure there was a disquieting fact: seventy years before, Benjamin D'Israeli had emphatically warned Europeans that race was the basis of civilization, that "there is only one thing that makes a race, and that is blood," that all the nations of Europe were covertly under the control of the Jews, and that the "destructive principle," which was being used stealthily to undermine our civilization, was "developing entirely under the auspices of the Jews." (4) Only a very few members of our race were sufficiently alert to understand what he had told them in the clearest possible terms. And thirty years before 1914, Friedrich Nietzsche had clearly foreseen that Europe faced "a long series of catastrophes" and "wars such as the world has not yet seen," had perceived that our civilization was suffering from a degenerative disease of both intellect and will, and had identified the deadly infection as a superstition that the Jews had devised and disseminated to poison our minds and souls. (5) Only a few men of philosophical intellect understood him. Not only the masses, of whom rational thought for the future is not to be expected, but almost all of the persons who thought of themselves as an aristocracy or a learned elite were sunk in an euphoric complacency, believing in an effortless and automatic "progress" and the Jewish economic system in which money is the only value of human life.

(4. *Coningsby* (1844) and *Endymion* (1880) are novels, but, as D'Israeli (who changed his name to Disraeli) explained in a preface to the former, they are political discourses put into the form which "offered the best chance of influencing public opinion." The same views were expressed in many of his speeches, both in and outside of Parliament. Some persons, notably Douglas Reed in his last and posthumous book, *The Controversy of Zion* (Durban, South Africa, 1978; available from Liberty Bell Publications), believe that D'Israeli, who professed to be a Christian, was sincerely trying to warn his contemporaries in Britain of the menace that would eventually destroy them. Others note that he always received massive support from the Jews in England and elsewhere, and especially from the Rothschilds when he made his dramatic gesture of buying control of

the Suez Canal and then selling it to Great Britain when the British government could raise the money. He may have told the truth about race as a calculated gambit, feeling certain that the British were too stupid to understand. He was not in any sense a defector from his race, which he described as the true "aristocracy of the world," but he courteously told his British hosts that their race could aspire to equality with his. He thus inspired the absurd myth of "British Israel," the preposterous notion that the British (but not other Aryans) were the Israelites of the "Old Testament" and should reunite with their fellow Jews to rule the world. Even those who believe that D'Israeli assimilated, rather than simulated, British culture have to admit that he, who became the Earl of Beaconsfield in the British (!) peerage and Prime Minister to Queen Victoria, opened the way to power for the most vicious of England's resident enemies. See below, pp. 66f., and the analysis of his political activities by Rudolf Craemer, *Benjamin Disraeli* (Hamburg, 1940.)

(5. Also *sprach Zarathustra* was published in 1883-84, and *Zur Genealogie der Moral*, the most incisive of the later works, appeared in 1887. Note that Nietzsche, like all of his contemporaries, took it for granted that the world belonged to the European race, which was menaced only by the rotting of its own moral fibre, not by external enemies. He was, of course, right at that time. For a suggestive discussion of the folly that led to the suicide of Europe, see the work by Luis Djez del Corral that is available in H.V. Livermore's excellent translation, *The Rape of Europe* (London, 1959).)

In 1914, our civilization was worm-eaten at the core, but its brightly glittering surface concealed the corruption within from superficial eyes. It was taken for granted that the globe had become one world, the world of which the Aryan nations were the undisputed masters, while all the lesser races already were, or soon would become, merely the subject inhabitants of their colonial possession. This reasonable conception of the world's unity oddly survived the catastrophes that followed and it conditioned unthinking mentalities to accept the preposterous notions of the current propaganda for "One World," which is couched in endless gabble that is designed to conceal the fact that it is to be a globe under the absolute and ruthless dominion of the Jews--a globe on which our race, if not exterminated, will be the most degraded and abject of all.

The apparent unity of the globe when it was under the dominion of our race depended, as must all rule, on military power, but it was so contentedly accepted by the other races in the various colonies because our power was proof of a biological superiority that was evident in the discipline of our troops and the courage, intelligence, and moral integrity of our men. (6) It was therefore a function of a biological unity that was only belatedly perceived by our people, and even then only by the few men who were able and willing to study the hidden foundations on which the imposing structure of power really rested, notably the Comte de Gobineau and Vacher de Lapouge. The reality of race was generally overlooked because men took the innate superiority of Europeans so for

granted that they thought it unnecessary to mention it and instead concentrated their attention on the rivalries and antagonisms that divided the great powers of Europe, assuming that a shift in the balance of power in Europe would automatically be a shift in power over the entire globe. Ignoring D'Israeli's blunt statement that "language and religion do not make a race," men generally thought in geographic terms: Europe was a region with odd prolongations to Canada, Australia, the United States, and other lands possessed by a European people.

(6. General Hilton, in his *Imperial Obituary* (Devon, Britons, 1968), remarks on the very significant fact that during the Pax Britannica an English gentleman, if he ran short of funds anywhere in the world, could borrow money from a native shopkeeper or man of means without difficulty, since there was never doubt about his absolute integrity and hence the certainty of repayment. When he was in Tibet, a region seldom visited by outsiders, the abbot of a Buddhist monastery unhesitatingly lent him 700 rupees--a large sum for the time and place--although his only security was trust in a British gentleman's honor. General Hilton's analysis of the causes of Great Britain's suicide is one of the most important documents of our time.)

It is not easy to determine when our people first became aware that Europe was inhabited by men who differed generically from the inhabitants of other parts of the world. The perception seems to have evolved slowly from the effective unity of Europe created by the preservation of Latin as the common language of educated men, which, in turn, depended on the religious unity of Western Christianity. A very clear statement of it appears in a discourse by Pope Urban II in 1095, reported by William of Malmesbury. (7) Urban regarded the Germanic peoples of France as a "race chosen and loved by God," but he recognized European unity by saying, in substance: "There are three continents, of which *we* live in what is by far the smallest, while Asia and Africa are inhabited by *our* enemies. Even the small part of the world that we possess is under attack by our enemies, who now occupy Spain and the Balearic Isles. We must strike back and subdue them before they destroy us." We, in other words, are Christendom, and it is significant that while Urban recognizes the Byzantines as Christians and asserts the propriety of aiding them against the Turks, he does not think of them as European: they are foreigners who fortunately practice what is much the same religion. In short then, Lawrence Brown is right when, in his *Might of the West*, he defines the West as composed of the descendants of the peoples who were Catholics in the Middle Ages.

(7. William's *Gesta regum Anglorum*, written before 1120, was edited by William Stubbs (London, 1887-89). My quotation is a condensed paraphrase of the relevant part of Urban's discourse, which was long and dealt with many other matters. Frederic Duncalf, in his part of Volume I of *A History of the Crusades* (edited by M.W. Baldwin, University of Wisconsin, 1969), observes (p. 220) that William relied on contemporaries who had heard Urban speak, but he oddly omits mention of Urban's appeal to defend Europe against its enemies by taking the offensive; he concentrates on the strictly religious and economic parts of the speeches by which Urban inspired the First Crusade.)

With negligible exceptions, all the inhabitants of Europe thus defined were Aryans, comprising Nordic, Alpine, and Mediterranean subraces with a slight Dinaric admixture in some places. (8) The leadership throughout Europe (even, e.g., in Italy) was mostly Nordic. The differences between the subraces, although slight when compared to the great differences that distinguish Aryans from all other races, impeded a consciousness of racial unity at a time when Europe was truly international (and, to be exact, there were no nations in the modern sense, the territories being divided according to the rulers who were sovereign within them). The great contribution of the Church was that it transcended all territorial boundaries and gave all educated men a common language and common culture. They could move freely throughout Europe. William of Occam, the great Nominalist, studied at Oxford, taught in Paris, and spent the later part of his life in Pisa. The abbots of Monte Cassino in its great days came from Germany. One could multiply at great length examples of internationalism *within Europe* during the Middle Ages.

(8. The clearest and most concise exposition of the basic difference between races and subraces that I have seen is Roger Pearson's booklet *Race & Civilisation* (London, 1966).)

The Renaissance did not diminish, indeed, it strengthened the awareness of the spiritual chasm that divided Europe from the rest of the globe. When the Reformation sundered the continent politically, its cultural unity was maintained by the *Respublica litterarum*, the European community of educated men who rose above the religious fanaticism of the masses and were largely independent of the various ecclesiastical organizations. They shared a culture based on the great Aryan literature and thought of Antiquity. From Spitzbergen to Palermo, every man who could consider himself literate had at least read Vergil, Horace, and Ovid, Cicero, and Livy, and read Homer, Plutarch, Lucian, and the Planudean anthology in Latin translations, if his education had not been sufficient to make him at home in Greek, while men who could claim to be learned had read far

more extensively in both of the learned languages. Latin of Classic quality was the language of scholarship and of international communication until it was partly supplanted by French in the Eighteenth Century. Although original writing in Latin, both prose and verse, and translation into Latin from the modern vernaculars gradually but steadily declined thereafter and has all but ceased today, a knowledge of our race's great classics, read in the original texts, was expected of all educated men before the onset of recrudescing barbarism that followed the First World War; and cultured men of our race remained aware of their common bond.

For this bond there has been no real replacement. When Thomas Arnold, in 1830, asserted that a "happy peace" had "taught every civilized country of Europe" that it was "disgraceful" not to be well acquainted with the languages and literatures of all the others, he meant that educated men must acquire (in addition to competence in Latin and Greek) fluency in French, Italian, German, and English; he not only failed to explain why countries in which Spanish, Portuguese, Norwegian, Swedish, Dutch, etc. were spoken were not civilized, but he proposed an educational standard to which few could attain. Today, English or recognizable imitations of it seems to be becoming a universal language, spoken and written not only our people but also by Asiatics and even some Congoids, thus obfuscating its racial quality, since a Japanese may artificially compose better English than many Germans, who must struggle against the many deceptive similarities between it and their native tongue. In the United States, and to varying degrees in other white nations, literature is no longer taught in any language in the public schools, having been supplanted by contemporary gabble chosen for its virulence as a poison for adolescent minds. The real sciences are not an effective bond since our research and our technology can be successfully imitated and even adopted by Russians, Japanese, Chinese, and Semites, thus producing an illusion of universality that seems to support Jewish propaganda for "One World," in which we are to be but one of the subject races.

After the catastrophe of 1945, our race's fatuity became so great that the bond between once-great Britain and the British overseas in Canada, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand was progressively broken, and Europe has become a merely geographical term. Politically, Europe has become less than it was in the Middle Ages, for treason and lunacy went so far in 1945 as to deliver a large part of it to its Soviet enemies. But nevertheless, the peoples of what remains of Mediaeval Christendom are perforce bound together by a common interest, whether they know it or not, and, as Yockey demonstrated in both *Imperium* and *The Enemy of Europe*, they will ineluctably share a common fate. At the very best, no nation of what remains of the old Europe can hope to escape that future, except that some one nation may be given the privilege that the cannibals

accorded to the white captain when they promised to eat him last. One hears that the Irish are particularly encouraged by such a prospect.

That some Europeans are aware of the unity thus forced on them is shown by a few small organizations, such as "Jeune Europe" and *Nation Europa*, which the Jews still tolerate. The only political expression of this unity is the "Common Market," to which most of the European nations, including Britain, have adhered, but that is obviously a device to frustrate an effective unity by opening all the nations to a deadly influx of their racial enemies in the guise of "workers" or "refugees," while forcing Britain into hostility toward the British in Australia and New Zealand and thus applying to those countries economic pressure to facilitate the work of their own traitors, who yearn to submerge the white population in a flood of their Oriental enemies. It is not by any means a coincidence that the "President" of the "European Parliament" is Simone Veil, a Jewess who was gassed and cremated by the awful Germans, but obviously rose from the dead, as God's Race seems able to do on occasion, and is probably still collecting from the Germans for her temporary decease.

The Enemy of Europe presents us with a double problem. To criticize Yockey's work, we must, naturally, consider the situation in 1949, when he published *The Proclamation of London*, a small booklet in which he anticipated in print part of what he said more fully in the book which he had already written, although it was not published until 1953. (9) To assess the relevance of his work to our plight today, we must naturally take account of all the misfortunes that have come upon us in the past thirty years.

(9. On the circumstances of the publication of *The Enemy of Europe*, see above, pp. 1f. *The Proclamation of London* was issued anonymously as a manifesto of the "European Liberation Front," in which Yockey was associated with several patriotic Englishmen, notably Peter Huxley-Blythe, the author of *The East Came West* (Caldwell, Idaho, 1964), a very important book, which I reviewed in *American Opinion*, May 1966. What is probably the most trenchant writing attributed to the Liberation Front is a brief article, "The Real Culprit," reprinted in *Liberty Bell*, March 1981, pp. 53-56. The anonymous author claims to be over seventy years old; neither the style nor the argument is Yockey's, and the article was obviously written after 1970, i.e., at least nine years after his death and twenty years after the Front founded by Yockey disintegrated for a variety of reasons that must be left to his future biographer. It is clear, however, that the programme of his Liberation Front, set forth on the back cover of the *Proclamation*, was injudiciously candid and not too drastic for the time and place. The integration of Britain into a single sovereign European state was a proposal that startled Britons who remembered that for a time their nation had seemed to stand alone against the continent, and in addition that manifesto called for the "immediate expulsion of all Jews and other parasitic aliens from the soil of Europe," a demand which it would not have been feasible to carry out at once and startling to a nation that had just ruined itself to punish its racial brethren in Germany for insubordination to God's Race, even though the policy of exporting Jews from Europe was entirely in accord with Zionist propaganda for the establishment of a "Jewish

homeland," which many naive persons took seriously. The programme of the Front, furthermore, included some economic demands, especially "the abolition of all unearned income," which (at least in the bald statement) contravened the innate instincts of Aryans, who (when not diseased) insist on a man's right to transmit property to his descendants. That demand, which must have seemed Bolshevik to most Englishmen, was exploited by Jewish propoganda that called Yockey a Communist. The *Proclamation* was reprinted by the Nordland Press in 1970, the editor knew of only three surviving copies of the original booklet. It is now available from Liberty Bell Publications.)

In 1949, what was left of shattered Europe was only beginning to recover from trauma. Everywhere there were grim ruins left by the suicidal insanity that had culminated only four years before, and it would be another decade before the most conspicuous scars of the war were effaced or covered up. The moral damage was greater and more lasting. Men were still appalled and benumbed by the frightful demonstration of how thin and fragile was the veneer of Western civilization--by the revelation of what treachery, barbarity, and inhumanity the supposedly Anglo-Saxon nations, Britain and the United States, were capable when they ran amok to please the Jews. There were, to be sure, some highly intelligent men who had been able observe objectively the G"tterd.,mmerung. Perhaps the most remarkable book that Yockey could have (but, so far as I know, had not) read, since it was published before 1949, was Peter H. Nicoll's *Britain's Blunder*. (10) It is a book that should encourage everyone who has not despaired of the powers of the Aryan mind, for its author, a singularly courageous Scot, had retained the lucidity and perspicacity of his intellect while living in Britain, where the population had been virtually crazed by the lies injected into their minds for many years by their great War Criminals, in collaboration with the Jews, to pep up the cattle they were stampeding to the slaughter. Although Mr. Nicoll, naturally, did not have access to much information that was then kept secret, he saw the essentials of the disaster with a clarity that still arouses our admiration.

(10. *Britain's Blunder* was published by its author, *s.l.&a.* [1948] and copies of it have been made extremely rare; it has been recently reprinted, again *s.l.&a.*, and copies are available from various dealers in books that have not been given the Kosher seal of approval. It is a slender volume of 140 pages, which its valiant author later expanded, with the assistance of the distinguished American historian, Harry Elmer Barnes, to a book of about 600 pages. This, however, is available only in a German translation, *Englands Krieg gegen Deutschland* (Tübingen, 1963). I assume, but do not know, that the Jews still permit the German publisher (Grabert) to sell copies of the book.)

Another judicious observer of the European catastrophe was Prince Sturdza of Romania, who had the great advantage of being able to view events with relative detachment from his post as Ambassador in Berlin. His sagacious analysis of the plight of Europe, *La Bête sans nom: enquête sur les responsabilités*, written in September 1942, was published in 1944 and, of course, before the terrible conclusion of the Jews' Crusade. (11) Although Prince Sturdza wrote before the tragic end, a judicious reader could extrapolate from his analysis of the causes and reach, after 1945, essentially the conclusions that its eminent author set forth in print much later in a book which he, who could write in fluid and lucid French, mistakenly wrote in Romanian, (12) and which is now generally available only in an English translation, drastically censored to please the Jews, that was made and published by the Birch business under the title, *The Suicide of Europe*. (13)

(11. *La Bête sans nom* was published at Copenhagen (Les Nouvelles Éditions Diplomatiques) in 1944 under the pseudonym "Charpeleu" and in an edition of 2000 copies. Copies of it have now been made extremely rare. Prince Sturdza, before going to Berlin as Ambassador, had been Foreign Minister of Romania, a small nation that was necessarily a pawn in the great game for world dominion, but one which, it is possible, was the key pawn that determined subsequent moves on the board. He, a most judicious and dispassionate observer, believes that the *coup d'état* and murders carried out by King Carol and his Jewish leman in 1938 impelled Hitler to negotiate a "non-aggression" treaty with the Soviet as a desperate expedient to avoid the war that the Jews' stooges in Britain and the United States were working so hard to force on Germany. (See *Suicide of Europe*, pp. 122-4). Hitler's decision, made on the advice of his General Staff and, no doubt, the infamous traitor, Admiral Canaris, may have been a military blunder, as Prince Sturdza believes; it was certainly a blunder from the standpoint of Hitler's desire to avert a war with England and France, for it made possible for the Jews to generate "world opinion" that National Socialism and Communism were essentially the same thing, and it is extremely doubtful that the War Criminals could have driven the British and Americans to an attack on Germany without the confusion caused by that spurious "alliance.")

(12. *Romania și sfârșitul Europei: amintiri din țara pierdută* (Madrid, 1966).)

(13. Boston (Western Islands), 1968. The translation and publication was subsidized by an American lady, who said she did not know how drastically the text was censored. For a few examples of the censor's alterations, see Warren B. Heath's introduction to the English version of Bacu's *The Anti-Humans* (Englewood, Colorado, 1971; now available from Liberty Bell Publications.)

The two books I have mentioned represent the best European thought around 1949, which, needless to say, was confined to a few men of extraordinary lucidity and perspicacity, and certainly did not represent the sentiments of the masses of stunned and befuddled victims of the war, whether in England or anywhere on the continent. What immediately concerns us here is the virtual despair of the authors. Nicoll concluded that "the general consequences of the most lamentable and perhaps the most unnecessary war in modern history" were "the destruction of Europe, the ruin of her greatest nation, the enthronement of brutal tyranny" and the "decadence of Britain as a great power," which had become an American base and would be, "in years to come...subjected to the appalling fate to which Hiroshima and Nagasaki were condemned." The instigators of the British attack on Germany had effectively "destroyed the classical Christian civilization of all Europe," and while Nicoll does not deny that there may be some hope of a new civilization to replace what was destroyed, he can see only a vague and tenuous hope for a far distant future. Prince Sturdza's conclusions are stated in the title of his later book: the result of Jewish instigation was simply the Suicide of Europe, which, for all practical purposes, became what India was in the Eighteenth Century when Britain and France were contending for mastery: Europe had become a territory on which would be fought battles to determine whose colony it would become. Such hope as Prince Sturdza permitted himself was that the American people might someday have a government that would act in their own interests.

The contrast between these views and the optimism of the *Proclamation* is obvious, and the expressed confidence in the proximate formation of an European Imperium must have been an example of wishful thinking. In *The Enemy of Europe* Yockey is much more realistic. He explicitly recognizes (p. 86) that "since Europe has no power, the question is: How is power to be obtained?" Europe *as a whole* has only a choice of enemies. Its only chance of regaining power depends on adroit political manoeuvring.

In that sense, the European unity that Yockey recognized is an unalterable fact, whether or not the various European populations know it. It is simply a consequence of the Suicide of Europe and the invention of high-altitude bombers and ballistic missiles. It is a consequence of the British-American innovation of total war against civilian populations. A war, for example, between France and Germany or between Britain and France is now, for all practical purposes, inconceivable, although people talk about an odd anachronism called a 'limited war,' in which both sides agree to use only some of the available weapons and thus, in effect, make the 'war' a kind of sporting contest, a large-scale football game.

Despite much babbling and squawking now fashionable, a 'limited' war can be only border skirmishing or a feint to test an enemy's resolution, a mere preliminary to a *real* war. (14)

(14. It is true that Western nations at one time observed certain moral restraints in war, but since these were repudiated and abrogated by the British and Americans, it is idle to dream of restoring them in the foreseeable future. See F.J.P. Veale, *Advance to Barbarism* (2d edition, Appelton, Wisconsin, 1953; 3d edition, New York, 1968). (I have not seen the first edition, published in England in 1948; I probably should have mentioned it when I referred to Nicoll's book above.) -- I need not remark that the 'limited war' in Vietnam was merely a device to kill white Americans, oppress American taxpayers, and further disgrace the United States. It was not in any sense a real war: the eventual defeat of the Americans was agreed on in advance, though probably not in writing. The importation into the United States of a horde of Mongolian enemies as "refugees" was probably not a part of the original plan and seems to have been added only when opportunity offered to afflict the American boobs yet further.)

Given the small extent of their territories and the concentration of their populations, a real war between Britain and France, for example, could be only the equivalent of the situation that was once much debated by theorists of the code of honor, a duel to be fought with pistols at arm's length. At the present time, the only powers that could fight a real war are the United States and the two that it created for the destruction of civilization, Soviet Russia and China.

Yockey, therefore, was right: the nations of Europe can no longer be independent of each other, however unpleasant that fact may be. If either England or France were occupied by a major power, the other would be helpless. And all the nations of Europe, concentrated in a relatively small and densely settled territory between the Soviet and the United States, are equally vulnerable and will necessarily share the same fate. Thus Europe, *nolens volens*, is a single political entity.

OVERSEAS EUROPE

When Yockey speaks of Europe's colonies, he is thinking of the territories outside Europe inhabited by our race, essentially Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and the United States, of which the latter, in continuing revolt, so to speak, against the mother country, had become its most dangerous enemy. He does not consider separately the future of the others. When Britain attacked Germany in 1939, she was able to count on

the whole-hearted support of the English who lived overseas. Everyone knows, of course, that she can no longer do so. If she were attacked today by any nation--the United States, the Soviet, France, Sweden, Ireland--she would find that she had not only kicked South Africa into independence, but has so alienated the three other former dominions that she can hope for no more than a few platitudes in the local newspapers and, if events give an opportunity for them, in kindly obituaries. There is no indication that Yockey foresaw this development.

In 1949, Europe still had extensive possessions overseas. The British not only entertained strange illusions about what they called their Commonwealth and the consequences of their folly in forcing "self-government" on their former subjects of other races, but Britain still possessed very extensive territories in Asia and Africa, and even some in the Western Hemisphere, as crown colonies of which she had not yet been stripped by the traitors in her government. France possessed Indo-China until it was taken from her by American treachery (15) and Communist China, which the Americans had created by stabbing their Chinese allies in the back. France considered Algeria a part of "metropolitan" France. In addition to the numerous minor possessions, she owned Madagascar and half of the Dark Continent north of the British Union of South Africa, while the rest of the territories of the savages were divided between Britain, Belgium, Portugal, and Spain, and the colonies that had been taken from Italy were booty that in a sane world Britain and France would have divided between them. And although the United States had set up a kind of vaudeville show called the "United Nations" to disguise a little its subservience to its enemies in the Soviet and further the subjugation of the American people, there was in 1949 no apparent reason why the European nations, which had not yet realized that they had defeated themselves as catastrophically as they defeated Germany in 1945, should not have retained and ruled their colonial empires.

(15. The nerve center of Communist agitation among the natives was evidently the American embassy, in which inflammatory bulletins urging the natives to get rid of the nasty white men were printed on the embassy's presses. So far as one can determine from the conflicting reports, the Americans promised military aid to the French, should the Chinese invasion become formidable, and then broke their promise at the last minute when the situation at Dienbienphu became critical, thus producing the delightful massacre of the French troops, which had been hopelessly outnumbered by a fresh invasion from China. Americans who dote on Mongoloids naturally reckon nothing of the American lives that were squandered in Vietnam, but they should try to calculate the total of all the precious yellow lives that were lost in Annam, Cochin China ("South Vietnam"), Cambodia, Laos, and Tonkin ("North Vietnam") as a direct result of the Americans' racial and diplomatic betrayal of the French to promote lovely "anti-colonialism.")

It is true that in 1949 our race was already showing alarming symptoms of a kind of epidemic lunacy called "anti-colonialism," which was supposedly derived from the prating of a shyster named Woodrow Wilson, whom the Jews had installed as President of the United States in preparation of the First World War. (16) A bigot who had peddled an ostensibly secular theology under the name of "political science," Wilson, when he used the United States to exacerbate the war in Europe and prevent a reasonable peace, had devised a mysticism called "the self-determination of peoples," which, like "theosophy" and "spiritualism," had a great appeal to minds that had been weakened by Christian superstitions. And, oddly enough, Great Britain, which had the most to lose by self-mortification, was the first Western nation to take a morbid pleasure in harming itself. (17) Incidentally, sentimentalists should note that the Western nations that contracted a kind of contagious epilepsy and had masochistic fits in which they forced "self-determination" on their colonies, invariably inflicted great suffering and enormous loss of life on the subjects whom they "liberated."

(16. On the training of Wilson by the Jews, who boasted that their satrap, Baruch, "leading him like [sic] one would a poodle on a string," taught Fido to sit up and bark ideals for political bonbons, see Colonel Curtis B. Dall's *F.D.R.* (2d ed., Washington, D.C. 1970), especially pp. 134-38. Wilson seems not to have been entirely devoid of conscience, for he is reported to have lamented, "I have ruined my country!" before his mind broke down in 1919, perhaps under the strain of realizing that he, a supreme egotist, had been merely a *fantoché* in the hands of his masters. His insanity was, of course, concealed from the American boobs, whose government continued to be conducted in his name until 1921. He partly recovered his reason before his death in 1924, but left, so far as is known, no confessions. His election to the presidency in 1912 was, of course, contrived by stimulating the vanity of Theodore Roosevelt and inciting him to form the "Progressive Party" and thus split the Republican vote and punish William Howard Taft for his lack of alacrity in kowtowing to the Jews. As Colonel Dall notes, the Jews laughed over their manipulation of Theodore Roosevelt, their "other candidate" for control of the United States.)

(17. The psychopathology of masochism would require a separate treatise. Such mental alienation in various races, usually as a concomitant of religious mania, but may take a peculiar form in Aryans, beginning with the notion of *tapas* that appears in India not long after the Aryan conquest and also in the Norse myth of Odin's hanging of himself on the world-tree. The hallucination is, of course, the basis of Christian austerities, appearing in most tales about saints, and particularly conspicuous in Seventeenth-Century Spain, where normally intelligent men had fits in which they lashed their backs with whips weighted with lead until the blood from their excoriated flesh flowed down over their trousers. They imagined that Jesus, if he happened to be watching, would be pleased to see them torture themselves. The same hallucinations are epidemic today in a holy conspiracy called Opus Dei, which was used by "our" C.I.A. to undermine and eventually capture the government of General Franco in Spain, for the members of that Catholic sect regularly torture themselves by wearing sharp-pointed chains next to their flesh and

flogging themselves with lead-loaded whips, confident that Jesus will be so pleased that he will assign them specially luxurious quarters in the best apartment house in Heaven and make them members of his own exclusive club. Incredible as it may seem, men who appear outwardly sane secretly indulge in such masochistic perversions. A Catholic Irishman, John Roche, a professor of the History of Science (!) with a doctoral degree from Oxford (!), was bewitched by Opus Dei when he was an undergraduate in an Irish college and acquired an addiction to self-torture that he compared to addiction to narcotics. He did God's Work by torturing himself for fourteen years (and doubtless serving the conspiracy in other ways), and he experienced "withdrawal symptoms" after he came to his senses. See his confession in the *Sunday Times* (London), 18 January 1981, p. 15. Even now, however, he has not guessed that the godly Opus Dei is partly or entirely financed by the C.I.A.)

In 1949, Great Britain had already begun to destroy herself, and although some mental and moral deficiency in the English must be regarded as the primary cause, it could be argued that the fatal folly was a consequence of the initial blunder that was made when D'Israeli was injected into the British peerage. A Jew named Samuel, who showed his contempt for the English by assuming the illustrious Norman name of Montagu, so enriched himself by his depredations in banking and international finance that his friend, King Edward VII, ennobled him with the good Anglo-Saxon name of Baron Swaythling. (Si quid sentiunt Manes, the ghost of the first King Edward, who had tried to run the Jews out of England in 1290, must have gibbered in fury at the act of his namesake.) The "British" Baron's son became Secretary of State for India in 1917 and worked, sometimes slyly, sometimes almost openly, to undermine British rule in India and to arouse among the natives discontent that could be used as a pretext for further sabotage of the Empire. In collaboration with Viscount Chelmsford, who was closely tied by marriage to the Goldmans and may have had Jewish genes himself, and who became Viceroy of India in 1916, "Montagu" prepared in the name of the King's government an official and astounding report on India--astounding because its authors were not attainted for high treason. The crucial section of the long and rambling document is cited by General Hilton in his *Imperial Obituary*. The report bewailed the deplorable fact that 95% of all the peoples of India were happily content under British rule and hoped for its continuance. It was therefore England's duty, the titled saboteurs said, to "bring about the most radical revolution" in India to enable the 5% of malcontents to terrorize and suppress the "pathetically contented" 95% and thus prepare India for "nationhood," i.e., for perpetual rioting, the venomous racial animosities that always accompany multi-racial societies that are not under foreign rule, large-scale massacres, savage atrocities, and contemptuous hatred of white men.

The work of dismembering the British Empire was carried on by a Jew residing in England, Rufus Isaacs, who was rewarded for his involvement

in the malodorous Marconi scandal (18) by being successively created Baron, Viscount Earl, and finally Marquess of Reading, Lord Chief Justice (!) of England, and Viceroy of India, where he made a feint of maintaining British rule while sapping its foundations. (19) His fellow tribesmen ran interference for him in England by a standard ploy, using their increasing control of the English press to publicize shrill protests that he was "brutally" failing to truckle sufficiently to the "aspirations" of babbling babes, whose minds had been stuffed with "democratic" verbiage in British schools. And so, in 1947, the British ignominiously retreated from their largest colonial possession, and the Hindus and Moslems promptly began to massacre each other on a scale that brought joy to the hearts of the apostles of "self-determination." And the "Republic of India" and Pakistan were created as enemies of our race and civilization.

(18. A typical financial operation carried out by artfully depressing the value of Marconi stock in both England and the United States to induce its owners to sell for a fraction of its worth and then artfully inflating its value to sell it to the public for more than it was worth. It involved the bribery of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, an unprincipled opportunist named Lloyd George, by the common device of "selling" him at depressed prices stock for which he would not be expected to pay until it greatly increased in value (it soared suddenly to twelve times its former price). English newspapers that were still in English hands sometimes caricatured Lloyd George as a little boy traveling under the escort of his two Jewish tutors, Isaacs and Samuel.)

(19. See the inadvertent admissions in the laudatory biography by H. Montgomery Hyde, *Lord Reading* (London, 1967), Chapter 8. For example, he censured and forced the resignation of General Dyer for having restored order in Amritsar after a mob killed five Englishmen, beat an Englishwoman almost to death, looted banks, and otherwise exhibited their idealistic aspiration. The fact that General Dyer had been publicly thanked by the decent Sikhs, who bestowed on him the highest honor in their power, merely proved the need for the "radical revolution" that would teach them "nationhood" and perpetual violence. Another trick was a loud campaign to end "racial discrimination," an infallible means of stirring up trouble and inciting other races to hate ours.)

Yockey certainly understood that the "successful Indian Mutiny in 1947," as he called it in the *Proclamation*, was a consequence of the First World War, which was itself suicidal and an effect of the "Culture-disease" spread by the Jews, but he does not remark on the curious circumstance that the British retreat from India had been conducted, not by Englishmen, but by aliens with British titles. He comments on the fatal decadence of the British aristocracy and upper class, (20) which he attributed correctly to a spiritual decay, but, perhaps in keeping with the racial theory we noticed above, he does not ask the drastic and fearful question, How

British are the British? It is a crucial question that admits of no precise answer, and discussion of it would require an inordinately long excursus. (Cf. note 27 below.)

(20. General Hilton (op. cit.), writing from an entirely different standpoint, also attributes some part of the responsibility for the loss of the Empire to the dilution and demoralization of the upper classes by "democracy" and Jewish ethics. The subject races respected gentlemen (cf. note 6 above), but not the bounders who gradually replaced them in an age in which a Lloyd George could become the King's Prime Minister and harbor several Jews in his Cabinet. The General could have mentioned the most flagrant instance of which I have heard. Around 1925, a certain Charles Arthur, who probably could not have attained a commission in the army before 1914 and certainly could not have held it long, was a Captain in His Majesty's Army and was appointed by His Majesty's Government *Aide-de-Camp* to Prince Hari Singh, son and heir presumptive to the Maharaja of Kashmir. The up-to-date young captain enlisted several accomplices and worked the old badger-game on the naïf young prince, whom they successfully blackmailed for the astonishing sum of 125,000 pounds sterling. Their enterprise would have remained unknown, had not Captain Arthur and one or more of his accomplices forged an endorsement on a cheque to cheat the "outraged husband" of his share of the loot.)

THE HEARTLAND

For Yockey, both kinds of colonies have only a secondary importance. The attitudes and cultural vitality of Europeans who have established themselves in other continents are determined by the power and vitality of their mother country. European dominion over other races is merely an epiphenomenon, a measure of a European nation's power, a salutary reminder that, as he tells us, power can be maintained only by increasing it.

We return, therefore, to the fundamental fact that new weapons have imposed on Europe a necessary unity. He is aware, of course, of the impediments to such a union: the ethnic differences that seem small only when our race is compared to other races; the corresponding differences in traditions and temperament, producing what Jacques Rivière described as discordant nervous rhythms; and the diversity of languages, perhaps the most troublesome barrier of all and one that grows higher, as the major languages deteriorate with the decline of education in the several countries. So great are the differences within Europe that the eminent historian, Geoffrey Barraclough, (21) denies that "European unity" ever existed in the past or the present, rejects all claims for a "common western European tradition," and sees no cultural force that can create "bonds (or

potential bonds) of unity between England and France (for example) or France and Spain." Very well, but later in his book he foresees that in the future "the war of 1939-45 will appear...as the decisive conflict in which Europe, committing suicide, surrendered mastery to the coloured peoples." So, in the end, he sees, as does Yockey, a unity imposed on Europe by a common destiny, by the natural and implacable hatred that the other races feel for our own--races that both the Soviet and the United States, in an effective partnership, are inciting and arming against our homeland.

(21. Geoffrey Barraclough, *History in a Changing World* (Oxford, 1955), pp. 43. 183.)

Yockey urged Europeans to consider the grim realities of the plight they brought upon themselves by their insane and suicidal war for the Jews. He told them bluntly that they must not permit themselves to be narcotized by the endless drivel about "peaceful solutions," "world peace," "one world," and the rest of the gabble to which weak minds are addicted as to opium or cocaine. If they are to have a future, they must deal with both the aliens that drove them to suicide and their own tares, which he, using a German idiom, called the "Michael stratum."

It is a regrettable but undeniable fact that the great mass of the population is interested only in present comfort and gross satisfactions; unwilling to take thought for their class, their nation, or their race and incapable of taking such thought anyway; materialists in Yockey's sense of that word (which has nothing to do with philosophical thought, from which they would instinctively flee as owls from the light) and craving only animal satisfactions, although they frequently have fits of religiosity or hypocritically affect a concern for their "fellow man," if such concern is in vogue and profitable. They are proletarians, regardless of income; they are by nature *Untermenschen*, the more pernicious the greater their incomes or the higher the positions to which they have climbed in a governmental or industrial bureaucracy. Theirs is the ochlocracy for which the United States made the world safe, while making the world unsafe for civilization. They are, however, a necessary part--a very large part--of every population, and the first task of a statesman is to control that mass in the interest of a civilization it cannot understand.

Yockey reminded Europeans that the only political reality is power, military power, not the twittering of idealists and "Liberals" as they hop from perch to perch on a tree of which they cannot see the roots or understand the life. And he suggested the means whereby Europe might regain at least some of the power that it had insanely thrown away to please its enemies.

THE NUTCRACKER

Yockey saw Europe as lying, temporarily helpless, between two overwhelmingly powerful antagonists, so that the only choice left to it was a choice between its two enemies, which were fortunately enemies of each other. His thesis depended, therefore, on his belief that the Soviet Empire and the United States were irreconcilable forces. And since the United States was obviously an instrumentality of the Jews, that meant that the Jews had lost control of Russia. Yockey thus proposed a solution to a problem that has been earnestly, sometimes furiously, and in the end inconclusively debated ever since, so that it remains the most urgent problem that is immediately before us. On the truth or falsity of Yockey's solution will depend our foreseeable future.

We are confronted by a total lack of trustworthy data. *All* of our information concerning conditions inside Russia comes from either Soviet or Jewish sources and is therefore mendacious except insofar as it may, through inadvertence or coincidence, contain some elements of fact. Russia--I speak of Russia because the rest of the vast Soviet Empire is merely its appendage--is, on even the most hopeful assumption, in the hands of men who have mastered the techniques of misinformation and disinformation, and who have virtually absolute and total control over all significant news concerning events in their empire, except what may come through Jewish sources. To be sure, a considerable number of men have defected from the Soviet and found asylum in Western nations, but for each of them we must first try to determine whether or not he is, as some of them undoubtedly are, a Soviet or Jewish agent, sent to increase our perplexity and confusion by providing a superficially different variety of misinformation and disinformation. If we have satisfied ourselves of his *bona fides*, we have the even more difficult problem of determining whether his reports are misleading because his knowledge of the facts is limited and inadequate, or because he has made his report serve his own resentments or ambitions, or because he conceals some part of the truth to avoid offending the Jews or a corrupt and perfidious government that could at any time return him to Soviet territory and a terrible death.

Our dilemma may be illustrated by a trivial bit of news from Russia, chosen at random. The press recently reported that Brezhnev was being treated by a wonderful "psychic healer," whose photograph shows her to be a not unattractive young woman, white but certainly not Aryan. She is said to have a luxurious apartment in Moscow, complete with servants, to

travel in a limousine, complete with chauffeur, and to dress expensively and elegantly.

Our press is apt to be truthful in reporting trivial matters, if one allows for the journalists' normal sensationalism. If the "psychic healer" were said to be ministering to a British Prime Minister or an American President, we would suppose that he either

- 1) was in fact suffering from some psychosomatic malady, or
- 2) had found a neat way to maintain a mistress in style.

But the news is about the Soviet President and came through a censorship that is vigilant about even trivialities. So we have to consider other possible explanations:

3) Brezhnev has become senile and feeble-minded, and the rulers of the Soviet are preparing us for his replacement.

4) Brezhnev's sickness is political, and we are being prepared for his removal by sudden death or forced retirement into obscurity.

5) The mention of Brezhnev is merely a trick to secure wide publicity for a story concocted by Russian experts in psychological warfare to further the epidemic of superstition and irrationality that is reducing the American masses to imbecility and thus hastening the national paralysis. This interpretation is supported by the inclusion in the story of a statement from a Russian physician, who certifies the miraculous cures accomplished by the witch's "laying on of hands." The story therefore fits neatly into the long series of stories that have been coming out of the Soviet in recent years to make credulous persons believe that Russian "scientists" are making wonderful discoveries about "extrasensory perception," "telepathy," "psi-power," and other occult hocus-pocus.

6) The story was manufactured by the Jews for the same purpose. As everyone knows, their press and boob-tubes in the United States are making a concerted effort to induce hallucinations in the masses by lustily advertising the charlatans, thaumaturges, astrologers, "psychics," evangelists, and other swindlers who are so lucratively preying on the ignorant and simple-minded.

7) There is the last possibility that this and other hokum about "psychic" marvels in Russia, instead of being acts of psychological warfare, more or less accurately reflect a wave of occult superstition in the Soviet that is tolerated either because (a) the rulers think it provides harmless amusement for the masses, or (b) the regime is actually disintegrating and

cannot shore up the official Marxian religion. The latter hypothesis will please those who wish to attribute recent disorders in Poland to Russian weakness, and the perennial hopefuls who never tire of assuring us that there is a craving for "freedom" in Russia and that a proletarian revolution there is sure to break out any moment since 1947.

The story about the "psychic healer" is, of course, too trivial to be of interest other than as an example of the kind of questions that we must ask ourselves about every bit of seemingly significant news that comes out of Russia, a territory that is enclosed by a censorship as efficient as the famous border that prevents unauthorized escapes from Soviet territory. No one can be really certain of what goes on behind that barrier. The most brazen lying is commonplace even when there is no official censorship. There is no greater intercourse between two nations than between Britain and the United States, and thousands of Britons are visiting or travelling in this country at any given time. But nevertheless one of the leading newspapers in London, *The Observer*, on 8 March 1981 carried a scare-head in large type: "Shadow of Terror Falls on U.S. Jews," and feeble-minded Englishmen were invited to believe that all of the millions of God's Race in this country were cowering in dread of the moment when the American "Nazis" will start popping them into gas chambers and reducing them to holy ashes.

We have been assured so many times that the Jews were losing or had lost control of Russia and the Soviet! The first wave of such hopeful thinking came when Bronstein, alias Trotsky, scuttled out of Russia, having purportedly lost a power-struggle with Dzhughashvili, alias Stalin. One consequence was that the misfits, crackpots, overgrown infants, and mattoids that formed the Communist Parties in civilized countries split into "Trotskyites" and "Stalinists," who quarrelled as furiously as did the Christian Homoousians and Homoeousians. The net result, however, was to accelerate and amplify the diffusion of Communist propaganda, and in the late 1930s the weekly periodical, *Time*, which was then still largely in American hands, suggested that Bronstein and Dzhughashvili were really co-operating in staging a performance for the suckers. The subsequent murder of Bronstein in Mexico proves nothing, for by that time (1940) he had become an embarrassment and impediment to "Stalin," who needed to reunite his stooges and dupes in the United States in preparation for the day when the American cattle would be stampeded into Europe. The view expressed by *Time* is not widely held now, but it has never been conclusively refuted.

After Trotsky's exodus from the new Holy Land in 1929, the next onset of propaganda that the Jews were losing control of their Soviet colony came with the "purge trials" of 1936-37, in which a passel of "Old Bolsheviks," most of them Jews, were spectacularly prosecuted and liquidated by

Stalin's subordinates, most of them Jews. The trials were a shock to Westerners who naively believed no hair on the head of a Jew could be harmed in a country controlled by his fellow tribesmen, forgetting how savagely Jews slew one another in struggles of power within their race, e.g., when Jesus and Onias slugged it out for the office of High Priest in 170-169 B.C., or the otherwise unrecorded occasion around A.D. 30 that provided the corpses which proved to horrified archaeologists that Jewish ingenuity had found a way to increase even the torments of crucifixion for fellow Jews who were mutinous. No one yet has convincingly explained why Stalin preferred to stage a grandiose show for the civilized world instead of having the selected "Old Bolsheviks" quietly disposed of in convenient lime-pits.

Yockey, however, was convinced by a smaller show in Prague and, as he tells us at the beginning of *The Enemy of Europe*, he revised its text in 1952 to take into account an event that he had foreseen in 1948. He discussed it in greater detail in an essay, "What is Behind the Hanging of the Eleven Jews in Prague?" It was clearly written for publication by his European Liberation Front, but, so far as I know, never printed. (22)

(22. It may have appeared in the short-lived periodical, *The Frontfighter*, of which I have seen only one number. I have photostats of a typewritten copy. It is reproduced in Appendix II below.)

Yockey marshals his arguments effectively. When Stalin joined the Jewish Crusade Against Europe, he appealed to Russian nationalism and patriotism to encourage his armies and peoples. That is one of the few verifiable facts before us, but we remember that our great War Criminal used American patriotism to pep up the livestock that he was sending to Europe to slaughter and be slaughtered for Yahweh's Master Race. For that matter, the cannon-fodder were told that wicked Hitler planned to invade the United States, and there were nincompoops so ignorant of military and naval logistics that they believed it. On the other hand, it was Germany's purpose to destroy the Soviet, so there was a genuine basis for Stalin's appeal to his subjects.

It is undoubtedly true that the Slavs feel a deep racial antipathy to the Jews and would gladly purge their territory of them. The question, however, is whether they are or will become sufficiently intelligent and strong to indulge that desire in defiance of the rest of the world, whom the Jews would infallibly incite against them.

It is probably true that the Jews planned to obtain a monopoly of atomic weapons by having them made the exclusive property of the silly vaudeville show in New York City called the "United Nations," which was simply a flimsy screen for their age-old dream of "One World" under their rule. (23) If so, Russia's insistence on using American and British knowledge to equip herself with the feared weapons disappointed them. To that extent, at least, Stalin acted as a Russian Czar, not as a stooge for the Jews.

(23. It would seem that the Jews lost interest in the farce, which now serves to provide, at the expense of American taxpayers, a luxurious life in New Jerusalem-on-the-Hudson for diplomatic riff-raff and savages, whose endless jabbering is as significant as that which may be heard at the monkey house in Bronx Park. Muzzy-headed American women still fancy that the babble has meaning, but the Jews are too intelligent to pay attention to it and probably do not even laugh when some idler calls for a "resolution" against their world-capital in Palestine.)

Yockey believed that the "cold war," proclaimed by the Jews' half-English stooge, Churchill, on a visit to the United States, was really an attempt by the Jews to encircle Russia, rather than a convenient pretext to get more Americans killed, in Korea and elsewhere, and to pump more blood out of the veins of American taxpayers to flush down sewers in Asia and to subsidize, under the guise of "foreign aid," the Communist conquest of one nation after another. It must be remembered that at the time Yockey wrote, the rodomontade manufactured in Washington sounded more convincing than it does now in retrospect, and that the "cold war" did excite intelligent Americans with a hope that they could force their government to action in conformity with its endless jabbering about "saving the Free World."

Yockey also took seriously the Yiddish yelping about "anti-Semitism" in Russia, which may have been no more than a ploy to deaden the hostility toward Russia felt by Americans who still hoped that their nation would someday act in its own interests. It must not be forgotten that the Americans who were most hostile to the Soviet were precisely the ones who would be mollified by reports that the Russians were shaking off their Jewish masters. (24)

(24. A good example is Commander S.M. Riis, a veteran of Naval Intelligence, who was stationed in Russia at the time of the Jewish take-over of that country in 1917-18. In his old age, he succeeded in boarding the ship that had brought Kruschchev to the United States; he conversed with agents of the N.K.V.D. disguised as simple Russian sailors and

was assured that Kruschchev was a "real Russian" who was kicking out the alien invaders. Believing that the Jews had at last lost control, he was greatly encouraged. See his *Karl Marx, Master of Deceit* (New York, Speller, 1962.)

Yockey also noticed that in the United States a pair of Jews, the Rosenbergs, were falsely accused of treason (for they had been strictly loyal to their race) and thrown to the wolves--to appease the Americans who resented the betrayal of their own country by Roosevelt and his successors, and also to facilitate the escape of other spies and saboteurs who had been caught in the act.

Yockey therefore concluded that the "treason trials in Bohemia" were "an *unmistakable* turning point" and, despite the official piffle in both Russian and Jewish sources, marked an "undeniable reshaping of the world-situation." The fact that "the Russian leadership is killing Jews for treason to Russia" was nothing less than "a war-declaration by Russia on the Jewish-American leadership." Stalin, who, Yockey recognizes, "had been pro-Jewish in his inner- and outer-policy" for thirty-five years, had at last taken the part of Russia against international Jewry, who had to abandon their hopes that they could "replace the Stalin regime." Yockey could not foresee that Stalin would die a year later in circumstances that gave rise to rumors that the Jews had at last succeeded in poisoning him.

To the end of his life, Yockey remained convinced that a war between the Jews' United States and the Soviet was inevitable. That conviction was the basis of his last essay, written shortly before his death in 1960. Its cover is reproduced here on the following page [see original--Ed.].

I do not know whether Yockey saw and approved the vividly symbolical painting, in the manner of Salvador Dali, that is reproduced on that cover or the date that is set beneath it. If he did set the date, 1975, he was in good company, as I shall remark later.

The World in Flames is a concise and lucidly logical conspectus of the situation in 1960, cogent if one accepts the premise that the Russians had liberated themselves from the Jews. On that assumption, the relentless expansion of Soviet power and the establishment of a Soviet outpost in Cuba, at the very doors of the United States, represented a series of defeats for the international race.

Yockey's analysis of the military situation is still valid. The Americans, if they are driven to fight the Soviet, will rely on ballistic missiles, but cannot win a war, since, even if they had an effective army, it could not mount an invasion of Soviet territory with the enormous number of ground troops necessary to occupy it, and Europeans cannot be induced to fight

again for the American-Jewish symbiosis. Russia will use ballistic missiles, since the logistic problem of transporting armies across the Atlantic or Pacific is one she cannot solve.

American missiles can inflict a certain amount of damage on a few cities, etc., but Russia is relatively invulnerable to such attacks because she is not really urbanized, her important installations are scattered throughout her vast territory, and her essentially agrarian people have the high morale of imperialism and will not be dismayed by such destruction and losses as it may be possible to inflict on them. Russian missiles, produced by German scientists and technicians and therefore more accurate and effective, will be directed at American cities, the destruction of which will not only paralyze the nation militarily, but will dismay a population already demoralized by peace-lubbers, fatuous females, and youth made derelict and cowardly by the rotting of our culture. The blasting of a few cities will make the panic-stricken rabble eager to surrender. (Yockey probably did not know that Washington was even then making studies of "strategic surrender" in the event of hostilities.)

When the United States surrenders, as it must and will, the situation will be drastically changed. Yockey notes that the British, a relatively civilized people much given to prating about their moral superiority and to the vapid idealism of humanitarians, having obtained the support of Americans crazed by a holy war, induced the Germans to surrender in November 1918, and then, by an act of unprecedented treachery, blockaded the helpless Germans for the express purpose of killing civilians, and did in fact starve to death a million Germans before lifting the blockade in July 1919. Now the Russians are barbarians and have never talked nonsense about the "sanctity of human life" and similar vaporings of sentimentalists. Their leaders, furthermore, are realists and have never shown the slightest inclination to imagine that treaties are more than pieces of soiled paper. Even if the United States does not surrender unconditionally (that would be poetic justice!), the Russians will not be obligated by such terms as they may have granted on paper to spare themselves unnecessary effort. In all probability, therefore, they will proceed, after the surrender, to annihilate forever the United States as a possible source of future trouble. They will, of course, immediately destroy all of the country's remaining industrial capacity. What is uncertain is whether they will elect (a) to occupy the territory with troops, reduce its population by starvation or shooting them as may seem the more entertaining, and spare the rest for use as serfs, at least until the land can be colonized by Russians, a virile and growing people; or (b) to reduce the territory to a lifeless and uninhabitable desert.

Yockey, writing in 1960, believed that the inevitable war might be precipitated at any time and would certainly begin no later than 1975, the

date given on the cover of his booklet. He obviously miscalculated, but so did men with access to the secret information accumulated by what was left of American Intelligence services. It was also in 1960 that an American Colonel in Military Intelligence, who had extensive experience during the Korean "War" and had maintained, after his retirement, close connections with the C.I.A., privately assured me that the war was inevitable, that the United States would be quickly vanquished, and that the country would be occupied by Russian troops, who would systematically exterminate all Americans suspected of intelligence and self-respect. That, he was certain, would happen by 1970 at the latest. His calculations thus allowed a shorter term than Yockey's, whose major thesis he did not accept. He believed that when the Russians invaded this country, the Jews would joyously cooperate with them, as they had done everywhere in Europe. He also believed that the Russians would therefore minimize damage to New York City and other Jewish enclaves in the United States.

Other miscalculations, made at the time by men whose experience and knowledge qualified them to judge, gave approximately the same result, with only a difference of a few years in the terminal date. It would take many pages to recapitulate the evidence and logical deductions on which the various estimates were based, and many more to inquire why the expected war did not occur. It will suffice to have made it clear that Yockey, an observer without access to secret information, was no more in error than experienced men who had the great advantage of knowing facts that were concealed from the public.

THE PARADOX

Yockey was aware of the major objection to his analysis: If the Jews had lost control of Russia, how did it happen that the United States, which saved the Soviet in 1941-45, (25) continued to facilitate the expansion of Russian power? I cannot do better than quote his answer:

'Russian "successes"--except for its German-made rockets--are all the gift of the Washington regime, Jewish-American political stupidity is invincible. But the power-gifts which the Washington regime has made to Russia are not explicable entirely by simple stupidity, simple incapacity. There is a further factor at work that the Zionist

Washington regime is on both sides of most power-questions in the world. Its sole firm stand is its fundamental anti-German position: Germany must be destroyed, its young men must be slaughtered. In Algeria, Washington is with both sides: it is with the French Government, as its "ally": it is with the rebels by virtue of its world-program of "freedom" for everybody. In Egypt, the Washington regime told Palestine, England and France to attack, and when Russia rose, it told them to stop. It was, within a week, anti-Nasser and pro-Nasser. It occupied Lebanon, then evacuated it. It held back Chiang when, from his island, he would have attacked China, with whom the Washington regime was then at war. It defended South Korea, but helped the Chinese maintain their supply line to the front. During the Chinese War in Korea, it made war and negotiated peace at the same time, for years. In Cuba, it forbade the exportation of arms to the loyal Batista and thus helped Fidel Castro; now it is committed to the overthrow of Castro.

'It is a psychological riddle, decipherable only thus: the Zionists have two minds, which function independently. As Jews, they are committed to the destruction of Western Civilization, and in this they sympathize with Russia, with China, with Japan, with the Arabs, and as such they anathematize Germany, which is the mind and heart of the Western Civilization. As custodians of the United States, they must half-heartedly retain at least the technical and political domination of that Civilization even while destroying its soul and meaning. In a word, they are working simultaneously for and against the Western Civilization. Quite obviously, they are thus doing more damage than conferring benefit.....

'Thus the newspaper tag of "East versus West" is meaningless. It is East versus East, with the West supplying the lives and treasure for destruction.'

The foregoing analysis is, of course, open to question. Was there ever any change in the policy actually pursued by the government in Washington, as distinct from bleating by Presidents and the like to keep the boobs confused? Was not that policy consistently and uniformly directed to ensuring the maximum disgrace and loss to the Americans and to making

them take slow and unperceived steps toward their eventual liquidation? The commitment "to the overthrow of Castro" of which Yockey speaks was, of course, just a spoonful of paregoric for the grown-up moppets. Most recently, as everyone knows, the United States delivered to Castro another possession, Nicaragua.

(25. In his essay on the hanging of the eleven Jews in Prague, Yockey mentioned a small part of what America, at the behest of its Jewish masters, gave to the Soviet: 14,795 airplanes, 375,883 trucks, and 7,056 tanks. He seems not to have known that the Soviet was also supplied with both the technical information and the materials necessary for the manufacture of atomic bombs. In *The World in Flames*, he does comment on the thoroughness and ubiquity of Soviet espionage in the United States, in contrast to the nugatory efforts of American Intelligence to penetrate Russia, but he seems not to have asked himself to what extent Soviet espionage depended on Jews in its service and on co"peration with the Jewish espionage system, admittedly by far the best in the world.)

Yockey's attribution of schizophrenia to the Jews is, of course, subject to the basic consideration that we can never understand their mentality: we can only observe the actions of a race generically different from our own and accumulate data which will enable us to say, statistically, that in a given situation the racial collectivity will react in a specific way. It is always hazardous and usually or invariably wrong to describe their conduct or motives in terms of our psychology and morality. What would be schizophrenia in an Aryan or group of Aryans, for example, is such by contrast with the normal mentality of our race. If it is characteristic of another race, it cannot be an anomaly in that race, and what seems abnormal to us must be normal in it. Yockey, however, is right in that those who believe that the Jews no longer control Russia must postulate that their racial mentality functions in a way that is incomprehensible in terms of our standards of rationality.

By far the most thorough, objective, and cogent presentation of the case for the view that the Russians have attained at least a measure of independence is found in Wilmot Robertson's *The Dispossessed Majority* and its pendant, *Ventilations*. (26) He assembled all the usual data, and almost every datum is open to doubt. Statistics and statements from Russian and Jewish sources represent what their authors thought it expedient for us to believe at the given time, and the Jews notoriously conceal, so far as possible, their actual numbers in each country they have infiltrated. When we are told, for example, that the percentage of Jewish deputies in the Supreme Soviet dropped from 41.1% to 0.25% between 1939 and 1958, we wonder whether the source is Russian or Jewish; if it is an estimate made by a European, it must be largely based on personal names, and the ingenuity of Jews in masquerading under native names and

otherwise concealing their race is notorious, and we have the further and insoluble question of the genetic effects of a tincture of Jewish blood in any individual's ancestry. (27) Furthermore, if the persons holding office are demonstrably non-Jewish, they may nevertheless be mere puppets manipulated from behind the scenes by Jews through wives, financial or political pressure, or deeply implanted superstitions.

(26. *The Dispossessed Majority* (Cape Canaveral, Florida, 1972), pp. 451-465, cf. pp. 346-353. *Ventilations* (ibidem, 1973), pp. 9-17. The publisher, Howard Allen Enterprises, announces that completely revised editions, printed from newly set type, of both books will be published in the autumn of 1981.)

(27. See above, p. 27, note 30. If Dr. Nossig is right about the genetic peculiarity of his race, that opens possibilities far more drastic and terrible than any thus far glimpsed or imagined by even the most vehement anti-Jewish writers. With the exception of a few noble families that have kept archives--it is said that there are in Britain two families that can trace their ancestry back to 1066 with certainty--the genealogical records of most individuals, even those who have attained some prominence, seldom go back more than a very few generations without the help of fantasy, and they quickly reach the point at which ancestors, especially females, are mere names. The names of Jews fall into three categories, viz.: 1) authentically Jewish names, e.g., Isaac, Jesus, Nathan; 2) Western names that have become distinctively Jewish, e.g., Rosenthal, Finkelstein, Oppenheimer; and 3) distinctively Aryan names assumed to conceal the individual's race, e.g., Montagu, Stewart, Brown. Resort to such disguises is an inveterate Jewish habit, probably dating from the time at which the race first developed its techniques for penetrating nations of *goyim*. And usually when the bearers of such names are not our contemporaries, the deceit can be detected only through the indiscretion of the Jews themselves. For example, the exemplary myth of Esther in its fuller text, preserved in the Septuagint, is warranted "authentic" (!) by pious Jews, and the names given are Dositheos, who is identified as a Jewish priest and Levite, his son, Ptolemaios (=Ptolemy), and the latter's son, Lysimachos. All are good Greek names; the first, we happen to know, was frequently assumed by Jews and so might suggest some suspicions; the second is, of course, the name of the famous Macedonian dynasty; and the third is the honored name of a number of distinguished Greeks. If we saw the names out of the context, we should never doubt but that Ptolemy and Lysimachus were of pure Greek ancestry and, of course, Aryans.)

The cumulative effect of the data taken together is impressive, but it seems to us inconceivable that the Jews, having taken over the whole government of Russia in their Bolshevik revolution (28) and always conscious of their secret and vigilant antagonism toward the races that show a tendency to be less than perfectly docile, could ever have permitted themselves to lose a mastery attained with such long and persistent labor and intrigue. (Note that we instinctively credit the Jews as a race with an order of intelligence higher than that of Aryans, and think them exempt from the fatuity that led our race to throw away its power and revel in its own degradation and

impotence.) The only plausible explanation is Robertson's.

(28. Aryan observers who were on the scene in Russia at the time of the Bolshevik take-over assure us that fully 85% of the Bolsheviks in positions of authority were Jews, and we know that the most important of them were sent into Russia from Switzerland by the stupid Germans (who were resorting to what could be described as a species of germ-warfare, probably at the suggestion of Jews high in Kaiser Wilhelm's government) and by Woodrow Wilson, who insisted that the British escort to Russia a shipload of venomous vermin from the East Side of New York City. A secret report to the U.S. State Department in 1919 (released from classification as secret in September 1960) lists the thirty foremost Bolshevik leaders, and identifies twenty-nine of them as Jews and one as a "Russian." That one "Russian" exception was Ulyanov, alias Lenin, who, as is universally admitted, was a mongrel of mixed Jewish and Tatar (Turko-Mongolian) ancestry and without a drop of Russian blood. It is nugatory to inquire anxiously about details and to wonder, for example, whether the real name of "Zinoviev" was Apfelbaum. It would not really matter if all the official heads had been Russian, for credit for the operation must go to its architects. St. Paul's in London is the work of Sir Christopher Wren and the mansion that now houses the Thomas Publishing Co. in Springfield, Illinois, is the work of Frank Lloyd Wright. The identity and race of the stone masons who worked on the former, and of the bricklayers who worked on the latter structure is irrelevant, as is the race of their various foremen.)

This explanation rests on two premises:

- 1) The Jews have a racial genius for infiltration, subversion, revolution, and destruction.
- 2) Their race is devoid of ability to organize and direct a viable society, whatever its type and whatever the political theory on which it is based. Having created chaos, the Jews can themselves survive in it only by enlisting the managerial talent of another race, commonly selecting administrators from the surviving (lower class) population of the nation they have just destroyed.

The first of these propositions is beyond question. It is verified by all history, for no nation deeply penetrated by Jews has long survived. It corresponds, furthermore, to their racial psyche, as frankly stated by some highly intelligent and remarkably candid members of the race, as, for example, by Samuel Roth in *Jews Must Live* (29) and by the eminent Maurice Samuel, (30) in his oft-quoted avowal:

'We Jews, the destroyers, will remain the destroyers for ever. *Nothing* that you will do

will meet our needs and demands. We will forever destroy because we need a world of our own.'

(29. Roth's *Jews Must Live* (New York, Golden Hind Press, 1934) has--for obvious reasons--disappeared from most or all libraries and become extremely rare. It is a book of 319 pages, including the frontispiece, etc.; about half of it was reprinted, Birmingham, Alabama, 1964, and is available from Liberty Bell Publications. Roth's is by far the most complete description of the quotidian behavior of the great mass of ordinary Jews in business and social relations, and we all owe him gratitude for his honesty and admiration for his courage. Relevant here is the reaction of Jews when the lowly Aryans try to have a club or a hotel or a residential district of their own. The Jews yell about "discrimination" and by bluster and, if need be, secret financial pressure, force their way in, but when they have made it squalid and hideous with their vulgarity, they abandon it and flock back to their own colonies, preferably leaving the Aryan owners bankrupt and dispossessed. Such conduct would show malice in an Aryan, but, if we are objective, we must attribute it to the impulsion of a racial instinct that operates as automatically and as subconsciously as an uncorrupted Aryan's instinctive admiration of certain forms of beauty.

There is an interesting analogy in the behavior of the Jews in ancient Alexandria, where a huge swarm of them, estimated at one million, took over a large part of the city and made it their vast and opulent ghetto, into which no Aryan, naturally, wanted to go. Not content with that, they perpetually swarmed through the rest of the city and were moved by their "righteousness" to break up the Greeks' theatrical performances and athletic contests, harassing the *goyim* until they finally lost patience, whereupon the Jews rushed wailing to the reigning Ptolemy or Roman governor, complaining of "anti-Semitism" and "persecution," and often, through the intrigues and financial power of wealthy and ostensibly civilized Jews, obtaining some punishment of the "intolerant" Greek population. Since the Jews, so far as is known, reaped no profits from these events and some of their rabble were injured or killed in the riots they provoked almost regularly every few years, their harassment of the Aryans must have been instinctive, rather than the result of some conscious plan or conspiracy.)

(30. See above, p. 45. The reprint is available from Liberty Bell Publications.)

One could corroborate Samuel's statement by citing hundreds of Jewish writings, ancient and modern. An example from the early years of the Christian Era is one of the great Jewish hoaxes, the forged Sibylline Oracles, (31) which were disseminated (naturally with a forged

certification that they were authentically Greek) to demoralize and subvert Graeco-Roman civilization by exciting dismaying apprehensions among the ignorant and credulous. No Aryan, I imagine, can read them without being appalled by the nihilistic lusts and venomous hatred of civilization that inspire them. A recent writer has cited, as an example of the innate nihilism of the Jewish soul,

'the Jewish apocalypse that the Fathers of the Church selected for inclusion in their appendix to the "Old Testament." That wild phantasmagoria describes in loving detail all the disasters and torments with which Jesus will afflict and destroy the civilized peoples of the earth when he returns in glory from the clouds with a squad of sadistic angels. One should note the characteristic provision that *goyim* are not to be merely killed outright: they are to be made to suffer agonies for five months first. But what Lloyd Graham has properly called the "diabolical savagery" of the Jew God is not satisfied with exterminating all the *goyim* with every kind of torture a lurid imagination could invent. He destroys the land, the mountains, the sea, the whole earth; he destroys the sun and moon; and he rolls up the heavens like a scroll, presumably including even the most remote galaxies...Everything is annihilated. And all for the sake of Jesus's pets, an elite of 144,000 male Jews who despise women. For these, to be sure, he creates a New Jerusalem, in which they will loaf happily for a thousand years.' (32)

One can only stand aghast at the ferocity of that lust to annihilate the whole universe!

(31. There are adequate editions, under the title *Oracula Sibyllina*, by Al Rzach (Vienna, 1891) and J. Geffcken (Leipzig, 1902, reprinted 1967). I have not seen the edition by A. Kurfess, *Sibyllinische Weissagungen* (München, 1951), which is said to contain a German translation. Some portions of the collection have been translated into English in various discussions of early Christianity, but I know of no complete translation of the long and miscellaneous collection. If there were one, persons whose minds are saturated with apocalyptic nonsense would undoubtedly find in it wonderful "prophecies" of the election of Reagan, the Jews' terrorism in Lebanon, and perhaps the latest increase in postal rates. -- A few old Greek reports of oracular statements are inserted here and there in the collection of forgeries to lend an air of authenticity to the hoax, of which the aim was to throw a scare into ignorant and weak-minded *goyim*, although some items encourage them to hope for a savior of some kind who will make all the earth his kingdom, with brotherhood and oodles of "world peace" for everyone, by teaching the wicked to venerate the living "Sons of the Great God." It is usually difficult to date the various hariations, but it seems that the earliest forgeries in the collection were perpetrated by Jews in Egypt during the Ptolemaic period: see John J. Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism* (Society of Biblical Literature, 1974).)

(32. Ralph Perier in *Liberty Bell*, August 1980, p. 20.)

Robertson's second proposition is less patently true, but it may be significant that in the apocalypse we have just mentioned, when the New Jerusalem is lowered *en bloc* from the newly-created sky, it is minutely described with what Frank Harris called "the insane Jew greed, which finds a sensual delight in mention of gold and silver, and diamonds and pearls and rubies," but there is no practical provision for the Chosen Few of the Chosen People who are to spend the next thousand years in it. We may assume that they will be miraculously supplied with food and raiment, perhaps by hard-working angels, and can spend part of their time in swilling down food and drink; but the noble males will have no nasty females around, and we can only guess whether they will find succedaneous amusements. For the rest, they evidently will have nothing to occupy their idle hands and vacant minds--for a thousand years! It looks as though the author of the wild hariation was intent only on the glorious destruction of the whole universe, and gave no thought to organization of the society that was to follow.

Jewish mythology has much to say about kingdoms and an empire of Solomon in the stolen land of Canaan, but archaeological data is too scanty to permit reconstruction of the historical basis for those tales. It is fairly certain, however, that when the wealthy Jews in Babylon betrayed the city to Cyrus the Great, the only non-Jew whom they ever called their christ, they made a deal with him for special privileges in his empire, for that is securely established by the Elephantine papyri. (33) The privileges seem to have included the establishment of a religious capital in

Jerusalem, and a Biblical book called *Esdras* (Ezra) and Josephus (34) give us a vivid description of the great caravan of rich Jews who set out from Babylon, their chariots loaded with gold and silver, with thousands of their *goy* slaves trudging along behind, while hundreds of slave musicians went ahead, so that the caravan travelled "to the music of harps and flutes and the clashing of cymbals," while the majority of Jews, who preferred to stay with business in Babylon, rejoiced and made merry. And when the immigrants reached Jerusalem, they began to dispossess the natives and kick them around, and they cunningly made their new Temple a fortress, as Herod was to do much later.

(33. Edited by A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford, 1923). The Jews of Elephantine, who thought of themselves as perfectly orthodox and seem to have been so regarded by the newly-established Temple in Jerusalem, recognized as the chief of their gods one whom they called YW (probably pronounced *Yu'*, a form that became *Ia* in the Septuagint) or YWH (thought to have been pronounced *Ya'u*) and provided him with a female consort, 'NT (probably identical with the Ugaritic-Canaanite goddess 'Anath). In the fifth century B.C., therefore, the Jews had not yet generally adopted the henotheism which appears in most of the "Old Testament," which they converted into monotheism when they came into contact with Graeco-Roman Stoicism and saw how expedient it would be to kidnap the Stoic's Providence (*animus mundi*). Of course, the erudite Bezalel Porten, in his *Archives from Elephantine* (University of California, 1968), labors mightily and learnedly to disclaim the early polytheism of the orthodox Jews, once (p. 175) even going so far as to suggest that the magnanimous Jews subsidized the worship of the gods of Arameans in Elephantine as a "goodwill gesture"!)

(34. *Antiq. Jud.*, XI, i-v, 1-183. There is an excellent edition and translation of this work by H. St. J. Thackeray, completed by Ralph Marcus, in the Loeb Library. Needless to say, the decrees of Cyrus and Darius quoted in the Biblical book and (with variations) by Josephus are forgeries.)

Under Persian protection, the Jews enjoyed autonomy, taxing and oppressing the hapless natives of Palestine (including the Samaritans, the native Jews, who vainly appealed to Persian justice), but when we hear next of them, (35) the high priest, John, murdered Jesus, his brother, right in the inner sanctuary of the temple, evidently as part of a civil disturbance so great that the local Persian governor had to intervene to restore order--and he, of course, was cursed for his pains, ostensibly because he wanted to peek into the sanctuary, where the Jews kept something they did not want *goyim* to see. (36) A spot of murder in the sanctuary did not seem worth noticing to the Jews of John's faction, for he was undisturbed in the exercise of his pious office.

(35. *Antiq. Iud.*, XI, vii, 297 sqq.)

(36. What the secret was is not known. The soldiers of Pompey reported they had seen in the sanctuary a statue of Yahweh with an ass's head. They are unreliable witnesses, of course, but there is some uncertain corroboration of their report, and such theriomorphic gods were normal in Egypt, whence the Jews claimed to have come. We cannot affirm that the soldiers were right, but what we must do is avoid the knee-jerk reflexes of most historians, who ignore this and all comparable evidence because they *know* that God's Holy People wouldn't do nothin' wrong. The Jews' talk about the strict piety of their race is a hoax, and false even after they appropriated the monotheism of the Stoics. For a brief summary of some recent archaeological evidence, see the *Scientific American*, CCXXVIII #1 (Jan, 1973), pp. 80-87. It is uncertain whether the Jews who worshipped Helios and Apollo in their synagogues in the Third Century (A.D.) identified Yahweh with those gods or added them to their ceremonies to ingratiate themselves with the "pagans" among whom they were living.)

John was succeeded by his two sons, who seem to have shared the high priesthood until one brother decided to knock the other out on the grounds that he was married to a Samaritan bitch instead of a nice orthodox Jewess, and that started another smouldering civil war. And so it goes, on and on, endlessly, with the Jews in Palestine unable to keep peace among themselves; with their various factions appealing to the Seleucid Greeks or the Romans to restore order in favor of one faction, while all factions are seemingly united in hatred of the civilized but useful *goyim*, whom they try to play off against each other through elaborate intrigues; and with the distracted *goyim* unable to protect the Jews who are friendly to them and are accordingly murdered stealthily by *sicarii*, experts in the art of plunging daggers into a man's back when he is off his guard.

In contrast to the perpetual disorders and outbreaks in Judaea, where the Jews enjoyed local autonomy, the majority of the Jews, scattered in enclaves throughout the civilized world (with the largest concentration of them probably in Babylon) and thus directly under the laws of the nations in which they had lodged themselves, seem to have lived in comparative peace with each other and with their hosts, except on the rare occasions on which there was an opportunity to betray a city to invaders or on which a self-appointed christ incited the Jewish rabble to insane outbreaks and massacres of the hated *goyim*.

After A.D. 70, the only autonomous or independent Jewish state that we can take into consideration is modern "Isra%ol." (37) As everyone knows, the Jews extorted the Balfour Declaration from Britain as the price for

stampeding American cattle into Europe in 1917, but since the English seemed to have had some scruple about betraying their Arab allies, the Jewish terrorists had to blow up and ambush quite a few stupid *goyim* before their new Zion was established formally in 1948 and God's People could start oppressing, kicking, and butchering the natives. (38) On this artificial "nation," which is, of course, supported by double taxation (39) of the world's beasts of burden in the United States, see Robertson's comments on it. It has its internal stresses, of which some reports are permitted to reach us, and is obviously held together only by its policy of steadily encroaching on the Semitic peoples around it and expanding its ill-gotten territory with military equipment donated by the American boobs. Living on money from the *goyim* and terroristic aggression, "Isra%ool" is certainly no proof that the Jews have the ability to organize and govern a state of their own.

(37. Not all Jews in Palestine followed the christ who caught the dozing Greeks and Romans off their guard in 132 and had great success in slaughtering them, but since the Romans were so bigoted that they disapproved of his cleverness, his ephemeral kingdom was quickly reduced to guerrilla bands hiding in the hills, and the christ never really governed any of the territory he claimed. -- The Jews did infiltrate and take over the kingdom of the Khazars in the Eighth Century, but too little is known about its internal government to permit us to use it as an example. (Incidentally, the Khazar-theory, so dear to Christians who want to eat their cookie and have it too, will have to be abandoned, if we accept the elaborate haematological study by Professor A.E. Mourant and his assistants, *The Genetics of the Jews* (Oxford, 1978). His results show that the Jews, despite the great differences in physical appearance, form a single hybrid race, having an infusion of at least 5% to 10% of Negroid blood, wherever in the world they have taken up residence.) -- The old Jewish colony in India claims to have penetrated that sub-continent before 175 B.C., since it did not observe the five great Jewish festivals, all of which (despite fabricated claims to greater antiquity) were instituted after that date. Whether or not those Jews reached India so early, it is certain that they never formed a state of their own: Schifra Strizower, *The Bene Israel of Bombay* (Oxford, 1971). -- Arthur J. Zuckerman's long treatise, *A Jewish Princedom in Feudal France, 768-900* (Columbia University, 1972), was based on tortuous inferences from illusory evidence, and his mighty Jewish realm in southern France and northern Spain was only a figment of his own imagination; see the review by Professor Bernard Bachrach in the *American Historical Review*, LXXVIII (1973), pp. 1440-41.)

(38. One wonders whether the British would have been so prejudiced as to become vexed, if the Jews had blown up their Parliament while it was in session. The first bomb planted in the building failed to explode and the Jewish High Command cancelled its orders before a second could be placed; see Avner, *Memoirs of an Assassin* (New York, 1960), pp. 104-121. His organization of "freedom fighters," he says (p. 64), operated on the principle that "an Englishman would always be a filthy Goy, who could be killed for that reason alone.")

(39. "Double taxation" because, in addition to the enormous subsidies that are openly and secretly sent to "Israel" by the Americans' government, the vast sums that are "privately" remitted by Jews residing in the United States are also taken from the American people. No one *dares* to protest.)

There is much to be said for Robertson's analysis, and we would accept his conclusion that the Russians have at last emancipated themselves--but reason revolts.

It is true that the Jews, who have always to be "persecuted" to conceal the extent of their actual control and power, are now screeching about "aunt-eye-see-mites" in Russia, but every few days we see the photographs of our real rulers, Kissinger, Armand Hammer, and others of the tribe, cuddling with Brezhnev and other real or supposed masters of Russia; American bankers are eager to supply the Soviet with seemingly unlimited quantities of the counterfeit currency manufactured by the Federal Reserve; and American farmers toil in their fields to supply the Soviets with all the grain and other foodstuffs they want. That, of course, may be just more of the looting to which the American serfs are accustomed. What really matters is the Jews' apparent satisfaction at the results of their sabotage of our armed forces. Since Yockey wrote, our Army has become what he foresaw. Demoralized by the operations carried out in Korea and Vietnam to kill and maim as many young Americans as possible while arranging defeats that would show the world how crazy and contemptible Americans are, (40) our remaining *military* officers are cynically trying to "stick it out" until they can retire on large pensions after twenty years. They are replaced by Jews, mulattos, and uniformed bureaucrats, whose notion of fighting is intriguing for promotion. If we look at our "fighting men," we see a motley horde of louts, perverts, females, and savages sullenly awaiting the day when they can put the hated "honkies" in their place. Do you really think that with that rabble the United States could defeat and occupy Ireland? For that matter, could our ground troops occupy Cuba?

(40. It will be remembered that an American officer was even tried by court-martial and imprisoned for having killed some of the enemy in Vietnam. The court-martial was held by our Army in slavish and shameful obedience to the outcries of journalistic pimps whose employers were engaged in a concerted effort further to demoralize our armed forces, and the campaign involved downright lying about the conditions of warfare in Indo-China. For an understanding of what war is like in such territory with such a population, see William Wilson's *The L.B.J. Brigade* (Los Angeles, Apocalypse, 1966_. The essential point is that the Vietnamese are *naturally* and by instinct as barbarous and treacherous as the crazed British and Americans *made* themselves when they repudiated all the canons of our civilization in the Jews' Crusade Against Europe.)

Russia now has the largest and most modern navy in the world. Our navy, far inferior in equipment, sports mulatto Admirals who strut around in ostentatiously slovenly attire and lord it over their white underlings, who try to conceal their resentment at the degradation imposed on them. The British officers who inspected the *Nimitz*, our largest carrier, were amazed to discover that parts of the great ship are "off limits" to white officers so that the savages won't kill them. The *Nimitz* is not a warship; it is a floating slum, on which, as a recent accident showed, the multi-racial warriors can't stay off drugs long enough to perform a perfunctory naval exercise. One hears that on some of our smaller carriers that still have white officers in command, it is thought that the white crew could "get rid of the niggers" and get the ship into fighting trim.

Since the operation of aircraft requires skill and intelligence, our obsolete bombers and comparatively few modern fighting planes could be relied upon, barring sabotage by multi-racial ground crews commanded by such ornaments as a Jewess Major General. But the failure of the maladroit attempt to rescue the "hostages" that we had cravenly abandoned in Iran naturally suggested doubts as to our capabilities even in the air, although the ineptitude may have been ordered in Washington. In the event of a war with the Soviet, we could sacrifice our air force and inflict a small or moderate amount of damage.

As for intercontinental ballistic missiles, the chances are that we are now inferior to the Russians, while our country, as Yockey pointed out, is far more vulnerable than theirs.

At the time of writing, it looks as though the Jews intended to order the Americans to clear the way for a Jewish advance and occupation of the Semitic countries around "Isra%ol." We could undoubtedly destroy the oil fields in Saudi Arabia and thus augment the fake "energy crisis" that is now used to chevy the boobs, and we could create by bombing from the air chaos in the other Semitic or partly Semitic countries--unless Russia intervened. That would mean a war with the Soviet, and, incidentally, if there were such a war, the Russians would certainly have to indulge, in sheer self-defence, their natural racial antipathy to Jews, all of the three million or more of them now in Soviet territory.

Since Yockey wrote, there has been one major alteration in the situation. The natural and inevitable racial hostility between the Russians, who are largely Aryan, and the Mongolian Chinese has evidently converted their original co"peration into active enmity. It is possible that fear of a Chinese invasion would deter the Russians from intervention in the Middle East,

but we do not know enough about conditions inside both of the empires that we created as our powerful enemies to calculate the chances of that. The most we can say is that it does not now seem likely that the Russians would abandon a strategically important part of the globe to Zion. And if they do not, that means war with the Jews' vassals, the United States.

In the event of such a war, the stooge in the White House could utter platitudes and talk about "saving the world for democracy," but there is no slightest indication of a will to fight in a nation--if it still is a nation (41)--that has long been lousy with peace-lubbers and the like. The Russians would have all the advantages of a first strike, and could inflict some spectacular damage on our cities, and, as Yockey predicted, our rabble would immediately clamor for surrender and start a furious civil war, if Washington even hesitated to put into effect its cherished plans for a "strategic" capitulation.

(41. In the continuous avalanche of books, most of them worthless and many worse than worthless, that vertiginously descends from the presses these days, the few important works are buried in the mass and often carried to oblivion unnoticed, but I hope no one has overlooked the sagacious analysis of our society by Professor Andrew Hacker, *The End of the American Era* (New York, 1970). He concludes that the United States has become nothing more than a geographical area, inhabited by incompatible races and individuals who, rootless and bewildered, no longer have a common culture or even a common interest. "What was once a nation," he says, "has become simply an aggregation of self-centered individuals." Our civilization--Aryan civilization, although he does not use that naughty word--has been so eroded and rotted that the American majority has lost all cohesion and has become merely a colluvies of miniature minorities, each composed of no more than half a dozen persons with a common purpose. Therefore, he concludes, "Our history as a nation has reached its end," and we have reached "a juncture at which it becomes pointless to call for rehabilitation or renewal." The only question now is the exact date and form of the final catastrophe. I wish I could refute that conclusion.)

The only alternative is the remote possibility that the United States has some really horrendous secret weapon which has not been betrayed to the Soviet, but that possibility is very remote.

So with all this before us, we are asked to believe that the Russians have become independent? Preposterous! With the example of Germany before us, we all know how terrible is the vengeance that Yahweh's Master Race inflicts on insubordinate *goyim*. If the Jews had been defied by the Russians, our armed forces would be drastically purged and every able-bodied white American below 40 would be conscripted and trained for the coming war. The Jews and their lackeys in all the media of communication would be frantically pumping a factitiously patriotic sludge in the faces of the boobs. Our holy men would be yelling in their

pulpits about our Christian duty to smite the Antichrist in Moscow and help an omnipotent god who obviously cannot help himself. Our automobile plants would be again converted to the production of airplanes and tanks; and all our laboratories would be filled with "crash programmes" to devise more effective missiles and counter-missiles.

You have only to look around you to see how absurd is a suggestion that the Jews' supremacy has been threatened in the Soviet! It's simply unreasonable!

So we say, but we do not know. My only point here is that if the Jews no longer control the Soviet, the only explanation is the one advanced by Yockey and Robertson. Although they differ in their psychological analysis, they agree that the explanation must be some mental peculiarity in Yahweh's Sons that impels them to conduct that would be irrational and insanely improvident in an Aryan.

THE THIRD SIDE OF THE COIN

We have, I think, followed Yockey and Robertson in drawing logical conclusions from the evidence before us. But all of our evidence--what we are told and what we are not told--comes from either Russian or Jewish sources. We do not have even a simple choice between stories told by two habitual liars, for when they disagree, both may still be lying, each in his own interest. And the world's masters of deceit are wily and subtle.

When travelling carnivals toured our country, the yokels were regularly fleeced by what was known as the shell game, which had many variations. In one variation, the sucker was led to believe that he had been given, inadvertently, a glimpse of the obverse of a coin and so could confidently bet on what would appear on the reverse when the shell was lifted, but, of course, when the coin was exposed, one with a different reverse had been substituted by a bit of prestidigitation.

When we ponder the Soviet enigma, one possibility always occurs to us, that internal rot within the empire may have gone much farther than we have been permitted to suspect by our sources--may have gone so far that what seems a monolithic state has some inner and hidden weakness great enough to affect its foreign policy. That speculative conjecture, however, we have always dismissed as gratuitous, since there was no plausible evidence to support it.

The periodical called *Fortune*, in its issue for 29 June 1981, published an astonishing article, entitled "Russia's Underground Millionaires," by a Jew, Konstantin Simis, formerly a Soviet lawyer and official in the Ministry of Justice, who says that in 1977, when the manuscript of a book that is to be published in this country was found in his apartment, he was invited to leave Russia and join his son, a professor in an American university.

According to this article, the Soviet is as rotten politically as the United States, although, of course, there are superficial differences. Corruption within the Communist Party we naturally take for granted, but here we are told of massive corruption of the Communist administration by bribery from outsiders, almost all of them Jews. There are distinct analogies to the almost universal political corruption that was established in this country in 1917 by the crackpots and mutton-heads who tried to prohibit our people from drinking alcoholic beverages.

We are told that there functions efficiently within the Soviet an enormous black market with its own factories, its own distribution-system, and its own retail outlets, operating comfortably by virtually wholesale bribery of Communist managers and police, and operated by capitalists, almost all of them Jews, who accumulate what are large fortunes by any standard and store their surplus wealth in gold, jewels, and other things that are intrinsically valuable. A typical entrepreneur, who was arrested, through some mischance, by the Secret Police, was found to have in his possession such valuables to the amount of 350,000,000 rubles, which, at current exchange, would equal \$546,000,000.

This great *essor* of Jewish enterprise, according to the author, began "in the mid-1930s" with such talented entrepreneurs and masqueraders as Isaac Bach, who, while officially only a supervisor in a small workshop and paid as such by the state, was secretly a capitalist worth some \$135,720,000, "owning at least a dozen factories manufacturing underwear, souvenirs, and notions, and operating a network of stores in all the republics of the Soviet Union." Such surreptitious business flourished, it should be noted, while Lazar Moseevich Kaganovich was Stalin's Deputy Premier in charge of industry, and naturally continued to flourish under his successor in that office, Benjamin Dimschitz, another Jew. (41a) And it has now reached the high financial level shown by the one example mentioned above, which, we are given to understand, was not at all extraordinary, except that the apostle of free enterprise either neglected to bribe all the officers of the Secret Police concerned or was rashly careless in some way that made it too awkward for them to cover up for him.

(41a. Dimschitz (or Dymshits) is the only Soviet official of very high rank whom Wilmot Robertson (op. cit., p. 456, n. 16) recognizes as a Jew. It's evidently a matter of the right man in the right place. What is extremely curious is that he is not even mentioned in the list published by *Candour*, to which I shall refer in note 48, below.)

The commercial activities of those energetic Jewish businessmen interest us only because they are all categorically prohibited by Soviet law, which provides for the guilty minimum penalties of years of imprisonment in slave labor camps. It necessarily flourishes through a vast system of pay-offs and the like (42) that would do credit to the genius for organization shown by American politicians. There are "tens of thousands of such factories" owned by capitalists of the black market, but almost all of them are actually state factories, operated by managers appointed by the Communist government, who fulfill their quotas and then turn to production for the capitalists, using, of course, the machinery provided by that state, their working staff, and sometimes materials provided by the state, although the production for the black market is usually of better quality and uses better materials. The manager must be given his cut, of course, and so must the workmen, who are often employed on overtime. All government inspectors must be bribed, and so must all local agents of the Secret Police, especially those in the branch that is expressly charged with policing industry. Much of the raw material must be obtained from nominally state establishments, with, of course, a corresponding round of cuts and bribes. The retail outlets are, for the most part, state stores which handle black-market goods surreptitiously, and so managers and bookkeepers and clerks must be given their cuts and massive bribery must keep inspectors and agents of the police in line. And, of course, it is necessary to put the fix on the bureaucrats who preside over the inspectors and agents. In short, the Communist empire must be a seething mass of political corruption. And after all such business expenses, the promoters reap huge profits and become enormously wealthy.

(42. When Franklin Roosevelt was gabbling about the "Four Freedoms" to entertain the boobs during the Jewish Crusade Against Europe, knowledgeable "New Dealers" defined the Four Freedoms as the rake-off, the pay-off, the shakedown, and the fix. There are technical differences between these four aspects of government in a "democracy," but we need not define them here.)

The "tens of thousands of factories," we are told, are chiefly in Moscow, Odessa, Riga, Tiflis, and other major cities in which are concentrated the Jews now in Russia--some three million of them, according to Jewish sources, who are now being "discriminated against" by the Soviet, it not

being explained why they are only half as numerous as the Jews who were "discriminated against" by the Czarist regime, under which they owned half the industry of Russia, We may assume that free enterprise is providing good incomes for a large part of the three million, perhaps most of them in one way or another.

Despite the massive bribery of Communist officials, something more is required for this vast clandestine business, which must be conducted without written records, and in which sums that may amount to hundreds of thousands of rubles exchange hands without documents of any kind or witnesses, "in an atmosphere of complete trust," such as could never exist among legitimate business men in this country. The explanation is given by the author: it is "the sense of national identity among Jewish underground businessmen," who may not be eager to migrate to their race's capital in Palestine, but "feel a blood relationship with it" and contribute money (in American currency!) to it. If the commercial honesty that is dictated by a sense of racial solidarity, which Aryans can only envy as they reflect with shame on the egotistic venality and financial opportunism of their own people, is reinforced by Jewish racial courts, the *kahal*, which some anti-Jewish writers allege to be secretly maintained in Jewish colonies, the writer gives no hint of them. (42a)

(42a. Jews vehemently deny the existence of the *kahal* and denounce as "anti-Semitic" the Jew, Jacob Brafmann, who wrote the most extensive and detailed description of the quasi-religious racial courts. His work has been translated into German, with a learned commentary by Dr. Siegfried Passarge, *Das Buch vom Kahal*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1928. See also the work of the Argentine writer, Hugo Wast, whose essay and novel, *El Kahal*, is also published in Mexico (Editorial Diana, 6th edition, 1964). Wast describes the operation of the Jewish tribunal in modern Argentina, and says "El Kahal es un soberano invisible y absoluto," which regulates the entire life of Jews, "comercio, político, religión, vida privada en sus detalles más minuciosos." He says that the disciplinary powers are vested in a secret tribunal, *Beth Din*, which, I gather, operates with the summary powers and secrecy of the Westphalian Vehmgerichte of the Thirteenth to Sixteenth Centuries, which will be familiar to many readers from the description, doubtless with romantic amplification, in Sir Walter Scott's *Anne of Geierstein*. The supreme *kahal* of the Jews, with jurisdiction over all colonies of the international race, sits in New York City, according to Wast. American attorneys who have handled litigation between Jews who have tried to swindle each other are certain no *kahal* is now in operation, but notice an odd convention in such matters, e.g., a bitterly resentful and injured Jew will not denounce his adversary for smuggling or fraud in income-tax reports, although he has proof in his possession.)

One limitation on the felicity of Jewish capitalists in Russia is the need to observe some discretion in public display of their wealth, since too much ostentation has brought some of them to the attention of Communist authorities not on their payroll, with sad results. Prudent financiers limit

their public expenditures to what they can pretend was legitimate income, e.g., from winning tickets in a state lottery, and amass their wealth in gold, jewels, and similar articles they can easily hide. Foreign money can be obtained, but would have no advantage in Russia. We may guess that the Rockefeller banks in Russia probably assist capitalists to transfer abroad holdings that they can enjoy when it pleases them to "defect" from Russia. The author suggests that the vast investments in gold and jewels, if not made for a miser's satisfaction in mere possession, may perhaps be held in anticipation of "the downfall of the Soviet régime."

If we accept Simis's account of the vast wealth of Soviet Jewry and the pervasive corruption of Soviet government in all its functions, including the Secret Police, it will be obvious that the ingenuity, secrecy, and bribery that maintains the capitalists' clandestine businesses could also promote a secret and formidable revolutionary underground, capable of striking suddenly and perhaps decisively. And that will alter all our estimates of the probable future of the Soviet and of its capacity to wage a major war. We accordingly wonder whether some credence may not be due to some reports about efficient and ostensibly Christian "undergrounds" in the Soviet. The reports once put out so industriously by evangelists who pretended to solicit funds for such organizations can be dismissed as mere sucker-bait, but, if Simis is right, such organizations could exist. (42b)

(42b. If we believe Paul R. Vaulin, *The Regiment of Kitezh* (Mobile, Alabama, 1977), Russia is now honeycombed by a formidable conspiracy of Christians, who have penetrated the Soviet bureaucracy and even the Secret Police, having placed or enlisted secret agents in strategic posts, and counting on exciting a revolt of "a quarter of a billion [Russian] men" when the time comes. Two colleagues of the author on the faculty of the University of South Alabama certify that the narrative "describes actual events," was written by "an American agent" who was dropped by parachute into Soviet territory in May 1972, and was copied from his manuscript, which "was smuggled out of the USSR by an American student." They further certify that Satan prevented the publication of the book by a commercial publisher, so that it had to be published privately "without the permission of Satan." If there is any truth to the story, the Soviet Secret Police have become hopelessly inefficient and stupid. There is an implication that the Christians' god keeps the conspiracy invisible to Communist eyes, and it would seem that Satan hasn't been able to wake up the Politburo.)

We can neither affirm nor deny the accuracy of Simis's story. If that number of *Fortune* has reached Russia, his report has probably been denounced in *Pravda* as an "outrageous Fascist lie" and perhaps even as "anti-Semitic," with many "proofs" of its spuriousness; if it hasn't been, it will be, at least when his book is published. All that we can do is say that the story is amazing, and put it down as another question mark around the

enigma.

AT THE WAILING WALL

We must grant that the evidence for the Jews' supposed loss of authority in Russia is meager and unsubstantial. Self-appointed "Kremlinologists" (!) expound to us the intentions behind certain Soviet policies, but mind-reading is always a hazardous business. It is true, for example, that Russia has supplied some weapons to the Semitic and largely Semitic countries that are menaced by the Jews' constant aggression and implacable hatred. (The Arabs and their allies, by the way, have always to pay cash to the Soviet, while the Jews have only to requisition all the equipment they want from their Americans serfs.) We are told that Russia clearly intends to impede the plan, of which the Jews openly boast, to make Jerusalem the capital from which Yahweh's Race will rule the whole world; but, for aught we know to the contrary, the subtle minds of Russia's rulers may be cozening the Arabs and planning eventually to betray them, as the Americans, for example, betrayed Chiang Kai-shek.

The nominally American government in Washington is in a fever of anxiety over the supposed plight of the three millions of the Self-Chosen People in Soviet territory, and claims to be squandering American resources as bribes to the Russians to increase the privileges granted to Jews (but no other race), in the hope that soon the whole three millions will follow the 200,000 who have recently flown from the Soviet and, after touching ground in Israel, flocked into the United States, except for a minority, who, after getting a whiff of their tribesmen in Israel, promptly flew back to their Soviet homes. (43) One cannot be impressed by the ostensible reasons for a policy of which the net result is further to augment American subsidies to the Soviet while simultaneously augmenting the saturation of our country with Jews.

(43. It is true that the Russians do not seem eager to welcome them back. *The Daily World*, 8 January 1979, reported that 300 Jews, who had left the Soviet, fled to Italy after they had a good look at the ant-heap in Israel. They were appealing to the "United Nations," evidently in the hope that the clowns in that circus would intercede and obtain for them permission to return home.)

The other evidence is much noise and very few facts, all of them no better than the facts on which are based the Jews' assurance to the British that in

the United States the wicked "Neo-Nazis" are on the verge of stuffing ten or twenty millions of God's persecuted darlings into crematoria. (44) The Americans have had the awful audacity to investigate a rather grandiose, but typical, Jewish hoax and expose its absurdity. (45) What the British may be stupid enough to believe, I do not know, but the imminence of a real "holocaust" in the United States will be considered unlikely by the hapless Americans, who cringe before the Jewish Terror; who see the homes of men who dare disbelieve the hoax besieged by mobs of Jews screaming for their blood and threatening to burn them and their families in their houses; who know that Presidents and Vice Presidents of the United States who dared mutter *in private* some lack of reverence for Jews were hounded from their office and forced to resign; who know that no business man dares offend our masters, not even by subscribing to a journal that does not have kosher approval, for even if it comes to a postoffice box under an assumed name, the spies will learn his identity and the Jews stealthily or openly will destroy his business and perhaps his family... It would be idle to go on enumerating what is known by everyone who ventures to raise his eyes and look about him. My point is that Americans should know that the fact that Professor Butz has not yet been murdered and all copies of his book destroyed by the F.B.I. is not satisfactory proof that the United States is persecuting the People of God. And it may not be amiss to consider Jewish lamentations about Russia with critical intelligence rather than faith.

(44. See above, p. 73.)

(45. On the hoax about the "six million Jews" who are said to have been exterminated in Germany before they migrated to the United States and a few other lands and began to collect for their deaths from the Germany they had ruined, the pioneer work was that of Paul Rassinier, who had been himself an inmate of a German concentration camp and later spent years in touring Europe vainly in search of someone who had actually seen one of the famous "gas chambers," for which the basis, of course, was only the Germans' attempts to control with disinfectants the epidemics of typhus brought into the camps by Jews and their body lice. See Rassinier's *Lemensonage d'Ulysse* (Paris, 1950) and its sequels, *Ulysse trahi par les siens* (Paris, 1961), *Le v,ritable proc,s Eichmann* (Paris, 1962), and *Le drame des Juifs europaens* (Paris, 1961). An English translation of the last of these was published by Steppingstones, Silver Spring, Maryland, 1975, which issued in the following year a translation of the book on the Eichmann trial (which Rassinier had originally intended to entitle aptly, "Les maitre-chanteurs de Nuremberg"), now published by the Historical Review Press, Chapel Ascote, Ladbroke, Southam, Warwickshire. I understand that translations of Rassinier's several books are assembled in *Debunking the Genocide Myth*, published by the Institute for Historical Review, Torrance, California. The fullest and most systematic demolition of the infamous hoax, which has been used to extort forty billion dollars or more from the helpless people of Germany, is the masterly work of Professor Arthur R. Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, published by Historical Review Press, *s.a.* (1976), and available from Liberty

Bell Publications; an American edition is published by the Institute for Historical Review in California. An especially notable work in German is *Der Auschwitz Mythos* (Tübingen, Grabert, 1979; available from Liberty Bell Publications) by Judge Wilhelm Stäglich, who thus brought on himself pseudo-legal vengeance by the Jews' puppet government in Bonn, which tried to make him penniless and did succeed in depriving him of half of his meager income. The author of a smaller volume on the same subject is now in prison in Germany for having dared to contradict God's Master Race. A very useful and handsomely illustrated book is William N. Grimstad's *The Six Million Reconsidered, s.l.&a.* (1977), which has been reprinted by the Historical Review Press in England and in the United States by the Institute for Historical Review. Perhaps the most noteworthy aspect of the "six million" hoax is the hoaxers' contempt for the simple-minded Aryans: they did not take the trouble to make their various fictions plausible or consistent. The point, of course, is that Aryans must be so trained that their minds will freeze and all thought stop whenever one of God's People speaks to the curs.)

One bit of evidence adduced by Wilmot Robertson is the publication of the Ukrainian Academy of Science (in 1963) of a book that spoke of Jews without reverence, and he adds that the Soviet authorities did not suppress the book until after "world opinion," as manufactured by Jewish journalists, began to howl. The suppression, however, does not satisfy the Jews, who now wax indignant that its Satanic author was, after a time, permitted to return to his employment, instead of being liquidated or starved to death. (46)

(46. See, e.g., the article by Dr. Spier that I cite below.)

Although as late as 1979 the Jews were still assuring themselves in some of their racial publications that their tribe was flourishing in the Soviet and that 400,000 of them ensconced in Moscow alone were joyful, (47) they are now telling themselves in their own publications, as well as in "our" press (which they own or otherwise control) that the international people are being "persecuted" by the vile Russians, in whose country they have chosen to reside. The volume of this propaganda is enormous, and it would be a waste of time to notice slight differences in the pitch of what is just one unending screech, but, if we dare be so evil as to look at a few specimens intelligently, we may derive some hints from them.

(47. A clever twist in propaganda was used by Aaron Vergelis, editor of the periodical in Yiddish that is lavishly financed by the Soviet. In his tour of this country in January 1979, he assured his Jewish audiences from coast to coast that "Soviet Jews are building a new and happy life in their [*sic!*] multi-national homeland," and that propaganda that the Jews are not living high on the hog in the Soviet is really a form of "anti-Semitism"

spread by "anti-Communists" to incite hostility to the Soviet and to encourage the nasty "anti-Semitic" elements in the United States. "Anti-Sovietism," he proclaimed with Talmudic subtlety, "is the greatest anti-Semitism." His speeches were widely reported in the frankly Jewish press and summarized in the *Daily World*, 30 January 1979.)

A yell by Kevin Klose in the *Washington Post*, 15 July 1979, headed "Soviet Jews are Fearful of Rising Anti-Semitism," brings us the shocking news that many more Russians are now being given positions in the Russian universities and other "institutions of higher learning where Jews have traditionally excelled." A book published in only five hundred copies "calls Zionism 'the worst form of fascism' "--a statement which should be good for a laugh even in Russia. Another, of which 45,000 copies were printed, "alleges that 'Zionist centers' control Western media." One gathers that Russians should not be told of the Jews' virtually total dominion over the press and boob-tubes of the United States, Britain, France, and other Western nations. Chief among the horrors that are giving the three million Jews in Russia nervous palpitations are two letters one or more diabolic Russians may have produced on a mimeograph and are clandestinely circulating to some "members of the Moscow intelligentsia." One of these horrid letters declares that "both in the U.S. Senate and the Central Committee of the Communist Party there is a powerful Zionist lobby." Americans know about the Senate and the rest of "their" government in Washington, where, according to the press of 36 July, Reagan, "personally ordered" everyone to cease and desist from criticizing the Jews' terrorist bombing of Lebanon and slaughter of the Semites who don't understand that the Jews have a right to their homes and lives--acts which some misguided men thought tactless at the very time that the United States was about to rush another big shipment of our best weapons to Israel, for which Reagan has "a very special affection." We wonder, however, whether the mimeographed letter was as accurate about Russia as about the country that once was ours. A second letter, furtively typewritten and copied on a mimeograph, says that Brezhnev's wife is a Jewess--as everyone in and out of Russian has long known--and that there are only three "real Russians" among thirteen members of the ruling Politburo. There is no claim that the second statement is not equally true, but Klose reports a rumor that "Russophiles," persons so wicked that they love their own country, expecting that Brezhnev will soon depart from this world, are manoeuvring "within secret 'higher circles' of the [Communist] party...to heighten traditional Russian antagonism and force Jews from such positions of power and influence as they now hold." Just as though God's People didn't have a prescriptive right to "power and influence" over the lower races!

What interests us is the claim, in the mimeographed sheet that is being clandestinely passed around to a few Russians, that the Russians have only

three representatives in the Politburo. The journal founded by the late A.K. Chesterton, *Candour*, published in its issue for Nov.-Dec. 1978 a list, obtained from Russian sources, of the members of the Politburo. This shows twenty-one men besides Brezhnev, and the score is: Russians, 6; race unascertained, 1; Jews, 14, including the Minister of Defence, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Chief of the Secret Police, and two others, who are among "the most powerful men in the USSR." (48) Date and place of birth are given and the real names of the Jews, most of whom operate under aliases in public, as is their custom. *Candour's* informant adds that "90% of the Soviet Ambassadors are Jews," and lists twelve examples. Since I am unfortunately deprived of the revelations from on high that enable so many in the "right wing" to *know* whatever they want to believe, I cannot affirm either the accuracy or inaccuracy of the list in *Candour*, but if the list contains no more than a fair percentage of truth, it would seem that the international race has prematurely rushed to its Wailing Wall, perhaps from sheer force of habit.

(48. It is odd that *Candour* and the clandestine mimeographed sheet that scares the Jews in Russia agree only on Kosygin as a loyal Russian. *Candour's* source had no information about Romanov, and, what is most remarkable, Suslov, who is one of the three "real Russians" on the mimeographed sheet, is identified in *Candour* as a Jew, born in 1902 in the principal city of Azerbaijan, whose real name is Suess and who is the principal representative in Russia of the B'nai B'rith that operates in the United States and watches of the Aryan sheep. Cf. note 41a above.)

TOD UND VERKLÄRUNG

The most nearly sober of the current lamentations is a long article by Ruben Ainsztein in the well-known and widely influential British periodical, *New Statesman*. On the cover of the issue for 18 December 1978, where it is illustrated by a photographic montage that shows the evil face of Hitler behind the evil face of Stalin, the article is entitled, "Soviet Union Today: Anti-semitism Institutionalized," but above the article itself appears the apocalyptic title, "The End of Marxism-Leninism." The author naturally does not miss a chance to reiterate the Jews' great "Holocaust" hoax, and he assures us that "Only Stalin's mysterious [!] death saved the Jews who had survived Hitler's Final Solution from annihilation." He then speaks of the awful book that Robertson mentioned, but without quite telling us that it was suppressed in 1963. His featured evidence, however, is a confidential memorandum to certain committees in the Communist Party, allegedly written by Valery Nikolayevich Yemelyanov, and presumably typewritten or mimeographed, of which Jewish agents were able to filch part in January 1977. (49) In that memorandum Yemelyanov

reportedly not only said unkind things about the sacrosanct race, but even proposed the formation of an international organization to unite civilized men of the West to oppose and perhaps avert the consolidation of Jewish control over the entire planet.

(49. Further information about the memorandum that Yemelyanov hoped to keep confidential is given in a despatch from Jerusalem published in the *Daily Telegraph*, Britain's largest conservative newspaper, on 9 March 1978. One of the Ministers in the Israeli government moaned that the stolen memorandum was "an all-out declaration of war against the Jews" by the one man who wrote it.)

I naturally cannot tell whether Yemelyanov did indeed express such evil thoughts, but I note that in a long article in the *Jewish Chronicle* (London), 25 July 1980, Dr. Howard Spier complacently remarks that the "paranoid" Professor Yemelyanov had been fired from his academic position and incarcerated in a "psychiatric hospital." (50) That sounds to me as though the Children of God still had influence in the Soviet Union, but it does not prevent Dr. Spier from chattering with fear about the likelihood of pogroms because, although "overt antisemitism" is not feasible in Russia today, there are Russians who regret that it is not and who even dare to write articles with "racial overtones," which are "thinly disguised antisemitism" and therefore offensive to Yahweh's Master Race.

(50. Poor Yemelyanov must have been released from the madhouse after Spier wrote, for a few lines in the Spanish press in January 1981 reported that he had been arrested and imprisoned for "racism," presumably shortly before. Since Yemelyanov is, so far as we know, the only man in the Soviet Union who has dared to suggest (in a confidential memorandum) actual opposition to the Jews, it may be assumed that if he were publicly crucified, the three million tribesmen in Soviet territory, who are now quaking with terror, could sleep o'nights.)

Among the innumerable shrieks of the Jewish Banshee, none is better written or more coherent than Robert Wistrich's article on the wickedness of Stalin in the *Jewish Chronicle*, 22 February 1980. Like Ainsztein, Wistrich identifies Stalin as the serpent who appeared in the Soviet Eden and, after beguiling the Slavic Eve by justly equating disrespect for Jews with cannibalism and making it punishable by death, finally gave effect to the evil thoughts he had secretly harbored in his black soul for a long time and slyly sold her the deadly apple of patriotism. The article is noteworthy for the relative absence of the usual hysteria and for its author's respect for

logic, and especially because it identifies, as did Yockey, the hanging of the eleven Jews in Prague as the turning point of Stalin's policy: "for the first time, antisemitism and anti-Zionism openly fused." The trials in Prague were a first step toward "Stalin's own Final Solution of the Jewish question--mass deportations to Siberia....The plan was foiled [*sic!*]" by the opportune death of Stalin. Stalin's policy was reversed, he is now discredited, and his monuments "have been pulled down," but the terrible thing is that "Stalin's heirs...studiously avoided mentioning antisemitism in the catalogue of his crimes." And that means, oh horrors! that we "must reckon with the return of the pogrom traditions of the Tsarist State under a thin veneer of Marxist-Leninist verbiage."

Two of the best articles, which I have mentioned, and numerous others assert that Stalin intended in his own mind to solve Russia's Jewish problem by either transporting the aliens to Siberia, as Wistrich says, or by exterminating them, as Ainsztein claims, presumably by finding engineers and chemists who could overcome the practical obstacles to constructing and operating "gas chambers," such as are celebrated in the Jews' great hoax about the "six million." (51) The evidence that Stalin had *in petto* a plan to become the Antichrist (52) is both meager and in conflict with all of his career before he was seventy-three, but we must remember that Dzhugashvili began his career as a theological student and doubtless acquired early the arts of dissimulation and hypocrisy, in which he must have perfected himself. There can be no doubt but that he was a highly intelligent man, so it is out of the question that he could ever have taken seriously the Marxist religion, which he used to manipulate the misfits, simpletons, idealists, and other crackpots over whom he climbed to power, and to outwit his fellow thugs. (53) So talented a man could have concealed even from Jews his opinion of them, but it is also possible that he, like Luther and many other men, trusted the Jews during the greater part of his career and changed his mind only late in life.

(51. The choice of this number may have some special significance. In the early years of this century, and especially during the administration of President Taft, American busybodies were a-twitter over the supposed plight of the *six million* dear Jews who were "imprisoned" in Czarist Russia because they preferred not to leave it.)

(52. It must be remembered that the term 'antichrist' does not specifically refer to the christ called Jesus who is the hero of the "New Testament." A christ is, of course, a divinely-appointed King of the Jews, who will lead his race to a solution of the Gentile problem by exterminating Aryans and the like, except for some who may be spared for slavery. The apocalyptic fantasies of the Jews call for the appearance of an 'antichrist,' i.e., a particularly disrespectful and wicked *goy*, before the appearance of the real christ, who will put the lower races in their place. An 'antichrist,' therefore, is a powerful

adversary of the Jews, except, of course, in Christian terminology.)

(53. It goes without saying that Communist leaders do not believe in Communism. An acute young American, Duane Thorin, who had been intensively interrogated while a prisoner, stated the facts concisely in *A Ride to Pannunjom* (Chicago, Regnery, 1956): "Intellects that failed to see through the falsities of communism were so arrested that they were of only limited use in the totalitarian state." Czeslaw Milosz in *The Captive Mind* (New York, 1953) devotes a chapter to the practice of *ketman* by the more intelligent Communist professionals as they jostle for places on the ladder: like Moslem and Christian theologians, they feign a belief in the orthodox doctrine of their sect and try to catch each other out by devising Talmudic quibbles as traps to obtain admissions that will justify a charge of heresy.)

The best proof that Stalin was or became inimical to the Self-Chosen People is that a pack of Jewish physicians tried to poison him a few weeks before he died suddenly, reportedly of a "cerebral haemorrhage." They would not have done so without good reason. It is true that some persons believe the story that the physicians were innocent, but they do so on the usual grounds that Jews are "righteous" people, and without reflecting that nothing could be more righteous than killing *goyim* that get in the way of God's Own. As all Christians well know, that is the lesson that is taught throughout the "Old Testament," which seems such an appalling record of crime to persons who read it without Faith. (54) The virtually infinite superiority of their race is taken for granted and openly avowed by Jews today. (55) The Holy People, for example, did not hesitate to boast over the French radio of their cleverness in poisoning a thousand German officers by slyly putting arsenic in the bread they baked for them. (56) And, as everyone known, Begin, who is now dropping bombs on the civilian population of Lebanon in preparation for conquest and annexation of that helpless country, early distinguished himself by his efficiency in killing *goyim*, such as the English men, women, and children whom he blew up by planting a bomb in their hotel. For such valiant deeds he is sometimes criticized adversely by "aunt-eye-see-mights," who do not understand that his victims were just English pigs and probably should have been butchered anyway. (57)

(54. Christians, I understand, find especially edifying the tale that is told about Moses in *Exodus*, 2.11-15, 19; 4.19-20. Seeing an Egyptian treat a Jew harshly, Moses found an opportunity to catch the *goy* alone and, after looking all around to make sure no one could see them, rubbed him out, probably by stealing up behind him and stabbing him in the back. Moses hid the body in the sand, but when he found that someone had seen him after all and would turn stool-pigeon, his chutzpah failed him and he took it on the lam across the border into a foreign country, where, passing himself off as an Egyptian, he lay low for many years until God came to his hide-out and told him the heat was off in Egypt

and the cops were no longer looking for him.)

(55. According to the press, Dr. Michael Wyschogrod, Professor of Philosophy in the City University of New York, frankly told a conference sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews that there was a vast difference between harming a Jew and killing *goyim*, because "what happens to the Jewish people is not quite the same" as what happens to other people in that there is "an element of the divine" in Jewish history that makes it special. He admitted that "humanists" and other irreligious persons would think the racial distinction "a scandal," but that is because they do not "grasp the uniqueness of Jewish history." Dr. Wyschogrod also told his audience what makes that uniqueness: the fact that a Jew is always a detached limb of his race and only secondarily an individual. "I am first a member of the Jewish people," he declared, "and only secondarily Michael Wyschogrod." That, of course, is something an Aryan can never understand, for while he may feel a loyalty to, or a duty towards, a class or nation, he can do so only *as an individual*, and even the strongest effort of the imagination will not enable him to think of himself as having the relation to his race that a member of his body bears to him. The conference was reported in *The Christian News*, 30 April 1981, p. 15.)

(56. See the *Toronto Daily Star*, 9 March 1968.)

(57. Cf. note 38 above.)

The heroic physicians, like the Lopez who was the personal physician of Queen Elizabeth I and tried to poison her, were caught, but we shall never know whether they had colleagues who were more successful. It is, of course, not unusual for men of Stalin's age to die of natural causes, but a sudden death that occurs so soon after an unsuccessful attempt at assassination, and occurs so opportunely--should we say providentially?--for a man's deadly enemies will always arouse suspicions.

When a great monarch dies, there is always a bitter struggle for power among the *diadochi*, and from what we know of Communists and given the impossibility of dividing the empire, we may be certain that the contest in Russia was especially vicious, but the essential facts concerning it remain secret. Eventually Khrushchev, whatever his antecedents, (58) came out on top, having pleased his henchmen by vituperating the man who had saved Russia, the Soviet, and Communism from the German invasion. In 1961, he ejected ignominiously from its tomb the body of the architect of Russia's position as a world-power, had his monuments and memorials destroyed, and even carried post-mortem hatred so far as to change the name of Stalingrad, the site of Russia's most celebrated victory.

Such spitting on a national hero and the sheer fury of the posthumous vengeance taken on him, must have had a deeper motive than a mere courting of popularity among the serfs, as sometimes happens in "democratic" countries. In fact, the vitriolic denunciation of Stalin for "tyranny" was a somewhat hazardous gambit, since it might encourage discontent with that tyranny, which was continued with only superficial changes. What the motive was, however, we cannot determine: it may have been known only to the inner circle of the Politburo and must remain an enigma for us.

(58. I refuse to debate the vexed question whether or not Khrushchev was really a Jew masquerading as a Slav. The evidence on both sides of the question is suspect.)

In sum, then, the evidence before us warrants the conclusion that for a period of about six months--from early November 1952 until 5 March 1953--Dzhugashvili-Stalin openly showed a certain hostility toward the Jews that he had doubtless meditated for some time before putting it into practice. (59) It is reasonable to conjecture that he may have intended or wished to put into practice the stated principles of Zionism. During those six months or more, the Jews seem to have lost the power to control Russian policy, and it may be they did not subsequently recover their dominance over it. (60) There is evidence that Russians are now permitted to occupy in the universities and bureaucracy positions that Jews want.

(59. The earlier stages of the affair that reached its climax with the hanging of the eleven Jews in Prague are uncertain. The most important of these Jews, Rudolf [nice Germanic name, Gothic hrôth-wulfs!] Slánsky, was arrested on a charge of treason on 27 November 1951, but the Czech executive who had formally ordered the arrest, Kópriva, was himself arrested on 23 January 1952, thus producing a neat confusion to keep everyone puzzled.)

(60. By far the most complete and objective treatment of the whole question known to me is the late Andrey Diky's *Jews in Russia and in the USSR, s.l.a.* [1978?]. When I last heard, copies could be obtained from L. Volovlikoff, P.O. Box 8082, Ottawa, Ontario. This work is based on Russian and Ukrainian sources not generally available, especially periodicals, and its author makes every effort to be fair and more than fair to the Jews, giving them the benefit of every doubt. In an appendix, pp. 297-319, the author lists the officials of the eleven principal organs of the Soviet government from 1932 to 1939. Here are the totals: Jews, 447; non-Jews, 68; race undetermined, 34.)

For the rest, we can only note that there is not the slightest indication that the present regime in Russia intends to accept the theory of Zionism, as it would surely do, if it wished to rid its territory of Jews. Hitler, to be sure, accepted Zionism and made great efforts to foster it, and the Jews will never forgive him for having taken them at their word, but nevertheless a regime that is really anti-Jewish would not overlook the enormous advantage it would obtain by officially supporting Zionism. (61)

(61. As we all know--or should know--the premise on which the Zionist movement was founded, and on the basis of which support for it (including the Balfour Declaration) was solicited, was that Jews and Europeans represent incompatible races and cultures, and that the presence of the aliens in Europe will always result in irremediable tension and animosities, to the distress of all concerned. The only solution, therefore, was the creation of a "homeland" to which all Jews could emigrate and in which they could form a nation that would have a geographic unity corresponding to its spiritual unity. See the writings of the founder of Zionism, Theodor Herzl, in his *Tagebucher* (Berlin, 1922-23) and the passages that were suppressed in the German edition but restored by Marvin Lowenthal in his translation of excerpts (New York, 1956). Herzl's diaries record his negotiations with various European monarchs and prime ministers and his reactions to their attitudes, and I can find in his writings no indication that he was not sincere in his purpose. He did obtain from the British government in 1903 the offer of East Africa as the desired homeland, and was bitterly disappointed when the Jewish Congress rejected the offer. As is well known, the National Socialist government of Germany made great efforts to obtain a homeland for the Jews in Palestine, Madagascar, and in a large part of the territory of the former Russian Empire; these efforts were successively frustrated by Great Britain, France, and the defeat of Germany in 1945. -- It is faintly amusing that Kevin Klose, in the article about "Anti-Semitism" in the Soviet that I mentioned above, lists a report that when the Russians grant exit visas to the Jews who wish to emigrate, they maliciously give preference to the ones who will head for the United States instead of remaining in the national ghetto, where they could enjoy "family [i.e., racial] reunification.)

We are here interested in Yockey. From the foregoing it will appear that he, more alert and perspicacious than other observers, was right in his analysis of the situation in Europe and the world in 1948-52, when he wrote *The Enemy of Europe*. He did not foresee the sudden death of Stalin, and it can be argued that if Stalin had survived for a lustrum after 1953, Yockey's prognosis would have been fully verified and the history of Europe and of the entire world would have taken a far different direction.

Yockey did not live to witness the official denigration and vilification of Stalin that began in 1961. You may wish to determine in your own mind what conclusions he would have drawn from that astonishing reversal of Russian propaganda, and whether or not he would have revised *The Enemy of Europe* to take it into account.

THE DYING AND THE DEAD

If Yockey had not been hounded to death by the Jews and were alive today, would he take again, without variation, the oath he took in 1946 when he left Wiesbaden, where he could no longer endure the obscene spectacle of the foul murders that the Americans were committing to please the Jews?

"I will go from one end to the other of my beloved Europe. I know well that I shall be going only to a churchyard, but I know, too, that the churchyard is dear, very dear, to me. Beloved dead lie buried there. Every stone over them, every bomb-crater containing the pulverized bones of these dead, tell me of a life once so ardently lived, so passionate a belief in its own achievements, its own truth, its own battles, its own knowledge, that I know, even now I know, that I shall fall down and kiss those stones, those endless ruins, this blood-drenched, sacred earth, and weep.

"But I surely also know that then, despite a convulsive rage at the perpetrators of this crime, I will again stand erect over this European graveyard and swear the solemn oath that to my last breath I will fight tooth and nail against those who attempted, in vain to be sure, to destroy the cradle of our Western Culture, with its unmatched accomplishments, with its deeds unique in the annals of Humanity. This, I, Francis Yockey, do solemnly swear!"

Do men die of broken hearts?

The physical scars of the Suicide of the West have been effaced. The ruins have been replaced by restorations or new structures that often do not show the grotesquely anti-human vulgarity of Jewish art. The intellectual and spiritual devastation, however, not only remains but grows apace. It reminds us of H. G. Wells' anticipation of nuclear warfare: the atomic bombs he imagined produced a steady chain-reaction, so that their craters

constantly grew large and spread wider, gnawing away the countryside, mile after mile. Or perhaps a better analogy would be an endemic disease that slowly but steadily destroys a dwindling and dying race.

Even a cursory survey of Europe today would require a volume, but we may permit ourselves a few hurried glimpses.

In Germany, the Jews did not insist on their original plan, set forth in Theodore Kaufman's *Germany Must Perish!*, (62) that after their Huns had overwhelmed Germany, the surviving Germans would all be surgically sterilized to ensure the prompt extermination of a nation that had offended the Sons of the Covenant. That Final Solution might have seemed objectionable to "an-tie-see-mites." So the good work was entrusted, in Germany as in other Aryan nations, to the demoralizing and disintegrating effects of what Yockey calls "culture-distortion": "democracy" (i.e., government by organized crime), "education" (i.e., sabotage of children's minds), usury, financial piracy, drug-addiction, promiscuity, miscegenation, mongrelization, promotion of superstition and irrationality, and the other blessings Americans now enjoy. That is working very well in Germany. A statistician has calculated that if all things continue as they now are, in ninety years the only living Germans will be senescent and past the age of reproduction.

(62. Newark, New Jersey, 1941; reprinted *s.l.&a.*, and available from Liberty Bell Publications. Kaufman's book is an excellent and most instructive specimen of Jewish thinking. He wrote before his tribe had invented the Holohoax, and so he can only scream that the Germans are militaristic and have produced such awfully wicked philosophers as Nietzsche; that makes them "an execrable people" and they must be exterminated, one and all. He prides himself on his tender heart, which makes him recommend that instead of having all the Germans massacred at once, the survivors, men, women, and children, should be herded together and sexually mutilated by surgeons (he even computes how many will be needed for the godly work) so that they cannot reproduce their damned species. In *Schuld und Schicksal* (Munich, 1962), J.G. Burg, a Jew who was born in Germany and lived throughout the war in Germany or adjacent territories, believes that Kaufman's book was part of a concerted effort by the Jews' master minds to exasperate the Germans and thus incite pogroms to help create "world opinion" for a war against Germany and for dispossession of the inhabitants of Palestine in favor of the Jews, and Burg supports his conclusion with photographic reproductions of documents in German and Yiddish. He quotes (p. 72) Chaim Weizmann as having said *in 1934*, "I would much rather see the *annihilation of the Jews in Germany* than failure to make Israel a land for the Jews." Weizmann (who became the first president of "Isra%ol" when it was finally established in 1948) in October 1934 mobilized Jewish pressure on the British government to make Britain frustrate Hitler's proposal that Jews who wished to leave Germany should be permitted to go to Palestine or whithersoever they wished, taking with them one thousand *pounds sterling* and goods to the value of 20,000 marks, the remainder of their holdings (if any) to be paid for in regular installments over a period of years. Several subsequent efforts by Hitler to help the Zionists attain their professed goal were frustrated by Britain and her allies, obviously in obedience to Jewish commands. It was the failure so to exasperate the Germans that they would resort to pogroms that made

it necessary to invent the "Holocaust" hoax. It is noteworthy that, with the exception of Burg and a very few others, the Jews do not seem to regard as immoral the efforts of Weizmann and other Elders of Jewry to procure the "annihilation of the Jews in Germany," who numbered about 500,000; presumably the sacrifice of those Jews would have been "good for the Jewish people," and that is all that matters.)

In Germany, as in other Western nations, the Jews are resorting to pseudo-legal terrorism as well as mob violence to enforce belief in their "Holocaust" hoax, and they are more or less committed to the slovenly version of the tale that they used as a pretext for the obscene and savage murders committed by the British and Americans at Nuremberg. That fiction was an improvement on earlier versions, (63) but it relied on the perjury of a German traitor who had been an American spy throughout the war, and was so carelessly contrived that it could not resist critical examination. (64) Since the exposure of the great hoax, there has been a belated attempt to produce "witnesses," who, I estimate, are as numerous as the individuals, many of them Aryans, who have reported their vacations aboard "flying saucers" or their confabulations with little green or cerise men from Mars or elsewhere. The principal burden of the attempts to enforce belief in the incredible, however, is the doctrine that it is an "insult to the Jewish people" to disbelieve whatever they choose to tell the lower races.

(63. According to the *Courrier du Continent*, a valuable little bulletin published at Lausanne, in its issue for May 1981, a delightful early version of the "Holocaust" hoax was given by a Jew residing in Sweden, Dr. Stefan Szende, in a book published at Zurich in 1944. According to this version, hundreds of thousands of Jews were exterminated by the cruel Germans at Belzec (a small town about twenty-eight miles south-southeast of Lublin), where the Germans had constructed a vast underground installation, including huge halls, built entirely of metal, with floors that could be raised or lowered by machinery. Each floor was a triumph of engineering, so large that several thousands of dear Jews could be packed on it, nude, at one time. The elevator then descended until the Jews were immersed into water to their waists, when a powerful electric current was introduced into the water, electrocuting them instantly. Then the elevator went up to a station at which a further application of electricity incinerated and presumably vaporized all the thousands of corpses, and the machine was ready for a new batch of several thousand. Presumably this version was thought too complimentary to the Germans' famous talent for engineering and applied science, just as the claims that Germans had exterminated 40,000,000 or 12,000,000 Jews were considered a bit hazardous mathematically and the figure was reduced to the 6,000,000 in the current version.)

(64. See the works cited in note 45 *supra*.)

We should not err, as do so many anti-Jewish writers, by interpreting this Jewish terrorism in terms of our own mentality and so regarding it as a consciously evil fraud. As several Jews told the National Conference of Christians and Jews, "normal [i.e., Aryan] ethical standards" are "irrelevant" in such matters. (65) I do not profess to understand the Jewish mentality, but it may be that one aspect of it was revealed by Professor Eric Goldman of Princeton University, if he was correctly quoted as contending that history is a "weapon" to be employed for "determining people's ideas and attitudes," and that a respectable historian has a "responsibility...for making sure that he writes history in such a way as will bring about the kind of action that he wants." Professor Goldman even made the frightening claim that his equation of history with propaganda was the view of "most historians [!]." (66) One can imagine no more total contrast to the Aryan conception of history as an effort to recover, as accurately as possible, the absolute truth about what actually happened: Von Ranke's famous standard of a perfectly objective description of the past *wie es eigentlich gewesen wäre*, and James Harvey Robinson's addendum that history should also determine objectively, if possible, *wie es eigentlich geworden wäre*. It is quite possible that to the Jewish mentality what actually happened appears completely irrelevant, and our interest in ascertaining historical truth may seem to be just another odd manifestation of our mental inferiority. The only thing that matters is what you can make your subjects believe, including, perhaps, the mass of your own race. To us, that seems reprehensible deception, but it is quite possible that to the Jewish mentality "truth" *is* whatever is good for God's People. (67) That may be why Jewish forgeries and hoaxes seem to us so amazingly careless, and we wonder why their contrivers disdained the relatively small amount of work that would have been required to make their fabrication consistent and plausible: to them it seemed apodictic that people *ought* to believe what is good for the Jewish people without thinking about it. The tales in the "Old Testament," for example, are attempts to simulate an historical record, but it seems never to have occurred to the rabbis to make them internally consistent and less absurd. (68) And the nonchalance appears today. When Professor Butz's masterly exposure of the Jews' Holy Hoax about the Germans was first published, Jews residing in the United States and holding professorships in American universities, who must surely have learned from observation of their *goy* colleagues what we consider to be the academic standards of integrity, began at once to denounce as "an infamous lie" a book of which they had never even seen a copy, and did so without even taking the trouble to ascertain its title, which they gave as "The Fabrication of a Hoax" or "The Holocaust Never Happened," and urging that such disgrace to the academic profession be "rooted out" and presumably exterminated. The venomous hatred is, of course, only natural, but what is significant is that the learned professors did not take the two minutes of time for a phone call by which they could have learned the title of the book they were

denouncing so hysterically. To us simple-minded Aryans, that seems amazing.

(65. Reported in *The Christian News*; see note 55 *supra*.)

(66. Goldman is quoted by Professor James J. Marin in his section of the impressive biographical monument, *Harry Elmer Barnes* (Colorado Springs, Myles, 1968), p. 241. That Goldman may be right about the majority of persons who now call themselves historians is suggested by the fact that the once-respected American Historical Association, which turns a penny now and then by renting out its membership list, crawled on its yellow belly in abasement and apology when it found it had rented the list to the Institute for Historical Review in Torrance, California, which wickedly conducts historical research that does not bear the Kosher seal of approval.)

(67. This attitude carries over, of course, into the Judaic religions, such as Christianity with its ostentatious repudiation of the "wisdom of this world" and its exaltation of the believing nitwit above the rational and learned seekers of the truth. A good example is Augustine, who must have known that he was lying (by "pagan" standards, at least) when he assured his open-mouthed congregation that he, as a missionary, had saved the souls of a whole nation of Africans, who had eyes in their chests and mouths where a man's neck would be but no heads, organs for which good Christians would presumably have no use. The same spirit appears in the numerous ecclesiastics who, during the Middle Ages, equipped a cathedral, monastery, or church with one of the many foreskins clipped from the infant Jesus when he was circumcized or a bottle of the Virgin Mary's milk or another Holy Shroud. The contriver of the imposture could tell himself, perhaps sincerely, that he was helping save the souls of many yokels by stimulating the tourist trade and augmenting his revenues.)

(68 It is true that when the "Old Testament" tales, in the form that they had around the beginning of the first century B.C., were translated from Hebrew and Aramaic into the *koine* dialect of Greek, thus forming the Septuagint, the translators did make some superficial efforts to clean up some absurdities in addition to converting the stories to monotheism. For example, the author of the myth about Esther gave the stupid Persian king the name of Assueras or Ahasuerus or something like that, a purely fictional and non-Persian name. The translators make him Artaxerxes, which was safe enough, since there were three Persian monarchs of that name, who ruled between 484 and 337 B.C., and that sounded plausible to persons who had no real knowledge of Persian history. In the story of God's unsuccessful attempt to murder Moses (Exod. 4.24), the translators reflected that it was undignified for the creator of Heaven and Earth to be lurking about a desert inn, and they accordingly made the terrorist "an agent of the Lord," which is certainly less grotesque. The Hebrew text underwent some censorship after the Septuagint was made; for example, in the tale of Esther there were several deletions, including the passage in which Esther explains to Yahweh how repugnant to a Jewess is coitus with an uncircumcized man, although, of course, she remains faithful to her duty to manipulate in the interests of her race the *goy* whom she has attracted sexually.)

The continuous rewriting of history, so graphically described in George Orwell's *1984*, may seem to the racial mentality of Jews no more than a common-sense provision for ensuring "social justice" and the like. For example, a Jew recently wrote a book to prove that no tribe of savages ever practices anthropophagy: all stories of cannibalism, except in a few cases of acute hunger (e.g., the Donner Party in California), were invented by the nasty "race prejudice" of the swinish Aryans. (69) I don't know whether that claim is important for Jewish purposes, but if it is, it is surely a proof of the evils of "racism" that it isn't feasible as yet to have all books of history and ethnology that mention cannibals dumped down a "memory hole" into ever-burning incinerators in all the libraries of the world. So far as I know, this attitude toward historical facts has never been systematically investigated, but Samuel Roth, the eminent and courageous Jew to whom we owe so much, touches on it in his references to the "Old Testament." (70) But, I repeat, we must not be misled by the emotional binges of writers who hate Jews and cannot consider the problem objectively. Whatever tampering with facts may seem to us, we must remember that to the Jews it is simply an expression of their righteousness, however little we may be able to comprehend such an attitude. It is strictly comparable to the mentalities, equally alien and mysterious to us, that Professor Haas studied in his fundamental *Destiny of the Mind*. (71)

(69. Professor W. Arens, *The Man-Eating Myth* (Oxford University [!], 1980.)

(70. See note 29. Roth discussed the expurgations and falsifications of the stories on pp. 25-51, 57-62 of his book. These chapters and part of a chapter were omitted in the reprint to avoid sending Christian holy men into fits.)

(71. See above, p. 17. n. 19.)

So much has to be said in explanation of the recent imposition of righteousness in Germany. The puppet government in Bonn has ordered its courts to find that it is a criminal offense to doubt even the most impossible parts of the Holofoax, on the grounds that such doubt "denies to every Jew the respect to which he is entitled." (72) Men are now serving

long prison sentences for having dared to express such doubts, and recently the Bonn government's Thought Police raided the homes of almost 500 Germans who were suspected of having in their possession books, pamphlets, or leaflets of which the Master Race disapproves. It is also a criminal offense in Germany to doubt the "authenticity" of "Anne Frank's Diary," a hoax contrived with such contempt for the Aryan mind that it contains such blatant internal contradictions that it could not impose on any reader who has even a modicum of critical intelligence. (73) And the exercise of normal intelligence is a criminal offense even though the Bonn government's own criminological laboratory reported that the manuscript was written throughout in the hand of a single author, who made many of his revisions with a pen that had not been manufactured before the supposed "martyrdom" of the young Jewess who is supposed to have written it. And there are rumors that the Jews are demanding that all mail that comes into Germany be opened and censored, lest some vile correspondent abroad say something that might start ratiocination in the *dumm Kopf* of a cringing German. Such is the plight of Germany today.

(72. The decision of the German Supreme Court is quoted in the Jews' "intellectual" periodical, *Patterns of Prejudice*, January 1980, pp. 32f. The article goes on to demand more stringent legislation in Germany to "plug the loopholes" in existing laws and make certain that Aryan curs do not even think improper thoughts.)

(73. If you want to make sure that you didn't overlook any of the ridiculous contradictions in the yarn, see Ditleib Felderer's incisive booklet, *Anne Frank's Diary* (Torrance, California, Institute for Historical Review, 1979).)

The British have not yet sunk so low, but one has misgivings for the future. They destroyed their empire, sacrificed the lives of 357,000 persons, permanently depleting their racial vitality through the loss of much of their best blood, and inflicted painful and often irremediable wounds on 370,000 more; they disrupted their society and demoralized their whole population; and they impoverished themselves and their descendants, perhaps forever. All this they did to punish the Germans for having wanted to have a country of their own, and I wonder whether many Englishmen expected gratitude from the Jews. If they did, what were their sentiments when they read recently in William R. Perl's *The Four Front War* that among the dastardly persecutors of God's Race the vile British are second only to the vile Germans? Maurice Samuel was right: *nothing* that Aryans *can* do will ever satisfy his insatiable race.

Americans, remembering the old British tradition of gentlemen, are wont to assume that British politicians must be somehow morally superior to the gangsters of the great syndicate of organized crime that rules the United States. That is a mistake: the only difference is that the subordinate gangs, which stage competition on the lower levels, are called "Conservative" and "Labor," instead of "Republican" and "Democratic." Their activities correspond, even in detail, to the treason and looting that James Farrel has clearly described in his new book, *The Judas Syndrome*. (74)

(74. San Francisco, Fulton-Hall, 1980. The author skirts warily around the edges of the race problem, but he does consider the sheer insanity of importing into our overpopulated land ever growing hordes of black savages, mestizos from Puerto Rico, Cuba, and Mexico, and Mongoloids from southeast Asia in the guise of "refugees." The obvious result will necessarily be a situation like that described in Jean Raspail's "chilling novel about the end of the white world," *The Camp of the Saints*, of which the English translation, published by Scribner's in 1975, had so large a sale that it is now out-of-print in both cloth-bound and paperback editions. (Guess why!))

The British, no less than the other Aryan nations, are driven by the death-wish that has been so deeply and perhaps ineradicably implanted in their subconscious minds. Not content with liquidating their empire, they began to import into their already overcrowded and overpopulated island hordes of anthropoid vermin from all over the world, from black savages to turban-wearing Asiatics. Any rational man could have predicted from the very first the inevitable consequence of the wholesale importation of racial enemies, but now, as well-organized mobs, directed by portable radios, surge through large quarters of British cities, burning and looting and killing, the Anglo-Saxon and Celtic boobs are astonished and listen, open-mouthed, to their government betrayers as they chatter about "unemployment" and, with almost incredible effrontery, claim that there are no "racial overtones" to race riots. The solution, of course, will be to surfeit the vermin with yet more blood sucked from the veins of the tax-paying serfs, who do not seem even to remember that they once had a country of their own. No one, so far as I have heard, has even dared to suggest what should be obvious even to schoolboys: the architects of the policy that imported the racial enemies and the loud-mouthed holy men and "humanitarians" who approved and endorsed that policy are either (a) conscious traitors, who intended the consequences of their acts, or (b) so feckless and feeble-minded that they must henceforth be excluded from influencing national policy in any way.

Traitors have imposed on the befuddled British a "Race Relations Act" to make certain that the white population, which is being dispossessed, does not openly resent the hordes of alien invaders. Englishmen are now in

prison for having been so bold as to assert that their race is fit to live. And although the British, who are still a majority on what was once their island, are harassed by economic pressures and deafened by the clamor of their dervishes and the rest of the rabble of world-improvers, their bovine acceptance of their degradation makes one wonder whether the imprisoned men were not mistaken in the belief they expressed. Christians, of course, must be expected to obey the command of the Jew they worship: "Love *your* enemies and slaughter *mine*" (Luke 6.27 & 19.27). But Christians are a minority in Britain, estimated by competent observers at less than one-fifth of the white population. What of the other minority that should be dominant, the intellectually superior minority that has enjoyed the incomparable advantages of the British public schools and of Oxford or Cambridge? They evince no more comprehension of reality than the religious. The gods first make mad those whom they would destroy. And we can only behold with painful catharsis the tragedy of a nation which once had an empire on which the sun never set, and which, in Herculean madness, reduced itself to a mass of frightened sheep, huddled together on a small island on which the sun will someday set for the last time.

The "Race Relations Act," to be sure, has some loopholes, and Englishmen who hire competent solicitors expert in such matters can still make some appeal to facts and reason without going to gaol, although, of course, they expose themselves to surreptitious chastisement. The Jews, needless to say, are agitating for legislation to "plug the loopholes" in the existing tyranny.

As mere specimens of the English way of life today, we may note the following. The Jews burned the printing establishment in Uckfield, Sussex, that had been printing magazines and books that do not bear the Kosher seal of approval. One of the arsonists, caught by his own arrogant overconfidence, pled the privilege of his race to destroy their enemies, but found that arson, even with such noble motives, was still technically illegal in Britain, and he received, from an apologetic magistrate, the minimum sentence. He was found to be an old hand in Yahweh's service, having been identified as one of the burglars who, equipped with forged credentials as telephone repairmen, "cased" the apartment of David Irving, the author of *The Destruction of Dresden*, and were later caught red-handed in the burglary, equipped with tools from the British postoffices. The daily press in Britain suppressed mention of the deplorable arrest and trial of the high-minded arsonist. (75)

(75. The trial was concisely reported in the local *Sussex Express*, 17 April 1981. The newspaper, doubtless hoping to be thrown a bone, interpolated the remark: "To say the publications handed to the judge [to justify the arsonist's pious deed] were 'vile and evil' was a masterly understatement," The incident was also reported in the small weekly

publication, *Focal Point* (London), 30 May, which *inter alia* observes that since the trial and sentencing took place hurriedly and without the knowledge of the victims of the arson, the purported specimens of their publications that were exhibited to the judge and newspaper may well have been forgeries. That would be only normal! My knowledge of the incident I next mention comes from a document prepared by the victim's solicitor and letters from friends.)

The masters of Britain naturally have their own corps of terrorists, special police, doubtless Englishmen willing to do anything for a small salary, paid by the bovine taxpayers. On 16 April 1981, these goons raided the apartment of an Anglo-Saxon in Brighton who, they said, was suspected of having in his possession a small booklet that did not show proper reverence for God's Race. Since he was at his place of employment, as they doubtless knew, they smashed open the door of his apartment and turned everything upside down, looking vainly for the horrible booklet. Frustrated in their suspicions, they departed with a large package that doubtless contained his expensive camera, the money he had left in a drawer of his desk, and other fenceable property, leaving the broken door open, so that they could claim that someone must have entered the apartment after them. At latest information, the victim, just an Anglo-Saxon, to be sure, has vainly petitioned for redress.

Britain has indeed been blessed with righteousness. An Englishman's home was once his castle; now it is his kennel.

We must cross the Channel to *la belle France* for the most accurate measure of Europe today. In the historic land of *liberté*, Professor Robert Faurisson of the University of Lyons, maintaining the now antiquated tradition of intellectual integrity in academic circles, stated publicly that the Jews' infamous hoax about the "six million" was a preposterous hoax. (76) Squads of Jews attacked him on the campus and burst into his classrooms to make it impossible for him to conduct classes, while the authorities of the university beamed approval. He and his publishers and even newspapers that had printed his replies to their defamation of him were prosecuted in the French courts for "insulting" the Jewish nation by doubting one of the lies by which it most conspicuously exhibits its racial solidarity as a super-organism. He has been beset by multiple prosecutions in the French courts, and he has thus far been sentenced to a public recantation of his veracity and fines that will amount to one million francs in the new currency (one hundred million in the old.) His total savings as a university professor with a family amount, he says, to about two thousand francs. And other prosecutions are still pending. The French system of justice doubtless hopes that it can drive the Aryan dog to suicide, but if that does not work, it will probably be wiser than the Inquisition that permitted Galileo to survive and will have Faurisson doused with gasoline

and burned in a public square, while Jews dance merrily about the pyre.

(76. It is said that the Institute for Historical Review will publish English translations of Professor Faurisson's major articles in an issue of its *Journal*. Presumably it will do so unless the Jews, who have made one attempt to burn down the building in which the Institute is located succeed in a new attempt.)

It is a nice irony that Professor Faurisson's only support, so far as is known, comes from a Jew, who has disobeyed his race, and a few French "leftists." He would doubtless have been supported by Professor François Duprat, if the Jews, as they openly boast, had not preferred to punish that man for his denial of the Holy Hoax by blowing up the automobile in which he and his wife were riding. The "New Right" in France, of which we once entertained some hopes, (77) has been taught a lesson by the Jews, who broke into one of their conferences and clubbed them, permanently crippling one man, while the French police looked on benevolently. The few French champions of Western science and rationality now slip quietly away from their universities or homes to meet, almost furtively, in secluded parts of the countryside, fearing raids by the Jews or the French police; and they are doing their best to pretend they never heard of Professor Faurisson. It's embarrassing, but *courage, mon ami, le pauvre diable n'est pas encore mort, mais il le sera bientôt.*

It is easy to foresee the future. The simplest way out of the disconcerting fact that so many of the "six million" whom the Germans exterminated are alive and conspicuous in such capacities as that of the President of the "European Parliament" will be to claim that the Germans did indeed kill them, but they, being Yahweh's pets, naturally arose from the dead after three days or some other appropriate period of time.

The next step is easy. As Douglas Reed observed in *The Controversy of Zion*, to the Jews "the world is still flat and Judah, its inheritant, is the center of the universe." (78) Surely, there can be no greater insult to the Jewish nation that to doubt the word of its god, who made the world a flat cake of mud and placed above it the sun and moon, balls of fire floating in the upper atmosphere, so that he could stop them whenever he wanted to help his Holy People massacre the inhabitants of a country they wanted to steal. French courts of justice will surely repress the vile "racists" who cast doubt on Yahweh's words, and a few million-franc fines, supplemented by burning a few incorrigibly sane Frenchmen at the stake, will establish righteousness throughout the beautiful land *où l'oui résonne.*

(78. See above, note 4. The passage I have quoted occurs on p. 105 and continues, "The ruling sect has been able, in great measure, to impose this theory of life on the great nations of the West, as it originally inflicted The Law on the Judahites themselves." Reed goes on to point out that Jews' mission in this world is based on the promise Yahweh made to Israel: "I will destroy all the people to whom thou shalt come," (Exod. 23.27). Reed's is, on the whole, an excellent book, marred only by some charitable efforts to temper the wind for Jesus's lambs. Incidentally, he makes the interesting suggestion (p. 207) that Herzl, the founder of modern Zionism (see note 51 *supra*) whom Samuel Roth described as "probably the first honest Jew in the public life of the world in two thousand years," may have been eliminated by Jews who wanted to take over and pervert his Zionist movement.)

And then one more step. Yahweh told Moses, "I have made thee a god to Pharaoh [i.e., the unnamed king of the Egyptian *goyim*]." Now it is only proper that the "Sons of the Living God" should be the gods of the lower races and be worshipped by them. It requires no great effort of the imagination to picture thousands of French men and women assembled in Notre Dame, in obedience to the orders of their courts and government, to worship bare-footed rabbis seated on the alters. (79) And the choir will sing the inspired words of the prophecy: "And Israel shall rule the world forever."

(79. Ralph Perier in *Liberty Bell*, November 1980, p. 22, has called attention to the extraordinary emotional fixation of the Jews, as shown in passages he cites from both the "Old Testament" and the Dead Sea Scrolls, which demands not only that other races, and especially Aryans, shall become their abject slaves, but shall demonstrate their submission by using their tongues to lick the dirt from the Jews' bare feet. No other race, so far as I know, has ever shown that bizarre lust. Perier also quotes, "Israel shall rule the world forever," from Gaster's translation of the *Dead Sea Scriptures*, where it is the climax of an imagined war in which the Greeks and Romans (i.e., Aryans) are *totally* exterminated, but also survive to do the desired licking.)

Fantastic? Less so than what has now actually happened in Germany, Britain, and France would have seemed before the Suicide of Europe.

Such is a hurried bird's-eye view of the continent that was, for Yockey, "the sacred soil of Europe," the homeland of our civilization. He was young when he was hounded to death, and he did not live to see the Europe of today. Perhaps we should say of him, as Tacitus said of Agricola, *felix opportunitate mortis*.

THE EPITAPH

Yockey's hopes and his striving seem vain and futile in the desolation of today. He appealed to a manhood and an intelligence that had died on a thousand battlefields and have become bodiless wraiths, drifting on the shifting mists of time. But he will be remembered--if there are any to remember us--as a man who sought to resurrect Europe and, in the end, gave his life for the dead. His memory will be honored in the future--if we have a future--as that of a man whose lucid mind enabled him to see the vapidity of the verbiage about "world peace," "brotherhood," "human rights," and the rest of the hallucinatory fictions that are used by evangelists, politicians, and other swindlers to benumb the minds of their victims. He was a man who had the courage to state the grim truth that a nation's survival depends on its spiritual cohesion and its will to power--to naked, undisguised, unmitigated power, power over others.

A nation, a civilization, a race that has lost the will to conquer and dominate has lost its will to live--has lost the vitality that makes it fit to live in a world in which the inexorable laws of nature provide that only the strong and resolute shall survive. Yockey summoned our race to put down its opium-pipes and look outside its den of dreams to the real world, in which it will soon have no choice but to fight belatedly or perish ignominiously. It was not his fault that the drugged minds could not respond, could not comprehend.

After *Imperium* was republished by *The Truth Seeker* (New York) in 1962, Yockey's work, which had been almost completely suppressed and was known only to the few individuals who had the luck to find, and the means to purchase, copies of books that had become extremely rare, became more widely known and accessible to those who wished to know it. It inspired untrammelled minds.

In the late 1960s, some youthful enthusiasts formed the Francis Parker Yockey Society, and, since it was not kept secret, they, few as they were, alarmed the boobherds of more than one local newspaper, ever on the watch for an outbreak of common sense. It was the young men's intention to erect a monument to Yockey, and, after much deliberation, they decided it should bear these words:

TO THE MEMORY OF
FRANCIS PARKER YOCKEY
AUTHOR OF *IMPERIUM*
WHO FOUGHT THE GOOD FIGHT TO THE BITTER END

Ço sent Rodlanz que la mort l'entreprent, ...

Sour l'erbe vert si s'est colchiez adenz,

Dessoz lui met s'espede e l'olifant.

The lines from the great *Chanson* may be translated thus:

And then, when Roland felt death coming upon him, he
lay down on the green grass, placing his sword and his horn
beneath his body, and with his face against the earth.

EPILOGUE, THE ERNIYES

In 1945, in the devastated and desolate land of a nation of heroes, the American Army forced a German physician to save the life of a captive who had tried to commit suicide. The wretched man, who had surrendered in the mistaken belief that he was surrendering to civilized human beings, had contrived to find a piece of wire and twist it tightly about his throat in the hope of escaping the long, lingering, and exquisite tortures for which the self-righteous sadists reserved him.

The German physician grimly did what he was compelled to do, but he was a man. He looked the commanding officer in the eye and said calmly: "You Americans have done more than violate the law of nations. You have committed hybris. God will punish you, and if there is no god, Nature will."

Yes, Nature will.

To Americans who do not enjoy leading a precarious and degraded existence in the filth and stench of a multi-racial society, it will seem that Nature has already done so. But, in the vernacular phrase, they haven't seen anything yet.

When the syndicate of organized crime that governs the witless and spineless Americans began to tax the serfs for "aid" to "underdeveloped nations," rushing American food and medical skill to accelerate the savages' already prodigious rate of breeding, giving them American equipment and American engineers to industrialize their jungles, and naturally inciting them to rape and murder the Aryans caught in the newly independent "nations," the ineluctable consequences of that policy were obvious to every man who could perform simple arithmetical calculations.

I did no more than state a patent fact, long known to thoughtful observers, when, in an article published in 1963, (80) I wrote: "At the present rate, the globe, sometime between A.D. 2000 and 2005--that is to say, *within forty years*--will be infested by 5,000,000,000 anatomically human creatures, the maximum number for which food can be supplied by even the most intensive cultivation. And *then*, to keep the globe inhabitable at that bare subsistence level, it will be necessary to kill *every year* more people than now live in the United States--kill them with atomic bombs or clubs, as may be most convenient."

It will be less than twenty years now.

(80. *American Opinion*, December 1963, p. 23. The fact was obvious from the "exponential" increase in the world's population of non-Aryans and the geographic determination of the amount of arable land on the planet. But the ineluctable process of nature could have been, and was, foreseen long before the "population explosion" actually occurred. Sixty-seven years ago, before the First World War and while our race's absolute superiority and dominion over the planet seemed assured forever, the great and forgotten American philosopher, Correa Moylan Walsh, wrote in the first volume of his *Climax of Civilization*: "A return will set in of the re-active pressure of nature upon mankind.... The struggle for existence will again become sharp and bitter.... But woe to the people which has not men that will stand up and fight without flinching. Those countries where the moral decay shall have gone deepest, where the proved stock shall have died out and given way to poor stock, where the greatest effeminization of men shall have taken place (for the masculinization of women will be no compensation), where the strong and the wise and the shrewd shall gain no more of wealth, power, and influence than the weak, silly, and incompetent, all being equal,--those will go to the wall. And when this fate shall have overtaken most of our western white men's countries, our cycle of civilization will be completed.")

Meanwhile, the Americans, eager to show they have elephant-sized hearts and canary-sized brains, are importing into their already overpopulated and befouled country hordes of racial enemies who quite frankly boast that they will take over for themselves entire states and groups of states, expelling or killing the stupid Aryans, for whose idiotic generosity they have a supreme and justified contempt. For the details, I must again refer you to James Farrell's *The Judas Syndrome*. (81)

(81. See above, note 74. Since savages are constantly pouring into Florida *from* Haiti, I cannot forebear to notice a little-known historical fact. Abraham Lincoln, who was not a man without foresight and conscience, although he presided over the fratricidal war of aggression that ended the American Republic, actually began to put into practice his determination to export all Blacks from this country. On 31 December 1862, he approved contracts with *entrepreneurs*, chiefly from financial circles in New York City, to export 5000 Negroes to Haiti and resettle them there, at a cost to the government of fifty dollars a head. The contracts were carried out, but many of the Blacks were subsequently brought back to this country by "do-gooders" eager to afflict the white population.)

And now the promoters of "aid" to "underdeveloped nations" have discovered what they knew all along, that they hastened a catastrophe from which the opium of superstition and maudlin sentimentality will provide no refuge. The Club of Rome, which had been busy fostering international "understanding" and international looting, hired experts from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to report on "the predicament of mankind," and published the results in *The Limits to Growth* (London, 1972). What emerges from the report is a desperate hope that catastrophe can be postponed by de-industrializing the "emergent nations" and finding ways to kill off a large part of the prolific anthropoids, so that global starvation will not begin in 2000. There are many graphs to show the possible effects of miracles: if, for example, the yield of food by arable land were *doubled* by some inconceivable means, the starvation crisis could be postponed to 2024. The shock to tender minds is cushioned by speculations about the invention of "perfect" means of birth control, which will be made "available" to everyone--"available" being an euphemism for making the use of such means compulsory, which, being impossible, in turn means mandatory abortions, which are equally impossible of application to the most prolific races--and that makes nonsense of the bland assumption that all races are equal and are to be equally reduced. Talk about reducing the birth rate globally is mere verbiage: everyone who knows anything about the non-white races (except Jews) knows that the only practical means of control requires an enormous increase in the death-rate.

The Club of Rome's report also made projections that simply ignored the crucial question of food, and these showed that even if manna showered from the skies, essentially the same crisis and struggle for life would occur at approximately the same time from the exhaustion of the natural resources of our insanely exploited and ravaged earth, and also that if that factor be disregarded, the planet is being so polluted by its anthropoid parasites that, at no distant date, it will cease to sustain their life.

Some glimmering of reality penetrated even the fog in Washington and produced the Global 2000 report which, officially endorsed by the Secretary of State, calls for the elimination of two billion (2,000,000,000) human beings by the year 2000 to avert the otherwise inevitable chaos. The report is naturally evoking screams from the holy men, who like to orate about the day when Jesus will pop out of the clouds and raise Hell, but naturally cannot bear to think about reality, and from a wide variety of others, who find such ideas bad for their businesses. (82) There is much that can be criticized adversely in the report, but not the statistics, and it is the statistics that excite hysterical denials on the grounds that they are unpleasant. The gang in Washington is, of course, trying to use the report for its own purposes, but that is quite another matter.

(82. A particularly odd yell of blind indignation is the booklet, *Global 2000*, published by the "National Democratic Policy Committee" = the "U.S. Labor Party" = the mysteriously financed operations of one Lyndon LaRouche. The booklet is well worth reading for its sophistries.)

One thing is quite certain: the population of the globe is going to be drastically reduced within the next twenty years as the struggle for life begins in earnest. Christians will, no doubt, go on bleating about "the sanctity of human life," especially the lowest forms of it, but they might as well expound that silly notion, which only our race has ever taken seriously, (83) to a typhoon or an erupting volcano. The forces of nature do not listen to idle talk. Neither do mammals who must kill or be killed-- unless they are degenerate and have lost the will to live.

(83. The even more absolute doctrine of the "sanctity of all life" appeared in the "Orthodox" religions of India and Buddhism while the Aryans were still dominant. In polyphyletic India of today, individuals who humanely avoid injuring the lice they remove from their hair associate with individuals who are votaries of Kali and believe that the highest religious merit is obtained by treacherously murdering a man whose confidence they have cleverly won. Such is the charming diversity of a multi-racial society.)

The population of the globe is going to be drastically reduced, and in the course of that reduction, it is virtually certain that the inferior races will become extinct, as Darwin foresaw, although not in the way he anticipated. (84) The only question is which races will not survive the inevitable war for survival.

(84. See above, note 3.)

Every species of mammal capable of conscious thought thinks itself as in some way superior, but a claim to racial superiority is particularly congenial to our race, which for long had proof of it in the mastery of the whole world which it suicidally discarded. Aryans still pride themselves on the superiority of their civilization, and it is undoubtedly superior, aesthetically, morally, intellectually, i.e., in terms of its own values, so that 'superiority' is merely a tautology. We must face the brutal fact that the only real superiority is biological, and is shown by a species' ability to survive and increase at the expense of others.

The colored races naturally multiply as do rabbits. In the coming struggle for survival they may eat each other, if they run out of white meat, but they will breed so rapidly that they will survive, unless a superior power makes an intensive effort to exterminate them.

The Jews, whose racial cohesion has made them a super-organism, are undoubtedly a superior species. Beginning as a wretched gang of marauders, they, in only 2500 years, scattered throughout the world while retaining with undeviating concentration the super-organic unity of their purpose, and achieved virtual mastery of the globe. That you may disapprove of their methods or their character is irrelevant. They have given proof of biological superiority. One wonders whether that superiority will enable them to consummate their total triumph or whether the super-organism is too inflexible, its instincts too fixed and rigid to cope with an entirely novel situation, so that the multiplex organism will perish in the chaos it has created, exulting, perhaps, in the total destruction in which it will also be destroyed.

So far as one can extrapolate from the present, disregarding our pathetic hopes for a psychological and biological miracle, there is one race which, by its own fatuity and degeneracy, seems likely to become extinct less than a century after it was master of the world.

END