

δύστανε, μοίρας ὅσον παροίχει

# Instauration®

VOL. 25, NO. 1

DECEMBER 1999

## Big Sister Is Watching You



(See page 5)

# The Safety Valve



In keeping with Instauration's policy of anonymity, most communicants will be identified by the first three digits of their zip code.

□ I know a great many people who agree with Buchanan's view that any child once conceived, whether a Mongoloid idiot or the result of a rape, must be carried to term. I would like to have a vote on whether these same people would be willing to pay a "social tax" of say \$200 a year to care for these children. I have a feeling their votes would not reflect their bleeding heart insanity.

800

□ The N.Y. Times recently had an article, "To Believe in Women," which favorably praised "contributions of lesbians to America. . ." The author urges heterosexual couples to learn from lesbian couples. Another article reports that public attitudes towards homosexuality are pretty much unchanged from 30 years ago, while those of the media and ruling class have reversed. Why?

119

□ Is the U.S. government at war with Iraq? Did Iraqis attack Seattle or Mobile or New Orleans?

522

□ Republicans defined: *wealthy, Israel-philies, homosexuals, insiders*. Democrats defined: *Ditto*.

111

□ I saw where ADL director Abe Foxman was pulling his hair over a supposed 44% anti-Semitic streak in the Russian population. Considering their history for

almost four decades while under those "enlightened Hebrew leaders"—from Trotsky to the Lubyanka Prison's Chief NKVD Commissar and Head Torturer—it's a miracle it isn't 100%. Millions of Christian Russians died at the hands of a totally discredited, Jewish-concocted political system and Jewish-enforced murder system, and Foxy is horrified that the Russians don't adore him! Declaiming, "It's beyond belief that as we enter the 21st century this aberration still exists." Aberration? The Fox is bloody lucky the Russians haven't fallen on his people and torn them to pieces!

782

□ Over 9,000 years ago a man unrelated to later "Native Americans" in the area was killed near Kennewick (WA). If my ancestors were here first, then can I have a casino?

983

□ Donald Trump, Warren Beatty, Cybill Shepherd, "The Body" Ventura. They reckon that if a guy like Bill could be president, they are overqualified! After Clinton, anyone—even O.J., Larry Flynt or Hugh Hefner—could be president!

992

□ Jews are claiming billions in reparations under any thin pretext, however farfetched. An October 15 N.Y. Times piece calls WWII G.I.s "Looters of Jewish Riches." The Chosen would dearly love to slap the Catholic Church with a multi-billion-buck claim, but they haven't quite got enough chutzpah. How long will it be before legislation is introduced to right these wrongs?

120

□ TV news or chat shows routinely interview prominent experts in various field. Virtually all are white, nearly all men. They'd give anything for a black female biogeneticist.

400

□ The vulgarity, stupidity and criminality of Negroes in America defies exaggeration, but white promotion of it is much worse. Blacks know no better. We used to.

120

□ There have been innumerable discussions on the abortion issue. Virtually all focus on the legal, moral and even aesthetic aspects of this question. Only rare-

ly has the crucially important aspect of the question been brought up: Is abortion eugenic or dysgenic? Has abortion, in the majority of cases deprived us of the more capable future components of society? Or has the legalization of abortion prevented, in the majority of cases, the birth of persons who are essentially a burden on society? For the future of our country these issues need careful, objective study.

741

□ If patience is a virtue, I have a sure-fire way to make oneself virtuous. On Saturday and Sunday evenings turn on either ESPN or your local sports news and check the college/pro-football highlights. Then see how long it takes before you get to witness a white man score a touchdown.

752

□ For over a millennium the most splendid specimens of Nordic man flourished at the strategic center of the Eurasian world island, Sinkiang. The virtues of the white race are many. Sadly fecundity is not among them.

947

□ Funny what you can perceive by tuning into people's vibes. While lurching at a Miami Subs Grill (pretty decent food by the way), I glanced at a tall, Nordic woman waiting in line. She had a grim mask-like visage. My immediate impression: this woman's got a problem! I don't know what it is, but she's got a problem.

## CONTENTS

Pope or Prophet? . . . . .	4
Big Sister Is Watching You. . . . .	5
Old Joe's Famine Cooked Up? . . . 10	
Underreported Guglag Atrocities. . 11	
Driven to Kill. . . . .	12
The New Siberia? . . . . .	13
Blockbuster Conference. . . . .	15
The Majority Must Vote Majority. 16	
Anti-Dysgenics Campaign. . . . .	17
Time Lapse. . . . .	17
Backtalk. . . . .	18
Cultural Catacombs. . . . .	20
Inklings. . . . .	21
Primate Watch. . . . .	22
Talking Numbers. . . . .	23
Satcom Sam. . . . .	24
Waspishly Yours. . . . .	25
Notes from the Sceptred Isle. . . . 26	
Elsewhere. . . . .	27

## Instauration

is published 12 times a year by  
Howard Allen Enterprises, Inc.  
Box 76, Cape Canaveral, FL 32920

### Annual Subscription

\$35 (third class)  
\$45 (first class)  
\$48 Canada  
\$50 foreign (surface)  
\$67 foreign (air)

Single copy price \$3, postpaid  
Magazine is mailed in plain white envelope

Wilmot Robertson, editor

Make checks payable to Howard Allen.  
Florida residents, please add 6% sales tax.

Third-class mail is not forwarded.  
Advise change of address well in advance.  
ISSN 0277-2302

©1999 Howard Allen Enterprises, Inc.

## The Safety Valve



A few moments later she was standing behind me and I heard (but did not see) her greet her boyfriend. After listening to the boyfriend mumble a few words of greeting, I turned around in time to see her give a Negro a big hug.

329

□ There's good reason to believe Chenchens are blowing up buildings in Moscow. Liberals are aghast that Russian police are rounding up people who look like Chenchens!

606

□ Hillary's only source of pride is that she got even with Bill long ago by cuckolding him.

899

□ Buchanan makes a good interview in these dull news days. When he mentions the Texas town which has seceded from the U.S. (English prohibited, illegal aliens welcome), his interviewers are uncomfortable. On the one hand they don't want to come right out and say that ceding part of Texas to Mexico is okay. On the other hand, criticizing minorities just isn't done.

557

□ Despite a very costly promotion campaign with multiple full-page ads, talk of an Oscar for Robin Williams' Holocaust-weep, *Jakob the Liar*, opened with a whimper. By its second week it had plummeted from the top-10 box office list. If you were to poll Americans about whether they want yet another "cry for the Chosen" flick, 110% would say they'd had enough. They don't have any way to force us to go. . .yet.

722

□ Our press is silent about China taking over operation of the Panama Canal (a state-owned Chinese firm is actually the front), so vital to our economic and military security. It's surprising that the same Blame America spirit which led us to give up the Canal has not yet led to proposals to "do the right thing" by returning the Southwest to Mexico, with reparations and apologies to follow, of course.

766

□ Juan Gonzalez, a mulatto Puerto Rican who plies his trade for the Texas Rangers Baseball Club, is *un hombre magnifico* in his island homeland. So now El Señor Gonzalez has deigned to devote a small

percentage of the millions he makes every year to the welfare of his people. Is he earmarking the funds for birth control, medical clinics, schools, churches? No, he's setting up a baseball school! Well, that ought to enhance the welfare of the average *puertorriqueno*. God knows we don't have enough Latinos in the major leagues!

257

□ Calling all geography buffs! Is there a city anywhere in America that doesn't have a thoroughfare named after Martin Luther King, Jr.? I've been around a bit, but I haven't seen any exceptions to the rule so far.

224

□ Donald Trump considers Pat Buchanan a nutball as a presidential candidate and "probably an anti-Semite." But who does Trump—himself a potential candidate—want for a veep? Oprah Winfrey! Now who's the nutball!

524

□ Nearly every week a Holocaust flick is on the tube and there are always several yearly on the big screen. Too much? On the contrary, Mrs. Bill Bradley (who has recently come out with a book on the Holocaust) informs us that the subject has barely been touched! Sure could have fooled me.

301

□ When his daughter Monica was servicing Clinton, Dr. Lewinsky seemed oddly indifferent, almost proud. As his buffoonish lawyer remarked, the important thing was how it all affected Israel. Now when "a Lewinsky" is a euphemism for oral sex, the good doctor rushes to defend his reputation. As if anything were left after Monica's self-parodying *Saturday Night Live* appearance.

128

□ Fashion photography is bereft of real black women. Seen now and then are good-looking quadrons. Ubiquitous are blondes and redheads always flanked by black studs.

948

□ Possession is nine-tenths of the law, the saying goes. All depends. Those who once were called Indians say they were here first. Any bone indicating the contrary just better be reburied. On the other hand, Serbs were first in Kosovo. We see how much good it's done them. Jews were absent 2,000 years from Palestine, but their claim to it trumps all others. Estonians and Latvians are envious. They'd like to treat Russians the way Jews treat Arabs.

562

□ In a recent letter to the Globe about the Pinochet affair, Jewish lobby spokesman Bert Raphael expressed satisfaction that here in Canada at least we have not given up on the pursuit of "war criminals." By this he meant, no doubt, the pursuit of doddering old men who might once have been guards in some Nazi concentration camp 60 years ago. In view of Israel's recent promotion to Foreign Minister of one of postwar history's worst "war criminals, Ariel Sharon—and the Jewish community's failure to protest this outrage—isn't Mr. Raphael being just a wee bit hypocritical? How can he justify using such a double standard? Are we supposed to accept that even the most heinous crimes committed by Jews are to be forgotten, swept under the carpet, while crimes against them are protested forever and ever? If former Chilean President Augusto Pinochet can be arrested for his "crimes against humanity," why not Sharon, the Beast of Beirut? Or are people of Mr. Raphael's persuasion demanding, in effect, that Israel and its malefactors should be placed above the law? Not many of us will go along with that!

P.J.L.

### Benefits to Israel of U.S. Aid Since 1949 (as of Oct. 31, 1999)

Foreign Aid Grants and Loans	\$80,097,600,000
Other U.S. Aid (12.2% of Foreign Aid)	9,771,907,000
Interest to Israel from Advanced Payments	1,947,000,000

Grand Total \$91,816,507,200

Total Benefits per Israeli \$ 15,052

## Pope or Prophet?

The discussion swirling around Britisher John Cornwell's new book, *Hitler's Pope: The Secret History of Pius XII*, naturally centers on Pius's failure to speak out against the Nazi Holocaust. As such, it is a gift to those Jewish propagandists who relish the chance to take another swipe at Christianity.

The most interesting thing about this discussion, however, is the confirmation it offers that a far greater "secret history" is still being kept secret! Thanks to the virtual suppression in our schools of half the history of the 20th century, the general public has no idea that the number of Gentiles killed by Jews in this century is many times the number of Jews killed by Gentiles. Nor is the public ever likely to learn that the greatest single crime of our century was not what the Nazis did to the Jews, but what Stalin's Jewish helpers had done to the people of Ukraine only a decade earlier. Yet, none of the commentary one hears on *Hitler's Pope* offers even a hint that Pius had a great deal more to fear from communism than from Nazism.

A newspaper Profile of the author reveals that Cornwell, himself a Catholic, had originally set out to exonerate the Pope. He did not believe the common charge that Pius (Eugenio Pacelli) had kept quiet about the Holocaust because he was an anti-Semite who sympathized with the Nazi regime. Researching the Vatican's archives (to which Cornwell was given access because of his earlier pro-Catholic writings) changed his mind. He discovered that Cardinal Pacelli, then Papal Nuncio to Berlin, had helped to forge the *Reichskonkordat* of 1933 between the Church and Hitler's NSDAP. This deal gave the Vatican more control over Germany's 23 million Catholics in return for the Vatican's agreeing to disband the Catholic Centre Party, which in those days was the chief non-Communist opposition to the Nazi movement. (Curiously omitted from this Profile by Michael Posner, a leading Canadian journalist, is another part of the bargain, one which Hitler honoured right to the end of his rule. This was that the Third Reich should continue remitting to Rome monies raised from Catholic congregations.)

What Cornwell himself seems to have found most damning was the discovery of two prewar letters from Pacelli which leave no doubt of his antipathy towards Jews. Posner writes, "The second letter accused the Jews of plotting the Bolshevik Revolution, a scheme, Pacelli believed, aimed at dismantling the very structure of Christen-

dom and of Western civilization." That this belief should be cited against Pacelli by some people shows the thoroughly brainwashed temper of our times. For Pacelli, as every Instaurionist knows, was right. Zionist and Bolshevik attacks on the freedoms fundamental to our civilization are a fact of life in every Western country. Many an honest man has been punished by French or German courts for disagreeing with views imposed on those countries by their Jewish minorities. Freedom of information is also under siege there, as it is in Canada. Not only do the media operate under a Jewish-influenced self-censorship, but books the Zionists don't want us to read are apt either to be banned by Customs or to go "missing" from our public libraries. (One can only conclude that people so keen on censorship must have a lot to hide!)

As to the religious issue, Pius was well aware that religion is the bane of every Communist dictatorship because it implies that some part of human nature may escape the control of the Party. He also knew that Christianity has been hated for 2,000 years by Jews who originally feared that it might supersede their own more primitive faith, and latterly see its values as an obstacle to their mind-control over the rest of us. Today, therefore, Christianity is subject to mockery and vilification of a kind which the Zionists now running Hollywood and TV could never have allowed themselves in days when their kind was less powerful. (The Talmud advises them to be nice when you're weak, but when you're strong, "in dealing with the goyim, moral considerations need not be taken into account.") The last word on this may be left to Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter, authors of a 1982 book called *Roots of Radicalism—Jews, Christians and the New Left*. "In sum," these two Jews write, "the aim of the Jewish radical is to estrange the Christian from society as he feels estranged by it."

To be fair, the increasing vulgarization of our time may result more from the character of those behind it than from a conscious conspiracy. But in everything from the attempted debunking of Majority heroes to the scatological ravings of a Howard Stern and the latest slaps at Christianity in the Brooklyn Museum of Art, we see what looks very much like a concerted campaign to bring about the dumbing-down of our culture and the degradation of the popular mind. A one-sided attack on Pius XII can only accelerate that process.

PETER J. LORDEN



Pope Pius XII

# Big Sister Is Watching You

In recent months I have had occasional conversations with a former schoolteacher who works in my department. As often happens in the workplace, the topic of conversation is frequently what was on TV the night before. We had both seen a news special about tactics used by law enforcement agencies to put drug suspects behind bars. I opined that I disagreed with the police state tactics. The confiscation of assets before trial is a pernicious development. Neither am I overjoyed that suspects were being sent to the pen with no physical evidence against them. All it took was one witness, a former associate, for example, who lied on the stand to save his own skin. Consequently someone tangentially related to a group of druggies was sent up the river for a long time while the real perps went free.

After outlining my objections concerning these tactics to my co-worker, I was somewhat taken aback when the usually mild-mannered young woman rebuffed me and asserted that we had to get drugs and dealers off the streets no matter if due process was distorted, mangled or twisted, much less abandoned. Fascism with a female face? It ain't a pretty sight. Then again, perhaps I shouldn't have been surprised by her reaction. She was a new mother.

Protecting the children has long been an excuse for every kind of social engineering. The gun control crowd in the media knew that the massacre in Littleton, Colorado, was a golden opportunity to promote their agenda under the guise of—you guessed it—protecting the children. Filtering or monitoring the Internet is another popular cause for those who wish to protect humans of tender years. Clinton even managed to work the kids into a foreign policy speech to justify the bombing of Serbia. He asserted that our children (or was it our grandchildren?) deserve to have a free Europe in their future. Considering the long history of Catholic Church authoritarianism, the divine right of kings, the installation of socialism and communism in Europe, one might wonder if that continent has ever been free. No matter. Kids today have more rights than our ancestors could imagine. What's one more?

This concern for children, whether real or as a ruse to conceal a different agenda, seems to grow as female involvement in politics and statism grow apace. We have long been familiar with the stereotype of a politician who kisses babies. I don't know when that came into common currency, but I'd be willing to bet it wasn't around before women were given the right to vote.

The human female, like her mammalian counterparts, is quite capable of taking extraordinary measures to secure the welfare of her offspring (which is as it should be). Without wall-to-wall care, the survival rate for human in-

fants might rival that of baby sea turtles—around 2%. Among human females even the most demure young thing can turn into a tigress when her babies are threatened. Sometimes motherhood brings about a change of personality. Have you ever known a free-spirited party girl who does an about-face after having a child and becomes the most attentive mother imaginable? Certainly the arrival of offspring usually precipitates changes in the human male, but his transformation is nothing like that of the mother, whose power over her infant involves a lot of drudgery and frustration but also something close to omnipotence. Indeed we might classify it as totalitarian. When the hand that rocks the cradle attempts to rule the world from the halls of government, the result is likely to be more government not less.

It goes without saying that human maternal behavior has great survival value for the species. But when the desire for security clashes with the desire for liberty, a fundamental split occurs in society—and it is mostly reflected along gender lines. Sure you can always find female gun enthusiasts or male socialists. By and large, however, civil liberties—the real McCoy, not the ACLU version—are pretty much a male bastion.

Does anyone remember when feminism was called women's liberation? The phrase implied that women wanted to be free of social constraints. Today the term has been superannuated. It is now obvious that if you scratch a feminist, you will find a socialist. What this portends is more, not less, government control, more daycare centers, more quotas (or "guidelines"), more laws, more restrictions, more "civil rights," more social engineering, more class action lawsuits. Sure, feminists call themselves pro-choice when it comes to abortion, but not when it comes to owning guns, certainly not when it comes to freedom of speech, if it conflicts with their world view. In this respect, the woman's movement parallels the black civil rights push. At first it sought removal of state restrictions against the Negro. Then somehow it modulated into state protection of the Negro. Blacks and feminists aren't demanding freedom any more. They're after "social justice" or "economic justice," which usually translates to more goodies for the aggrieved group—and more government interference in the lives of the non-aggrieved. After all, in order to redistribute income more equally, it is first necessary to know how much money the better-off folk have. Try the "right of privacy" argument against the Internal Revenue Service in tax court. Neither does this tactic work too well in civil lawsuits. The discovery process requires defendants to produce mind-boggling volumes of documentation. This fits snugly within the female mindset, as females

really don't believe in privacy. You can't hide anything from the lady of the house. If it's anywhere in her domain, she will find it. She will not think, "Oh, that's my teenage daughter's closet, so I won't look in there to see what she's hiding," or "That's my husband's wallet, not mine, so I won't look inside it." The whole house is hers, no matter who else lives there, does the chores and pays the rent.<sup>1</sup>

Monitoring the "children" of the state falls not just to the proverbial jackbooted thugs, but also to the bureaucracies concerned with the implementation of government policy. The image of a police state is almost exclusively male, although the female plays a key role in edging us closer to authoritarianism.<sup>2</sup> Only rarely will women be wearing jackboots, but they will put on this footwear if it looks like the best bet for security. Does anyone think that Hitler could have gone as far as he did if he didn't have the support of the German *Hausfrau*? With the collapse of communism in the Soviet Union, don't be surprised if women flock to support a strongman style of government. If it is the only realistic form of security available, they will be all for it.

Should the American system collapse, the power vacuum will be filled by the strong. With no government to protect the children, the unfettered strongman will find his once detested masculine behavior back in vogue. Instead of a threat to society, he is becoming the protector of society. It is perhaps this yearning for a strongman that explains the election of Jesse Ventura in otherwise hopelessly liberal Minnesota. After all, an electorate can only take so much of the likes of Senator Paul Wellstone.

In the U.S. the push for more and more female candidates for higher and higher offices strikes me as a danger signal. Does anyone think that we will be a freer people as a result? We need only look to socialist Scandinavia, where some legislatures have mandated that political parties must nominate a prescribed percentage of women to office. Perhaps it was inevitable in developed countries with low birthrates.<sup>3</sup> Large families, the norm until recent history, keep women busy. Small families can also serve the same purpose, as female supervision per child tends to expand as the number of children dwindles. Empty-nesters and childless women must seek other outlets for their maternal instincts. For some, the outlets are relatively harmless, such as the SPCA or charity work. For others, the outlet is in social engineering, or protecting other people's children. In the mind and soul of the typical mother, her offspring never stop being children. How often have you heard a woman refer to her adult children as her babies? To the female the umbilical cord is never completely severed. The children (now the citizens) need constant attention. You can't turn your back for a minute. Who knows what they might be up to? If they're playing with dangerous toys (guns, bombs), we must disarm them. If they're flirting with dangerous ideas (racism, nationalism) we must scrub their minds clean.

The state is the female politico's home and she is the queen bee. This is why female pols tend to be reformers

and do-gooders. Loosed in the halls of government, Suzy Homemaker cannot help but see a problem where a man doesn't even see a situation. That wrinkle in the bedspread, that smudge on the curtain, that dust bunny under the sofa—the state's counterparts of these petty problems—will be addressed by her. When queried about a social issue, no matter how trivial, do not expect a female politico to say that it is not within the province of government to solve it or that she has no Constitutional mandate to do so. In that respect the feminists and the ladies' auxiliary of the Christian Coalition have more in common than they realize—and not just in their attitude towards pornography.

Hand in hand with the female instinct to protect the children goes the instinct to make sure that all her children are happy. Can't play favorites. In this particular aspect of motherhood, the mindset that gave birth to socialism is painfully obvious. If one of mom's kids (or one of society's minority misfits) is unhappy, the situation must be swiftly addressed. We must do everything possible (affirmative action, civil rights laws, hate crime laws) to make them feel better about themselves. And it isn't necessary to whine too loudly to get the female's attention. Remember it is she who will awaken at the slightest whimpering of her infant while the male snores away. One of the most damning epithets one can hurl at a politician today is "insensitivity." Almost always this accusation is directed towards a plain-speaking male.

The male's insensitivity parallels his virtually unlimited potential for propagation. Sperm cells are plentiful—for all practical purposes infinite. Female eggs become available at puberty: one per month for approximately 35 years or about 420 total. The male doesn't worry about his biological clock. He can ejaculate twice a day and ten times on Sundays without worrying about his sperm supply (even if the sperm count is not always what it should be). For the female each month a human egg goes unfertilized is another tick on that biological clock that women joke about in the most dire tones of voice. The ticking gets louder as time runs out. But with such an orientation to the finite and the concrete, the female is hard-wired to believe in the uniqueness and irreplaceableness of the individual, which is not to say that she herself is more independent than the male. The male knows reproduction is a cinch, and no matter how egocentric he may be, deep down he knows there are plenty more where he—and his sperm cells—came from. He knows he is expendable, and by extension, so is everyone else. Is there a better explanation for why war and mass murder are the prerogative of the male?

The savvy male politician may not be partial to minorities, but he knows he must appear to be a minority-hugger. The female politician is more likely to actually do something to assuage the hurt feelings of the minorities among her constituents. And don't expect her to laugh at any Negro or Jew jokes. When freedom of speech clashes with civility, we know which side Miss Manners will

come down on. Being polite is more important than the First Amendment, if you can't say anything nice.

In the U.S., when female political candidates are touted, it is often with the assumption the "softer, gentler" agenda of domestic issues will be better addressed by the fair sex. This sentimentalization of the female gender is sexism at its most blatant—but no one ever calls the offenders on the carpet. Feminists, who normally adhere to the environmentalist line, have been known to exalt their gender as nurturing, caring and empathetic. But if you use that as an excuse to keep women out of combat or law enforcement, they can get very hostile indeed! True, they are born nurturers, and if society didn't perpetuate those dastardly sex roles, they could be warriors as well as earth mothers! In pagan times female deities were worshipped for their procreative powers. True enough, ladies, but since you started exalting birth control as a human right, our contemporary goddesses have flat bellies and no stretch marks. The ultimate irony is that the modern white woman, she of the minuscule birthrate, has little concern for children at all! What children? Certainly not yours. If you really wanted to protect that rare white child you deigned to give birth to, would you dump it at a daycare center, a government school or in front of the TV set?

Nothing constricts personal freedom more than child care, which explains why freedom, for the most part, has always been a guy thing. One certainly doesn't hear the Bill of Rights invoked by female politicians to the degree one does by their male counterparts. Men demand freedom, fight for it and occasionally die for it. Throughout history females have traditionally been under more restrictions. Their lives are a nexus of obligations, as evinced by the fact that manners are almost wholly a female realm. Women are the teachers and the arbiters. It was not your father who pushed you to write thank-you notes. If anyone did, it was your mother or perhaps your grandmother. Is that why the female sees nothing wrong with burdening society with more and more regulations? After all, women see such restrictions as natural, so they will not hesitate to implement them legislatively, if given the chance. Perhaps in her heart of hearts, the socialist/feminist gets a kick out of hobbling the male, taking away his freedom, gradually emasculating him and bringing him closer to the status of a kept woman. Indeed, socialism/feminism empowers the unattractive female who can't get a man. By pushing totalitarian political beliefs she can control all men, if not an individual man. School taxes and social welfare programs force males to pay child support, even those who have never sired a child, even those who lead celibate lifestyles or engage in exclusively homosexual practices. If the flaming feminist can't control a man in the microcosm (through marriage), she will control him via the macrocosm (big government).

By subjecting all aspects of human behavior to a bewildering array of regulations, some of them seemingly contradictory, even the most robust man of action eventually considers throwing in the towel. Socialism siphons

power from the individual man to the state. Many a self-employed man or small businessman comes to realize the futility of striving when faced with the realities of modern statism. Taking care of one's clients or customers is nothing compared to keeping the government mollified. Socialism is stifling and confining. Nothing induces passivity more than bureaucracy and regulations. It makes rebellion futile even as it engenders it. Such rebellion usually dissipates itself in meaningless activities, such as rock music, sports, drugs or drinking, none of which is a serious threat to the power of the state.

The Byzantine and contradictory ways of big government are legion. It pays for anti-smoking programs while subsidizing tobacco farmers. It attempts to attract more minority visitors to National Parks while lamenting that said parks are already overcrowded. It warns of the dangers of population growth and all that it portends for the environment, then gives the OK for record numbers of immigrants to come ashore. In foreign policy the conflicting goals are too numerous to mention. Big government is the expression of the female instinct to take care of the needs of all her children. This may facilitate family functioning, but in government it frequently evolves into tyranny and sometimes bankruptcy.

It may be futile to attempt to answer Freud's famous question: "What do women want?" But let's give it a try. More specifically, what does a woman look for in a relationship with a male and what does this have to do with females in government? It is a common theory that many a man is really looking for a mother figure. Since his mother is the first woman who made a home for him, he may indeed be looking for a mother figure who can perform many of the same functions. But unless a woman selects a partner noticeably older than she is, the average woman is not looking for a father. If anything, she is looking for a child. The mother-child bond, remember, is the most primal of all. All other kinship relationships are subject to modification. The cultural anthropologists have never shied away from delineating how different these relationships can be. The ethnologists, generally anathema to the cultural anthropologists, have theorized that romantic behavior is derived from parental behavior, that the kiss is an offshoot of feeding behavior, where the mother would masticate food before sharing it with her child. The young woman's behavior vis-à-vis her boyfriend is not terribly different from a young mother's behavior towards her child. The girlfriend will cook for her man, pick out his clothes, clean his apartment and cater to his moods. At heart, the female believes that she knows best:

This shrewd perception of masculine bombast and make-believe, this acute understanding of man as the eternal tragic comedian, is at the bottom of that compassionate irony which passes under the name of the maternal instinct. A woman wishes to mother a man simply because she sees into his helplessness, his need of an amiable environment, his touching self-delusion.<sup>4</sup>

But if the relationship results in a child, the father will be admonished to grow up. Those boyish mannerisms that once seemed so appealing lose their luster once a real child enters the family. The overgrown child cannot compete with a real live baby. Hubby, it turns out, is little more than a proxy until he is a father.

Any male, boyish or otherwise, with a talent for manipulation can still exert a strong influence on female behavior. At heart the female has an instinct to be needed. This instinct is usually satisfied by the birth of offspring, whose protracted needfulness exasperates many a father long before the mother gives up. The child's need for a mother is obvious. The adult male's need for a mother figure is less obvious, but his expression of need is the way to a woman's heart. Have you never seen a shrewd boss extract more work from an overworked secretary by asserting that he needs her and couldn't get by without her? A woman has little interest in a relationship—romantic or otherwise—with a man who has no need for her. Often she will strive mightily to show the man that he needs her as surely as a toddler needs a mother.<sup>5</sup>

I wouldn't go so far as to say that women believe there is no such thing as a bad boy, but they do seem to believe that there is no such thing as a bad boy who can't be redeemed by a relationship with the right sort of woman—namely herself. In that sense the man needs her; he just doesn't know it. In fact the female believes she has the power to mold a man's behavior, just as she would that of her own infant, if she had one. If he changes his life and cleans up his act, it is a testament to her power over him. It has long been a puzzle to the nice guys of this world—who have already cleaned up their act—why the hoods have a lock on the female psyche. It is tempting to think it is just masochism on the part of the female. But it is more than that.

Ask female movie fans why they like Jack Nicholson so much. As loutish, boorish, arrogant, overbearing, ill-tempered, loud- and foul-mouthed as he is, women respond to him. He is the classic bad boy—no matter if he is old enough to collect Social Security. As a movie image, Nicholson may be irresistible. In real life, if he persists in his behavior, he may get dumped.<sup>6</sup> Though a woman may have an urge to "save" a man, if her efforts aren't bearing fruit, she may jump ship. Still, we have to explain why so many women remain with wife-beaters. Can it be that deserting such a man would be tantamount to deserting a child—an act that invites universal opprobrium even in these liberated times?

As for really "bad boys," consider the astonishing number of women who propose to and marry prison inmates. The more heinous the crimes, the more female attention the inmates receive. Would a man ever do the same towards a female felon?

Even if Cindy Crawford and Heather Locklear get sent up the river, I don't see it happening.

But one need not be a bad boy to invite female attention. The young man who is the apple of his mother's eye will likely make a good ladies' man. He has learned the art of being a son, perhaps even mastered the corresponding role of teacher's pet. When he turns his attention to his female peers (and they turn their attention to him), his boyish demeanor will awaken their maternal instincts. When the pubescent female first shifts her attention to the opposite sex, the adjective most likely to be used to describe the young male is "cute." This adjective is used to describe desirable males well into adulthood. Cuteness goes a long way, at least until baldness and graying render the adjective no longer credible.

Cuteness may also be the motivating factor for females who hang out with male homosexuals. Is the "fag hag" really enjoying the company of a man (usually well-groomed and well-mannered) who has no intention of hitting on her? Or is she looking for a "bad boy," albeit a cute one, to redeem? In her heart of hearts does she think a queer man-child is as malleable as a straight boy-child?

The wish to be a man is a common female fantasy. The desire to be a woman is not one felt by the human male unless he is a pervert. The ultimate frustration for the feminist is that no matter what her profession, that no matter how high she rises in the corporate hierarchy, that no matter how much money she earns, that no matter how much she embraces the traditional trappings of the male, she can never be a man. Hence she is set up for frustration from the word go, yet all the while her voice grows louder and louder in the ranks of government. Has her resentment of the male diminished as equality has grown and his privileges have diminished? Not at all. Anti-male sentiments are now more piercing than ever.

From time to time at work, when I compare my leisure time activities with those of my co-workers, I sense a bit of envy from the distaff department. I get plenty of vacation time and have the money to travel. The typical married with children co-worker spends her leisure time chauffeuring the kids to organized activities, cleaning the house, perhaps taking care of aged parents. Her life is an endless round of obligations with no end in sight. Whereas, if I want to go to the races, the ballpark, the movies, the art museum, the beach, or whatever, I can do it. Other than my job and my house, I don't have to consider anything else.

Women look at a bachelor pretty much the way they would at an 8-year old boy running loose around the neighborhood. To the woman the question is why isn't he married? The common question for both is what are they doing running around without female supervision? The as-



What makes unattractive  
Jack Nicholson so attractive?



sumption is that the transition from mom-as-supervisor to wife-as-supervisor should be close to seamless with as short an interregnum as possible. A man who has logged too many years without female supervision is suspect, though not so much as the man who still lives at home with his mother.

My last sojourn at home with mom was during the “poster” phase of my youth (in other words, when I bought posters of my pop culture heroes and wallpapered my bedroom with oversized portraits of writers). One day my grandmother passed by my bedroom, looked at one of the posters (I don’t remember if it was Steinbeck or Hemingway), portrayed in a characteristically disheveled pose, and snorted, “Those writers think they can do anything they want and dress anyway they please.” That sounded pretty good to me, but to grandma, it was an unpardonable sin. Nobel Prize winners or not, they obviously lacked female supervision.

I also remember a bachelor friend of my uncle, who sometimes came over to the house and shared a beer with me. He was not dissolute and never attempted to lead my uncle astray in any way. But in the eyes of my aunt, my mother and my grandmother, he was suspect not because he was single, not because his burdens were few—but because he had no female supervision in his life! To make matters worse he seemed to function perfectly well without it.

A man leans towards freedom and simplicity; a woman towards obligations and complexity. A woman’s life is a Gordian knot. The male instinct is to cut it.<sup>7</sup> When he gives in to his sexual instinct, he is going against his simplicity instinct—hence his great reluctance to commit. The great ascetics of history have been men, usually celibates. The empire builders have also been men, but they usually delegate the detail work to their inferiors while they concentrate on the big picture.<sup>8</sup> Women tend to be creatures of creature comforts, however those are defined by her social milieu. In some female circles these days, deliberately roughing it—rock climbing, white water rafting or whatever—is fashionable. But this is how they spend their vacations. When they return home, it’s business as usual.

Women will always opt for security over freedom. Deep down it galls them to see an independent man of means whose life is not a morass of responsibilities and obligations like their own. This means that a single man running for President hasn’t got a chance. How could he tend to the needs of the nation’s extended family when he’s never had to worry about the needs of an immediate family? The female franchise would be exercised elsewhere. In a real sense the male politician is married to his female electorate as well as to his wife. When female voters turn against him in large numbers, he hasn’t got a chance. They will throw him out of the House or the Senate or elsewhere, if he shows little interest in protecting their children.

I don’t know that I would recommend bachelorhood for men not seeking political office. Granted the marriage

contract has a lot of fine print these days, but there are a lot of men out there who need to be redeemed by a good woman—or a good something. Certainly society would collapse if the marriage and kinship system withered away. (Indeed many assert that is just what is happening.) Twenty-five years ago George Gilder wrote two books (*Sexual Suicide*, 1973 and *Naked Nomads*, 1974) blasting the single lifestyle which is now so entrenched in the American social fabric. Basically he asserted that single men tended towards instability in all of its anti-social variations. He believed that when their numbers grew too large, they would become a destabilizing force in society. I agree with him, though I hardly consider myself a threat to society. I must say, however, that my literary efforts for Instauration might convince some people otherwise.

When it comes to destabilization, I can’t think of a more destructive force than large numbers of women in government. While the push for a female President will continue into the next century, I don’t think the real danger to society is having a female in a figurehead position. Granted, Hillary Clinton is a clear and present danger, but history has shown that an exceptional female (Elizabeth, Victoria, Catherine the Great, Queen Isabella) may occasionally take the reins of state without jeopardizing the welfare of the opposite sex. If anything, the aforementioned rulers had an appreciation for the many ways in which masculine behavior could aid the nation-state. The real threat comes when top-level bureaucrats and members of the legislative bodies become more and more female. Under such circumstances, a busier and busier busybody government is assured. Figureheads come and figureheads go but bureaucrats and federal judges go on forever and members of Congress seemingly forever.

And it can only get worse. Today in the U.S., half the students in the nation’s law schools are female. That means we will see more and more ambitious women, not just openly running for office but as behind-the-scenes policy wonks reinventing government. . .and protecting the children.

Be afraid. Be very afraid. I am. But I’m not sure if I’m more afraid of females tying a Gordian knot or the inevitable strongman who will come along to sever it. It may be necessary. It may be inevitable. But I have a feeling it won’t be pretty.

JUDSON HAMMOND

1. But don’t assume that if you live in the same house with her that you have the same right to go snooping through her things.

2. Physical enforcement of the law is still largely a male prerogative, as the time-honored phrase, “Wait till your father gets home,” implies. Yet it is mom who investigates and interrogates before dad gets home. Dad is generally not a snoop. If daughter is hiding birth control pills in her underwear drawer, he’d just as soon not know about it, though he will make his feelings known if confronted with such a situation. As we are all becoming painfully aware, when dad is absent, discipline is lax to nonexistent.

3. The opposite is true in Latin countries where high birth-rates are the rule and feminism has been slower to take hold, though the global do-gooders gleefully assert that things are changing even there. Still, one may well ask just how much real freedom the Latin macho man really has. Over generations the authoritarianism of the Catholic Church, as well as *caudillos, padrones* and dictators have hamstrung Latin males not lucky enough to be born into the ruling classes. Can we say that when constructive manly behavior is discouraged, destructive macho posturing is the likely result? Isn't the same thing happening here in America, where binge-drinking, road rage, lavish spectator sports and other obnoxious, meaningless or self-destructive activities have become more popular?

4. H.L. Mencken, *In Defense of Women* (Alfred A. Knopf, 1922), p. 4. Though Mencken skewers men far more than he does women in this volume, there is nary a paragraph that wouldn't be offensive to today's egalitarian establishment, notwithstanding that highly original ideas expressed in a highly original prose style always have a subversive edge.

5. There may be a psychological connection in the female mind between the domestication of the male and the domestication of animals. It is tempting to speculate that the pre-pubescent

girl's love of horses is a warm-up for adolescence. How else to explain her fascination with corralling a headstrong, physically powerful, wild animal and domesticating him (literally putting him in harness). Change the horse to a human male and you have the template for the romance novel.

6. Nicholson in his personal life had a highly unusual experience with motherhood. Turns out he was an illegitimate child and the woman he thought was his mother was really his grandmother. The woman he thought was his older sister was really his birth mother.

7. It is not unusual to come across men who are masters at tying Gordian knots. Such a mindset may not be entirely unnatural, since the ethologists assert that the basic mammalian template is female and that the male brain is a more recent development. At the same time it would be difficult to imagine that such a man would ever become an alpha male—such as Alexander the Great.


8. One of my enduring memories of working in various offices is noting that the head honcho's desk is almost always clean except for whatever he's concentrating on at the moment. For the underlings, cluttered desks are a way of life.

---

## Old Joe's Famine Cooked Up?

Recently I spent time with some religious friends. At one point the conversation turned to the biblical tale of Joseph in Egypt. I remembered vaguely about the seven prosperous years followed by the seven years of famine in which Joseph saved the country. But my friends provided some additional insights about this ancient Chosenite. According to them (I claim no biblical expertise), Joseph fed the populace—for a price. Because of years of famine the people had no more money, so he demanded that they sign over their property. In short order he owned most of the country. Does this story sound depressingly familiar? Doesn't it explain Egypt's subsequent anti-Semitism?

The Bible is historical (more or less), but history is written by the winners. Could other relevant details have been omitted from the story of Joseph? This is speculation but,



The Pyramid builders weren't dummies

given the rapacious and parasitic behavior of Jews over the next several millennia, is it not possible that Joseph might have somehow caused the famine and profited from it? Is it not odd that such an old and established civilization was so unprepared? Were a people intelligent enough to build the Pyramids too stupid to deal with one of nature's most elemental hazards? Was Joseph's foresight divine inspiration or simply the first of history's big Jewish scams?

The record of the Chosen makes this scenario plausible. Joseph's demonic descendants in the NKVD caused the Ukrainian "famine" by simply confiscating the food supplies. Perhaps the Bolsheviks were just emulating their Jewish ancestors. The current Jewish financial rape of Russia is another instance of the Jews' genetic propensity for amassing large amounts of money.

442

# Underreported Gulag Atrocities

Americans have been saturated for half a century with stories of Nazi atrocities, a few of which may actually be true. What has been sorely lacking, probably deliberately concealed, are exposés and revelations about Soviet concentration camps, collectively called the Gulag, stretching over a period of some 60 years from 1918 to about 1975. Robert Conquest and Alexander Solzhenitsyn have focused their expertise on this subject. But Conquest's work is mostly read by historians and the highly educated, while Solzhenitsyn's *Gulag Archipelago* is scarcely read at all, except in a condensed version.


Overall, the general public has been so heavily propagandized about alleged German war crimes and kept so uninformed about the much more extensive Soviet criminality that it has a completely distorted picture of 20th-century history. National Socialism, a reaction to the Versailles Treaty and to the threat of communism, lasted twelve years before it was eradicated from the world scene by the Soviet Union and its Western allies. Unfortunately communism, even though the U.S.S.R. political state has disintegrated, is still very much with us. Meanwhile, Americans continue to be stuffed with anti-German propaganda, possibly to distract them from the underhanded operations of the Office of Special Investigations, which is still being funded to prosecute 90-year-old German, Latvian, Estonian and other anti-Communists, while we deal with the former MVD and NKVD goons as the legitimate rulers of "democratic" Russia.

Regrettably even American presidents have been used to bless the inmates and condemn the managers of German camps while totally ignoring the inmates of the Soviet camps. Presidents Carter, Reagan, Bush and Clinton have rarely been seen in public ceremonies concerned with WWII without an Elie Wiesel or some other "witness" at his side. At the same time no American president (at the advice of his foreign-born advisers) has had the courage to be seen with Solzhenitsyn for fear of offending Brezhnev, Chernenko or some other nonentity.

A MVD major who worked in the Gulag from 1951 until his retirement in 1981, Danchik Sergeevich Bal-

daev, ethnically a Buryat, has published a book depicting the travails and agonies of Russians declared "enemies of the people" by the Communist government.

Baldaev's book is arranged thematically, with sections on camp organization, tortures and cruelties, sex, food and housing, climatic conditions, common and political criminals and so on. Special mention is made of Naftaly Aronivich Frenkel, Stalin's favorite camp butcher and willing executioner. The Jewish Frenkel, originally a common criminal convicted in 1927 of swindling and corruption, swiftly rose to a privileged position in the Solovetsky camp by proposing special techniques to the authorities for eliciting more productive work from his fellow inmates. One of his "contributions" was linking a prisoner's




Gulag barracks

food ration, especially hot food, to his production. Frenkel became a camp official after observing that a prisoner's most productive work is usually done in the first three months of his captivity, after which he or she was in such a weakened state that the efficiency of the inmate population could be kept high only by killing off the exhausted prisoners and maintaining a high influx of fresh inmates. So pleased was Stalin with these efficiency proposals that in 1937 he made Frenkel the head of the newly founded Main Administration of Railroad Construction Camps (GULZhDS).

Another method of having prisoners show enthusiasm for their work—and at the same time culling the camp population by killing off the weak—was quite simple. When the prisoners were called out on a work detail, they fell into line. The last man in the line would be shot as a laggard or *dokhodyaga*, one so weakened as to be considered useless for work.

While Stalin's thugs, the NKVD and MVD, officially managed the operation of the camps, unofficially, inside the barracks, common criminals (murderers, rapists, psychopaths of every variety) ruled, using and abusing the women and the weak. Calling themselves *vory v zakone* (thieves or professional criminals), these thugs were mafiosi of the lowest type. It is ironic and tragic that Russia today is ruled by these same elements, along with the secret police and their old thuggish colleagues in the camps.



Master criminal Frenkel

The women were preyed upon from all quarters. During their transport to the camps they were often raped on the transport ships and in the railroad cars. Upon arrival at their destination they would be paraded naked in front of the camp officials who would select those they fancied, promising easier work in exchange for their sexual favors. The officials, according to Baldaev, preferred German, Latvian and Estonian women, who would never see home again, over native Russian women who might. Women not selected by the camp officials became "prizes" for the

common male criminals or for the lesbians.

Besides the everyday tortures of starvation, work exhaustion, exposure to the cold of the Far North and beatings, more recalcitrant prisoners might be subjected to impalement, genital mutilation or more mercifully a shot in the back of the head.

While today the average American college graduate would probably be much better prepared to appreciate the *Illustrated Kamasutra*, Baldaev's work must be recommended to all mature and serious students of 20th-century communism. As unlikely as it might seem, Baldaev manages to depict the entire pathology of the Communist camps and their overlords in an almost clinical manner, starkly and without theatrics.

*Danchik Sergeyevich Baldaev dedicates his Gulag Zeichnungen (Gulag Drawings) to his father and to Alexander Solzhenitsyn. Aside from the Library of Congress and perhaps a few other libraries specializing in Russian and Communist history, the book is not readily available in the U.S. It may be obtained by mail only from: Zweitausendeins, Postfach 610 637, D-6000, Frankfurt am Main 60, Germany.*

200

## Driven to Kill

Within 24 hours of the Ft. Worth Baptist church murders, the Jewish media (as always) informed us the perp was a "white male," "a loner," "mentally unbalanced" and a "nasty hater." These white male killers are always said to have some sort of association with "hate groups," whether they really do or not. I suppose it is important to the culture vultures to blame these "hate groups" for crimes instead of their own putrid, rotting behavior.

Half of today's male white youth start out from broken homes with no healthy male role model in sight. They live with a working or welfare mother "trying to find herself." They are schooled by a matriarchy of emasculating, politically correct NEA teacher-harpies. They go to some P.C. church where they get love-thy-Negro, love-thy-fag sermons.

I have heard too many depressing tales from divorced fathers denied visitation rights to their own children because they are deemed "mentally unstable" by lawyers and judges for anything from racist or non-P.C. thought crimes to taking Sonny Boy too often on hunting trips. Any

exercise of masculinity in this culture is considered unhealthy. This killing society that exports its bloody warfare overseas hasn't fought a war on its own soil for more than 130 years, which makes Americans squeamish about home-grown violence.



Loser Buford Furrow

Half of young white males fortunate enough to reach their majority with both parents still together usually find dad is

never home. When he is, he is a sports nut, a computer nerd, consumer-crazed or an alcoholic. Mom has a hyphenated surname and puts in 50 hours at the office to pay off credit card debts. Sonny is entrusted to daycare, a church camp or a charter school, where he is deracinated and learns about the guilt and shame he must feel for being male and white. Football is too aggressively violent and competitive. The debate team is too exclusionary and elitist. Even a chemistry set is too dangerous. It might make bombs! So Sonny Boy listens to rap music, wears his hat backwards, smokes dope and ends up acting like a black.

Small wonder a tiny subset of alienated white males who eschew these dead-end options end up crazed. Like Buford Furrow, Larry Ashbrook and even Timothy McVeigh, they "get in touch with their anger." Nothing personal. It's just the way an unhinged mind strikes back at a lifetime of psychic rape and raw deals. If America loves its victims, then let it love these losers instead of portraying them as monsters!

838

# The New Siberia?

**A**dolf Hitler believed that allowing Jews to call the shots in any society would inevitably result in the corruption of its institutions and the degradation of its culture. The government of Canada seems bent upon proving his point! Some examples:

**CANADA CUSTOMS** is authorized by law to bar the importation of any material deemed to be “hate propaganda.” In practice, this seems to mean anything a Jewish censor wouldn’t want us to know. How else can we explain the banning of Wilmot Robertson’s lament for the decline of his people in *The Dispossessed Majority?* Or Ingrid Rimland’s great novel, *Lebensraum?* Or an Australian educator’s book describing how David Irving was barred from that country? These are but three cases among hundreds in which Canadians have been denied their democratic right to freedom of information.

**CANADA’S SUPREME COURT** ruled in 1996 that an honest schoolteacher named Malcolm Ross should be barred from the classroom. His offense? He had, on his own time, exposed the manifest absurdity of yoking together in “Judeo-Christianity” two faiths that are morally incompatible. An excellent and popular teacher, Ross had *never* brought his “controversial” views into the classroom. Nevertheless, a sleazily dishonest campaign led by Dr. Karen Mock’s so-called League for Human Rights (the Marxist branch of B’nai Br’ith) presented him as a danger to the community. The Supreme Court agreed, ousting Ross in a judgment so patently illogical that even Canada’s “national newspaper” concluded, “We dissent.” Would it matter if the whole country dissented? What the enemies of truth and freedom want, they get.

**PARLIAMENT.** Canada’s politicians are a plastic bunch. When Jews suddenly demanded that they be allowed to wear their yarmulkes in the halls of the Royal Canadian Legion—despite the no-hats tradition there—some Cabinet Ministers backed them up. Didn’t those Ministers *know* that the yarmulke is the symbol of the oldest and ugliest racism on Earth? That its wearer is identifying himself with the doctrine that all non-Jews are “cattle” and all our womenfolk, “whores?” Why should Legionnaires put up with that? Yet, when we refused to do so, we were called “racist!”

Similarly, protests to politicians about the escalating attacks on our traditional freedoms, and about governmental *financing* of the attackers, draw no response. Like most of the people they represent, our politicians get their education on these matters from the professional liars of the

Jewish Lobby.

When the latter discovered, for instance, that Ernst Zündel had rented a room on Parliament Hill for a small meeting, they raised such a stink about it that all three Parties dutifully fell into line. No way that awful man could be rented a room on the Hill, they chorused. Had any of them actually *read* Zündel? Did they know that the prosecution in one of Zündel’s trials conceded that the publication he’s chiefly associated with, *Did Six Million Really Die?*, is “substantially correct?” Of course not! They were just doing what their Jewish masters told them to do.

**THE TRILLIUM FOUNDATION** was set up by the provincial government of Ontario to distribute to various “good causes” some of the profits of the Ontario Lottery Corporation. Something strange happened there in 1995. The aforesaid Dr. Mock, having secured a TRILLIUM grant of \$186,000 for her League, then lobbied the Board for a grant of \$8,000 to an underground terrorist group calling itself Anti-Racist Action. This being given, Mock then took TRILLIUM’s Jewish president with her to lobby Toronto’s Metropolitan Council to grant another \$8,000 to the ARA.

This bit of ethnic “networking” inspired letters of protest to TRILLIUM and the Jewish head of the Ontario Lottery Corporation. There was no reply, nor did the RCMP or Ontario’s Provincial Police respond to complaints. Evidently, “the fix is in.”

How *could* public monies be diverted to a body of Stalinist and Anarchist thugs with no legal standing whatsoever? Ask Adolf! He remarked in his “Secret Book” that once Jews had attained equal rights they would demand super-rights. So they do. And in Canada, apparently, it puts them above the law.

## **MEDIA.**

(1) **Magazines.** Canadian nationalists and magazine publishers have been worrying about the effect on our “cultural autonomy” of unfair competition from America’s “split-run” magazines. But haven’t newspapers a far greater influence on public opinion? And are not some 60% of Canada’s daily papers owned by a Jewish-run corporation based in New York? Our cultural autonomists daren’t say a word about that.

(2) **Newsletters.** Several newsletters are put out in Canada by conservative people dedicated to defending the culture of the Majority and exposing the attacks upon it. Some examples of what these patriots have to put up with:

(a) A newsletter put out by the Pressler couple in British Columbia aroused the ire of Dr. Mock’s close

associate, "Red" Professor David Lethbridge. He tried to shut the couple down by bankrupting their pharmacy business through a campaign of lies and defamation. They sued, and won damages of over \$70,000. But it's doubtful whether they will ever collect, as Lethbridge has appealed the verdict. Being funded by the Communist Party, he can afford to do this, whereas the Presslers are on their own.

(b) A long-serving adult-education teacher named Paul Fromm has for many years published highly informative newsletters about corruption in Immigration and Foreign Aid, and about the erosion of our traditional freedoms. This naturally angered Dr. Mock, who seems eager to live up to her family connection with the KGB. In 1997 she and Lethbridge teamed up to have Mr. Fromm dismissed by the local Board of Education on grounds eerily similar to those on which Malcolm Ross was fired. (Their two cases mean that freedom of speech no longer exists for teachers in Canada.) Fortunately, Mr. Fromm is still publishing, but it's difficult. Besides being threatened with physical violence by the ARA, he must depend on private subscription, while his enemies are getting government grants.

(c) Not content with these shabby triumphs, the foes of truth and freedom seem determined to go even further. Some years ago, a Jewish lawyer named Charles Harnick introduced into Ontario's socialist legislature a bill which would virtually have abolished freedom of expression in that Province. This Bill 56 was aborted at the last minute through a public protest led by Mr. Fromm. Mr. Harnick, however, went on to new heights of influence, being appointed Attorney-General by the succeeding Conservative(?) government. The last we heard of him, he was conferring with fellow travellers in Ottawa with a view to legislation which would (are you sitting down?) make it a criminal offence to subscribe to these Majority newsletters! That has not yet come to pass, but could anything more clearly illustrate what these people are about?

(3) **THE CBC.** It's rumoured that the next head of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation will be a Jewish associate of the Bronfman clan.

To be fair, this Mr. Rabinovitch may well be a fine administrator. But what sort of people would he bring in with him? Would they be the same kind who have just contrived (led once again by the busy Dr. Mock) to have *The Lord's Prayer* banned from our schools? Will they be arguing that it's inappropriate for a publicly owned medium to celebrate Christian festivals, and therefore that the traditional Christmas broadcast of Handel's *Messiah* is a no-no?

But why go only half-way? If Ottawa's intent is to vulgarize the CBC, why not give the job to Howard Stern? He could do it faster than anyone else.

**IMMIGRATION.** For the last 25 years, Canadian governments have discouraged British and European immigrants in favour of those from the Third World. This anti-white bias reached a bizarre climax in the tale of a nameless ship arriving on our West Coast with 123 illegal immigrants from China. Rather than being sent back—as most people thought they should have been—these invaders got a warm welcome from Ottawa.

Though nobody believed these people to be *refugees*, they were invited to apply for refugee status. Naturally they accepted, since this entitles them to immediate release into the general population with generous social benefits and free legal aid. (It also offers them a convenient back door into the U.S.) Predictably, the horde of lawyers and "refugee consultants" who profit from the corruption of the Immigration process applauded Ottawa's decision, while we who opposed it were called "racist."

The Minister of Immigration promptly made things worse by declaring that we would *never* send such invaders back. This was an open invitation to the professional people-smugglers (charging around \$40,000 a head) to send as many more boatloads as they can round up. (Two more have since arrived. And China's own Bureau of Public Security estimates that there are hundreds of thousands of Chinese already outside China waiting to be smuggled to their final destinations.)

The latest word on this issue is that a new Minister of Immigration has finally bowed to overwhelming public pressure in two respects. Fifty-seven of the 444 arrivals *will* be deported, she says, and the latest bunch will not be released but held in detention until their refugee status is determined. But let's not hold our breath! The usual suspects are already threatening to block both reforms by endless judicial "appeals." Some also argue that since China has a repressive government, *all* Chinese arrivals must be classed as refugees and therefore entitled to the taxpayers' bounty. If only 5% of China's population heed that message, we're looking at 50 million people!

It has to be added that if Ottawa's policy makes no sense to Canada's Majority, it makes a whole lot of sense to the traditional enemies of Western/Christian culture. What better way to undermine that culture than by swamping it with people who neither share nor respect its values?

**"JUSTICE."** For many years we've seen a pattern of increasing attacks on our democratic rights to freedom of speech and assembly. A countrywide network of Jewish activists is poised to prevent or disrupt the meetings of people whose views the Bolsheviks don't like.

No matter how many times we repeat that it's not about "White Supremacy" but about White Survival—the survival of a culture based upon truth and freedom—the other side's control of the media makes it easy for them to convince a brainwashed public that it's we who threaten a free Canada! They love to talk about "racism" and "hate," about "hatemongers" and "hate sites" on the Internet. But

since Jewish writers tell us that “the heart’s blood” of their religion is the Talmud, and since the heart of the Talmud is hatred and contempt for non-Jews, mustn’t it follow that the majority of hate sites in Canada are synagogues? And how can a people espousing Jewish Supremacy accuse others of racism? Isn’t a racist a racist whether he gets his master-race myth from Adolf or from Moses?

Another favourite tactic of the Bolsheviks has been the perversion of our “Human Rights Commissions.” Originally formed to protect individuals from unfair treatment by the rich and powerful, these bodies are now too often turned into the opposite—a mechanism whereby the powerful enemies of truth and freedom can persecute anyone telling a truth they don’t want told.

The multiannual Jewish pursuit of columnist Doug Collins is a case in point. In order to nail him, British Columbia’s Bolshevik legislators passed an amendment declaring that “truth shall be no defence.” All that a minority complainant then had to say was that his feelings had been hurt by something Collins had written; its truth became “irrelevant.” (Especially unfair is that the complainant’s costs are paid by the HRC, while the accused must pay his own expenses.)

Having worked in British Columbia, this evil development is now being projected onto the national scale. Agents of B’nai Br’ith (a political lobbying group disguised as a “charity” and therefore tax-exempt) have persuaded our Federal and 10 Provincial Ministers of Justice to approve a similar amendment to Canada’s Criminal Code. If this becomes law, you could actually go to jail for telling the truth! A court need only deem that the truth you expressed was likely to expose “an identifiable group to hatred or contempt.” So if you told of the Jewish role in the Ukrainian Holocaust or cited reasons to doubt the fabled Six Million” in the Nazi one, you could be found guilty of HATE. Then how long would it be before we heard it suggested that special camps be set up, à la Gulag, for the detention of “hatemongers?”

The only good thing about this diabolical initiative is that it finally brings the diabolists out of the closet. For it must now be plain to all of us that people wishing to equate TRUTH with HATE (and thereby abolish the teaching of history) have embraced EVIL as surely as Shakespeare’s Iago does when he says, “Evil, be thou my Good!”

PETER J. LORDEN

---


## Blockbuster Conference

Sponsored by David Irving, the modern world’s most persecuted and most knowledgeable historian, the Real History USA Conference was held in Cincinnati on September 24-26. Featured were fascinating lectures by contemporary free speech advocates who have been hounded and in some cases prosecuted by liberal and minority thought control fanatics operating behind an “anti-hate” smokescreen.

The Conference opened with a welcome from David Irving who then introduced the evening’s speakers. First was Bradley Smith of the Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust who held forth on his efforts to open debate on many university campuses despite the narrow and stifling parameters imposed by the American academy. Peter der Margaritis, the second speaker, had interesting things to say about the mystery surrounding the recall of Field Marshal Erwin Rommel from commanding the D-Day front in the West.

Saturday, the second day, began with amateur histori-

an Joseph Bellinger, who discussed the suspicious circumstances surrounding the suicide of Heinrich Himmler.



David Irving, master Revisionist

zation given Irving’s supporters by professional minority racists, Israel boosters and Anti-Defamation League defamers.

Later in the day the film, *Inferno in Dresden*, prepared for TV’s History Channel, was shown, followed by a talk

by Irving on the writing of his first and widely acclaimed book, *The Destruction of Dresden*.

The program continued with a lecture by Brian Renk on Professor Christopher Browning, an expert retained by Deborah Lipstadt, in the upcoming libel action brought against her by Irving on account of her scurrilous book attacking Holocaust Revisionists in general and Irving in particular.

Saturday concluded with a banquet at which the guest speaker was gutsy Canadian journalist Doug Collins who, as a WWII prisoner of war in Germany, set a world record for escape attempts. Collins recounted his fight against the bigoted campaign of the Canadian Human Rights Commission to impose politically correct boundaries on freedom of speech. Collins was born in Britain and migrated to Canada after WWII. He reminded the audience of a quote from George Orwell: "Freedom of speech means my right to say what you do not want to hear." It made an Anglo-Saxon proud to see that there are still some Brits who have retained the original values of their liberty-loving race.

The speakers on Sunday included Californian Russ Granata who focused on the activities of Italian-American Carlo Mattogno, who has purchased and evaluated some 20,000 documents from the Russian secret state archives on Auschwitz and other camps.

Pennsylvanian Charles Provan spoke on the grisly massacre of prison guards and personnel by American forces at Dachau.

Perhaps the high point of the Conference was the appearance of Germar Rudolf, a brilliant young German formerly employed by the prestigious Max Planck Institute. A chemist, Rudolf was fired as a result of publishing research which demonstrated the physical impossibility of mass gassings at Auschwitz. He was then driven into exile from Germany by threats of huge civil fines and jail terms.

Rudolf's English has improved and his speech was well delivered. He makes a fine appearance—looking like a German is supposed to look—tall, long-headed and intelligent looking. His demeanor brought home to his audience his high principles, courage, remarkable perspicacity and integrity. A young man, he has made enormous personal sacrifice for our cause and promises more important things to come.

Rumor has it that Rudolf will be setting up a publication in English on the subject of the Holocaust. If true, this would be a great boon for Revisionists.

Irving deserves a rousing "thank you" from one and all for putting this Conference together. It ran like clockwork. Comparisons are odious, but this Conference was far better and far better organized than the IHR Conferences in the past.

Only someone like Irving—not involved in the disastrous split and consequent litigation of the two Revisionist factions—could have created this gathering. Supporters and participants on both sides of the Revisionist dispute were able to sit in the same room and not come to blows.

Irving promises that Real History USA Conferences will be held annually. Instaurationists owe it to themselves to make every effort to attend.

The next Conference promises to include such a notable as Nicholas Tolstoy, the White Russian author who has so bravely and at great cost badgered the British establishment on the deportations and forced return to the Soviet Union of Russian and other refugees from communism after WWII.

To keep abreast of Irving's activities, and to pre-register at a discount for next year's conference, Instaurationists should write Focal Point Publications, 81 Duke Street, London W1M 5DJ; phone 0171 491 3498; fax 0171 409 7048; email: info@fpp.co.uk

303

---

## The Majority Must Vote Majority

The Republicans and other real or pseudo-conservatives are worried that Pat Buchanan will draw away enough voters from the G.O.P. to ensure the election of Gore or Bradley. Let's torture this logic a little. Why shouldn't Pat do everything in his power to weaken the not so Grand Old Party? As it now stands it represents the status quo, the ongoing dispossession of the Majority. Its present wishy-washy politics can only plunge the country further and further into political anomie.

So three cheers for spoiler Pat. Long may he spoil. The more votes he manages to chivy from the Republicans, the more votes he draws to the Reform Party, the more votes will be shifted from the Republican to the Democratic presidential

candidate. Which is a good thing. Let me explain.

Because of his idiotic, anachronistic and antediluvian stance on abortion, Pat will never make it to the White House. But he can help set the stage for some future Majority-conscious presidential candidate.

Truman once said there's not a dime's (shekel's) worth of difference between the two parties. Actually there is. The Republican Party, though it doesn't know it and doesn't act it, is the party of the Majority. The Democratic Party is the party of the minorities. Until our people understand this simple political truth, the American Majority isn't going anywhere but down.

The white vote is split between Re-

publicans and Democrats at the very time it should be solidly in the Republican fold. When if ever are Majorityites going to face up to this lose-lose situation.

So spoil on Pat, spoil on.

What we need is a Majority racist in the White House. The Democratic Party is pervaded with racism, minority racism, and a sizable number of white voters in the country pander to minority racism. Only severe and continuing punishment in presidential elections will make Republicans wake up and smell the coffee.

Rub their noses in their predicament, Pat. Rub the noses of the do-nothing and know-nothing Republicans until they get radicalized—and racialized. This is our only hope.