

Is It All an Accident?



By
Willie Martin

Is it all an Accident?

By
Willie Martin

Is it all an Accident? One of the very few phrases that passed the lips of Franklin Roosevelt that was not a lie was this:

"In politics, nothing happens by accident. If something happens, you may be sure that someone planned it that way."

POSSIBLY HE LET SLIP THAT PHRASE IN AN UNGUARDED MOMENT OR WHILE IMPAIRED BY PAINKILLERS: WE SHALL PROBABLY NEVER KNOW. Certainly his administration, if judged by the standard of causation he implied, would have had to answer to a great many things in those terrible years of 1933 to 1945.

But what we are concerned with today is far bigger than just a single president or a single administration. I am concerned about the future of America. we are concerned about the future of the little children who are the descendants of the valiant men and women who founded and built this country, and whose future looks increasingly dim as America becomes more and more like a Third World nation. I am concerned about our heritage of Liberty, which is being increasingly abandoned as our "leaders" move aggressively toward their goal of an all-powerful world government which they call the "New World Order."

The reason we quoted the late and unlamented FDR was to point out the absurdity of the view held by a majority of White Americans today, a view which is essentially the opposite of Roosevelt's, and which paralyses our will to resist the changes which are being imposed upon our beloved country.

The view that political and social effects are, in the main, the direct result of plans carried into action by individuals and groups is the only logical view. So we will term this view the "Logical" theory of history. This Logical theory is sometimes disparagingly called the "conspiratorial" theory of history.

The opposite view, held by most of us, might be termed the "accidental" theory: The idea that political and social changes are primarily wrought, not by organized and motivated groups of men and women acting in concert, but rather by impersonal so-called "forces" which no man or woman has ever seen or ever will see; by pure happenstance; and by the errors of well-meaning leaders who purely by mistake - by accident - lead us into tragedy and evil.

Nearly every major city in the United States has undergone a horrifying transformation in the last few decades. Where once, women young and old went shopping alone and unafraid, where happy children frolicked in the shadows of great buildings and monuments to our culture, and where the glad and confident sons of the pioneers came to live and to commerce; now blows an evil wind that smells of AIDS and dirty needles, of minority gangs and drive-by shootings, of stinking porno clubs and pervert bathhouses, of a thousand dark and sullen faces staring at you with hate in their eyes from behind the barbed wire and the jagged outlines of what used to be our grand hotels, theatres, and shops.

This evil wind blows continually outward, and the destruction spreads, as traditional Americans move to ever more remote suburbs. Those of us who are old enough to remember when America was still America will be forgiven if we shed a tear for our country which now exists only in our memories - and our hopes.

The "accidental" theory of history tells us that this tragic destruction was an unintended result of the policies of well-meaning idealists who really believed that integrated schools and liberal welfare handouts could turn the ghettos into Everytown, U.S.A.; who really believed that opening the borders to unlimited Third World immigration would lead to harmony and peace and understanding.

Well, it is certainly true that a lot of gullible airheads believed those things because they were fashionable things to believe. But those who are behind the push to remake America in a Third World, non-European mould cannot be called gullible airheads, nor can they be truly called "Liberal," although they assume that guise much of the time.

They never believed that the Black underclass would be lifted up by their programs. They never believed that the millions of Third Worlders who have come here since the borders were opened in 1965 would really "become Americans" as they claimed.

And although they tell us again and again through their controlled newspapers, magazines, and television programs, that "Diversity is good for America," they never believed that either.

What they do believe in is power. Power for themselves. Worldwide power. The concentration of power into a centre so great that no nation could oppose them has been the unwavering goal of America's enemies for the last one hundred years.

The enemies of America do not have a warm concern for minorities or the "downtrodden," as they claim. They use humanitarianism and "brotherhood" as a front, they use all racial and ethnic groups as patsies in their game.

It works like this: Put yourself in the place of America's enemies. Assume your goal is world government, world control. What would be the biggest obstacle in your path? Would it be the existing governments of the various nations?

Well! They might in some cases prove to be an obstacle, but governments, particularly ones run as mass democracies, are easily corrupted by your money and intimidated by the power of the controlled mass media.

What would really throw a monkey wrench into your plans would be a not a government as such - but a government under the control of patriots with a strong sense of nationhood. Such a government wouldn't let you

buy into their mass media, nor would they allow you to come in and start buying property and influence with your money. They wouldn't want any part of your scheme. You would be obliged to oppose such governments, using more compliant nations as tools to subdue them.

Thus we have the spectacle of UN and US military action against the fiercely independent and nationalist Arab states; and the shameful international sanctions against the equally independent Afrikaners in South Africa, who are now being forced to accept a Communist ANC dictatorship.

To reach your goal of world government, you would also have to work everywhere possible to undermine patriotism, nationalism, and racial pride - because when people are proud of their racial and cultural heritage, proud of their nation, and when they possess a strong sense of identity as a people, they will very likely be strong opponents of your plan.

What better way to undermine national and racial identity than to engage in a massive program of population transfer? Those of widely differing culture and race should be encouraged or compelled to come here. Bring them by the millions.

Don't ever give the people a chance to vote on your population transfer - they might vote against it. Make it illegal to resist the population transfer - call such resistance "discrimination." Create the impression in people's minds that those who want to preserve the traditional makeup of their nation are evil "racists."

Make it illegal to even express opposition to your population transfers, calling such expressions of opposition "hate crimes." In a few generations, all the differing peoples and nations will have forgotten their heritage and their traditional ways.

They won't even think of themselves as a people anymore - they will have utterly lost their sense of national and racial identity - they will just be a mass of disconnected and powerless individuals. Without the natural cohesion that comes from being of similar genetic and cultural background, they will no longer be able to offer any resistance to your

world government plans. The enemy that America faces today is not some malevolent foreign nation ready to strike at our cities with missiles and bombs. Our enemy is an enemy already within our gates, who has been and is now working steadily to change our nation into a province of a one-world government.

We know that what we have been telling you runs counter to everything that you have been taught in school, to everything you have read in the newspapers or seen on television. If you are sceptical (and we don't blame you for being sceptical) I ask you to do this: For the next month, indulge me, and pay close attention to every news article in your newspaper and every news item on television, bearing my world-government hypothesis always in mind.

Notice the code words which are constantly being used, such as "international cooperation," "community of nations," "multinational forces," "global economy," etc. All of these concepts, and the actions taken in their names, tend in the same direction: the weakening of our national sovereignty and freedom and an increase in the power of faceless international entities like the United Nations. Notice Clinton's plan to put our military under the command of the UN.

Notice the operation in Somalia, where the excuse of "humanitarian aid" has worn rather thin, and the real goal of installing a government more to the liking of the internationalists is becoming increasingly obvious.

Ladies and gentlemen, what do you call it when foreign troops come into a country without the permission of the people in that country? It's a three syllable word and it starts with "I."

Notice how the United States never makes a military move without the approval of the UN; and notice how American forces are never used where American interests demand their use, such as in the closure of our southern border to illegal immigration - no, our boys have to die to enforce the dictates and power of the internationalists around the world, while the controlled media dance like dervishes in an effort to convince us that it's our patriotic duty to send our sons to die in the jungle or the sand.

Korea, Vietnam, Libya, Panama, Iraq, Somalia - the story is tragically familiar. Since World War II the United States has not declared war, because our current rulers do not believe that we have the right to declare war on an independent basis. We have the high privilege of being policemen for the New World Order, but that's all.

So study the news with my theory in mind, then write me and tell me what you think. And to those of you who still believe that this program of national suicide has been imposed upon us by chance or by mistake, you have my sincere sympathy and I wish you good luck.

You'll need it. The future of America belongs to those with awareness of what is happening, and the will to do something about it.

From American and world history, to current social and racial problems, from "gun control" to Communism, from Western science and philosophy to the invasion and subversion of America.

One of the main ways that America's enemies and those who serve them have gained support is by buying our votes and our acquiescence with our own money. They promise us economic security without effort, they promise us universal health care, they promise us "world peace," they promise us anything - and then follow through by paying us back or buying a service with a little bit of the money they've already taxed away from us, after deducting a substantial commission for themselves.

As one of Franklin Roosevelt's lieutenants once admitted, their formula for gaining and increasing their power is "tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect..."

Their now empirically validated theory is that a nation of dependents is unlikely to bite the hand that feeds it. As the great patriotic writer and researcher Garet Garrett put it in his book *Ex America*: "By a long lure of planned grass a society of bison may be decoyed to captivity in the Valley of Security. In moments of uneasiness its bulls may be soothed by the voices of the herders saying: 'You are free at any time to back to the plains. Remember the grass there? It was poor and many of you were hungry.'

[But] there is no going back because, first, these gentle herders are rough with the few who try to start a stampede, and secondly, tame grass is sweet poison. From the eating of the way of life on the plains is soon forgotten. To many whose stomachs were never so full before, even the memory of it is harrowing. If one asks, 'But will the herders always be good to us?' another answers, 'Nature was sometimes cruel.'"

What these schemers who are trying to ruin our country and take it away from us haven't figured on is that there are still millions of independent-minded Americans who aren't fooled by the lies of the corrupt politicians and the controlled media. There are still millions of decent Americans who don't like the direction in which America has been going, but who are searching for the facts as to just how their birthright has been stolen, and by whom.

There are still millions of patriotic Americans who will rally to the cause when they are presented with the truth. If we didn't believe that, we certainly wouldn't be taking the risk and spending the time and money to write articles such as this to you.

You know, if all we had was the controlled media as a source of facts, we'd all have the impression that the American people are asleep, and that there is really no significant opposition to the New World Order conspirators except for a few irresponsible cranks. But we know better.

The Destruction of the Academy: The debate over the enforcement of Political Correctness at American colleges and universities has been raging in the print media long enough now that everyone from the party-loving frathouse jock to the most un-cool computer nerd on campus has been made at least dimly aware that he must be careful what he says when talking about anything even remotely racial or sexual in nature.

One must never use the word "girl" in referring to any human female over 10 years of age or the word "boy" in referring to a Black male of any age. (And one must not use the word "Black" either, which is considered by the most Politically Correct thinkers to be almost as offensive as "Negro," "darker," or "nigger"; the only acceptable designation now is "African

American.") Homosexuals must never be referred to as "queers," "lesbos," "dykes," "fruits," "faggots," "fairies," or anything else other than "gays" (except when the speaker is himself or herself of the sodomite persuasion: "queer" is now in vogue as a self-descriptive term among the pervert avant garde).

If one really wants to be on the safe side, he also should use the term "Politically Correct" (or its abbreviation, "PC") as sparingly as possible and certainly never with a smile on his face or a hint of derision in his voice lest he indicate that he is one of those benighted souls whom the Red Guardist cadres of Political Correctness have been charged with re-educating. The PC position is that there is not now and never has been a program to enforce Political Correctness, and that the term itself was invented by bigots and reactionaries to stigmatise progressive, right-thinking folks.

Does that sound a bit Orwellian? Alas, Orwell himself would be dumbfounded by the present state of affairs on our campuses. At the University of Connecticut students may be expelled for "conspicuous exclusion [of a female, non-White, or homosexual student] from conversation" or for "inappropriately directed laughter"; i.e., laughter at a "racist" or "sexist" or "homophobic" joke or at or about a woman or a member of a protected minority group in a way which might cause embarrassment or injured feelings.

Although the University of Connecticut conduct code doesn't actually spell it out, perhaps an inappropriately directed smirk or smile or grin would draw the same penalty as actual laughter, especially for a repeat or unapologetic offender. Remember Orwell's description of "face crime?"

At the University of Minnesota six professors recently were charged with sexual harassment. The specifics of the charges included such offences as not greeting a female student in a friendly enough manner, not teaching in a sensitive enough way, and not having read a certain feminist-favoured novel. Eventually the charges were dropped, but only after the professors had been subjected to an ordeal of calumny and intimidation and had gone to great lengths of grovelling and self-abasement to prove themselves

innocent of any non-PC tendencies. At the University of Michigan a student who recited a limerick which speculated jokingly about the homosexuality of a well known athlete was required to attend "gay-sensitivity" training sessions and write a letter of self-criticism for publication in the campus newspaper, under threat of expulsion.

Pages could be filled with similarly outrageous or amusing or alarming anecdotes about the excesses of Political Correctness, but anecdotes alone, no matter how outrageous, cannot give us a full understanding of the disaster which has befallen our universities.

Many people have the belief that the enforcement of Political Correctness is simply an effort by well-intentioned university administrators to keep the peace on campuses with increasing numbers of minority students: that the main thrust of their effort has been to restrain uncivil students from using expressions like "kike" or "Niggers" or "queer" or "bitch" in referring to their fellow students, thereby giving offence and disrupting the orderly climate of learning.

People with this belief generally regard anecdotes of the sort cited here as evidence that in a few cases the efforts to maintain civility have become a little overzealous and have gone a little too far in the direction of restricting speech and other forms of expression.

They tend to believe that what we need to do is guard against these excesses and protect the freedom of students and faculty members to exercise their First Amendment rights; within reasonable limits, of course. Such people miss the whole point.

The drive for Political Correctness is not an overzealous effort to maintain an orderly learning environment at our universities; on the contrary, it is a manifestation of the determination by certain elements inside and outside the universities to insure that the universities not be permitted to perform their traditional function of educating and civilizing a leadership elite for the next generation of Americans. To be sure, there is among the PC cadres an element motivated primarily by the desire to maintain civility or, rather, to avoid giving offence.

There always have been those excessively tender-minded souls who flinch at the very thought of saying anything which might hurt someone else's feelings.

A cripple must never be referred to matter of factly as a cripple, but instead as a "physically disadvantaged person"; a man who likes to bugger little boys must under no circumstances be made to feel that his behaviour is considered distasteful, unnatural, or contrary to the public interest; a woman must not be reminded that she is in any way different from a man, because that might limit her self-image and lead her to resign herself to motherhood and housewifery instead of pursuing a career as a corporate raider or a mud wrestler; a Black; oops, an African American must not be laughed at or even gently corrected when, full of the absurdities and pufferies of one of the "Black history" courses now being offered at most major universities, he proudly claims that Hannibal and Cleopatra were of his race.

Solicitude for the feelings of others and the avoidance of unnecessary offence always have been characteristics of a gentleman. Women traditionally have gone a bit further and put a high premium on being "nice," even at the expense of truth.

Elevating niceness to the ultimate virtue, however, has become possible only in a society which has completely lost its moral bearings. Such niceness is the virtue of emasculated men and of women deranged by the ravings of the feminists.

Niceness is the principal motivation of only a relatively tiny element among the cadres of Political Correctness, however, even though it plays a substantially larger role among the non- cadre camp followers of the movement.

The cadres themselves are recruited mainly from the ranks of the radical feminists, the militant homosexuals, and the racial-minority activists (Blacks, mestizos, Asians, Amerindians, etc.). Their ranks are supplemented by a sprinkling of very sick White males hoping to atone through self-flagellation for their sins of Whiteness and maleness, a few

die-hard Marxists who have established a final redoubt in America's universities.

The sayings and writings of these cadres, taken as a whole, leave no doubt that their aim goes far beyond protecting the sensibilities of hypersensitive minorities. One of the main thrusts of the Political Correctness movement has been to stamp out what they call "Euro-centrism" in university curricula.

Their contention is that traditional curricula, freighted as they are with the writings of "dead White European males," "dwems" for short, are not only irrelevant to the needs of today's university students but are absolutely harmful.

PC Professor Stanley Hauerwas of the Duke University Divinity School complains, "The canon of great literature was created by High Anglican ass-holes to underwrite their social class."

A Politically Correct committee at Tulane University has prepared a report on "race and gender enrichment" which laments: "It is difficult for us to see and overcome racism and sexism because we are all the progeny of a racist and sexist society."

There is, of course, truth in the assertion of Tulane's Red Guardists about the nature of European society. Pick almost any White male writer of prominence from any era prior to the Second World War.

And you can be practically certain that his message will be tainted with racism, sexism, homophobia, paternalism, patriarchy, imperialism, or some other strong verboten "ism."

Open Virgil's great epic from the first century before this era, and the first words we see are, "Of arms and the man I sing." Not "of arms and the person": clearly a male-centred, sexist creed.

Fourteen hundred years later Geoffrey Chaucer still was writing in the same vein, of a husband invited to keep a tally of debts on the tail of his

wife and of a "cursed Jew" who slit the throat of a Christian child in an act of ritual murder.

A century and a half after Chaucer the great Martin Luther was writing of the Jews: "The sun has never shined on such a bloodthirsty and vindictive people, who cherish the idea of murdering and strangling the Gentiles. No other men under the sun are more greedy than they have been, and always will be, as one can see from their accursed usury.

They console themselves that when their Messiah comes he will collect all the gold and silver in the world and divide it among them." ("The Jewish people as a whole will be its own Messiah. It will attain world dominion by the dissolution of other races, by the abolition of frontiers, the annihilation of monarchy, and by the establishment of a world republic in which the Jews will everywhere exercise the privilege of citizenship.

In this new world order the Children of Israel will furnish all the leaders without encountering opposition. The Governments of the different peoples forming the world republic will fall without difficulty into the hands of the Jews. It will then be possible for the Jewish rulers to abolish private property, and everywhere to make use of the resources of the state. Thus will the promise of the Talmud be fulfilled, in which is said that when the Messianic time is come the Jews will have all the property of the whole world in their hands." (Baruch Levy, Letter to Karl Marx, La Revue de Paris, p. 54, June 1, 1928)

Toward the end of the 16th century William Shakespeare was writing of the Jew Shylock and his demand for a pound of flesh. In the 18th century we may be tempted to peep into the works of the Founding Fathers: oops! make that the Founding Parents.

Thomas Jefferson wrote that Whites and Blacks were so manifestly different that they could never live as equals in the same society. Benjamin Franklin's often quoted advice on choosing a mistress would send today's feminists into orbit. In Germany at the same time (and well into the next century) Johann Wolfgang von Goethe was inspiring his own countrymen with his patriotic writing. We could nail him for sexism, racism, or any

of a half-dozen other heresies. For example: "The important thing is that the race remains pure: in this way we become a people! And only in this way will we be able to preserve and enhance the German character."

Moving further into the 19th century, we can look into the works of any of the better known and better loved English-language writers. Take Edgar Allan Poe. One needs go no further than the third paragraph of what is probably his best-known tale, *The Gold Bug*: "In these excursions he was usually accompanied by an old Negro, called Jupiter—who could be induced, neither by threats nor by promises, to abandon what he considered his right of attendance upon the footsteps of his young `Massa Will."

Or how about Rudyard Kipling? Do we want to know what secrets lurk in the covetous heart of "dark Israel?" We'll find that in his *Song of the Fifth River*, among other places. Do we want White supremacy? Here is a snippet from his poem *A Song of the White Men*: "...well for the world when the White Men drink to the dawn of the White Man's day!" Do we want imperialism? We'll find it in nearly everything he wrote.

Charles Darwin, (Charles Darwin's Uncle, factory owner Josiah Wedgewood, owned a business that worked White Children of Five Years of age in a chemical factory permeated with lead oxide, a deadly poison. Wedgewood acknowledged that the lead made the children "very subject to disease" but worked them anyway) easily the most significant writer of the last century, remarks in his *The Descent of Man*, in a chapter in which he compares the mental powers of men and other animals: "—how little can the hard worked wife of a degraded Australian savage, who uses very few abstract words, and cannot count above four, exert her self-consciousness, or reflect on the nature of her own existence."

This is only one of a hundred passages of Darwin's which would have the Red Guards of Political Correctness shrieking for his blood.

In Russia, at the same time, that country's greatest writer, Feodor Dostoevsky, was condemning the avaricious nature and practices of the Jews, most notably in his *Diary of a Writer* (See the article "Dostoevsky on the Jews" in *National Vanguard* No. 72, reprinted in *The Best of Attack!*

and National Vanguard Tabloid).. Nikolai Gogol was writing much the same thing about Russia's Jews in fictional form, in his novel Taras Bulba.

It is easy enough to hunt out explicitly heretical passages from the writings of virtually every contributor of note to the edifice of Western civilization, from the days of Homer to those of Thomas Stearns Eliot and William Butler Yeats, but it is not really necessary.

When racism, sexism, and the other heresies are not explicit, they nearly always are implicit. One does not expect to find many commentaries on the shortcomings of the Negro by European writers when there were no Negroes in Europe, but European society was nonetheless "racist" in every fibre of its being.

European men usually loved their women, who usually reciprocated, but their society was as "sexist" by today's Politically Correct feminist standards as it was racist.

A generation ago it was enough to attempt to shield students from the more explicit reminders of these facts: to explain away Luther's and Dostoevsky's denunciations of the Jews as aberrations, to make a few excuses for Poe's depictions of Blacks, to skirt around Kipling's more forceful calls for White pride. Anthologies compiled for classroom use carefully omitted the writings which were too hard to explain away.

This bowdlerizing of European civilization in an attempt to make it palatable to a diverse horde of students and teachers without European roots, as well as to growing numbers of disturbed White men and women whose inability to come to grips with their genders make the traditional "sexism" and "homophobia" of our civilization hateful, was utterly dishonest, and it was bound to fail.

The first post-war generation of White professors and university administrators (i.e., those who began retiring in the 1970's), the authors of the policy of bowdlerization, was characterized by timidity and hypocrisy. Many of them were not happy with the moral compromises they were making, but what were they to do?

Some simply did not have the courage to come right out and say that the bearers of Western civilization had committed a collective act of ritual suicide by engaging in the Second World War: that America and Britain, in particular, had been tricked into fighting against everything on which the cultural ascendancy of the West is based, and that now they must either repudiate their role in the war or look forward to the eventual abandonment of their heritage altogether. Had the war not been fought in the name of equality and democracy, and is that not what Political Correctness is all about?

Others already had developed the habit of moral ambiguity, and it was easier to compromise even further than to draw a line and make a stand.

The second post-war generation (i.e., those entering their professions during the quarter-century since about 1965) grew up in the television age and went through puberty under the influence of the Beatles, the Students for a Democratic Society, the Yuppies, and the media deification of Martin Luther King; with cities being set to the torch by Black rioters and looters, while the media and the politicians blamed "White racism" for the turmoil; with permissiveness, the denial of individual accountability, the belief that all points of view are equally valid, and protests against every form of authority. The youngest members of this generation were weaned on Sesame Street and sent to racially integrated schools.

They grew up, in other words, in a time of cultural, moral, and racial chaos, and they reached maturity with no clear sense of identity, no firm cultural roots, and no moral bedrock as a basis for their values. They were ready to go with the flow, wherever it might lead: to take their direction from anyone with a loud enough voice.

This moral vacuum provided the perfect opportunity for any interest group which could organize itself on a large enough scale for its voice to be heard. Many groups organized, and the media perversely provided the loudest megaphones for precisely those with the most destructive aims.

The feminists, the homosexuals, and the racial-minority activists, who in healthier times would have been sent scurrying back to their holes, were first tolerated on the campuses and later welcomed with open arms.

There they have formed an interest bloc strong enough to swing an increasing amount of weight in setting policy. Despite their diversity they have a common hatred which unites them: a raging, burning hatred for the White, heterosexual, patriarchal society which abhorred and rejected them.

Anyone who thinks that the preceding sentence is an exaggeration has not paid attention to what the PC cadres are saying. When Black professor June Jordan was criticized for teaching her English class at the Stony Brook campus of the State University of New York in Black ghetto dialect instead of standard English, she defended herself thus: "Should we use the language of the killers - standard English - in order to make our ideas acceptable to those controlling the killers?"

T

he more radical feminist professors preach that the only ways in which women can gratify their sexual feelings and retain their self-respect are through lesbianism and masturbation. To yield to sexual attraction for a man is to betray their own gender and consort with "the enemy."

Women who date are railed at as "prostitutes." Alison Jaggar, a PC professor at the University of Cincinnati and chairperson of the American Philosophical Association's Committee on the Status of Women in Philosophy, teaches her students that the traditional family is a "cornerstone of women's oppression" and should be abolished.

The students and professors who attracted national attention during the last two years with their successful campaign to eliminate the "Eurocentric" character of the humanities curricula at Stanford University weren't merely trying to have a few changes made or a few minority-oriented courses added; their chant was, "Hey, hey, ho, ho, Western culture's got to go!"

The statements of Politically Correct academics are replete with references to the "oppression" and "exploitation" of women, racial minorities, and homosexuals by heterosexual White males, and the texts which have become required reading for all students at Politically Correct universities are brimming over with resentment at wrongs inflicted and with

exhortations for revenge. One should not be surprised, of course, that minority activists long steeped in this literature of resentment should hate those they have been persuaded are their oppressors.

It goes beyond that, though and it reaches from the universities down into the high schools and the elementary schools. A master plan for multicultural education put forward two years ago by New York State Education Commissioner Leonard Sobol is based on the thesis that "intellectual and educational oppression has characterized the culture and institutions of the European-American world for centuries."

The remedy for this intolerable situation, according to Mr. Sobol and his colleagues, is to require that "all curricular materials be prepared on the basis of multicultural contributions" so that non-White children "will have higher self-esteem, while children from European cultures will have a less arrogant perspective."

We may be tempted to laugh when we hear one of Mr. Sobol's race complain about arrogance in others, but it is no laughing matter. The aim of the cadres of Political Correctness is not merely to make Blacks feel good about themselves by convincing them that their ancestors were founders of great civilizations and that the only reason for their own non-achievement is "oppression" by Whites.

It is, more urgently, to squelch White racial consciousness and pride. It is to confuse heterosexual White males (and females), to keep them off balance, to make them feel apologetic, even guilty. It is to morally disarm "the killers," to emasculate them, to prepare them to accept annihilation quietly.

One may think this too ambitious a program. Certainly, the radical feminists who would like to persuade all other women not to consort with "the enemy" have not made a very large dent in heterosexual activity on our campuses although they have sown all too many seeds of discord between men and women which surely will sprout later. And claims about the superiority of ancient Black cultures are generally ignored, even if few have the courage or honesty to refute them.

Furthermore, the cant and humbug of Political Correctness are largely confined to the humanities, the "soft" sciences, and the vast array of post-war "Mickey mouse" and vocational curricula which have invaded the campuses. A student whose aim is to become a micro- biologist, an electrical engineer, or a computer scientist will be too busy with facts to pay much attention to propaganda.

Nevertheless, the damage done has been enormous, and the threat of even greater damage is ominous. Whites have been confused. They have been put on the defensive. Some of the lies have stuck.

Consider, for example, the reactions of students, faculty members, and university administrators to a simple call for concern about the future of the White race. Members of the National Alliance, an organization whose principal activity is the publication of materials designed to raise White racial consciousness, have distributed on university campuses around the country a large number of stickers bearing the text: "Earth's most endangered species: the White race. Help preserve it."

After all, the last thing they want is for White Americans to develop the same sort of racial consciousness which gives the minorities their own strength. As they have said many times in their calls for racial solidarity among their own people, "We've got Whitey on the run now; let's keep him running!"

It is the irrational fear of many Whites which provides the real evidence of the damage done by the program of thought control at our colleges and universities.

When stickers appeared on the campus of Allentown College of Saint Francis de Sales, a Roman Catholic school in Pennsylvania, the president of the college, Reverend Daniel Gambet, sent a letter to all students and faculty members warning them not to be influenced by what he described as "hate literature."

He went on to say, "We believe it is important to publicly and unequivocally condemn this kind of material and the intolerant behaviour which produces it."

When National Alliance stickers were posted on the campus of Hobart and William Smith Colleges in Geneva, New York, faint hearts were set aflutter again, and a group of especially guilt-stricken White students organized an "anti-racism" meeting on campus, while the administration announced that it had "contacted the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the FBI will investigate the National Alliance."

The same stickers on the campus of William Paterson College in Wayne, New Jersey, provoked education professor Edward Bell to demand that the trustees of the college "do something" to protect Black students on the campus and resulted in breathless newspaper articles and urgent meetings of the college's "bias harassment panel."

When not only stickers but a proposal to form a campus group, a White Students' Union, to implement the message on the stickers appeared on the Minneapolis campus of the University of Minnesota last year, an uproar began which still has not died down.

The organizers of campus Jewish groups, Black groups, Asian groups, feminist groups, and homosexual groups are accepted calmly by other students and by the faculty and administration, but the organizer of the White Student Union, mild-mannered, soft-spoken senior Tom David, is a constant centre of controversy. His presence on the campus provokes hand-wringing editorials in the student newspaper about "bigotry," disgustingly wimpish letters to the editor by White males eager to confess the guilt of their kind, and rallies aimed at restoring the racial harmony on the campus David supposedly has upset.

In general, the reaction of many young White men and women to the National Alliance's stickers is similar to what one might have expected in 1892 if someone had distributed fliers on campuses promoting free love and illustrating the concept with a photograph of a nude, copulating couple.

Sex was the taboo subject then, the subject that decent people didn't talk about and pretended that they didn't think about. Any mention of it released a rush of confused emotions: guilt, fear, embarrassment. Anyone

so indiscreet as to challenge the taboo was denounced by many and hated by others. Rational debate was a rarity.

Today the taboo subject is race: rather, any deviation from the Politically Correct position on race. Just as the parents, teachers, and preachers of a century ago managed to persuade young people, at a subconscious level, that their natural sexual feelings were somehow unclean, perhaps even sinful, and therefore to be kept repressed, the unceasing harangue about "White racism" and the supposed White male repression, exploitation, and general mistreatment of practically everyone else has had its effect.

Even the suggestion that the White race ought to concern itself with its survival releases a flood of confused and disturbing feelings. No one can say quite why such a suggestion is "hate" or "bigotry," simply because, as was the case with sex a century ago, debate has been stifled and the persuasion has taken place largely at a subconscious level.

Which is not to say that some of the lies have not come to the surface; after White students have been put on the defensive subconsciously, they are inclined not to stick their necks out by debating the propositions that "diversity" is to be valued above homogeneity, that there are no significant racial differences in ability or character, and that men and women are essentially interchangeable units and should have the same roles in society.

This is grievous damage indeed. Those students also are damaged, however, who for whatever reason; perhaps stronger character or less susceptibility to group pressure, remain free of any feeling of guilt or of obligation to tolerate every minority impudence. They may still be able to learn their chemistry or their mathematics as well as ever, but to the extent that the insanity of multiculturalism has corrupted the teaching of history, of literature, of philosophy, of anthropology, and of other subjects they are robbed of their education and therefore of their culture, their civilization, and their identity.

Universities cease to function in their natural role as formative institutions for intellectual elite and become mere vocational training centres. And that is the way it was planned.

The reaction which has developed on our campuses to the crusade for Political Correctness is in some ways more dangerous than the sickness it purports to be attempting to cure. We can perceive the truth of this statement if we look closely at the position taken by the reaction and at the leading personalities in the reaction.

At Yale University, for example, the recognized leader of those holding the line against the zanier excesses of the Red Guards is the dean of the undergraduate arts and sciences students, Donald Kagan.

He is widely hailed as a force for reason and moderation in Academia, because he has refused to be stampeded into going along with those who insist that homosexuals be elevated to a privileged status and Euro-centrism be replaced with Afro-centrism.

He has even gone so far as to refuse to appoint a cadre of openly homosexual senior counsellors for incoming freshmen, as Yale's organized perverts have demanded; and when Black students erected unsightly shanties on the campus as a protest against South African apartheid Kagan reminded them that the structures were in violation of university rules.

Kagan is a Jew. So is student Jonathan Adler, the editor of the Yale Free Press, generally considered a conservative and politically incorrect periodical. Dinesh D'Souza, the author of one of the most scholarly critiques of the excesses of Political Correctness, *Illiberal Education* (available from National Vanguard Books), is an Indian.

Not every publicist with a politically incorrect voice is non-White, but non-Whiteness helps. Most White, male academics who still retain their freedom of thought are afraid to exercise their freedom of speech, lest they be condemned as "racists," "anti-Semites," or what have you.

Among the PC cadres themselves Blacks are at least as noticeable as Jews, but not as influential; the Black cadres, with their often ludicrous ideas about history and their bizarre attempts to assert an African identity, provide the comic relief and the muscle for the movement, while the Jews; assisted, of course, by the feminists, sodomites, etc., provide the brains.

It is not just the disproportionate presence and influence of Jews which justify calling Political Correctness a Jewish phenomenon, however.

It is Jewish in the same sense that Marxism is Jewish: that is, it is Jewish because the propaganda of human equality and of cosmopolitanism which validates it is Jewish in origin, because the principal off-campus support for the movement has come from the Jew-controlled entertainment and news media, and because the foundations for it were laid in a horrendously cruel and bloody war fought to serve Jewish interests and advance Jewish socio-political theories.

The reaction studiously avoids mentioning any of this, of course, and it avoids attacking Political Correctness at its roots. In fact, it accepts the same axioms that its PC opponents do: namely, the axiom of equality and the axiom of cosmopolitanism.

It believes in "diversity" and multiculturalism, in moderation, of course. In his 1991 address to Yale's freshmen Kagan gloated over the fact that the university, once virtually all White, had been transformed into a mirror of America's multiracial society.

He said that Yale's new "diversity is a source of strength and it should be a source of pride as well." His restrained warnings not to scrap Western culture entirely just because it was built by dead, White, European males are usually accompanied by praise for the increasing attention being paid to Black studies and other PC areas of interest.

He supports Yale's program of compulsory roommate assignments for freshmen, in which an effort is made to mix races as much as possible in the dormitories, and he says that he is happy that upperclassmen are not segregating themselves to any large degree.

The same general pattern is to be found at most of America's universities. On one side are the nutcase weirdoes, the hate-crazed dykes and fags, the dashiki-clad Blacks nursing their resentments, the Red Guards raging incoherently at the White, male, heterosexual world; and on the other side are the cooler heads counselling a slower but surer strategy for destroying

the White world. Most of the former are too silly to be taken seriously; the latter, however, by appearing to champion the cause of sanity and moderation manage to pre-empt most of the opposition to the lethal principles the former represent while embodying those same principles themselves.

It really is a tragedy. America once had some truly great universities. They not only turned out scholars; they also imbued those who passed through them with a certain sense of identity, with a feeling for the race's past and a sense of responsibility for its future. They helped with the business of sorting out values and fixing priorities.

Greatness cannot coexist with egalitarianism, however. Most of America's universities today are beyond redemption. One can put down the loonies and chase the freaks and aliens off the campuses, but one cannot put a sense of honour back into academics who compromised theirs away. And without honour one cannot expect truth to prevail.

Perhaps one day we all will be grateful to the minions of Political Correctness for having drawn for us in such bold and clear strokes the real meaning of egalitarianism and thereby given us the impetus to do what is necessary to deal with this disease of the soul.

The following is a chronology of events which demonstrates the intimate connection between CIA and the drug dealing of the Contras.

1959: Felix Rodriguez, a Cuban refugee, hired to be a member of a special assassination team, works under Theodore Shackley of the CIA in Miami, Florida.

1970: Felix Rodriguez works under Donald Gregg in the CIA operation in Vietnam. Gregg reports to Shackley.

1976: George Bush succeeded William Colby as the head of the CIA under Gerald Ford. Bush appoints Ted Shackley to be his Chief of Covert Operations Worldwide. 12/1/81: Bush meets with the National Security Planning Group in

the White House. They discuss and approve a \$19 million expenditure to Argentina for the creation of a 500 man anti-Sandinista Contra force. 4/82: Bush meets with Australian Labor leader Hayden to discuss the CIA's involvement with the Nugan Hand bank in Australia. Nugan Hand was [a] money-laundering machine for the southeast Asia heroin operation that began during the Vietnam war. Defence Department spokesman Richard Armitage acted as bagman, carrying cash from Bangkok, Thailand, to Australia.

1983: Gustave Villolda gets a letter of recommendation from Donald Gregg as "combat advisor" to the Contras. Villolda was with Felix Rodriguez during the Bay of Pigs invasion and the CIA track down and execute of Che Guevara in Bolivia.

10/84: Gerald Latchinian, co-director with Felix Rodriguez of Giro Aviation, a CIA proprietary airline, arrested for smuggling \$10,300,000 in cocaine to finance the assassination of Honduran President Roberto Suazo Cordova. Latchinian maintains that this was a CIA operation.

12/84: Felix Rodriguez meets with Donald Gregg, who is now George Bush's National Security advisor. Gregg has an autographed photo of Rodriguez on his desk. He gets Gregg to call other high- ranking officials for help in getting a job in El Salvador as a Contra military advisor.

1/85: Felix Rodriguez meets with George Bush to discuss the Contra job, less than two months after the Latchinian indictment.

6/85: Felix Rodriguez meets in Washington, D.C. with Donald Gregg and Colonel Steele of the Salvador Milgroup that works with the Contra supply network. Steele was given one of the super-secret KL-43 encryption devices for secure telephone conversations.

8/5/85: Bush's office is the first place notified when the C-123 carrying Eugene Hassenfus is shot down. Buzz Sawyer, the pilot of the plane, has the private White House phone number of George Bush in his pocket when his body is recovered from the plane. Hassenfus testifies that he worked for the CIA under Max Gomez (alias Felix Rodriguez) and Ramon Medina (alias Luis Posada Carriles) with the knowledge and approval of George Bush. Telephone logs from the phone company in El Salvador for the "safe houses" used by the plane crew show many calls to North's White House office.

12/85: Felix Rodriguez attends the Christmas party at George Bush's White House office, and is introduced to the staff as an old friend of Donald Gregg and Bush.

1/86: Felix Rodriguez meets in Bush's office with Colonel Sam Watson, Gregg's deputy in Salvador, and Colonel Steele to discuss counter-insurgency.

5/86: Felix Rodriguez meets with Bush, Gregg and North in Bush's office.

6/86: Felix Rodriguez is called to Washington to meet with North to explain phone calls to Tony Avirgan and Martha Honey (U.S. journalists in Costa Rica), which North has taped.

8/86: Felix Rodriguez meets with Bush and Donald Gregg to complain about the quality of arms shipments from Richard Secord's arms supply operation. Later that same month, Donald Gregg meets with Alan Friers, the Central American Task Force chief, to support the purchase of military equipment from Felix Rodriguez rather than Secord. Friers is told by Gregg, "Don't buy any of those damned airplanes from Secord."

9/86: General Singlaub sends memo to North expressing concern about Felix Rodriguez's daily contact with the Bush office, warning of "damage to President Reagan and the Republican Party."

The above information was compiled from *The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia* by McCoy (1972), *Price of Power* by Seymour Hersch (1983), *Endless Enemies* by Jonathan Kwitny (1984), *Veil* by Bob Woodward (1987), *Out of Control* by Leslie Cockburn (1987), *Crimes of Patriots* by Jon Kwitny (1987), as well as the affidavit submitted to the Federal Court in Miami, Florida, in the RICO (Racketeer Influenced Corrupt Organizations Act) suit filed by Tony Avirgan against those who bombed the press conference at La Ponca [sic] in 1984, and the "Drugs, Law Enforcement and Foreign Policy" statement issued by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in December 1988.



**THE NEW CHRISTIAN CRUSADE
CHURCH**

CALLING THE PEOPLE OF BRITAIN

At last the bible makes sense!

At last we know its meaning.

Its the book of the RACE

