

The Big Book of Racialism



Anonymous Author

The Big Book of Racialism

THIS IS A COLLECTION OF FACTS AND EXPERIENCE arranged specifically to open the eyes of anyone fortunate enough to read it. “Racial Equality” is a fantasy. It is false. We are led to believe it for the sake of feelings. We all have been led to embrace a lie just because the truth is offensive. Yet to see through it all, you’d simply have to ask yourself, if we’re all equal, how come we are always having to come up with excuses for the failings of others?

Well, the answer is simple. We, the people of the White world, have been lavished with a guilty conscience. For whatever reason, we’d rather believe that everyone is equal. We are not all equal. Ask yourself, what countries of the world are the ones *receiving* the bulk of immigrants? White countries. What countries enjoy the highest standards of living? White countries. What countries wield nearly all the power in the world? White countries. What make up the greatest society the world has ever seen? The White countries.

If you are sceptical, read on, and either solidify your beliefs in what you call the truth, rejecting what you’ve been told is bigotry, or be shown the true light of the world.

First things first. What have you been taught all your lives? That people from all over the globe are all equal. We are equal to one another; the only thing to separate us is the colour of our skin. This leads you to believe that racism is based on nothing but pigmentation, and therefore, is complete trash.

Well I’m afraid that’s simply not true. There are numerous physical differences between the races, but there is no need to get into them simply because they are inconsequential. The size of your stature, and anything else, do not dictate to your muscles the actions you take. What we want to look at are the mental differences, the ones that really matter.

When the White race was unfortunate enough to stumble upon Blacks, what sort of condition were they in? Well, the simple answer is, the condition they’re **still** in. Africans were, and are, in a condition of complete and total squalor. They lived, and live, in poverty. They were, and are, totally unable to construct a functioning society.

What will your typical politically correct Joe say to this? Well the Blacks were denied the means to build a society like Whites and Orientals had.

Africa is a continent of **RICH** natural resources. The Blacks in Africa were surrounded by ocean, yet never constructed a sail. They were surrounded by jungle, yet never cut a tree down. They were plagued by wild beasts, yet never built a weapon worth preserving after its use. The land was endowed with rich minerals, yet they never utilised these for progress of any kind. They were surrounded by each other, yet never devised a written language of any kind to communicate on paper or record history. Blacks in Africa had an unimaginable number of resources at hand, yet they never thought to do anything with them. If we are all equal, shouldn’t the Whites, Orientals, and Blacks all have progressed at the same rate? That would seem logical, but we didn’t. This is a fact.

Just to clarify, I in no way am lying in this text. The simple fact is that I do not need to lie. The lie is equality, and to disprove it all I need to do is speak the truth.

They were unable to rise above; their limit was the pathetic squalor they created. They were eventually forced into slave labour, which was of course, both morally and economically, wrong. This brings up a surprisingly common, but completely invalid argument.

The argument is that the slave trade denied Africa the much needed vitality of its youth, which prevented it from advancing in parallel with the Europeans and Orientals. Well, any educated person can tell that's simply not true. First off, they weren't advancing in parallel when we found them, which was before we started shipping them off to the slave markets. France and Britain had sent entire armies to die at the hands of each other, and their numbers were replaced within a generation. France and Britain seemed to do just fine. So please, don't bother trying to press that argument any further.

Another common misconception (that I am also guilty of) is that Whites went and rounded up the Blacks when they wanted slaves. It was the Blacks themselves that sold their own people into slavery. Slavery is **still** practiced today in Africa.

When the slaves were freed, we (Whites) said, alright, who wants to go home? Some Blacks said I do, so we shipped them off to the African coast, dumped them on a beach and said here you go, build what you will. They founded the country of Liberia (named for being recently liberated) and they were in fact so grateful they named their capital Monrovia after the US President Monroe. They then proceeded to enslave the indigenous population. This made up 19 times their number. So after just being freed from slavery, they proceed to enslave their own people, not only that but the slaves make up 95% of the country! A few hundred years with the White man and these people pick up a few tricks. This is to such a point that they can return to the ordinary Blacks and enslave 19 times their own number. The very notion of being recently freed from slavery and then pushing those very conditions on your **own** people; it's enough to make you question the morality of their race.

There is no question that Africa is a primitive place. But why is that? It certainly isn't our fault, is it? No, Africa is the simple sum of the abilities of the Black race. This is what they can create. For those of you who live in dense, urban areas or large cities, which neighbourhood do you dare not venture to at night? The Black neighbourhood, no doubt. Maybe The Hispanic Neighbourhood? Well, whatever answer came to mind, it wasn't "The White neighbourhood", was it?

Whites are not dangerous (by and large). We are not an aggressive people. The comparative murder rates (which I will get into later) show this. I'm not saying Whites are perfect. We are not. But as a race, we produce more of the great minds, more of the brilliant people than any other. We may produce rapists, murderers, drug dealers and thieves, but not on the scale Blacks and Hispanics do, and it is of no hindrance to our progress as a people. These claims I just made will be supported by the factual statistics later in this document. Take my word for it for the next few minutes.

By now you'll have noticed that my arguments are primarily, if not exclusively directed at Blacks. This is because they are a) the utmost extreme of cases and b) common everywhere. By this I mean if I were to argue against Mexicans, I would be alienating Canadian and British readers (In Canada and England, Mexicans are basically non-existent). Rest assured, when my point is across, it won't matter who I'm making an example of.

Blacks, as a race, are not capable of producing a sophisticated society, developing sophisticated technology, or even a written language, for that matter. If we adhere to the principle, "If you are unable to create it yourself, you are not qualified to operate It.", then immigration seems to be an insane prospect. Allow me to explain this further. The reason we are able to say...operate

computers, is because they were specifically engineered to be user-friendly. Our society has not been structured to cater to those who are less able to perform to its standards. This is why Blacks cannot immigrate here and succeed on the level equivalent to Whites. We created it to our standards, which is far beyond that of Blacks. To cater to them, we've already dumbed down the educational system to close the "achievement gap", the gap between where Whites score and Blacks on standard testing. We offer extensive welfare programs which are overwhelmingly taken advantage of by non-Whites. We push the myth of racial equality so they can feel better about themselves. Is it that somehow we are responsible for them? Our justice system persecutes White-on-Black crime as hate crimes, but overwhelmingly not Black-on-White crime. That is an injustice. If we're all equal, shouldn't hate crimes be applied in an equally fair manner?

We've grown so obsessed with not offending non-Whites with the truth that we've basically taken all of their problems onto our own shoulders. It extends abroad too! Suddenly it's our responsibility to alleviate Africa of its problems. Well, I hate to break it to you, but to do that would mean removing the Blacks.

The other night I was listening to some stand up comedy and this comedian said, I don't like hockey, there's only one black thing on that ice, and they're all hitting it with a stick *laughter*, golf... on the other hand *laughter*. Now think about that for a second, why is it that a Black person can make this sort of joke, when as if it were a White comedian standing in front of that microphone, telling the joke from the opposite standpoint, how he hates golf and loves hockey because he gets to beat the black puck with a stick, no one will laugh. Why is it like that? He'd probably be brought up on charges, don't you think? Ever hear the James Brown song, "Say it loud, I'm Black and I'm Proud"? What do you say about music that is about White pride? It's "oi!", it's for Skinheads, it's for Nazis.

There is something wrong with society today if the major ethnic group to whom these White countries originally... belonged to ...can be guilted into being ashamed of who they are to the point where they not only allow themselves to be ridiculed, but punish people who do the same thing from the opposite standpoint.

That, is an injustice. It's ridiculous. What gives them the right to make us feel guilty for such a thing as being proud of who WE are? Are we not allowed to be proud because White pride is associated with Nazi Germany? Think about it, what was Hitler doing? He was securing the prosperity of his people. The people in Germany were sick of poverty and immigrants ruining their society, so, as one, they rose up and took action. Is that so bad? Self defence is completely justified. White racism is justified. It is a reaction. It is a reaction to decades of oppression and injustices.

What brings on this oppression? We're being deliberately targeted and discriminated against by non-Whites. Who always takes the blame for the whole's actions? The man at the top. Well, my friends, the Whites are at the top, and we bare the responsibility that comes with it. We are blamed for the failings and faults of others. Worse still, we accept it. What is the reasoning behind it? We're responsible for slavery in America, and therefore, the poor performance of Blacks? Most certainly not. At the time of this writing, slavery has been over for 140 years. How long does it take to get your act together? If that weren't enough, they hold a grudge against us for it. Shouldn't hundreds of thousands of Whites dying to free the Blacks be enough? The Arabs ran a slave trade much larger than that of the Whites, yet Blacks seem to hold very, very little animosity towards them. We died for them, and are less deserving of their hate, but we receive it anyway. Why. I suppose the answer is inconsequential. It doesn't even matter.

In my country, Canada, the government has to meet racial quotas. Why should a law like this be in place? If we are all equal, then the workforce should be made up of equal proportions of people of all races, just because that will be the way it works out, more or less, right? Wrong, if the

government didn't have to meet racial quotas, we'd have more non-Whites out of work, because they are less qualified than Whites. It's the simple truth.

Blacks, as a race, produce criminals on an unprecedented level. This makes them more dangerous as a people. For instance, almost 1 million White Americans were murdered, robbed, assaulted or raped by Black Americans in 1992, compared with about 132,000 Blacks who were murdered, robbed, assaulted or raped by Whites, according to the same survey. (Note: My statistics are American. Race-based statistics are extremely difficult to come by for Canada. They were banned in Toronto and many cities to follow in 1989 because the crime report said (you guessed it) that Blacks were committing a disproportionately large amount of crimes. It was deemed offensive and banned.) Blacks thus committed 7.5 times more violent inter-racial crimes than Whites even though the Black population is only one-seventh the size of the White population. When these figures are adjusted on a per capita basis, they reveal an extraordinary disparity: Blacks are committing more than 50 times the number of violent crimes of Whites.

Pretty difficult to believe, isn't it? Well, unless you're about to accuse the US Department of Justice of being racist, you'd better believe it.

*According to the latest US Department of Justice survey of crime victims, more than 6.6 million violent crimes (murder, rape, assault and robbery) are committed in the US each year, of which about 20 per cent, or 1.3 million, are inter-racial crimes. Most victims of race crime – about 90 per cent – are White, according to the survey "Highlights from 20 Years of Surveying Crime Victims," published in 1993.

The American news media does not want to talk about the Race War, which remains between the lines and unreported. In fact, to even suggest that the war exists is to be discredited. So let's start suggesting, immediately.

No matter how crime figures are massaged by those who want to acknowledge or dispute the existence of a Race War, there is nothing ambiguous about what the official statistics portray: for the past 30 years a large segment of Black America has waged a war of violent retribution against White America.

And the problem is getting worse, not better. In the past 20 years, violent crime has increased more than four times faster than the population. Young Blacks (under 18) are more violent than previous generations and are 12 times more likely to be arrested for murder than young Whites.

According to the latest annual report on murder by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, most inter-racial murders involve Black assailants and White victims, with Blacks murdering Whites at 18 times the rate that Whites murder Blacks. These breathtaking disparities began to emerge in the mid-1960s, when there was a sharp increase in Black crime against Whites, an upsurge which, not coincidentally, corresponds exactly with the beginning the modern civil rights movement. Over time, the cumulative effect has been staggering. Justice Department and FBI statistics indicate that between 1964 and 1994 more than 25 million violent inter-racial crimes were committed, overwhelmingly involving Black offenders and White victims, and more than 45,000 people were killed in inter-racial murders.

When non-violent crimes (burglary, larceny, car theft and personal theft) are included, the cumulative totals become prodigious. The Bureau of Justice Statistics says 27 million non-violent crimes were committed in the US in 1992, and the survey found that 31 per cent of the robberies involved Black offenders and White victims (while only 2 per cent in the reverse). When all the crime figures are calculated, it appears that Black Americans have committed at least 170 million crimes against White Americans in the past 30 years. It is the great defining disaster of American life.

All these are facts, yet by simply writing this story, by assembling the facts in this way, I would be deemed a racist by the American news media. It prefers to maintain a paternalistic double-standard in its coverage of Black America, a lower standard.*1

Think to yourself and ask, what causes racism? Racists? No. If that were true, where could racism have come from? Racial tension causes racism. Multiculturalism causes racial tension. Never before in the history of human civilization have two separate peoples lived in proximate geographical spaces and not come into conflict with one another. If the conflict was race motivated, who knows, the point is never before have two races lived in proximity to one another and had peace.

No society has ever survived multiculturalism. The only possible argument you can raise against that is that no society has endured indefinitely. Well, I'd like to hope that ours will. How can our culture survive if we do nothing to celebrate it, whilst taking in other peoples at the same time?

Do you think bringing them into our society has changed them? Because you're right. (Remember Liberia?) It has. The Blacks here are clearly not only smarter, but more able to become intelligent than their African companions who have not been immersed in White culture. You do have good, hard-working, decent Blacks, but who's to say his children will be the same? Sure, you can teach a dog to shake hands, but have you ever heard of a dog teaching its puppies to shake hands?

"It's funny to me that the same lame excuses they use for Africa is what we hear in America.

'Lack of education.' (School is not only free, but it's mandatory in America)

'They live in violence-prone areas.' (They create violence-prone areas)

'Lack of jobs.' (Businesses will leave an area that is dangerous, and no new businesses will come)

The only BS excuse we hear in the U.S. that they can't get away with saying in Africa is 'A history of racism and discrimination.'

Otherwise, the failure of Black Africans is the same as the failure of Blacks in America. They can't claim discrimination in Africa as a cause of failure, because of the simple fact that in areas of Africa heavily influenced or controlled by Whites, Blacks have the highest standard of living on the whole continent. That is an undeniable fact.

Now, even in those areas, do the Blacks have as high a standard of living as Whites? No, of course not, and they never will. Some people think Blacks and Whites will only have equal standards of living when the Whites decline the level of Blacks, but that will never happen. Will our standard of living decline? Of course. But no matter how low our lifestyle goes, that of non-Whites will go proportionally lower. When we are able to thrive and start businesses, niggers may complain that they are poor, but at least they have jobs. And the ones who won't work will still be fed, clothed and housed by our tax dollars. When we are put out of business, our standard of living will decline, but then the niggers will have NO jobs and there will be NO free welfare money, since the tax base will be gone.

So even as we decline to the level niggers are at now, niggers will have no way of maintaining their current lifestyles, so as we sink, they will sink even lower. So there will never be parity. I am basing that on historical and economical reality, there is nothing new happening here.

The Blacks are, once again, being used to fruitlessly go to war with the hand that feeds them in the vain hopes that they will somehow benefit from our demise.

A few simple examples are Haiti, Rhodesia, South Africa, and American cities. The niggers jack the White man, and then realize that they are worse off than before. The short term gratification of gloating over our reversal of fortune doesn't do much for an empty belly. I can't blame the niggers for not learning their lesson, since White people haven't learned that lesson, either."

The Black race produces more criminals and delinquents than Whites. This is on a racial level; as a whole. If you just kept the good ones, what criteria would you judge them on? What do they bring to the table? Is it worth the time and effort spent sorting them? Just because these particular ones have risen above their genetic limitations doesn't mean their kids will.

* Blacks commit more crimes than Whites, therefore, they are not only more dangerous (to us *and* themselves), but cost us money in the form of policing, jailing, and the pricy court process disproportionate to their numbers.

* When Blacks populate an area, they turn it into a ghetto. It's not that Ghettos produce poor, stupid Blacks; poor, stupid Blacks produce ghettos. This can be attributed to their inability to form a functioning society on their own.

The following is a table containing data on the top 10 Whitest and Blackest cities in America[1]. The First column contains the name and location of the city, the 2nd contains the % of White or Black inhabitants, the 3rd contains the Crime Relocation Index [2] rating, and the 4th the % of the population below the poverty line.

[1] Each city has a population of at least 500,000.

[2] The Crime Relocation Index is a number system used to gauge the crime in a city. 100 is the national average, so if your city has an index rating of 50, it has half the crime of the national average, if it has an index rating of 200 it has twice the crime of the national average, etc.

See Table 1 - Page 7

So all the White cities have low poverty rates, while all the Black cities have high poverty rates. What does this tell you? Poverty causes crime? Maybe. Blacks cause poverty? In a way. Blacks cause crime which causes poverty? Definitely. Poverty generates petty crime, such as theft of food. Theft of food is generally not reported and simply written off as an expense at the end of each accounting cycle for the store.

Poverty does not cause crime, not the kind of crime we're looking at here. Simply because the overwhelming majority of crime you can attribute to poverty, plain and simple, will go unreported. Crime causes poverty. Crime makes an area a worse place to live, so property value goes down and it's a stack of dominoes from there. Therefore it is the inhabitants of the cities that truly dictate whether they do well or not, as it is their responsibility to well, you know... not kill each other.

That can be argued back and forth forever, so we'll leave that alone for now. The Blackest cities have higher poverty rates, and by the equalist's logic, the crime should be proportional to the poverty, so we'll compare.

The Blackest city was matched with the Whitest, the 2nd Blackest with the 2nd Whitest, etc.

See Table 2 Page 7

Table 1

Top 10 Blackest Cities				Top 10 Whitest Cities			
City	Black	Index	Poverty	City	White	Index	Poverty
Gary, IN.	84%	538	22.2%	Livonia, MI.	95.5	35	2%
Detroit, MI.	81.6%	556	21.7%	Cape Coral, FL.	93	30	5.3%
Birmingham, AL.	73.5%	367	20.9%	Boise City, ID.	92.2	56	5.9%
Jackson, MS.	70.6%	368	19.6%	Independence, MO.	91.9	107	6.4%
New Orleans, LA.	67.3%	405	23.7%	Cedar Rapids, IA.	91.9	53	4.9%
Baltimore, MD.	64.3%	601	18.8%	Sioux Falls, SD.	91.9	76	5.6%
Atlanta, GA.	61.4%	532	21.3%	Warren, MI.	91.3	87	5.2%
Memphis, TN.	61.4%	321	17.2%	Manchester, NH.	91.7	65	7.7%
Washington, DC	60%	436	16.7%	Springfield, MO.	91.7	79	9.9%
Richmond, VA.	57.2%	386	17.1%	Scottsdale, AZ.	96.2	70	3.4%

Table 2

White City	What Crime Should Be	What It Is
Livonia, MI	48.5	35
Cape Coral, FL	135.8	30
Boise City, ID	103.6	56
Independence, MO	120	107
Cedar Rapids, IA	83.7	53
Sioux Falls, SD	179	76
Warren, MI	129.9	87
Manchester, NH	143.7	65
Springfield, MO	258.5	79
Scottsdale, AZ	76.7	70

In every case, the Black cities are committing more crimes in proportion to poverty than the White cities. Approximately 11.9% of the United States lives below the poverty line. The mean % of Black poverty in the Blackest cities is 19.92. The mean crime index for the Blackest cities is 451. This means that the rest of the United States should have crime equal to 269.4. Wow, it's 100.

The following are just race-based statistics I felt were too much to work into the body of my argument, so they are here for you to see.

Blacks murder more than 1,600 Whites each year.

Blacks murder Whites at 18 times the rate Whites murder Blacks.

- Black neighbourhoods are 35 times more violent than White neighbourhoods.
- In the last 50 years, the White part of the American population has declined from 90% to 72%. The U.S. now has about 33 million Blacks and 25 million Hispanics (legal and illegal). By the year 2050, American Whites will be a minority, just 49%. By 2100, Whites will be 25% of the population.
- The White race is 8% of earth's population.
- There are an estimated 486 prison inmates per 100,000 U.S.
- At midyear 2004 there were 4,919 Black male prison and jail inmates per 100,000 Black males in the United States, compared to 1,717 Hispanic male inmates per 100,000 Hispanic males and 717 White male inmates per 100,000 White males.
- 400,000 foreigners collect Social Security in the U.S.
- Immigrants cost 133 Billion dollars a year in job losses.
- Last year over 10 Billion dollars was sent to Mexico alone by Mexican workers in the U.S.
- Bilingual education doubles the cost of educating immigrants.
- Services and benefits to legals and illegals is 68 Billion dollars a year, and rising.
- Non-citizens get 7 Billion dollars a year in Welfare (Food stamps, housing, medical, etc...)
- Between 1991-1995 The number of illegal aliens sentenced in Federal court rose 167% while the increase among citizens sentenced rose only 13%
- Bureau of Prisons officials estimate that 20% of Federal inmates are illegal aliens.

The average annual cost of a Federal inmate is \$23, 381

U.S. Population in 1994		
74.0% White, 12.5% Black, 9.1% Hispanic, 3.5% Asian		
Perpetrators of Murder		
1993	40.7% White,	57.6% Black
1995	43.4% White,	54.4% Black
Perpetrators of Rape		
1993	56.9% White	41.3% Black
1995	55.6% White	42.4% Black
Perpetrators of Robbery		
1993	36.5% White	62.1% Black
1995	38.7% White	59.5% Black
Perpetrators of Assault		
1993	58.4% White	39.8% Black
1995	59.6% White	38.4% Black

The average Black commits *murder* 7.9 times as often as the average White.
(Frank Borzellieri puts the ratio more recently at 8.5.)

The average Black commits (reported) *rape* 4.4 times as often as the average White.
If all rapes were reported, the Black to White ratio would be closer to 11.*

The average Black commits *armed robbery* 9.6 times as often as the average White

The average Black commits *murder* 7.9 times as often as the average White.
(Frank Borzellieri puts the ratio more recently at 8.5.)

The average Black commits (reported) *rape* 4.4 times as often as the average White.
If all rapes were reported, the Black to White ratio would be closer to 11.*

The average Black commits *armed robbery* 9.6 times as often as the average White.
The average Black commits theft 17 times as often as the average White.

The average Black commits *aggravated assault* 3.9 times as often as the average White.
The average Black commits simple assault about 22 times as often as the average White.

- In 2002, Whites and Blacks were each 40 percent of the inmates in local jails around the United States, even though Whites outnumbered Blacks by about six to one.
- In 2001, Blacks were about six times more likely than Whites to be sent to prison, while Hispanics were three times more likely than Whites to be sent to prison.

These tables show that Blacks are committing murder on a higher per capita rate in every age group over the decade span of the survey of statistics.

The tables show that Blacks at all ages exhibit *much* higher per-capita rates for murder perpetration than Whites (at the same age) do. The racial behavioral difference is higher for younger Blacks than it is for older ones, with the very largest deviation at about age 21 or 22.

However, at no age do Blacks have a per-capita murder perpetration rate that is low enough to be "merely" twice that of the White rate.

Further, only in the 55-64 age group do Blacks *in some years* have a per capita murder perpetration rate slightly less than *triple* the White rate for that same age group.


If the crimes of Hispanics were removed from the tally of "White" crimes, the exception just mentioned would not occur, and there would be no age group for which the Black per capita murder perpetration rate was low enough to be "merely" triple the White rate. The tables in the previous two parts were not corrected for the Justice Department's erroneous inclusion of non-White Hispanics in its list of allegedly "White" offenders.

As a rule of thumb, White people over the age of 20 have about the same per capita murder perpetration rate as Blacks who are 2.0 to 2.5 times their age.

It is important to remember that the racial classification policy of the Justice Department, including the FBI, erroneously designates Latino Hispanics, Arabs, Jews, various mixed breeds, and etcetera as "Whites" when they are crime perpetrators. (It makes no such error when these other racial groups and mongrelizations are crime victims.) It is possible to estimate that real Whites probably committed about 75% of the crimes attributed to "White" offenders in Justice Department statistics, but that estimate was not undertaken in the tables.

Black and Mestizo (Mexican – Spanish/Native Mix) gangs commit more murders in a single week, on the average, than all the organized White "racist" groups have even been *accused of* for the past 50 years. The government's emphasis on so-called "hate crimes" (with a notable bias toward finding White people guilty of committing them) is the result of political pressure brought to bear on government agencies by the Jewish controlled media and by Jewish pressure groups, including the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith. There is no genuine criminal

justice need for the special category of hate crime; however, even if there were, the categorization is presently being abused with an anti-White bias.



"Hate crime," in other words, is less of a law-enforcement concept than a political one. It is used to assist in maintaining the "politically correct" illusion — an illusion exactly opposite to the reality — that Whites are less lawful and more violent than non-Whites. As we shall see from official government sources of crime data, the truth is that Whites are **more lawful** and **less violent** than Blacks or Mestizos, the two non-White groups having the most substantial minority presence within the United States.

Whites comprise 59% of death-row inmates, while Blacks comprise only 39%. Dishonest liberals like to portray those numbers as showing bias against Blacks because the percentage of Blacks on death row is higher than the percentage of Blacks in the general population (about 14% in 2000). The implicit assumption that the liberals are making is, as you might expect, that Whites and Blacks are equals in terms of the per capita murder perpetration rate. That assumption is false, and it is a false assumption that liberals make with

mendacious consistency. The per capita murder perpetration rate for Blacks is about eight times higher than that for Whites, so that although Whites outnumber Blacks in the United States by almost six-to-one, Blacks often commit more murders per year than Whites do. If the death penalty were applied without bias, then *at least half* of the death-row prison population would be Black. Any Black death-row percentage less than 50% indicates an *anti-White* bias with the death penalty, not an anti-Black bias.

Here's a comparison between Detroit, Michigan, and Windsor, Ontario. You can see each city from each other, they are mere kilometers apart. They watch the same TV, listen to the same music, see the same movies, listen to the same radio, etc



WINDSOR (2%Black)		
Type of Crime	Total # of Incidents	Rate per 100,000 Population
Murder	8	4
Robbery	143	72
Aggravated Assault	1,710	865
Car Theft	53	27
Arson	120	60
Rape	162	82

Here's a comparison between Detroit, Michigan, and Windsor, Ontario. You can see each city from each other, they are mere kilometers apart. They watch the same TV, listen to the same music, see the same movies, listen to the same radio, etc.

DETROIT (81.6%Black)		
Type of Crime	Total # of Incidents	Rate per 100,000 Population
Murder	396	42
Robbery	7,868	827
Aggravated Assault	13,037	1,371
Car Theft	25,892	2,722
Arson	2,121	219
Rape	811	85

1999

****It's actually much worse. The Detroit police have been caught falsifying rape (and other) statistics.**

To summarize, my argument is that non-Whites, Blacks, in

particular, bring nothing to the table except costs and crime. They cannot create anything of value on their own, and therefore cannot be expected to live to the standards we've set for ourselves. They have proven that to be true. They murder, rob, rape and beat us at a rate completely disproportionate to their numbers. This converts to a cost not only in life but in billions of dollars. We are a superior race. We are the most civil. We are the most dominant. And I, for one, am not going to sit back and live a fantasy while my race is destroyed by inter-breeding and lowering my standards for the sake of acceptance. Your people are dying. Take action, spread the word, and spread this document so that more may become aware.

We must not alleviate the responsibilities of these people to be decent human beings. It's not crime, it's poverty? It's not a riot, it's rage? What is that? That is making excuses. They have no excuse. If anything, tolerance will be our downfall.

Sources

- *1 Paul Sheehan, Sydney Morning Herald
- *2 Census Bureau and FBI Uniform Crime Reports -<http://www.jabpage.org/jabpage.html>
- * Various statistics gathered from various government sites. All reputable, guaranteed.

Hitler, the Holocaust, and the Jews

Dear Lord, where to begin? If you thought what I had to say about Blacks was broad and incoherent, just wait. We've been raised to believe that Hitler was this terrible tyrant. But was he really? What were his objectives?

- Create a Germany free of non-Whites.
- Secure the resources his people needed to prosper.
- Ensure that his Third Reich will endure long after he is gone.

Few people actually recognize that Hitler tried to deport the Jews. He didn't want them, and as it turns out, no one else did, either.

“If you go to a bar one night, get beat up and kicked out, too bad, but if you go to 9 bars in one night, get yourself beat up and kicked out of all of them, it's probably you.”

No one wanted them. Hitler was forced to keep them, and feed them, throughout the course of the war to follow. If Hitler's original intentions were to exterminate the Jews, rather than remove them from Germany, why did he then proceed to provide for them over the course of the war. Hitler, at the time, was supporting armies all over the world, yet he still found enough food, water, shelter and clothing so that these “Holocaust Survivors” can still be talking about it today.

Arguing that Hitler was a great man will lead to nowhere, so instead I will make arguments about what he did, and you can decide for yourself who he really was.

The holocaust, in White Nationalist circles, has become known as the “Holofoax”. This is not because we choose to deny the despicable acts of our beloved Hitler. This is because the evidence and logic has revealed the story of the Holocaust to be nothing but propaganda.

It has been said that in order to expose the perpetrator of a crime, you must look to who will benefit. Who benefited from the Holocaust? Jews. As a direct result, they were awarded a state to call their own. The terror-state of Israel. The Jews forced their way into Palestine, guns drawn, and it's been that way ever since. They still have their guns drawn. Why? Because they have no right to be there, and the Arabs aren't too happy about living next to Jews that shoot their children for playing soccer too close to the border. Maybe that's why Arabs hate us so much, because we put the Jews on their doorstep. I'd hate anyone that put a murderous, manipulative, deceiving, corrupting, parasitical vermin race at my doorstep too.

“The Holocaust is a huge moneymaking enterprise, an endless gravy train of "reparations" and Government grants to museums, foundations and 'tolerance' centres flows to Jewish pockets. It legitimises the bandit state of Israel and places the Jew on a moral pedestal so that no matter what crimes he may commit his position is unassailable.



Left: Before Right: After

Why, when the number of detainees who died at Auschwitz was cut from 4 million to 1.5 million by the camp museum researchers, was the total of 6 million not reduced accordingly? Where did the extra 2.5 million dead Jews come from to keep the magic number at 6 million?

HOLOHOAX MATHEMATICS : 6,000,000 - 2,500,000 = 6,000,000

Some important questions to ask yourself:

- Why do the Jews own figures for their total European population pre and post Holocaust not show a fall in numbers?
- How can the 'confessions' from the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal be regarded as authentic when according to Allied doctors who examined the German prisoners many of them had been tortured?
- How can confessions which state that Jews were variously steamed to death, gassed by non poisonous diesel exhaust fumes, beaten to death by pedal powered clubbing machines, electrocuted 25,000 at a time on giant metal plates and vaporized by a 'death ray' be regarded as evidence?
- Why is the confession of the Auschwitz camp commandant written in English, a language he did not understand, and why are the pages spattered with blood?
- How could the Germans have gassed one million Jews at Auschwitz in 'chambers' which could never have functioned? Why would these chambers be designed so that they would have discharged highly explosive and toxic Hydrocyanic gas right under the naked flames of the camp crematoria and next to the commandant's quarters? Did the Germans wish to poison themselves and blow the entire camp apart?
- Why did the Simon Wiesenthal Centre exhibit a photograph on its website showing smoke coming from a 'crematorium' which was in fact airbrushed on and was coming not from a chimney but a fence post?
- Why do 'survivors' claim to have seen smoke and flames and ashes issuing from crematorium chimneys night and day when reconnaissance photos show no smoke at all and the blueprints of the crematoria show that the chimneys were fitted with flame and smoke traps?

There was a Concentration Camp at Treblinka where 850,000 Jews were killed then why does it not appear on wartime reconnaissance photos - and why has a ground penetrating radar survey of the site revealed no foundations, no evidence of buildings and no bodies?

How did the Germans dispose of 1.1 million corpses at Auschwitz? The crematoria did not have anything like the capacity to dispose of this number. The alternative story of burning bodies in pits would have required so much petrol that the entire German war effort would have been paralyzed. So how WERE the bodies disposed of?



Here is what happens when you dig a pit at Auschwitz, where the water table is only inches under the soil, how many bodies do you think could be burned in this pit?

Can 'eyewitness' tales of Jewish prisoners working as 'Sonderkommando' dragging bodies from



the 'gas chambers' be true? None of these stories mention gas masks and some even say the Sonderkommando were smoking cigarettes IN A CHAMBER FULL OF EXPLOSIVE POISONOUS GAS.

ADOLF HITLER'S ONLY MISTAKE WAS THAT HE WAS TOO NICE TO THE JEWS"-www.Whitepower.co.uk"

The term 'Holocaust survivor' originally designated those who suffered the unique trauma of the Jewish ghettos, concentration camps and slave labour camps, often in sequence. The figure for

those Holocaust survivors at war's end is generally put at some 100,000. The number of living survivors cannot be more than a quarter of this figure now. Because enduring the camps became a crown of martyrdom, many Jews who spent the war elsewhere represented themselves as camp survivors. Another strong motive behind this misrepresentation, however, was material. The postwar German government provided compensation to Jews who had been in ghettos or camps. Many Jews fabricated their pasts to meet this eligibility requirement. 'If everyone who claims to be a survivor is one,' my mother used to exclaim, 'who did Hitler kill?'"

**-Norman G. Finkelstein
Jewish Writer**

During the war 4,000,000 Jews entered the United States illegally.

Where are these numbers accounted for?

Many Jews however did die, but that was from the lack of food, and typhus carrying lice. The common belief is that the Germans used Zyklon-b to gas the Jews. The camp invoices show that large amounts were ordered. The problem here is the fact that Zyklon-b is a fumigating agent, used to rid clothing of lice. Besides, if they were to successfully kill 6 million Jews by gassing, they would have had to have done it at a rate of 157 Jews an hour, and it takes Zyklon-b more than 21 hours to completely filter out of a well ventilated room. It is of interest to note that the "Holocaust Survivor" tales tell of Germans entering the gas chambers mere minutes after the gassing took place.

Let's look at the facts.

Most the Jews died of starvation and typhus. The Jews starved towards the end of the war because the allies were bombing Germany's infrastructure day and night. By the war's end, they were simply unable to feed them.

Typhus broke out because of all of the dead bodies they couldn't process.

The "ovens" and "burning pits of bodies" are lies. While the ovens existed, they were never designed to process Jews wholesale; they were designed to cremate bodies. (But not on the scale they were eventually called upon for.) -To prevent outbreaks of viruses. As mentioned before, the water table is just inches below the soil, how can you burn a bunch of bodies in a pond?

They did not use Zyklon-b to gas Jews, it's a delousing agent. Every aspect of the German war effort was efficient, why not this? The Germans had nerve agents, why not use them to exterminate the Jews if that was Hitler's intention?

There was never an order from Hitler to exterminate Jews.

F. Leuchter was an engineer and America's leading gas chamber expert. He designed gas chambers for the American prison system.

He was hired by Ernst Zundel (Prominent Holocaust Denier) to go to Europe and study the alleged gassing sites, because Zundel was being charged with a crime in Canada for questioning the holocaust. Leuchter believed everything he had been taught about the gassings, but he objectively did his job, and quickly became convinced that nobody could possibly have been gassed in any of these camps.

"There is too much data to go into.....but the simple way to look at it is to wonder how come there are so many "holocaust survivors" in the world.....How the hell do you survive 6 years in a death camp? If I had you in a "death camp" I just wouldn't waste food or water on you for

2 weeks, and you'd be dead.....Some of them say, "Oh, they made us work so they couldn't kill us right away." Well--was it a work camp or a death camp? Because I assure you that hundreds of thousands of people don't survive death camps.....”

1939:	15,688,259
1947:	11,266,600

	4,421,659

This is odd: 4,421,659 does not equal 6 million. It is 1.6 million less. Then why do the Jews say 6 million perished?

But wait, a very strange discrepancy occurs in the almanacs for 1946 and 1949 as they state their respective 1939 figures:

1949/1939:	16,643,210
1946/1939:	15,688,259

	954,951 = around 1 million

So, when the AJC (or anyone else using the same statistics) calculated WWII Jewish losses using the 1949 figures, they would be about 1 million higher than before.

How did they arrive at these two different figures? If we use the higher 1939 WJP number, then the total difference pre/post war is 5.4 million. I guess 5.4 is close enough to 6 million to call it 6 million. But by this time I think the game is up. There is a book titled [The First Holocaust](#) which states that the Jews were using the 6 million figure in pre-WWI days, apparently to obtain sympathy -- and, more importantly, money.

The real problem with all of the figures in the *World Almanac* is that the sole source for them is the American Jewish Committee, which is an anti-Christian, anti-Gentile, and anti-American organization. When you add those three things together, they sum up to massive disinformation.

May we not give heed to Jewish fables.” <http://www.ihr.org>

Hitler was right.

After the war ended, the Jews pounced on the opportunity to manipulate events to their benefit. They used the deaths of their people to push their agenda. And it worked. How many people do you know that question the events of the holocaust? Logic tells you it's false, so how is it that we have all come to accept it? Through our guilt, we've been accustomed to not question. In the same way we're always making excuses for Blacks and other minorities, we're constantly trying to find ways around reality to make sure the Jews aren't offended.

We are all under the influence of the mass media, whether you admit to it or not. Would you have ever questioned the holocaust had I not said anything? I know I never did until someone said something to me. The charade is so perfect, that even when logic is slapping you in the face you still believe. I have to acknowledge how effective it is. But also I have taken it upon myself to debunk it, to fight it, and to spread the truth.

I just don't know what to do. My personal opinion is to kick them all out of our countries. Or perhaps, segregation is the answer. If we did that, the horrible, crime-ridden communities would be created for everyone to see and prove my point further. Then, after everyone is fully convinced, we could kick them out. I hope all who have read this have done so with an open mind. Hell, even if you didn't you're probably asking yourself a few questions anyway. I hope you've all

learned something for having read this. I hope you're all aware. I hope, for those of you who still reject this as unfounded racism that it doesn't take a gang of Blacks to rape you, or your sister, or daughter, or girlfriend, to get you to really think.

To conclude, it is evident that Blacks commit more crimes than Whites. They are less civilised, despite our efforts. They continuously squander the money we give the African nations. The NAACP always chews anyone out who speaks the truth. When Blacks can't think of an excuse for their actions, they resort to unfounded, ignorant statements such as "George Bush does not care about Black people" (- Kanye West on Hurricane Katrina).

I will take the blame no longer. It is not my fault that Blacks act like a bunch of monkeys when we do not absolutely, ruthlessly outnumber and dominate them, and I am in no way obligated to help them.

Our governments, under the influence of an overwhelmingly Jewish media, and under pressure of guilt, continuously pour tax dollars into helping them out. Has it changed anything?

*We have enough problems at home to worry about before we should even consider sending money abroad.

*Africa has been receiving aid for decades, and nothing has changed.

*How can we possibly expect lending more money to them would bring them out of debt?

*Blacks in America, together, would constitute the 10th richest nation on the planet, yet still, as evident in the crime statistics; they're raping, robbing, murdering and beating Whites on an ever increasing scale. What does money change? Nothing. No amount of money changes that they're still Black; they're still an inferior, violent people, as a whole.

In crime, and in education, it's always the same order: Blacks on the bottom, Hispanics a little better, and Whites on top. Do we intentionally do this? We must, because it's racism that keeps the Black man down, right? So what, do we like Hispanics a little better than we like Blacks, that's why we've rigged the system so they're a little better? Asians do better than us half the time in school, do we like them better than we like ourselves? Absolutely not, that's just the way it works.

Mulattos (Black/White mix) always do better than Blacks, but worse than Whites. Is it because we recognize them and immediately scheme to push them down, but not as far down as the full-blooded Blacks? In my personal experience, actually, I find mulattos to be somewhat smarter than Blacks, like I said, but just as poorly behaved. It would seem that, seeing how popular it is to be Black these days, they feel they need to prove their Blackness, and act like an even bigger jackass than the full-Blacks do. But that could be just where I'm from.

Asians, actually, come from such densely populated areas that they have to try exceptionally hard to get ahead. Japan, for example, has but one natural resource, fish. In order to have a competitive economy, the Japanese emphasize education to make their workforce extremely skilled and intelligent. Japan is by far the most developed Oriental country. Perhaps this can be attributed to the fact that it was basically engineered by the Americans post WWII.

It's a common belief that Asians are smarter than Whites. That's simply not true; they're just raised to try harder. If they're so smart, how come they're unable to construct a functioning society? The closest example to ours is one that we built from the ground up. But anyway, I have much admiration for the Japanese; they're a hard-working, dignified people.

Does that mean I want to have a kid with one of them? No. Does that mean I want to live among them? No. It means I accept them as good, decent people. Race mixing is treason. Look what it did to the Spanish! The Spaniards came to America, and their colonists bred with the Amerindians, giving birth to the trash Americans find south of their border, and more and more every year, within their borders.

The very fact of the matter is that Blacks, for the most part, embrace a culture that celebrates violence, crime, stupidity and ignorance. People try to blame their behaviour as a people on that, but they don't listen to rap in Africa, and things aren't any better there. India is the rape capital of the world. When Indians come here, they don't bring the rape with them. You can conclude that the rape must be a product of circumstance, and not the people. In Africa, however, there is rape, murder, theft and general violence. When Africans come here, they bring the rape, murder, theft and general violence with them. You can conclude that is a result of the people, regardless of the environment.


“You know, the Blacks use the same graphs and statistics that we do, except they try to use it as proof that the American justice system is racist. Uh-huh. Like the majority of crack dealers are White, but we are so racist we only arrest the Black ones. You know, I see that 99.9% of Americans in prison for rape are men. Can I say that proves discrimination against men? You aren't trying to say that 99% of rapists are men are you? That would be sexist. Well, most rapists are men. And most crack dealers, rapists, murderers, carjackers, etc, are Black men. Just the facts.”

This is not racism. This is racialism. I am acknowledging the differences between the races. It's offensive, sure, but then again, thousands of Whites being victimized consistently is offensive too. These are the facts. Do what you will.

There was a Concentration Camp at Treblinka where 850,000 Jews were killed then why does it not appear on wartime reconnaissance photos - and why has a ground penetrating radar survey of the site revealed no foundations, no evidence of buildings and no bodies?

How did the Germans dispose of 1.1 million corpses at Auschwitz? The crematoria did not have anything like the capacity to dispose of this number. The alternative story of burning bodies in pits would have required so much petrol that the entire German war effort would have been paralyzed. So how WERE the bodies disposed of?





The above PowerPoint presentation is available at Pastor Eli's website:

www.anglo-saxonisrael.com

Parts 1 - 6 plus a short introduction can now be viewed or downloaded - the latest addition part 6 covers the German people in relation to the migrations of the Tribes of Israel.

**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

**"For out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the
Word of the Lord from Jerusalem"
(Isaiah 2:3)."**

