

Jews The Great Deceivers



**By
Willie Martin**

Jews The Great Deceivers

Parts 1 through 4

By
Willie Martin

Jews The Great Deceivers - Part 1

By Way of Deception Thou Shalt Do War

THE MOTTO OF ISRAEL'S SPY AGENCY, MOSSAD, is, according to recently defected Mossad agent Victor Ostrovsky: "By way of deception thou shalt do war." That motto describes more than the modus operandi of the world's most ruthless and feared organization of professional assassins and espionage agents; it really describes the modus vivendi of an entire race. It is necessary to understand that fact before one can hope to understand fully the role of the Jews in national and world affairs.

The concept of a race eternally at war with the rest of the world is alien to us. It is difficult to believe or even to grasp. When we examine such a concept and begin sifting the evidence it is easy to become confused.

Similarly bloodthirsty, explicit injunctions are repeated so often in the Jews' holy books that we can only assume that they are meant to be taken seriously. The historical evidence suggests that in ancient times the Jews did indeed take their religion seriously: they were notorious everywhere and at all times as implacable haters of humanity who in turn were thoroughly despised by every other people among whom they lived.

Then on the other hand we have the modern, American Jew in the role of humanitarian, shunning the instruments of war and urging that all citizens, including himself, be disarmed, in order to make the streets of our cities kinder and gentler. Not only do the Jews provide the principal impetus to America's gun-control effort, but they are found in the forefront of every other squishy, do-good movement, from those ostensibly aimed at

reducing hostility between the races to those designed to increase tolerance of homosexuals and their practices. How are we to make sense of this apparently conflicting evidence?

Is the Jew in the U.S. Congress who cites the rising murder statistics and then demands that the government confiscate all privately owned firearms trying to deceive us as to his intentions? When he talks peace and disarmament is he really thinking war against the Gentiles?

And what of the carefully cultivated media image of the Jew as a gentle, inoffensive victim of bigotry, always being persecuted but never persecuting others? Is that also deception? And even if it is, does it necessarily mean that beneath the Jew's mask of benevolence and innocence hides the malevolent visage of a cunning predator?

Perhaps for every bloodsucking Jewish swindler like Ivan Boesky or Michael Milken there is a Jewish benefactor of mankind like polio vaccine developer Jonas Salk, and for every bloody-handed Jewish gangster like Ariel Sharon, Meyer Lansky, or Yitzhak Shamir there is a Jewish Nobel Peace Prize winner like Menachem Begin, Henry Kissinger; or the appropriately named Elie Wiesel.

Or are we also being deceived when the Salks and the Kissingers are held up to us as reasons for not condemning all Jews for the transgressions of some? By way of deception thou shalt do war.

Does that injunction mean: "If you must wage war, if it is impossible to avoid war, then you stand a better chance of winning by being tricky?" Or does it mean: "Thou shalt wage war, and thou shalt deceive?"

The answer to this question is important. If it is the former, if the Jews, as a whole, are not malevolent, if they have broken with their Old Testament tradition and no longer feel that their racial mission is to destroy all other peoples, but they merely feel that when forced to defend themselves they are justified in using all means, including deception, then we may be able to live on the same planet with them, at a distance. We don't have to like them or agree with their policies, but we can see the

possibility, at least, of some sort of peaceful coexistence, once a separation of peoples has been accomplished.

In seeking the answer we should keep in mind that deception is, in itself, hostile. A policy of systematic deception is tantamount to a policy of war. If we discover that the Jews (as a whole, not just a few swindlers among them) have been deceiving us deliberately and systematically over an extended period of time on any matter of substance, then we may infer that they regard the relationship between us as one of war, and we should respond accordingly.

The pursuit of this inference may be the only path to an un-muddied answer. After all, how do we know that someone is waging war against us? If he makes an open declaration of war and then begins shooting and bombing us, the matter is clear enough. But if, because he always follows a policy of deception, he declares that he is not at war with us and only has our best interests at heart, we may have difficulty in deciding whether the injury he causes us is deliberate or inadvertent.

Suppose he undertakes courses of action which damage us in ways somewhat less directly than shooting and bombing, ways such as bringing hordes of non- Whites across our borders, breaking down the barriers to racial mixing in our society, encouraging permissiveness, undermining our institutions, promoting cultural bolshevism, all the while claiming that he does not regard these things as harmful.

If we were a more practical people we might pay less attention to what the Jew says and more to what he does; we might stop worrying about his motive, judge him on the basis of the effect his presence has had on us, and then act accordingly.

Unfortunately, there are many who cannot in good conscience take a stand against the Jew without knowing what is in his heart; and the Jew is aware of this. We must catch him deliberately lying to us, deceiving us systematically and massively, in order to infer that his intent is hostile. That's one reason why the unravelling of the "Holocaust" myth is so important to us, and why the Jew clings so desperately to every lie in its fabric.

We should draw some sort of conclusion from the consistency of the Jew's actions. Virtually everything he does is harmful to us. Without exaggeration we can say that whenever the Jew takes a stand on a new issue, the proper position for us is on the other side.

Everyone who has read any Jewish literature; i.e., literature by Jews about Jews, has encountered the traditional Jewish character who whenever he must make a decision about something the goyim have done asks himself: "Is it good for the Jews?"

That's an admirable trait in any person, Jew or Gentile: always being concerned first about the welfare of his community, of his tribe, of his race. The Jewish author more often than not sprinkles a bit of dissimulation over it, however, suggesting that it may be unfashionably parochial, but it is excusable on the grounds that the Jews have been obliged by bitter experience to be wary of anything the Gentile does.

It goes without saying, of course, that the same author would regard it as totally inexcusable for a Gentile to use a similar criterion: to ask himself about some policy or action of the Jews, "Is it good for the White race, for Gentiles?" Such a character could only be cast in the role of villain.

And what we never encounter in Jewish literature is a Jewish character weighing a Jewish policy by asking himself: "Is it bad for the goyim?" Unspoken though it may be, however, it seems that this criterion plays as large a role as the first in determining Jewish policies.

Perhaps to them it is just another way of saying the same thing, although they are very careful not to phrase it that way. At least, they have been since the Second World War; before that they sometimes seemed to think that the goyim couldn't read, and chutzpah got the better of discretion.

In 1924, for example, the prominent Jewish publicist Maurice Samuel, author of a score of serious books on Jewish matters and recipient of numerous awards from Jewish organizations, wrote in his *You Gentiles*, a book addressed to his hosts: "We Jews, we, the destroyers, will remain the destroyers forever. Nothing that you will do will meet our needs and

demands. We will forever destroy because we need a world of our own, a God-world, which it is not in your nature to build."

Even here, however, there is deception, with the will to destroy masked as piety. Think of the enormous demographic and social changes which have transformed our world since the Second World War. In 1941 the United States was for all practical purposes a White country. Blacks and other minorities existed, but they were not seen in White residential areas, White schools, White recreational facilities, or most White workplaces. They had a negligible influence on the political process, on public morality, and on the national culture.

Racial intermarriage was illegal in most jurisdictions and extremely rare everywhere. America's city streets were safe by night and by day. There was no drug problem; the use of marijuana, heroin, and other drugs was confined almost entirely to Blacks and Hispanics, in their own, separate communities. Teenage pregnancy (among Whites) was as rare as a public display of homosexuality. Schools were orderly, disciplined, and safe.



Jews The Great Deceivers - Part 2

America had its problems, of course. Whites, even when they are in control of their own destiny, are not angels. Greed, meanness, superstition, and stupidity were reflected in a thousand social and cultural ills. A thoroughly corrupt political system, inevitable in a democracy, provided the country with its top political leaders and public officials. Blacks and other racial minorities, though invisible and powerless, were a festering sore which eventually would have to be dealt with.

The country, however, was still White and gave every indication of staying that way; in the years immediately prior to the war immigration to the United States was predominantly White, with immigrants from Europe outnumbering those from Asia and Latin America combined by five to one.

America's problems were still soluble and Western civilization was still viable, still capable of being cleansed and renewed. Furthermore, in Germany a man was showing the race the way to save itself.

In response to that man's efforts most of the Western world engaged in an all-out war to destroy him, his works, and his followers. His ideas and teachings became anathema, and the half-century which followed was dedicated to justifying the slaughter and destruction of the war by promoting the antitheses of those ideas and teachings.

He had taught that the White race is the most progressive race and is inherently superior to the non-White races in its civilization-building capacity, and so the elevation of the social and economic levels of non-Whites at the expense of Whites became the premier postwar goal.

He had taught that racial mixing is a crime against Nature, that our race must strive above all else to maintain the integrity of its gene pool, and so racial mixing became the postwar fashion: schoolchildren were bused to achieve mixing in the schools, forced housing laws were passed to achieve residential mixing, laws against miscegenation were struck down everywhere, and the immigration laws were changed to bring a new flood of non-Whites into the country.

He had taught that the building of self-discipline in young people, the strengthening of their will-power and of their ability for self-control, is the most important task of a nation's educational system, and so in postwar America discipline became a dirty word, and permissiveness became the norm.

He had taught that, just as races differ in their innate abilities, so also do the individuals within a race, and that a healthy and progressive society must conform its institutions to this natural inequality among its members. Consequently, in postwar America egalitarianism became the new religion, and levelling the aim of government. To seek out the best and brightest, in our schools and elsewhere, and give them the recognition and the special training to enable them to move upward to positions of leadership, even to admit the possibility that some were better and brighter than others and could contribute more to civilization, became taboo.

He had taught a healthy, complementary relationship between men and women, with the former as providers and protectors and the latter as nurturers, and the new society he built in Germany was family centered, with laws and institutions aimed at strengthening the family and helping it to provide a sound environment for healthy children.

Therefore, after his works were destroyed the victors denounced sexual complementarity as "repressive" and brought women out of the home and into the workforce by the millions, with children relegated to day-care centres.

Every sex-role distinction was officially discouraged or outlawed, even to the point of bringing women into the armed forces on an equal footing with men. Feminism and homosexuality have flourished with governmental protection.

Today we can see the consequences of these postwar policies all around us, and it is a matter of public record that the Jews have been the primary instigators and propagandists for each of these policies without exception. They had non-Jewish collaborators in abundance, of course. The legislator primarily responsible for the change in postwar immigration patterns, the late Jewish Congressman from Brooklyn, Emanuel Celler, for many years chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, chose as a co-sponsor for his 1965 immigration bill the Gentile Senator from Massachusetts Edward (Teddy) Kennedy.

The "civil rights" revolutionaries who were organizing "sit ins" and "freedom rides" during the 1950's and 1960's received their financing, their legal assistance, and their media support from Jews, but without an utterly corrupt and unprincipled Gentile collaborator in the form of Lyndon Johnson, first as Senate majority leader (1955-1961) and later as President (1963-1968), the series of legislative coups which made the agenda of the revolutionaries the law of the land would not have come so easily.

Collaboration has come from Blacks as well as Whites. Many of the organizations pushing for legislated "equality" between Blacks and Whites

have been headed by Blacks in recent years. The most venerable of them, the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People, was given its first Black president as long ago as 1975, after an unbroken succession of Jews (although the separate NAACP Legal Defence and Educational Fund, which bills itself as "the legal arm of the civil rights movement," is still strictly kosher, with a Jewish chief).

In no area of endeavour have the Jews had more willing non-Jewish collaborators than in the postwar promotion of permissiveness. Jews Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin may have been the most flamboyant spokesmen for permissiveness during the 1960's with their "if it feels good, do it" and "kill your parents" maxims for young Americans, but dozens of well-known Gentiles were right on their coattails, from "New Age" guru Timothy Leary with his campaign to popularise LSD and other psychedelic drugs to soft-porn publisher Hugh Hefner and his advocacy of "the Playboy philosophy."

It is, after all, hardly the case that Jewry forced its way into America with tanks and machine guns and compelled the unwilling Aryans to stand by and watch while their civilization was destroyed and their race corrupted by the Semitic invaders.

From the beginning the prey collaborated with the predators at all levels: the primitive Bible-beaters who for generations have been taught by their own kind that the Jews are "God's Chosen People" and that it's bad luck to cross them; the jaded, self-indulgent great grandsons and great granddaughters of an earlier generation of hard-headed, hard-working pioneers and entrepreneurs, eager to be amused and titillated by every new fashion in ideology, art, music, or life-style dangled before them by wordy, alien hucksters; hungry opportunists in business, in education, and in the cultural establishment, ready to take the part of the obnoxiously pushy but admirably well-organized strangers.

Once those strangers had established sufficiently strong beachheads to be able to offer favours in return; and, of course, the politicians, democracy's inevitable maggots, who are ready to ally themselves with the Devil himself if they think they can gain a temporary personal advantage by doing so.

It is clear that when cleanup time comes there's as much weeding to be done in our own garden as in any other race's. An inattentive observer might even conclude that the Jews are no more blameworthy for the bad directions taken by our society than our own worst elements are; that as opportunists they merely look for ways to turn the weaknesses they find in us to their own advantage.

Did they push for opening our borders to the Third World because they had a long-range plan to mongrelize us, or were they merely going along with greedy and irresponsible elements of our own race who wanted to keep the cost of labour down?

Have they been the principal promoters behind every destructive fashion in painting and music in order to cut us loose from our cultural moorings, thereby confusing our sense of identity and making us easier prey, or simply because they have recognized the lack of aesthetic discrimination on the part of our consuming masses and are as eager as the confidence men of any race to sell the suckers whatever they'll buy?

Do they use their control of the entertainment industry to promote the acceptance, and in many cases the approval of homosexuality, feminism, and interracial sex as a way of softening us up morally and preparing us for slaughter, or are they simply trying to please and thereby win as customers for their commercial sponsors the more degenerate elements of our population?



Jews The Great Deceivers - Part 3

An inattentive observer might be stumped by such questions. A more attentive observer, however, will note the details, the specifics, as well as the generalities, and he will understand that those details, taken together, are not consistent with simple opportunism but only with war by way of deception.

Forcing the stream of immigration into America after the Second World War to change from White to Brown and Yellow has most notably kept the cost of farm labour down, but Jews are not farmers, and it is difficult to see how they could expect to benefit economically from this change.

The influx of non-White immigrants also has kept the cost of certain other types of labour down, restaurant workers, unskilled construction workers, but the connection to any vital Jewish business interest is tenuous at best.

There can be no doubt that culture distortion has been enormously profitable for Jews. With a controlling economic interest in every facet of the popular- culture industry from art galleries to music records, tapes, and compact discs, they make money from nearly every product that the culture-consuming public can be persuaded to buy.

And since no one has ever lost a nickel by underestimating the taste of the public, the deliberate Jewish debasement of art and music is understandable on the grounds of greed alone. But the specific directions are not.

In the production and promotion of what might be called "consumer music," for example, the one great change which has taken place since the Second World War has been the ascendancy of African rhythm over European music.

Fifty years ago one could walk into any record store catering to the general public and find 78-rpm phonograph discs with a number of different types of music: classical, hillbilly (a form of White American folk music known today as "bluegrass" and subsumed under the more general heading "country and western"), numerous samples of genuine folk music from Europe, the religious music of the more primitive Christian fundamentalists ("gospel"), and a wide-ranging selection of "popular" music.

The last category contained everything from the songs of Stephen Foster to the vacuous, fluffy stuff of the musical comedies which were especially popular then.

Jews already had established a strong beachhead in popular music production; Sigmund Romberg, Richard Rodgers, Oscar Hammerstein, George Gershwin, Jerome Kern, Irving Berlin but, at least, most popular music, even that composed by Jews, was still based on European forms.

Jazz (and the "swing" and "big band" forms into which it evolved) was for all practical purposes the only non-White music being peddled to White consumers, and it constituted a relatively small minority of the wares. Eighty per cent of the music was White in form and origin, with classical music still very prominently represented.

By the end of the Second World War jazz- influenced popular music was evolving away from its Black roots into hybrid forms that most people considered more White than Black.

The introduction of the long-playing record, which for the first time permitted people to listen to an entire symphony without changing records, and of high- fidelity sound systems even brought about a renewal of public interest in classical music. At this point the people controlling the music industry could have moved in any of a number of directions. They chose to put their heaviest promotional efforts behind another music form with Black roots: rock 'n' roll.

Rock also evolved, of course. Today in its many forms, some of which have moved rather far from their Black origins, it dominates consumer music. And the masters of the industry have begun pushing yet another non-White music form, more blatantly Negroid than anything heretofore: rap.

Today one must look hard to find even a handful of classical cassettes or compact discs in the music section of a K-Mart or other consumer emporium. European folk music can be had only from a few specialty stores. The majority of the music offered to the consuming public is in some significant sense non- White.

Economic democracy might be invoked to explain, at least in part, the displacement of structure by rhythm, as the taste of the average consumer has become more primitive. But it is clear that deliberate promotion has

had much to do with this trend. Why have the promoters so consistently chosen directions which weaken and dilute the White cultural heritage?

Certainly, the feminists, homosexuals, and race-mixers are pleased to see themselves depicted on television and cinema screens as people of a morally superior sort, as role models for the younger generation of goyim. Perhaps they even show their appreciation by buying more of the products of the sponsors of Star Trek, True Colours, and other brave, new television productions. But feminists, queers, and interracial couples still make up only a rather small minority of the population, despite the best efforts of the media masters. Wouldn't it make better economic sense to cater to the majority?

There are as many approximately normal consumers who feel at least a twinge of disgust when a television program tries to persuade them that hard-drinking, hard-swearing female soldiers or cops are "normal" as there are bull-dykes who will run out and buy the sponsor's brand of beer. And there certainly must be more healthy viewers who seethe with suppressed rage when they see a White woman kissing a Black man on the screen than there are avant-garde sickos who applaud such an abomination.

No, opportunism does not explain the Jews' destructiveness. There is no doubt that they are opportunists. But their opportunism is too consistently destructive. They have too inerrant an instinct for what will be bad for the goyim.

Can their behaviour be explained in terms of an alien brand of idealism, an idealism which evolved in the marketplaces and bazaars of the Middle East over the last five thousand years and is natural for them, but which leads to disaster when applied to European society and institutions?

Was their support for communism from the middle of the last century up until its recent collapse really based on their sympathy for the oppressed proletariat and their desire for social and economic justice, as they claim? They themselves have been oppressed, they say, and so they have a natural sympathy for the underdog. They will tell you that the reason they promote feminism, argue for the acceptance of homosexuals, and demand the

integration of Blacks into every facet of our lives is that their religion requires it of them; the ethics of Judaism is egalitarian, and it specifies that each man be judged only by his or her character.

Undoubtedly there have been naive, starry-eyed idealists among communism's Gentile propagandists, at least, in those countries which had not yet experienced communism in practice; the great American writer Jack London was one, and there certainly may have been a few Jewish idealists of Marxism as well.

But only a person who has no knowledge of communism in practice can believe that those who engineered its revolutionary triumph in Russia or commissared its institutions in Eastern Europe after the Second World War were seekers of justice for the workers.

As for the claim that Jews have an affection for justice and equality greater than that of other races, we only need to look at the ways in which this alleged affection manifests itself in that part of the world where it should be seen in its purest form: namely, Israel and the Israeli-occupied Arab territories.



Jews The Great Deceivers - Part 4

Ask any Palestinian about Jewish justice! Judaism, of course, is unequivocally opposed to feminism and homosexuality for Jews. Furthermore, it is a race- based religion, which defines its adherents in terms of their bloodline and declares them inherently superior to all other races. How does their promotion of feminism among the goyim, for instance, square with the well-known Jewish prayer, "I thank you, oh Lord, for not having made me a goy, a slave, or a woman," which is recited every day by the Orthodox faithful?

In the Talmud, that authoritative compendium of the Jewish oral law, there are a thousand other reminders to the Jew that he is absolutely superior to

all other life forms: "Heaven and earth were created only for the sake of the Jews." (Vayikra Rabba 36); "The Jews are human beings, but the goyim are not human beings; they are only beasts." (Baba Mezia 114); "Yahweh created the non-Jew in human form so that the Jew would not have to be served by beasts. The non-Jew is consequently an animal in human form and is condemned to serve the Jew day and night." (Midrash Talpioth 225)

So much for Jewish egalitarianism. Jewish solicitude for Blacks in America today is as much a fraud as was the claim of Jewish sympathy for the oppressed proletariat of Russia on the eve of the Bolshevik Revolution. What truly lies in the Jewish heart was revealed by an exceptional Jew, Baruch Spinoza (like Ostrovsky, a renegade), who wrote in the 17th century: "The love of the Hebrews for their country was not only patriotism but also piety and was cherished and nurtured by daily rites until, like their hatred of other nations, it was absolutely perverse—

Such daily reprobation naturally gave rise to a lasting hatred, deeply implanted in the heart: for of all hatred, none is more deep and tenacious than that which springs from extreme devoutness or piety and is itself cherished as pious." (*Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, Chapter 17)

The Jewish role in the non-Jewish world and the Jewish motivation for the policies pursued by the Jewish community would be much easier to perceive if the Jews acted in a more consistent and straightforward way: if they spoke with a single voice and spoke truly, saying what really was on their minds.

But, then, consistency and straightforwardness would violate the cardinal rule: By way of deception thou shalt do war. Nevertheless, on a somewhat higher plane of subtlety, there is a consistency in the Jews' inconsistency. On virtually every major issue; political, social, cultural, moral, or what have you, where there are two principal sides or factions, one will find Jews pushing in both directions and serving as spokesmen for both factions but with a difference. Consider: For many years prior to Mikhail Gorbachev's recent dismantling of the Soviet power bloc and the general recognition of Marxism as a fraudulent, unworkable system, communism's

principal apologists and apparatchiks in the West were Jews. So were a number of anti-communist spokesmen.

During the Second World War, of course, the communists could do no wrong in the eyes of the West's controlled media, because they were helping to destroy the man about whom the Jewish media masters had nightmares.

Thus, while Soviet butchers were torturing thousands of patriots to death in the police cellars of the Baltic countries and liquidating the Polish leadership stratum at the killing pits in the Katyn woods, Jewish communists in the United States were stealing the plans and test results from America's atomic bomb program and sending them to their colleagues in the Soviet Union.

After the war was over, however, and a reaction began to set in among White Americans as they realized that the communist beast they had unleashed against Eastern Europe might end up devouring them too, it was time for Jews to begin hedging their bets: it was time for the media to begin quoting "responsible" anti-communists. (The "responsible" ones were those who failed to mention the Jewishness of the system they were speaking out against.)

While the memory of Jewish atomic spies Julius and Ethyl Rosenberg was still fresh and Jewish communist sympathizers such as Robert Oppenheimer were being weeded out of America's atomic weapons program, Jewish scientist Edward Teller became the spokesman for anti-communist Americans who wanted a strong, nuclear-armed America able to stand up to the Soviet Union.

Three decades later, after Jews had rooted for the Viet Cong communists throughout the war in Vietnam, Jews began flocking to the neo-conservative movement to speak up for an America strong enough to defend Israel's interests in the Middle East against the Soviet Union's Arab clients there. Often they were the same Jews who had been cheering for the Reds a year or two earlier. That really confused the goyim. Consider: Whenever a gaggle of eggheads gets together in some area to sponsor a

classical-music FM radio station as a sole outpost of European culture in a sea of African rock-and-rap rhythm or sub-dimwit gospel bleating, there surely will be a Jew or two among them. And when they are interviewed by the local press, it surely will be one of those Jews who is quoted.

That helps to spike any nasty rumours as to who's behind all of the garbage-music programming at the other stations.

Consider: As detailed elsewhere in this magazine, the madness of "political correctness" which has infected America's colleges and universities is Jewish through and through.

And as also pointed out elsewhere in this magazine many of those who are urging their colleagues to hold the line against "political correctness" also are Jews (at least, the ones appointed by the media to be spokesmen for academic freedom are). This not only ensures that the Jews manning the PC barricades won't be criticized as Jews for wrecking our universities, but it preempts those who might try to swing things too far back toward academic freedom.

Consider: While Jew Howard Metzenbaum in the U. S. Senate and Jew Charles Schumer in the U. S. House of Representatives spearhead the legislative drive to strip Americans of their right to armed self-defence and are unanimously and vociferously supported in this effort by the Jewish media, a tiny, Milwaukee-based, Jewish pro-gun group calling itself Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership (JPFO) manages to attract far more attention to itself than its size ordinarily would merit.

JPFO is not just a group of pro-gun people who coincidentally happen to be Jews; it is a group of people who are shouting to the world: "Hey, look at me; I am a Jew, and I am in favor of gun ownership."

Whenever a JPFO spokesman is quoted in the news media, which is often enough to give the impression that his organization is right up there with the National Rifle Association, fighting for gun owners' rights, he flaunts his Jewishness. It doesn't take a genius to figure out that in any contest it's a good strategy to control your principal opposition. That way you can put on a great show of bad guys versus good guys struggling against each

other, but you are always in a position to make the contest go in either direction you want and only as far as you want. Not only do you pre-empt any real opposition, but you keep the goyim fooled and deflect any criticism of your role in the affair.

By way of deception thou shalt do war. The deception is masterfully done. It suffices to keep most of the people fooled most of the time. Only a careful study of the details of a number of different social phenomena in which Jews are involved parts the veil of lies and trickery sufficiently for us to see a clear pattern.

The pattern is this: Jews come into any homogeneous society, and such was America at the beginning of this century, as outsiders, as strangers. The society is effectively closed to them. They cannot easily penetrate its institutions. They cannot get their hands on the levers of power. If they try they are noticed, suspected, and resisted. And they always must try. In this they apparently cannot restrain themselves.

To make way for themselves, to open up possibilities for penetration and control, they must break down the structure of the society, corrupt its institutions, undermine its solidarity, weaken its sense of identity, obliterate its traditions, destroy its homogeneity.

Thus they inevitably will be in favour of democracy, of permissiveness, of every form of self-indulgence and indiscipline. They will be proponents of cosmopolitanism, of egalitarianism, of multiculturalism. They will oppose patriotism (except when they are inciting their hosts to fight a war on behalf of Jewish interests). They will agitate endlessly for change, change, change, and they will call it progress.

And no matter what they are for or against they will have at least some of their number taking the opposite side: If they are promoting the public acceptance of homosexuality, they also will have a few prominent Jewish publicists bemoaning the downfall of traditional morality and warning of the consequences of the confusion of sexual roles. If their aim is to neutralize the universities as institutions for passing on the historical, intellectual, and cultural traditions of our people to a new generation of

potential leaders, at the same time that they are organizing Red Guard brigades to enforce Political Correctness they will have a contingent beating the drums for tradition and free inquiry.

If they are working feverishly to disarm White Americans in order to prevent the latter from exercising their right of revolution they will go to the Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership for a contrary statement now and then.

What does all of this prove? In the strictest sense of the word, nothing; it is only suggestive. If you watch a person flip a penny five hundred times, and it always comes up tails, you cannot be absolutely certain that the penny has two tails. But you at least ought to suspect that someone has been working on that penny in his machine shop.

If you study the historical record and observe that every matter of importance in which the Jews have been involved turns out badly for us, even though there are usually a few Jews on our side of the matter, you cannot be absolutely certain that the game is rigged. But you at least ought to suspect that the Jews are following their ancient maxim and waging war against us by way of deception.

Definition of an American: "A person who is a slave to the International Bankers and Zionist elite, but believes he is free, because they can voice their opinions; as long as the government agents don't hear it."



**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

