

ON EXTERMINATIONISM

César Tort (Editor)

Cover:
Maxfield Parrish:
The Lute Players (1924)

Daybreak Press
First printing: December 2020
Revised edition: August 2021
Second revision: November 2022

Other books edited
and /or authored
by César Tort

In Spanish:

De Jesús a Hitler:

Hojas Susurrantes

¿Me Ayudarás...?

El Grial

In English:

The Fair Race's Darkest Hour

Day of Wrath

Daybreak

Christianity's Criminal History

Letter to mom Medusa

On Beth's Cute Tits

cesartort@yahoo.com

<http://www.westsdarkesthour.com>

One can say, with more and more certainty as the ‘Dark Age’ goes on, that the god-like men of action are defeated, at least for the time being, *not* for having been too ruthless, *but for not having been ruthless enough*—for not having killed off their fleeing enemies, to the last man, in the brief hour of triumph; for not having silenced both the squeamish millions of hypocrites and their masters, the clever producers of atrocity-tales, by more substantial violences, more complete exterminations.

—Savitri Devi

Foreword

There is no freedom of speech in Europe. Europeans have been muzzled since the Second World War. But if a young Aryan with great aspirations to do something in the darkest hour for his race visits the racist webzines based in the First Amendment country, what does he find?

A white nationalist site like Greg Johnson's, which seems more concerned with profiteering than his Nordic race? A site like Andrew Anglin's, which only discusses recent news with no historical perspective? The site of patriot Jared Taylor who romanticises the American founding fathers, or Hunter Wallace who secretly aspires to a Christian reconquest of the US? Will he go for Kevin MacDonald's webzine which focuses on the Jewish Question, or the much-visited forum of Ron Unz, who is Jewish?

All these people lack the meta-perspective of Adolf Hitler in his after-dinner talks or the ferocity of William Pierce who, like the National Socialists, left Christian ethics behind. Pierce was the first on the American continent, in a fictional book, *The Turner Diaries* and in a non-fiction book *Who We Are*, to suggest exterminationism as the final solution to our problems.

Here I collect thirty entries that have appeared on my website, *The West's Darkest Hour*, since 2009. The blog posts have been edited to appear more formally in this book, and in the case of the novel *The Turner Diaries*, there is a passage so important that I quote it more than once. If the reader wants to get an idea of where I am coming from, he can read Jake's long interview with me on pages 94-107. There he may begin to guess how I came to a point of view so far removed from the common man's viewpoint.

I have authored about half of the articles in this book. Compared to the first two editions of this anthology, I have added

some articles and removed many articles. The first one, ‘The Red Giant,’ contains a quote of mine from when I still admired the United States. I was also unaware of the Jewish problem, and even of the Christian problem! It is very instructive to read how a Swede educated me on the Christian problem.

In contrast to our great inner transformation, as you can see in the Mauritian rating scale in this book, ‘How awake are you?’ white nationalists are psychologically stagnated at levels four and five. *Turner Diaries*’ levels of reclaiming white lands can only be reached after transvaluing Christian values. But it is only until the last pages of this book that it becomes crystal-clear what we mean, especially in the three essays following what Savitri Devi says about the Kalki archetype.

César Tort
November 2022

Contents

Foreword 7

First Part

The Red Giant – <i>Conservative Swede</i>	13
The blood flowed ankle-deep – <i>Editor</i> quotes <i>Pierce</i>	33
Email to Mark – <i>Editor</i>	37
<i>Terre et Peuple, Blut und Boden</i> – <i>Commenter</i>	39
<i>Who We Are</i> excerpts – <i>William Pierce</i>	40
Linder on the <i>Diaries</i> – <i>Editor</i>	44
<i>Turner Diaries</i> excerpts – <i>William Pierce</i>	45
The word ‘racism’ – <i>Commenter</i> & <i>Ed.</i>	49
On the origin of the word racist – <i>Hadding Scott</i>	52
The depth of evil – <i>Andrew Hamilton</i>	56
Ostriches – <i>Editor</i>	58
Follow my yellow brick road – <i>Editor</i>	61
Kemp’s book – <i>Editor</i>	63
Animal hell and white sin – <i>Editor</i>	65
On my moral inferiors – <i>Editor</i>	68
<i>Turner Diaries</i> climax – <i>William Pierce</i>	71
Why I am not a neonazi – <i>Editor</i>	81
On exterminationism – <i>Editor</i>	85

Second Part

Jews genociding Germans – <i>Anonymous</i>	89
Foundation myth – <i>Felix Rex</i>	90
Interview with Jake – <i>Ed.</i> & <i>Jake</i>	94
Steiner’s critical review – <i>Editor</i>	108
How awake are you? – <i>Maurice</i>	113
The Christian Question – <i>Maurice</i>	115
<i>Lebensraum</i> – <i>Editor</i>	117
Subtitle – <i>Editor</i>	130

Kalki the Avenger – *Savitri Devi* 132
Panentheism – *Editor* 141
On solving the problem of evil – *Gaedhal* 143
Am I a psychopath? – *Editor* 145

First part

The Red Giant

by Conservative Swede

In England one must rehabilitate oneself after every little emancipation from theology by showing in a veritably awe-inspiring manner what a moral fanatic one is. That is the *penance* they pay there. —We others hold otherwise. When one gives up the Christian faith, one *pulls the right* to Christian morality out from under one's feet.' —Nietzsche ¹

WE are witnessing the historical demise of Christianity. When a star dies, in its last phase it expands into a red giant, before it shrinks into a white dwarf. Liberalism is the red giant of Christianity. And just as a red giant is devoid of its core, it expands thousandfold while losing its substance and is about to die. The world I live in consists of Christians and liberals. It's their world and I do not belong to them. I leave their limited wars, knee-jerk Islam apologetics and World War II mythology to them. They are not about to change. On the contrary, they are continuously generating new problems with their way of acting.

There were certain sites, certain bloggers, even certain countries, that I had put hope in. But now it has become clear that they are all part of the same big train of lemmings. Bye-bye! Denmark, nope. *Brussels Journal*, nope. *View From the Right*, nope. *Gates of Vienna*, nope. This is the way it goes in the world of liberals and Christians. It's their world. I can do nothing but sit on the side and laugh at it. They are too stuck in their inner fears and hang-ups to be able to do anything useful. They will do what they are programmed to do: demise. These people are just not prepared for

¹ *Editor's note:* I have added the Nietzsche epigraph. This article consists of excerpts from an August 2007 entry in the blog 'Conservative Swede,' and after the asterisks from a long monologue that the Swede posted in the comments sections of 'Reversal is Possible' and 'Hellish Saviors' on *Gates of Vienna* in July of 2009.

a proper fight. They are too much driven by superstitious fear and emotions. And there is not exactly anyone else around.

So what's the future for people like me? Because even if I belong nowhere politically, I belong somewhere socially and ethnically. Well, the world is being homogenised. Tomorrow the whole world will be like the Third World. People like me, of European ethnicity, will have no home, no nation. We will live like the Jews as elites in other people's nations.

卐 卐 卐

I have written: 'People today live in a historyless, now-bubble-world, and have forgotten about all previous [axiological—*Ed.*] reversals, many of which happened in the last century,' therefore the widespread and deep sense of hopelessness, I forgot to add.

It's hard to conceptualize a situation outside of the bubble, or the bubble not being there, when living inside of the bubble. However, history provides us with numerous examples of such reversals, of bubbles bursting, and of course new bubbles being built (we are bubble mammals after all). This is my happy message, my gospel. People just need to let go their precious beliefs and myths, these huggy teddy bears. When deeply invested in the core beliefs of the bubble, it becomes impossible to look outside of the bubble, to think of a world without the bubble, and everything looks utterly hopeless. Well, it's not. On the contrary, the bubble will burst.

Unlike how it is presented, the relation between left and right is not symmetrical. Instead the left is the norm, and the people to the left are the holy people of secular Christianity. The right is just dancing along, effectively not being much more than an alibi for the whole setup, dancing in circles around the left, who is the one setting up the direction of 'progression.' Occasionally pulling the break, but never setting up a new general course. The direction of the course is built into the paradigm, and never fundamentally questioned by the right.

Another evidence for the asymmetry between left and right is how right-wingers fear and loathe to being associated with any person or organisation even slightly to the right of themselves (they

feel that this would totally undermine their reputation), while willing to make connections magnitudes further into the left. Such as appearing in left-wing media, which often makes these right-wingers hilarious, since they feel they have gotten a stamp of approval thereby; while they can be paralysed by fear of the thought of being published in a right-wing magazine just slightly to the right of themselves...

America is seen as right-wing in the current political theater. However, historically America together with France has been the main force in pushing our civilisation to the left.

After World War II European patriotism was seen as the root of the evil, which had to be held down. The only permitted patriotisms were American and Israeli. Britain and France got away with some, but after the Suez crisis in 1956 they were effectively out of the picture too. Now offensive military actions were only accepted from America and Israel.

In the 1950s and the 60s America and Israel were celebrated as model countries of progressivism. European conservatism had been rooted out in the cultural revolution imposed by America in Western Europe. But the Europeans learned fast. First they learned to follow the American example and see America as the model country. The Europeans could pick this up fast since the ideas were rooted in the Christian gospels. But soon they learned that America didn't live up to code of moral goodness that they had imposed on the Europeans. And left-wing anti-Americanism was born. And to be precise, even anti-Americanism wasn't born in Europe but also imported from the US. The problem for America was that in their quest to end all 'evil' empires, they had effectively become the big empire themselves, for example by inheriting the role of maintaining the *Pax Britannica*. Then they had to do all the sort of things they had taught the Europeans were wrong. The Europeans soon learned to beat the Americans in their own game, becoming the leading in progressivism and 'holier than thou.' And curiously enough, thus America ended up being seen as right-wing. The original right-wing had been rooted out in a collaboration between America and the European socialists in the wake of World War II. The turning point came by the end of the 1960s—the Vietnam war and the Six-Days war. The image of America and Israel shifted, and they were no longer seen as the model countries of progressivism but as 'evil' right-wing countries.

We should remember that our progressivist paradigm (which is always going left) is based on Christian ethics. And Christian ethics means the inversion of values. So it's the weak that is considered good, while the strong is considered evil.² In World War I and World War II America had defeated all the strong (and therefore evil) European empires. The job was completed in the Suez crisis in 1956 by turning against their former allies. But you can never win with Christian ethics, because now America became the strong one, and therefore the evil one. So now American and Israeli patriotism becomes highly questioned and opposed, though not based on restoring any other patriotism but by going even deeper into deranged progressivism. Thus, in effect, American and Israeli patriotism are still the only permitted patriotisms. Surely now the holiest priests of our leftist paradigm condemn the actions of America and Israel. But in effect it is tolerated, while if any other (white) country acts militarily offensively it's seen as a major global crisis (e.g. Serbia, Russia). So this gives a background to why Geert Wilders, Vlaams Belang and others have a pro-American and pro-Israeli profile, and even stress these patriotisms more than their own.

When the threat of Islam [this was said in the context of the mass migration of Muslims to Europe—*Ed.*] is added to the historical situation I gave above, there are westerners who wake up from their deranged progressivism. But they generally revert back to the 1950s (I myself reverted to before World War I). In the face of Islamic aggression their patriotism gets heightened. But this is a patriotism based on a narrative of hate of Germany and Russia.

So when intensifying this American patriotism in order to build-up the necessary hate against Islam, the hate against Russia and Germany heightens simultaneously. There does not seem to be a way to slide this parameter up without this happening. NATO was after all built on the motto of 'Keeping Russia out, Germany down, and America in.' And since this narrative in its previous step is based on the de-legitimisation of European patriotism in general, and how hate and demonisation of Germans is the blueprint for white guilt and self-hatred, we have a more general problem here too.

² *Editor's note:* Conservative Swede was called 'Nietzschean of the North' by the American-Jewish commentator Lawrence Auster.

There's surely no way to stop the chaos coming. But just as surely, from the ashes of the chaos, a fantastic renaissance will grow. We will prevail, severely hurt yes, but with an ironclad inspired spirit. I just hope the chaos will start soon enough, so that I will be able to live when the turnaround happens. My conclusion is that we'll have to revert far back in history to find something sustainable to build on, to cut off the rotten and infected areas. For some things a hundred years, for some a thousand years. It's definitely not enough to revert the social revolution of the '68.

Gates of Vienna's editor Ned May commented: Part of the modern Liberal ideal is the foolish notion that we can simply abolish by fiat millions of years of evolution, thousands of years of culture, and centuries of tradition.

Conservative Swede responded: This is a very important sentence which conveys so very much, if we just examine it closely. Not only the liberals, but also most people (anti-liberals), who see and fear the fall of the liberal world order, have forgotten that these things cannot be erased. But neither the rise nor the fall of liberalism can take away millions of years of evolution, thousands of years of culture, and centuries of tradition. This is what Chechar refers to as my optimism.³ It's just following the conservative principle you gave here. But unfortunately the effect of the current belief system is so strong even on anti-liberals, that they cannot see that.

So it's the liberal layer (on top of evolution, culture, and traditions) that will get peeled off, together with those traditions that led to liberalism in the first place. The fall of this liberal world order will hit us hard (together with the destruction that liberalism has already caused). But we won't suddenly just disappear. And as long as we are around we have millions of years of evolution, thousands of years of culture, and centuries of tradition on our side.

Even if there would be only 100 million left of us, we are the best people in the history of mankind. As Huntington pointed out, we have always been superior in the ability to apply organised violence. As soon as the will power is there, we can achieve anything we please. We can rule any continent where we choose to live, as long as the liberal layer gets peeled off. And it's bound to come off, since it's just a cosmetic layer. The reason that it has not

³ *Editor's note:* "Chechar" was the penname I used for the first time in the *Gates of Vienna* forum in 2009.

come off yet is that it has not yet become obvious to the collective mind that it has failed. But that is about to change...

Norse mythology is a much more useful mythological narrative than Christianity, which does not only mean adherence to universalist individualism and the importation of a foreign god (and in its final stages the importation of a lot of other immigrants), but also has a mythological narrative where the survival of our people hold no significance whatsoever.

The only people that are guaranteed to survive until the end of days in Christianity are the Jews. Swedes, Italians, etcetera, are of no significance whatsoever. We see all these tenets of Christianity manifested around us today: even in how the struggle for ethnic survival of the Jews is accepted within our current paradigm, while it is not accepted for the other people of our civilisation. *Each ethnic group needs her great mythological narrative, starting with the birth of her people and guaranteeing their existence until the end of times.*⁴ Without such a narrative the dissolution of the ethnic group eventually becomes self-fulfilling: nothing is holding it together.

We see this happening around us in the very now with eager work to dissolve our countries and ethnic groups. In Christianity the Germanic people cannot (as a people) have a relation with god, only the Jewish people has. Germanic (and other) people can only have a relation with god as individuals. People are directed by myths more than anything else, so with a narrative where your ethnic group is of no importance, it will eventually become self-fulfilling (i.e., the opposite effect of self-confidence as a group).

A commenter said: In that case, I would be very interested to hear what you propose should be done to save western civilisation.

Conservative Swede responded: And there is your assumption again: that the Western Christian Civilisation should be saved, that it can be reformed, be mended; while I'm assuming that the current order, the current belief system, will self-implode. And as the current order is the last and terminal phase of Western Christian Civilisation, which has reached a dead end, this means the end of Western Christian Civilisation as such. Yes, we are seeing something like the fall of Rome before us.

⁴ Emphasis by *Ed.* See the last pages of *On Beth's Cute Tits* (the last book listed on page 3).

I've been clear about this from the very beginning. For example, three days ago I wrote: 'Likewise many people, who are ideologically invested in the current paradigm instead of in their ethnic group, will see the fall of the Western Christian Civilisation as the end of the world; commit suicide, etc. But instead the fall of the Western Christian Civilisation should be celebrated. This is the paradigm that stands in the way of our saviour. This is the key knot in need to be untied.'

Yes: the Western Christian Civilisation is exactly the problem, and the problem is solved by it going away.

What we should hold on to are our ethnic groups and European Civilisation and culture in the deeper sense. Western Christian Civilisation is a novelty and now it failed. Western Christian Civilisation is just the tip of that iceberg. It's just a way of politically organising our peoples. We should not save this format, but save the matter.

The Western Christian Civilisation is what happened when Germanic people met Christianity. But nothing lasts forever. Quite as the Roman Empire it can be compared with a fruit, going through all the stages: bud, flower, incipient fruit, green fruit, ripe fruit, overripe fruit, rotten fruit. With this I'm saying: (1) indeed Western Christian Civilisation has meant many good things, and (2) it's all over now.

It is unsustainable for Germanic people to keep Christianity. It would indeed mean their death. And since the Western Christian Civilisation is all about Germanic people meeting Christianity, the necessary turnaround for Germanic people also means the definitive end of Western Christian Civilisation. Africans and Italians sticking to Christianity do not make a Western Christian Civilisation.

When I talk of Christianity I use it in the same sense as Huntington or Qutb. That is, it doesn't matter those who claim to be atheists, they are equally much Christians in this perspective. In fact, you will find that they stick to Christian ethics even stronger than the nominal Christians: trying to be holier than thou, as if trying to get in line before the nominal Christians to the heaven they don't believe in.

Medieval Catholicism was nicely mixed and balanced with Roman and Greek components. The explosive and revolutionary message of the gospels was kept secret from the general public. The

Protestant Reformation changed that. Christianity became purified into its Hebrew component, and the explosive and revolutionary message of the gospels were set free. This purification was taken even further, and completed, by the Puritans and the Quakers that left across the Atlantic, to found America. And these are the people who rule our civilisation today.

There are several reasons why Christianity leads to secularism in its latter phases. Let me get back to that if there is interest, since this is becoming very long as it is.

Secular Christianity has thrown out god and Christ, but keeps the Christian ethics (inversion of values, etc.). And Christian ethics actually gets heightened and unfettered in Secular Christianity (I have written much about that in my blog). With Christ as part of the equation, the Christian ethics of the Gospels became balanced. Humans were seen as imperfect and it was Christ who covered for us with his self-sacrifice. In Secular Christianity each person has to be like Jesus himself, doing self-sacrifice, since there's no other way to fulfil Christian ethics. On top of that, with the Industrial Revolution and the surplus it created in our societies, we came to the point where all the good deeds of Christian ethics could finally be executed by giving off our surplus to all the poor and weak foreign people around the world: food, Western medicine, and other aid.

Thus the Western Christian Civilisation caused the population explosion in the Third World. It is entirely caused by the Western Christian Civilisation, since these Third World countries were completely unable to do this themselves. Christian ethics commands that every single human life should be saved if possible. Before, more than half of the children in Third World countries died. Now virtually all survive, and we have the population explosion.

What this will lead to is the following:

With the dollar collapse and the complete breakdown of our economical (and then political) world order, mass starvation will spread like a wildfire across the southern hemisphere. This since their population numbers are not supported by themselves, but entirely backed by us. It will all fall apart.

So the concrete effect of Christian ethics here is to make the number of people that will die in starvation and suffering as high as possible once it hits (we are speaking of billions thanks to Christian

ethics). Only the devil himself could think out such a brutally cruel scheme, and of course Christian ethics [is the culprit—*Ed.*], in which case it's according to the idiom "The road to hell is paved with good intentions."

But that's not enough. This mass starvation, where we can expect something like two-thirds of the people dying in the Third World countries, will slash these societies into pieces, and they will meet a complete breakdown. In the alternative scenario, where the Christian ethics would have kept its fingers away, these countries would have supported themselves: every year many children would have died at a pretty constant pace. But this is a stable phenomenon that does not at all threaten the stability of their societies. When the Western economic order falls apart, they would not be the least affected.

But Christian ethics cannot stand the sight of little brown children dying. They *must* help them, or they will freak out. They cannot keep their fingers away. So they are dooming them to mass starvation in the billions and complete breakdowns of their societies. This is the concrete effect of Christian ethics. At this point it wouldn't help putting back god and Christ into the equation. Instead we need to leave Christian ethics.

I have already stated how Western Christian Civilisation = Germanic people + Christianity. I will now clarify why specifically Germanic people need to leave Christianity.

Look at the phenomenon of clan mentality around the world. In many places around the world it is strong, in Europe it is not. But even within Europe there are clear differences. Indeed we find clan mentality in Southern Europe, while there's none of it in Northern Europe (among Germanic people).

There are historical reasons for this. In the cold north people lived far apart. Human contacts were few, and strangers were therefore treated with friendliness. This was the best survival strategy in this context. However, the Mediterranean area was crowded, and there was always competition about land and resources. The best survival strategy in such a context was to stick to your clan, in this tight competition.

The whole point of Christian ethics, when it works well, is to have a balancing effect on the morality of people. In the Mediterranean area it had a balancing effect on the natural clan

mentality, leaving a good result. However, Germanic people, as described above, have a natural altruism. When combined with the unfettered Christian ethics of the latter stages of the Western Christian Civilisation, it creates an interference that goes completely out of bounds. The morality of Germanic people has reached a point where it has to be balanced back, or we will perish. To create this balance Germanic people have to leave Christian ethics. (Romance and Slavic people can keep Christianity; it's not a matter of life or death for them.)

What we are witnessing in the present time is the great tragedy of Germanic people.

With the lack of clan mentality, we find that Germanic people are the ones that most faithfully turn their loyalty towards the nation. But due to the inherent universalism of Christianity, we see in the current incarnation of Western Christian Civilisation how nations are considered illegitimate and gradually being dissolved. The nationalist loyalty of the Germanic people becomes redirected to universalist loyalty, still lacking clan mentality.

Germanic people do not use the power of their family to solve problems. They go to a higher level, the authorities. To use the power of your family to solve a problem is here considered a sin; we are supposed to abide by the law. In Italy or Spain people do use the power of their family to solve problems. There is an abundance of stories in blogs from Northern Europe of kids who go through their whole school time being beaten up by Muslims every week. The furthest the parents of these children would do is to bring up the problem with the authorities (and possibly having a 'dialog' with the Muslim parents). Which of course will do nothing about it, since the belief system of the authorities doesn't allow for it. And even so the parents never use the power of their family to deal with the problem. They are programmed to abide by the law and the order.

I cannot see this happening in Italy or Spain. There is a whole different mentality. There would be an outrage, and the whole family would be engaged in the matter—mostly not going into mafia methods, but in some places yes.

Germanic people are simply wired the wrong way to be able to survive in a multi-ethnic context. Or to be exact: Germanic people adhering to Christian ethics are. We managed fine in the age of the great migrations and as Vikings. Now we are entering a world

of multi-ethnic societies at a planetary level. And the Germanic people adhering to Christian ethics are constitutionally unfit for this. Unless we leave Christian ethics, we will perish. Or rather, those who cling to Christian ethics will perish, according to the law of the survival of the fittest.

Leaving Christian ethics has nothing to do with becoming secular (as I explained above). To the contrary, it makes it worse! *What is needed is to introduce another great mythological narrative into the minds of the Germanic people.*⁵ This is the only way to replace the moral grammar of Christianity. Something with roots in our long history. This must be done by political means, by a regime with such a focus. But given that focus, it's not such a big thing to achieve. There are numerous historical examples of how to do it. And it only takes a generation to make the change (even less). And in a dire situation, after a major trauma, it will be even easier.

And thus we are speaking of the deepest level of a paradigm change here. Our very concept of good and bad, our moral grammar, has to be transformed. Even the apparent moral tautology 'We should strive for what is good, and fight against what is bad' no longer holds.

Our very concepts of good and bad are what has to be transformed. It's hard to think outside of this box. But that's the whole point of the word paradigm. It's a box that it is virtually impossible for people in general to think outside of. I recommend reading Thomas Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* for a deeper understanding of the concept paradigm. It's truly a mental box we are trapped within. In the same way we are about to witness the transformation of our whole grammar of morality, quite as our grammar of morality was different before the Age of Christianity. When the paradigm shifted from Newton to Einstein, it didn't mean the end of science. I just meant the end of a scientific era, which became replaced with a new one. In the same manner the fall of the Western Christian Civilisation does not mean the end of European Civilisation in the larger sense. It just means a new era. Quite as when the Roman-Greek civilisation was replaced by the Western Christian.

⁵ Emphasis by *Ed*. Unlike Conservative Swede's anti-Nazism, I believe this narrative was best represented in National Socialism.

A commenter said: The Protestants, being literalists, conceived of themselves as the direct successors to the ancient Israelites who had been given divine authority to kill the Canaanites and establish Israel. The Protestants looked on themselves as the New Israelites and the Native Americans as the New Canaanites to be wiped out.

Conservative Swede responded: It's sad indeed that Christians have to imagine themselves as Israelites to become truly good fighters, which implies effective total war, and the psychology of will power to win at any cost. Once again it is the same pattern of Christianity that I discussed above, when discussing permitted patriotisms. Our ethnicity is utterly insignificant in the Christian narrative, while the Jewish ethnicity holds a pivotal position. So Christians have to use this substitute ethnicity to find true confidence and strength.

Good total war has been waged by Christians when imagining themselves as Israelites aiming for building the New Jerusalem. They can also fight a limited war in the name of the universal good, or for the sake of Israel (for example the crusades). But war by Christians in the name of their own ethnicity is considered illegitimate; well, not even of importance. In Christianity we cannot be ourselves. We have to pretend we are someone else.

I still think the Russians can efficiently use their Christianity only because their Christianity hasn't been washed through the Enlightenment, quite as the American pilgrims and the Boers, discussed above, hadn't. Nor Spain of La Reconquista, of course. But we can stay assured that the Christians having been washed through the Enlightenment—and then the Industrial Age, liberalism and secularism—won't be able to see themselves as Israelites. So this strength is not coming back within the context of Christianity. Why not be ourselves instead—replace the current mythological narrative with one where we are ourselves? After all, that is the simple truth: We are ourselves. Christianity is based on deception and distortion of reality. Another way to go, for those unable to imagine themselves as the Israelites, is at least to make Christianity universal instead of Jewish. Such as we saw recently here at *Gates of Vienna* in how many people in Poland for example do not see Jesus as Jewish. There's no way to win within the frames of Christianity.

A commenter said: I agree that Christianity is at the end of its tether and is unable to assert itself without breaking its own value

system. Probably something similar must have happened in India during Muslim invasions, where Buddhist ideas of compassion and Karma (you get what you deserve, because you produced the cause) left them completely defenceless. They indeed had no narrative that would support their collective existence.


Conservative Swede responded: This is an excellent historical comparison. A universalist religion of goodness is replaced with the original national gods, when faced with a threat of existential magnitude.

A commenter said: Altogether, yours is the most complete argument for the death of Christianity I can imagine, certainly more complete than what Nietzsche has ever written.

Conservative Swede responded: Thanks, that's a very nice thing to say. Of course, I had an unfair advantage, since I could read Nietzsche but he couldn't read me.

A commenter said: I am always impressed by the fact that the further North you go in Europe, where people are more Germanic, the more harmonious mastery of mind over nature you can see.

Conservative Swede responded: Yes, we have focused on fighting nature instead of each other. All due to our historical situation. If we didn't fight nature we died. If we hadn't isolated our house and stored up well for the winter we died. Out of this a special kind of cooperation between people grew: a traditionalist form of egalitarianism which apart from Sweden and Norway we only find in America (this is an interesting topic in itself, but no time for that now). However, if you put unfettered Christian ethics on top of that...



A necessary condition for a Germanic project—and the renaissance of Europe altogether—is the return of Germany. Germany today is the planetary bully victim, bound and caged in many layers of chains and bars. Not permitted to show even a single shred of national self-confidence. We won't see that until American troops have left Germany and the whole NATO regime has been reversed. But it will come. Rest assured.

Above is the first step and, let's say, how far I think we'll come in this century. We will be in a situation with China as the great power. There will also be competition with Russia. Probably

China will be first in occupying the oil fields around the Persian Gulf, but we will be competing with them about it.

America together with France and Britain will be utterly discredited, seen as the guilty ones for the greatest treason in the history of mankind against their own people (as Fjordman put it); while Germany was completely innocent in this, and will hold the morally superior position.

France might no longer exist, having first been overrun by Muslims, and then reconquered by Germanic people.

The United States will no longer exist. But the Confederation of the Northern US States will be a natural ally to the Germanics.

Maybe there will be something as a Germanic empire at this point. Or maybe even two, one German-speaking and one English speaking. But I'm not as sure about the English speaking one (I'm not saying people won't speak English, only that there might not be a separate empire with English as the official language).

Will American troops reside in Germany forever? No. When it comes to the imminent fall of the current order, there are too many factors in motion at the same time that each alone has the potential of making it fall: dollar collapse, ethnic civil war, Iranian nukes, weak and paralysed leadership.

I find Germanic people boring and square, but sort of brilliant (history clearly shows that). After about a decade out in the cold, I have once again taken Germanic people to my heart because I can see their great tragedy. I think I can see their dilemma and how to solve it while at the same time it makes perfect sense for Poles, Spaniards and Celts to take an interest in this for the political stability it would give to all of Europe, once the current order falls. Without it there would be a huge power vacuum.

Who would expand into that? Russia, China, Islam? Or first Islam, then Russia, and finally China? That's the good thing with the day the American troops leave Germany, because at that time the Germanic European will be forced to immediately build a strong military power. And you could imagine how many of the good things that we have discussed here would be catalysed by that.

When I say that I want Christian ethics to go away, it's not because I want to see a 180 degree turn away from it. What I want to do is to balance things back. So what I have suggested is:

1) A new great mythological narrative where our ethnic group is given the pivotal position; 2) A constitution where citizenship is reserved for people of our ethnic group. 3) Alien ethnic groups, typically from the Third World, that do not identify with our ethnic group, will have to be removed one way or the other...

I think it is clear that the people won't turn away from the current belief system with less than a major catastrophe. But this time the catastrophe is not something as benign as a 'Western civil war,' but something of a higher magnitude, and of real external threats (which we are not the least prepared for). If we had only been facing something as harmless as World War I or World War II, I wouldn't have been speaking of the end of the Western Christian Civilisation. If there only had been two strong sides of the West fighting each other to death, we wouldn't have been facing this discontinuity of our civilisation.

But now it is our very belief system that makes us unable to fight and defend our civilisation. And the threat is external, and when we lose, it means this discontinuity. Losing here means losing our dominant position, not that everything is lost.

Our current empire will fall, that is, America, and not to another Western empire as before—since this time there is no one standing in line—but to external forces.

If we do not meet a major catastrophe within the next twenty years, we will be silently walking into our demographic eclipse, something that could indeed mean the end European Civilisation and the values that you have talked about. The demographic forces in motion are so great, yes exponential. Not so much our declining birth rates, but the population explosion in the Third World that we are causing and the mass immigration and demographic Jihad in our own lands. If this process continues we will end up in Diaspora as the Jews. And with white people as a mere 2-3 percent of the world's population and without our own homeland, that's indeed the end of European Civilisation altogether, and we can say goodbye to the manifestation of all these values that you and I cherish.

It's the Western Christian Civilisation that feeds all these processes (population explosion etc.). So the Western Christian Civilisation is in fact the worst enemy of what I call European Civilisation: another reason for wanting the Western Christian

Civilisation to go away. If it would continue a few decades more it will mean the definitive goodnight for all of us.

So to summarise: When I speak of civilisation as in the Western Christian Civilisation, I speak of a concrete manifestation: an empire. And when I speak of civilisation as in European Civilisation, I speak of the existence and self-government of white people, and the values and lifestyle that is integral in our beings. But now we have come to a point where the former is the greatest threat to the latter. In Aristotelian terms European Civilisation is the matter to the Western Christian Civilisation, which is the form. That is, white people is the matter for the current Western Christian 'Empire'. But now the form is suffocating the matter.

Chechar said: 'It is the Western Christian Civilisation that feeds all these processes.' Why do you say this? Wasn't everything relatively fine until the 1950s, before radical feminists almost took away our highest divine right: women? If many women were still with us at home having lots of pretty children, as the Pope likes, the current problem wouldn't exist, would it? Isn't the sexual revolution to blame for the demographic winter? And isn't the Islamisation of the West merely a by-product of our ethnic dwarfing? If so, why blame Western *Christian* civilisation? Rome fell precisely because infanticide (the abortion of classical times) and contraception were practised on a massive scale from the time of Julius Caesar. However, since Constantine and Theodosius the Church made enormous efforts to curb infanticide.

I agree that a great catastrophe is needed. That is why, as I have repeated elsewhere, every morning I wake up with longing dreams of mushroom clouds over Western cities to wake me up—and the West. But couldn't we reject the revolution of the 1960s without the United States necessarily falling?

Yes: I know you want to go deeper into the root cause. But I still think that solid arguments based on the demographic winter show us that the West took a very wrong turn in the mid-1960s. I mean, the West was still healthy in the year I was born! (maybe because you were born after that you have not seen the healthy West with your own eyes). We tried to cheat the god Eros through contraception and women's liberation. Now we suffer for having messed with the laws of Nature. Our present problems with a resurrected Islam are the vengeance of Venus. Funny that I am not

a Christian— like Tannhäuser I seek the grotto of Venus— and yet I admire conservative Protestants and Catholics on this issue, uhm?

Conservative Swede responded: You need to read more carefully, because you missed my point. I repeat what I said:

The demographic forces in motion are so great, yes exponential. Not so much our declining birth rates, *but the population explosion in the Third World that we are causing* and the mass immigration and demographic Jihad in our lands. It's the Western Christian Civilisation that feeds all these processes.

Our declining birth rates have a slow effect in comparison with the exponential growth that the population explosion and demographic Jihad means. And it's exactly because of Christian ethics that people, like for example you, entirely look at our birth rates (narrowly blaming feminism, etc.), instead of focusing on the much bigger and alarming problem caused by us: the population explosion in the Third World.

For the very same reason that Christian ethics abhors infanticide, it causes the population explosion in the world. It's a deeply held doctrine within Christian ethics that every single human life across the planet must be saved if possible. According to Christian ethics it is forbidden and unthinkable to think in terms of not saving every little brown child across the planet. But the consequences of this mindset are catastrophic, not only for us but also for them, as I have already explained. But since people are so programmed according to Christian ethics, what I'm saying does not seem to enter their heads. The thought is too unthinkable to be absorbed. It's an utter taboo.

You asked, 'Wasn't everything relatively okay up to the 1950s?' Sure it was. But the better our lives got, the more we destroyed, and the faster we destroyed it. It was exactly in the '50s that this problem started. In the '50s people of European descent was 30 percent of this planet, today we are just a little more than 10 percent. Not by us decreasing (in fact we are more than in the '50s) but by the rest of the planet exploding in numbers, from 3 to 7 billion people—all caused by us.

The population of Africa is four and a half times higher than in 1950. And the population in Asia almost three times higher.

As I have already explained: With a highly developed industrial society, the Western people got a huge surplus of resources, and much more time at their hands. Since Christian

ethics mandates what it does, they have since gone around the world to save every single little life that they could: using Western medicine, modern fertilizers, GMO crops, and all other means possible, to keep as many alive as possible. Thus the population explosion.

This is derived from the deepest moral grammar of Christianity. But it took all these centuries until we had an industrialised society that made it possible to enact. And because of that, Christian ethics mandated that we caused this Third World population explosion. Something that could never have achieved themselves, which makes our deed so deeply irresponsible in so many ways, just because it's artificial. Which means (1) they are not adapting their life-style accordingly but continue and continue to explode in numbers, and (2) they are completely depending on us, which means their societies will break apart once our economic world order collapses. That means that we will have to remove the industrial society, if we want to keep Christian ethics. Think over which one you appreciate the most.

You asked, 'But couldn't we reject the '60s revolution without America necessarily falling?... the West took a wrong turn in the middle 1960s.' No, this is not a matter of reverting the '60s revolution. It goes far deeper than that. You know, the '60s revolution wasn't brought to us by extraterrestrials. There is an internal logic to our civilisation, and its ideals, that led to that. It wasn't an accident. Start looking at the French Revolution.

In general your answer is about rejecting the '60s and going back to older Christian values, rejecting for example abortion and contraception. But this is just a stronger version of the Christian dogma to save every single human life possible. If anything it would just make the Third World population explosion worse! The population explosion is not caused by liberalism: it is caused by Christianity in its most general form. And if you bring in more deeply Christian people, it will only make it worse.

卐 卐 卐

First the dollar bubble will burst, and soon after, the population explosion bubble. At this point people will see that Christian ethics caused this whole thing, and it will be utterly

discredited. This narrow-minded dogma of saving every possible life will cause more death and suffering than if Christian ethics hadn't meddled with the situation in the first place.

It's like a plan the devil had thought out. To give birth to billions of people that could then be killed in one single blow in mass starvation.

What this Christian dogma hasn't taken into consideration is that each society needs to be self-dependent. Because sooner or later there comes hard times. And if we have made them utterly dependent on us what they will face then is death since they cannot support themselves.

So what this Christian dogma will have caused is the death of societies. So much simultaneous death will kill also the societies. This would never have happened if this Christian dogma hadn't entered the picture in the first place. A constant degree of child deaths, while being self-dependent in the traditional way, would have been the best thing for these societies. It wouldn't have hurt them or us.


I think that once it has happened, people will see this point clearly, and change their ways.

'Feed the world' trumps saving the resources of our planet (i.e. actually saving the planet), according to the moral grammar of our current belief system. Quite as multiculturalism and Islamophilia beats for example feminism (as they say: 'Race trumps gender'). Our moral grammar is full of such hierarchies, from which the priorities are derived, once the objectives end up in conflict with each other. To save every single possible human life is one of our deepest dogmas, but try to discuss overpopulation with these anti-CO2 freaks (i.e., 90 percent of the westerners). Even when believing in their theory about 'global warming by human CO2' it would be clear that this problem would be strongly connected to overpopulation. But to address that as a problem is an utter taboo for these people.

And just a general note: People here at *Gates of Vienna* focus on the immigration problem. But mass immigration is just the local projection of this much larger and more fundamental problem of which I'm talking of here; that is, the planetary population explosion and our attitudes towards it (which also caused it). It won't help to address the immigration problem without addressing this global problem. That is, it won't help to be a lonely Polish if

surrounded by Arabs, Pakistanis and Africans all along the border. What is happening across the world is the large scale version of what is happening within our countries. Our relative numbers are diminishing by theirs increasing exponentially, in both cases.

Things will not be able to turn around until the current belief system breaks apart, and makes a 180-degree turn. The main thing we can do today is to thoroughly prepare for that moment. These preparations also help to protect ourselves from violence and hardships in any sort of context. So no matter what future scenario one envisions, I'd say that the breakdown of the current belief system is not that far away.



Copied, pasted and edited for the first incarnation of *The West's Darkest Hour* on July 29, 2009 under the title 'Conservative Swede's Weltanschauung.'

The blood flowed ankle-deep

Editor quotes Pierce



Along with the justice meted out to white women who had sex with blacks in ‘The Day of the Rope’ in the closing pages of William Pierce’s *The Turner Diaries*, originally published more than three decades ago, I enjoyed the fate of feminised Western men in the final stages of the race wars in North America and Europe:

For the first time I understand the deepest meaning of what we are doing. I understand now why we cannot fail, no matter what we must do to win and no matter how many of us must perish in doing it. Everything that has been and everything that is yet to be depend on us. We are truly the instruments of God in the fulfilment of his grand design. These may seem like strange words to be coming from me, who has never been religious.

While I am not a religious person either, the chosen images that once decorated the sidebar of my blog, Maxfield Parrish’s *Florentine Fete* murals on display at the National Museum of the American Enlightenment (above), reflect better than a thousand

words what we have in mind: the potential divinity of the fair race. To avoid anachronisms, I have lightly edited the final pages of Pierce's 1978 novel below. No ellipses have been added between paragraphs that I haven't quoted:

Food became critically scarce everywhere during the winter. The Blacks lapsed into cannibalism, just as they had in California, while hundreds of thousands of starving Whites, who earlier had ignored the Organisation's call for a rising against the System, began appearing at the borders of the various liberated zones begging for food. The Organisation was only able to feed the White populations already under its control by imposing the severest rationing, and it was necessary to turn many of the latecomers away.

Those who were admitted—and that meant only children, women of childbearing age, and able-bodied men willing to fight in the Organisation's ranks—were subjected to much more severe racial screening than had been used to separate Whites from non-Whites in California. It was no longer sufficient to be merely White; in order to eat one had to be judged the bearer of especially valuable genes. In Detroit the practice was first established (and it was later adopted elsewhere) of providing any able-bodied White male who sought admittance to the Organisation's enclave with a hot meal and a bayonet or other edged weapon. His forehead was then marked with an indelible dye, and he was turned out and could be readmitted permanently only by bringing back the head of a freshly killed Black or other non-White. This practice assured that precious food would not be wasted on those who would not or could not add to the Organisation's fighting strength, but it took a terrible toll of the weaker and more decadent White elements. Tens of millions perished during the first half of that year, and the total White population of the country reached a low point of approximately fifty million.

Outside these zones of order and security, the anarchy and savagery grew steadily worse, with the only real authority wielded by marauding bands which preyed on each other and on the unorganised and defenceless masses. Many of these bands were composed of Blacks, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, and half-White mongrels. In growing numbers, however, Whites also formed bands along racial lines, even without Organisation guidance. As the war of extermination wore on,

millions of soft, city-bred, brainwashed Whites gradually began regaining their manhood. The rest died.

The only time, after that November, that the Organisation was forced to detonate a nuclear weapon on the North American continent was a year later, in Toronto. Hundreds of thousands of Jews had fled the United States to that Canadian city, making almost a second New York of it and using it as their command centre for the war raging to the south. So far as both the Jews and the Organisation were concerned, the US-Canadian border had no real significance during the later stages of the Great Revolution, and conditions were only slightly less chaotic north of the border than south of it. Throughout the Dark Years neither the Organisation nor the System could hope for a completely decisive advantage over the other, so long as they both retained the capability for nuclear warfare. Then, of course, came the mopping-up period, when the last of the non-White bands were hunted down and exterminated.

With the principal centres of world Jewish power annihilated, and the nuclear threat neutralised, the most important obstacles to the Organisation's worldwide victory were out of the way.

There is a major flaw in Pierce's worldview. The Jews didn't take over the American financial system and media by force of arms. It was white Christian idiots who admitted them in the late 19th century, under the influence of liberal ideas since the founding of the United States. This critical paragraph about Pierce doesn't appear in the entry I published on my site nine years ago. I have matured in recent years. That said, Pierce is right about the need for ethnic cleansing:

From as early as that year the Organisation had had active cells in Western Europe. The disastrous economic collapse in Europe in the spring, following the demise of the System in North America, greatly helped in preparing the European masses morally for the Organisation's final takeover. That takeover came in a great, Europe-wide rush in the summer and fall, as a cleansing hurricane of change swept over the continent, clearing away in a few months the refuse of a millennium or more of alien ideology and a century or more of profound moral and material decadence. The blood flowed

ankle-deep in the streets of many of Europe's great cities momentarily, as the race traitors, the offspring of generations of dysgenic breeding, and hordes of *Gastarbeiter* met a common fate. Then the great dawn of the New Era broke over the Western world.

As everyone is aware, the bands of mutants which roam the Waste remain a real threat, and it may be another century before the last of them has been eliminated and White colonisation has once again established a human presence throughout this vast area. But it was in that year, according to the chronology of the Old Era—just 110 years after the birth of the Great One—that the dream of a White world finally became a certainty.

Pierce was referring to Hitler.



11 December 2011, edited in 2022 as the rest of the articles will be edited for this edition.

Email to Mark

by Editor

In his most recent article, 'The New Right versus the Old Right,' Greg Johnson, editor of *Counter-Currents*, wrote:

The North American New Right is founded on the rejection of Fascist and National Socialist party politics, totalitarianism, terrorism, imperialism, and genocide... For instance, latter-day National Socialist William Pierce routinely pooh-pooed the Holocaust. But he was willing to countenance real terrorism, imperialism, and genocide on a scale that would dwarf anything in the 20th century. That spirit is what we reject.

Although I am closer to David Irving and Mark Weber on the so-called holocaust than Pierce and most people in the movement, I am tempted to write a brief rebuttal to Johnson's article because

1. Fascist and National Socialist party politics will be very useful after the fall of fiat currencies.

2. Totalitarianism could be useful to completely eradicate the Enemy, and the Enemy's entire worldview after the ethnostate is founded.

3. Terrorism is a must: without our little revenge (the Day of the Rope) no hard lesson will be learned by the uprooted whites.

4. Imperialism will be indispensable. After the astronomical blunder of exporting Western technology to non-Western nations, some of which are already nuclear, the only way to ensure that Aryans survive with such aggressive competitors is to conquer whole continents for white children, starting for example with Africa and Latin America.

5. Comparatively humane genocide—for example, by separating non-white males from non-white females, thus preventing their reproduction—will be inevitable if these continents

are to be conquered entirely (as was inevitable when the Anglo-Americans conquered your precious lands).

Tempted to write a rebuttal I said, but these days when I want to read Gibbon I don't have time for a formal rebuttal to Johnson's conservative article. However, I am so fed up with the incredible cheers his article received in the comments section that something has to be said anyway. Would you like to write an in-depth article or should I publish in *The West's Darkest Hour* this email?

We need someone of Pierce's stature to write a proper rebuttal. Where the hell are Pierce's intellectual followers, Mark? Gee, I'm only a couple of years into the movement and it seems to me that the new breed of white nationalists are sort of typical feminised bourgeois males, unfit for the hard work ahead (see what Breivik has recently said about the currency crisis of the future).

Is this a fair assessment of 21st-century white nationalism?

12 May 2012

Terre et Peuple, Blut und Boden

by a commenter

The notion that every people needs their own land is absolutely essential. The white race must acquire a Homeland of its own, some place on earth where white children can be born and raised in physical and spiritual safety, and where the numbers of European-descended peoples may be restored and the threat of racial extinction overcome.

Land and people, blood and soil.

5 June 2012

Who We Are excerpts

by William Pierce

Mixing and retrogression

From the far north they came, the *xanthoi*, the golden-haired ones: tall, blue-eyed and grey-eyed giants, on horseback and on foot, carrying their battleaxes and their spears, bringing their women and their wagons and their cattle. Warrior-farmers, craftsmen and traders, they worshipped the shining Sky Father and spoke an Indo-European language. They were the Greeks.

The Greeks—or Hellenes, as they later called themselves—crashed down upon the Mediterranean world in a long sequence of waves. The first wave, a relatively weak one—and more properly described merely as Indo-European rather than as specifically Greek—hit about 5,100 years ago, and it apparently took a roundabout course, passing first from the north into western Asia Minor, and thence, by way of the Cyclades and other islands of the southern Aegean, westward into Crete and Greece...

The Minoan civilisation was in its essence, however, much more a Mediterranean than a Nordic civilisation. The Greeks did not bring civilisation to Crete; they brought only the tendency toward civilisation and the capacity for building it inherent in the higher human type which they represented.

But inevitably racial mixing occurred, sometimes soon and sometimes later. The Nordics would disappear into the mass, and the civilisation they had created would lose its vital spark, stagnating and eventually retrogressing, although it might coast for centuries on its momentum after the disappearance of the Nordic element before retrogression set in. Race-mixing and retrogression were avoided only when the Nordics exterminated the non-Nordic natives of an area instead of merely conquering them. But then there was left no large serf-class for the maintenance of a culturally innovative aristocracy...

Because the Mediterraneans were only conquered and not exterminated; because they formed the bulk of the economic base on which Greek society rested; because the lifestyle of Hellenes themselves changed, becoming more dependent on agriculture than before; and because race mixture inevitably followed conquest, it is not surprising that the religion of the conquerors underwent a change and assimilated many elements from the religion of the conquered natives.

Extermination or expulsion

And what a contrast between the Hellenes and their achievements, on the one hand, and what existed before—and has existed since—in Greece! That is not to say that every Greek of today is unimaginative or insensitive or ugly, but it is clear that something essential has been lost between the time of Aristotle and the time of his late namesake, Mr. Onassis. And the loss was at least as great between the time of Achilles and Aristotle, although the culture-lag phenomenon tends to mask this earlier decline in racial quality.

The Hellenic genes are still there, the genes of the race which gloried in single combat between equals facing one another on the field of battle and pitting skill, courage, and strength in a contest to the death, but they are now submerged in the genes of a race which always preferred to sling its stones from afar, to lie in stealthy ambush, to give a surprise knife-thrust from the rear. The race-soul which first envisioned the symmetry of the Doric temple and pondered the mysteries of existence as none before it has become inextricably mingled with one concerned, first and last, with personal advantage and disadvantage, profit and loss.

This catastrophic mixing of bloods has occurred over and over again in the history and prehistory of our race, and each time it has been lethal. The knowledge of this has been with us a long time, but it has always failed us in the end. The Hellenes of Sparta and Athens both strove to keep their blood pure, but both ultimately perished. The only way they could have survived would have been to eliminate the entire indigenous population, either through expulsion or extermination, from the areas of the Mediterranean world in which they settled.

The Hellenes always possessed a certain feeling of racial unity, distinguishing themselves sharply from all those not of their blood, but this racial feeling was, unfortunately, usually overshadowed by intrarracial conflicts. The rivalries between Hellenic city-states were so fierce and so pervasive, that the Mediterranean natives were more often looked upon as a resource to be used against other Hellenes than as a biological menace to be eliminated.

Lost opportunity

The attractions of the vast and rich Orient for one Nordic conqueror after another are obvious. What is unfortunate is that none made racial considerations the basis of his program of conquest—and it could have been done.

Alexander, for example, could have laid the foundations for a Nordic empire which could have stood against the rest of the world—including Rome—forever. The Macedonians and the Greeks shared common blood and had similar languages (ancient Macedonian was an altogether different language from modern Macedonian, which has its roots in the sixth century c.e. conquest of Macedonia by Slavic tribes). If, before invading Asia and defeating the Asian armies, Alexander had devoted his energies to forging just these two peoples into a unified population base, casting out all the alien elements which had accumulated in Greece by the latter part of the fourth century b.c.e.; and if, while conquering Asia, he had carried out a policy of total extermination—then he could have colonised Asia with Nordic settlements from the Indus to the Nile, and they could have multiplied freely and expanded into the empty lands without danger of racial mixing.

But Alexander did not cleanse Greece of its Semitic merchants and moneylenders and its accumulated rabble of half-breeds, and he chose to base his Asiatic empire on the indigenous populations instead of on colonists. And so the Greco-Macedonian world, despite its uninterrupted prosperity and its maintenance of the appearance of might after Alexander's death, continued its imperceptible downward slide toward oblivion.

Economics over race

The ultimate downfall of the Nordic conquerors in Asia, just as in the Mediterranean world, can be traced to an economic consideration and to an error in human judgment. The economic consideration was that a conquered population, just like the land itself or the gold and other booty seized by the conquerors, had real value. Whether the people were enslaved or merely taxed as subjects, they were an economic resource which could be exploited by the conquerors. To drive them off the land or wipe them out completely would, from a strictly economic viewpoint, be akin to dumping captured gold into the ocean.

Such an action could be justified to a conquering tribe of Indo-Europeans only if they were willing to subordinate all economic considerations to the goal of maintaining their racial integrity into the indefinite future—and if they also had a sufficiently deep understanding of history to foresee the inevitability of racial mixing wherever two races are in close proximity. Unfortunately, even where the will for racial survival was very strong, the foresight was insufficient. Measures which were quite adequate to prevent race-mixing for a few generations, or even for a few centuries, broke down over the course of a thousand years or more.

19 July 2012

Linder on the *Diaries*

by Editor

I don't think anyone could like [*The*] *Turner Diaries*. It is a disturbing book, frightening even—even if you agree with him, as I obviously do. But it is undeniably heavy. In a way that Covington's novels, so beloved of [Greg] Johnson, are not. They are almost fruity in how bubbly the characters are, given the situation, although they are certainly enjoyable escapism.

Pierce's work has a gravitas befitting a genocidal struggle, and no other WN [white nationalist] novel has come even close to it except Raspail's *Camp of the Saints*. Raspail is a better artist than Pierce, by a long stretch, but both books are about equally heavy, in that they impress and linger.

I published Alex Linder's words on my site on 8 August 2012. Linder is considered the harshest racist among those who try to educate other whites through the written and spoken word. I didn't criticise Linder at the time, but it is clear that we live in parallel worlds. Not only did I love Pierce's novel when I listened to it as an audiobook a decade ago, but I saw myself so completely portrayed in it that, even though Pierce had died in 2002, I felt I had finally found a kindred spirit, at least as far as exterminationism is concerned.

Linder wants to exterminate the Jews, but as a typical white nationalist, he fails to see that it is not only them who must be exterminated. Either Linder has not read *Who We Are*, or a residue of Christian moral standards in the anti-Christian Linder prevents him from seeing that only extermination can prevent the Nordics from miscegenating again, as we shall see in more of the following quotation from *The Turner Diaries*.

15 August 2012

Turner Diaries excerpts
by William Pierce



Since then he has been issuing idiotic proclamations about ‘restoring the Constitution,’ and holding new elections to ‘re-establish the republican form of government intended by the Founding Fathers,’ whatever that means. And he has denounced our radical measures in the south as ‘communism.’ He is appalled that we didn’t hold some sort of public referendum before expelling the non-Whites and that we didn’t give individual trials to the Jews and race-criminals we dealt with summarily.

Doesn’t the old fool understand that the American people voted themselves into the mess they’re in now? Doesn’t he

understand that the Jews have taken over the country fair and square, according to the Constitution? Doesn't he understand that the common people have already had their fling at self-government, and they blew it? Where does he think new elections can possibly lead now, with this generation of TV-conditioned voters, except right back into the same Jewish pigsty? And how does he think we could have solved our problems down here, except by the radical measures we used?

卐 卐 卐

'Finally, we warn you that, in any event, we intend to liberate, first, the entire United States and then the remainder of this planet. When we have done so we will liquidate all the enemies of our people, including in particular all White persons who have consciously aided those enemies.'

Then we formed the people into labour brigades to carry out a number of necessary functions, one of which was the sanitary disposal of the hundreds of corpses of refugees. The majority of these poor creatures were White, and I overheard one of our members refer to what happened to them as 'a slaughter of the innocents.' I am not sure that is a correct description of the recent holocaust. I am sorry, of course, for the millions of White people, both here and in Russia, who died—and who have yet to die before we have finished—in this war to rid ourselves of the Jewish yoke. But innocents? I think not. Certainly, that term should not be applied to the majority of the adults.

After all, is not man essentially responsible for his condition—at least, in a collective sense? If the White nations of the world had not allowed themselves to become subject to the Jew, to Jewish ideas, to the Jewish spirit, this war would not be necessary. We can hardly consider ourselves blameless. We can hardly say we had no choice, no chance to avoid the Jew's snare. We can hardly say we were not warned.

Eventually the System began regrouping its forces elsewhere, to meet new challenges in other parts of the country. And then, just as the Jews had feared, the flow of Organisation activists turned exactly 180 degrees from what it had been in the weeks and months. From scores of training camps in the liberated zone, first hundreds, then thousands of highly motivated guerrilla

fighters began slipping through the System's diminishing ring of troops and moving eastward. With these guerrilla forces the Organisation followed the example of its Baltimore members and rapidly established dozens of new enclaves, primarily in the nuclear-devastated areas, where System authority was weakest. The Detroit enclave was initially the most important of these. Bloody anarchy had reigned among the survivors in the Detroit area for several weeks after the nuclear blasts of September 8. Eventually, a semblance of order had been restored, with System troops loosely sharing power with the leaders of a number of Black gangs in the area. Although there were a few isolated White strongholds which kept the roving mobs of Black plunders and rapists at bay, most of the disorganised and demoralised White survivors in and around Detroit offered no effective resistance to the Blacks, and, just as in other heavily Black areas of the country, they suffered terribly.

Then, in mid-December, the Organisation seized the initiative. A number of synchronised lightning raids on the System's military strong points in the Detroit area resulted in an easy victory. The Organisation then established certain patterns in Detroit which were soon followed elsewhere. All captured White troops, as soon as they had laid down their weapons, were offered a chance to fight with the Organisation against the System. Those who immediately volunteered were taken aside for preliminary screening and then sent to camps for indoctrination and special training. The others were machine-gunned on the spot, without further ado.

The same degree of ruthlessness was used in dealing with the White civilian population. When the Organisation's cadres moved into the White strongholds in the Detroit suburbs, the first thing they found it necessary to do was to liquidate most of the local White leaders, in order to establish the unquestioned authority of the Organisation. There was no time or patience for trying to reason with short-sighted Whites who insisted that they weren't 'racists' or 'revolutionaries' and didn't need the help of any 'outside agitators' in dealing with their problems, or who had some other conservative or parochial fixation. The Whites of Detroit and the other new enclaves were organised more along the lines described by Earl Turner for Baltimore than for California, but even more rapidly and roughly. In most areas of the country there was no opportunity for an orderly, large-scale separation of non-Whites, as in California, and consequently a bloody race war raged for months,

taking a terrible toll of those Whites who were not in one of the Organisation's tightly controlled, all-White enclaves.

Food became critically scarce everywhere during the winter. The Blacks lapsed into cannibalism, just as they had in California, while hundreds of thousands of starving Whites, who earlier had ignored the Organisation's call for a rising against the System, began appearing at the borders of the various liberated zones begging for food. The Organisation was only able to feed the White populations already under its control by imposing the severest rationing, and it was necessary to turn many of the latecomers away. Those who were admitted—and that meant only children, women of childbearing age, and able-bodied men willing to fight in the Organisation's ranks—were subjected to much more severe racial screening than had been used to separate Whites from non-Whites in California. It was no longer sufficient to be merely White; in order to eat one had to be judged the bearer of especially valuable genes.



Copied and pasted from William
Pierce's novel on 9 November 2012.

The word ‘racism’

by Ed. & Commenter

‘Racist is a control word for whites.’

—Anonymous

The fact that the word *racism* was coined relatively recently explains why my grandmothers, who were born in 1888 and 1914, never used it when I lived with them. They had formed their minds in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, respectively, when no one used a word that is now used to control whites.

The critique of language is the most radical of all critiques. If we don’t uproot the Newspeak of anti-white societies from our vocabulary—bear in mind that when all the great European civilisations were at their height the word ‘racism’ didn’t exist—we cannot even begin to discuss the issues.

Some linguists have argued that language is rhetorical, and that humans make a fatal mistake in believing that if a group of people use a word in all seriousness, it means that there is something real behind it. According to Orwell, the aim of Newspeak is social control. While Orwell’s focus was a *hard* totalitarian dystopia, today the word racist as a pejorative is used in *soft* totalitarian societies. As long as racism is seen as the ultimate evil, we should be aware of the

Viruses for the white mind

If we translate the term into Oldspeak—just as ‘pagan’ only meant the usual adherent of classical culture—we see that racism is a code word for ‘pro-white.’ Detecting psychological operations is an elementary step in the process of de-brainwashing. In addition to the more obvious words, such as ‘Islamophobic’ or ‘xenophobic,’ here is a brief sample of Newspeak terms translated into Oldspeak:

Affirmative action – Blacks stealing our jobs.

Antisemitism – The belief by gentiles that Jews may be criticised like any other group.

Civil rights – Coloureds have more rights than the Aryan Man in the New World Order.

Diversified workforce – Much fewer white males are to be hired or promoted.

Disadvantaged – Unqualified and can't speak English, German or French, so give them money.

Equal treatment and opportunity – Fewer opportunities for white people.

Feminism – Psychotic breakdown at the social level or *folie en masse*, more recently called 'mass formation'.

Hate – Anything pro-white.

Historic grievances – White people ended slavery, human sacrifice in the American continent and cannibalism in tribal societies.

Homophobia/gay-bashing – The healthy revulsion of Lot regarding Sodomite or Gomorrahite behaviour.

Human Rights Commissions – Inquisitions denying free speech. Thought Police that enforces liberal political doctrine.

Immigration – Race replacement. Genocidal levels of immigration.

Interracial relationship – Spoiled white women perpetrating the sin against the holy ghost! Also called racial engineering or soft genocide of white people.

Misogynist – Anyone who disagrees with the racially-suicidal empowerment of women.

Multicultural enhancement – Destroy all European cultures.

Politically correct – Fines and/or jail for anybody not liberal and following the New World Order.

Respect and tolerance – Surrender. Tolerance for millions of immigrants means demographic genocide for whites.

Woman's choice – Abortion and genocide of millions of white babies.



19 September 2012. Although most of the above translations appeared as a sarcastic comment on a racist forum, 'racism' might be a term mostly used not by our enemies but by us. If values had not

been inverted by Christianity and its bastard child, liberalism, racist attitudes would be considered a virtue. After I published the above piece, the following month Hadding Scott posted on his blogsite National-Socialist Worldview the following article.

On the origin of the word racist

by Hadding Scott

There is an urban legend that has been floating around for some years now, that the word racist was coined by Leon Trotsky, for the purpose of cowering and intimidating opponents of leftist ideology. In his *History of the Russian Revolution* Trotsky applied the word racist to Slavophiles, who opposed Communism.

Just from the word's etymology (the word race with a suffix added) it is not immediately apparent why this word is supposed to be inherently derogatory. Words like anarchist, communist, and fascist have a negative connotation for many people, but that is because of their perspectives on anarchism, communism, and fascism, not because the words are inherently derogatory. The words anarchist, communist, and fascist have objective content toward which one may be positively or negatively disposed. Likewise the word racist. Objectively, it seems to denote somebody for whom race is a concern.

Is it not possible that Trotsky's use of the word, regardless of what his feelings about racism may have been, was merely descriptive, insofar as the effort of Slavs to assert and preserve their Slavic identity inherently involves a concern with race? Are not racists, as Trotsky regarded them, essentially just a species of anti-Communist, rejecting submersion into nondescript humanity under alien personalities and interests?

Our so-called conservatives in the United States do not ask such questions. If the left uses a term with a negative feeling attached, our conservatives accept that what the term denotes is objectively negative. If leftists and Jew-controlled mass-media disapprove of racists and racism, our so-called conservatives will not dispute that value judgment; for the purpose of rhetoric they

will even embrace it. Conservatives outwardly accept that racists and racism are bad, and will not challenge it.

What the conservatives like to do instead of debunking their enemies' assumptions, which are also supported by mass-media, is to try to find a way to throw an accusation back at them, even a ridiculous accusation based on a specious argument and a flimsy premise. The legend that Leon Trotsky coined the word racist offers a basis for that kind of rhetoric. It seems a silly argument, but they will say something like, 'If you use the word racist then you are a bad person like Communist mass-murderer Leon Trotsky, because he invented that word!'

Did Trotsky really invent that word? No, apparently not. The work in which Trotsky is supposed to have coined that word was written and published in Russian in 1930. I found several examples of the French form, *raciste*, preceding Trotsky's use of the word by far. I find *pensée raciste* (French for 'racist thought') and *individualité raciste* ('racist individuality') in the volume *La Terro d'oc: Revisto Felibrenco E Federalisto* (a periodical championing the cultural and ethnic identity of people in southern France) for the year 1906. Here the word racist was used without a hint of negativity:

I express my best wishes for the success of your projects, because I am convinced that, in the federation of the peoples of Langued'Oc fighting for their interests and the emancipation of their racist thought, the prestige of Toulouse will benefit.

This unfortunate South! He is a victim in every way! Ruined, robbed, brutalised, it's a fate of conquered countries that one reserves for him, and whatever would be likely to characterize his *racist* [emphasis added] individuality and whatever's survival or worship could make him regain consciousness of himself to snatch him from his torpor and safeguard his moral and material interests, is it good for anything except to be combated and ridiculed?

While racists were bad people for Leon Trotsky, some people in Occitania in 1906 did not share that value-judgment, because they had a different perspective and different interests. Why should I accept the value-judgments of my enemies? The label racist is only an effective attack if it is perceived as one, which means, only if the value-judgment attached to it is accepted. Don't accept that! If you can stop worrying about being called a racist, if

you can refrain from using a barrage of flaky counterattacks (the way ‘conservatives’ do) to avoid talking about your own real views, then you can be sincere and really communicate with people. You might even have a chance to explain that almost everybody is racist and that it’s normal—which is a fundamental fact that every White person needs to know.

Even earlier examples

In Charles Malato’s *Philosophie de l’Anarchie* (1897) we find both *raciste* and *racisme*:

No doubt that before arriving at complete internationalism, there will be a stage which will be *racism*; but it must be hoped that the layover will not be too long, that it will be rapidly surpassed. Communism, which appears that it must inevitably be regulated at the beginning of its functioning, especially in regard to international trade, will bring about the establishment of *racist* federations (Latin, Slavic, Germanic, etc.). Anarchy—which we can glimpse at the end of two or three generations when, as a result of the development of production, any regulations will have become superfluous—will bring the end of *racism* and the advent of a humanity without borders. [emphasis added]

Although Malato was not in favour of *racistes* or *racisme* as such, regarding them as constituting an intermediate stage on the path from the destruction of the existing empires to his ideal of global anarchy, his use of those words back in the late 19th century was clearly not polemical but based on their objective content. Malato saw a tendency in Europe toward reorganising political boundaries and allegiances along racial (or ethnic) lines, and he called this tendency racism. Note also that Malato specifically refers to Pan-Slavism as a form of racism, thus anticipating Trotsky’s application of the word.

First English usage

A piece for National Public Radio (Gene Demby, ‘The Ugly, Fascinating History of the Word Racism,’ 6 January 2014) cites the Oxford English Dictionary to the effect that the first use of the word racism in English was by Richard Pratt in 1902, five years after Malato’s use of *raciste* and *racisme* in French.

Pratt was a Baptist religious zealot who was particularly devoted to stamping out the identities of various North American tribes through assimilation. National Public Radio's author for some reason finds it paradoxical that somebody who condemns racism would be trying to stamp out the racial as well as the specific ethnic identities of Cheyenne, Choctaw, or Muscogee, when in fact it is perfectly consistent.

Racism in its proper meaning, as we see with Charles Malato and the Occitanian separatists a century ago (contemporary with Pratt), means concern for one's race (however that race is defined), and an impulse to preserve that race, and, in accord with that, organisation along racial lines. To condemn racism as such is ultimately to condemn the preservation of any race, with the mongrelisation of all mankind, explicitly hoped by some, being the predictable long-term result.

Deliberate destruction of races through assimilation and mixture, as advanced—although in a more direct and obvious manner than we usually see—by Richard Henry Pratt with his Carlisle Indian Industrial School, is the ultimate implication of anti-racism. It is remarkable that anyone pretends to be confused about this.

29 October 2012

The depth of evil

by Andrew Hamilton

The mass media and state-controlled education have displaced the family in the formation and transmission of attitudes, beliefs, behaviour, and culture. In addition, the mass media winnows candidates for public office at every level, thereby exerting effective control over the (formerly) democratic political process. There are many unexplored reasons why TV, movies, video games, pop music, and other forms of media exercise such tremendous influence over our ideas and behaviour. A 'simple' one, I believe, is the (literal) hypnotic effect they have on us.

The Jews, as William Pierce recognised, control the mass media of news and entertainment (which he invariably denominated the 'controlled media'). There is perhaps no other truism of modern life that he emphasised so repeatedly. It is somewhat surprising, therefore, that he never developed, or at least never publicly articulated, a theory of media control, or analysed the nexus between media messages and human psychology and behaviour. Instead, he stated his case axiomatically:

By permitting the Jews to control our news and entertainment media we are doing more than merely giving them a decisive influence on our political system and virtual control of our government; we also are giving them control of the minds and souls of our children, whose attitudes and ideas are shaped more by Jewish television and Jewish films than by parents, schools, or any other influence... To permit the Jews, with their 3000-year history of nation-wrecking, from ancient Egypt to Russia, to hold such power over us is tantamount to race suicide.

William Pierce also taught that the vast majority of whites are neither good nor evil; they will think and behave in whatever manner the powers that be direct them to. Most people that is, will conform and obey, no matter what (Pierce called them 'lemmings').

Only a tiny handful, he said, are truly good or evil—he estimated 1 to 3 percent in either direction. For some reason he believed the number of ‘good’ people, though exceedingly small, was roughly double the number of intrinsically bad people.

My own inclination is perhaps closer to the Christian belief that humans are afflicted with original sin, and can only be saved (become good) through a process of change and redemption. What I failed to realise for many years was the depth of the evil and the resistance to individual redemption. Obviously, if people are evil when evil people rule, and good only when good people rule, they are not really good.

Nevertheless, people’s beliefs and behaviours can change radically. Change (for the worse) during my lifetime has been massive. Of course, it is easier to destroy than to build.

Unfortunately, if Pierce’s assumptions are correct—and, apart from his optimistic overestimation of the number of good to evil people, they appear to be—then it is comparatively easy with modern technology and dedicated ruthlessness for a small, domineering elite to continuously identify and destroy the tiny handful of good people on the margin, as they did under Communism and have continued to do in the post-WWII era. As a result, whites opposed to genocide or totalitarianism have failed to gain any traction.

Editor’s comment

‘What I failed to realise for many years was the depth of the evil and the resistance to individual redemption. Obviously, if people are evil when evil people rule, and good only when good people rule, they are not really good,’ said Hamilton. In other words, people, including the vast majority of whites, aren’t good. And if they are not good, what can be wrong with the genocidal fantasy of my ‘Dies Irae,’ published in *Day of Wrath*, with a vengeful Star Child calling home 500 million Caucasians (and, of course, all non-whites, including Jews) to ensure that Dave Lane’s words are fulfilled by the remaining Aryans?

The point is that, as moral values are inverted throughout the West, the depth of evil among today’s Caucasoids is something that no white advocate I know of has been willing to digest.

22 December 2012

Ostriches

by Editor

In Sebastian Ronin's recent rejoinder to some of Matt Parrott's comments here in *The West's Darkest Hour*, this paragraph caught my eye:

Nothing is 'free,' not even 'virtually free,' especially not energy. No one, absolutely no one, gets to dodge the bullet of Post-Peak Oil energy devolution. A global civilisation, to which Murka is the metaphorical Rome, collapses; it comes to an end... In historically relative terms, the current century will make the Black Death seem like a nose bleed.

Why most Murkan White Nationalists cannot see, will not see, or refuse to see how this most devastating of historical events will impact racial politics is simply mind-boggling. Wait! No, it's not all that mind-boggling at all, but that is another matter, another day.

The reason most white nationalists don't want to look at the evidence of both the coming collapse of fiat currencies and apocalyptic energy involution is easily explained by considering several posts on this blog where I have said that, unlike William Pierce, today's nationalists still like the American way of life. See, for example, how I responded to Andrew Hamilton in the provocative post 'The Depth of Evil.' Moderately edited, I would like to republish below a substantial part of what I said in an entry from almost a year ago, 'On Ostriches and Real Men.' I have to take issue with Greg Johnson's statement: 'We believe it can be achieved through peaceful territorial divisions and population transfers.' Apart from the fact that many Jews were most probably killed in World War II, the following is what, like ostriches, most nationalists still don't want to see:

1. The dollar will crash;
2. In all likelihood, the crash will lead to high unemployment, riots and looting in the major Western cities;

3. Unlike New Orleans after Katrina, the bullet will not be dodged. On the contrary: racial tension in ethnically ‘enriched’ cities will intensify throughout the West, insofar as all Western paper ‘money’ is now fiat currency;

4. Much later, these socio-political crises will converge with energy devolution which, by the end of the century, will wipe out the global population surplus created as a result of Christian ethics (as Søren Renner said: ‘Billions will die, we will win’).

The reactionary, non-revolutionary stance of the white nationalists buries its head in the sand. In the coming tribulation, few will worry about ‘totalitarianism, imperialism or genocide’ as Greg Johnson worries. In all likelihood, during the convergence of catastrophes, the racists will be ruthless survivors à la *Turner Diaries* committed to the fourteen words and no longer to Christian ethics.

The future belongs to the bloodthirsty, not the alt-righters. Johnson’s manifesto might be read by those conservative types who are torn between guilt and anti-white sentiments. But, unlike Johnson, I agree with Mark that the plight of whites is so dire that, with Mother Nature’s help, only a scorched earth policy has any chance of success. Even those nationalists who strongly disagree with me on moral grounds, like Franklin Ryckaert, should open their minds to the coming collapse of the dollar and the subsequent devolution of energy. Get your heads out of the sand. The convergence of catastrophes will mark ‘the metamorphic rebirth of Europe or its demise and transformation into a cosmopolitan and sterile Luna Park,’ as Guillaume Faye puts it.



Conservative Swede once said that the white nationalist movement 'is weak.' Except for Pierce's books, I tend to agree with that statement. Practically all of them are like the tender-hearted women who lie weeping and wailing, awaiting the results of the bloodshed to come in Jacques-Louis David's *Oath of the Horatii* (previous page). We, on the other hand, are like the three brothers who express loyalty and solidarity with their father and are willing to sacrifice our lives, and billions of other lives if necessary, to fulfil the sacred words.

28 June 2013

Follow my yellow brick road

by Editor

Today is my birthday, so I'm going to indulge in a bit of my typical ethnocidal fantasies.

I recently saw the 1939 film *The Wizard of Oz* after decades of not having seen it as a child, based on Frank Baum's 1900 novel: a film that featured the yellow brick road for Dorothy as opposed to a very different, red brick road. It occurs to me that I realise more and more every day that I have little to do with those who follow the latter. I am closer to the historical Himmler; not the fictional Himmler of the effeminate WN literature who denies having dispatched a couple of million *der Juden* (while the enemy committed a Holocaust of Germans). In my previous post today, I quoted from Helmut Stellrecht's *Faith and Action* (1938) for the Hitler Youth, and a single line caught my attention: 'Love the animals that are tortured and tormented in other countries.' A *Kladderadatsch* cartoon from September 1933 depicted laboratory animals, including white rabbits, giving the Nazi salute to Hermann Göring for his order to ban vivisection. My hero Göring banned this monstrosity and said that those who 'still think they can continue to treat animals as inanimate property' would be sent to concentration camps. But the West raged against poor Germany just after the release of *The Wizard of Oz* and, as Stellrecht hinted, in other countries the torture continued.

As you know, I live in Mexico. Every time I hear about how these slightly mesticised Amerindians torture cows in slaughterhouses and continue to perform vivisections I can't help but be reminded of Frank Baum's words. His solution is the only way to end the torture of the creatures I love:

With his fall [Sitting Bull] the nobility of the Redskin is extinguished... The Whites, by law of conquest, by justice of

civilisation, are masters of the American continent, and the best safety of the frontier settlements will be secured by the total annihilation of the few remaining Indians. Why not annihilation? We cannot honestly regret their extermination...

Yes: these are the wise thoughts of the famous author of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, words that appeared in the *Saturday Pioneer*, 20 December 1890. Just compare Baum's words with the effeminate, politically correct pronouncements of today's white nationalists, so ready to use epithets like 'sociopaths' and 'psychopaths' for any Aryan who dares to think like old Uncle Frank.

Neochristian white nationalism must die. The spirit of William Pierce must live on in its place. That's why I am posting and will continue to post entries on Nietzsche (let's transvalue Christian values). As long as, unlike Uncle Frank and Uncle Friedrich, the current generation of nationalists clings to the old standards of morality, white Americans will continue to travel down the reddish road to extinction. My birthday tip: Start following my yellow brick road if you don't want to see America completely turned into the grotesque African-American interpretation of *The Wizard of Oz*.

12 August 2013

Kemp's book

by Editor

The following sentences from Chapter 30 of Arthur Kemp's *March of the Titans: The Complete History of the White Race* caught my attention:

The lands making up western and southern Russia, Asia Minor (Turkey), and the southeastern Balkans were to be the scene of some of the most dramatic racial conflicts between various tribes of Europeans on the one hand, and various Asiatic, Mongol, and mixed race Muslim armies on the other.

These wars started around 550 c.e., a century after the crushing of the Mongolian Hunnish invasion of Europe. They only finally stopped with the defeat of new Asian invaders some 400 years later, with the defeat of an Asiatic alliance known as the Magyars, in Bavaria in 954 c.e. This massive struggle against Asian and Mongolian hordes can rightly be grouped into one heading, even though different players acted in the drama. If these combined Asian invaders had not been turned back, then it would most certainly have given the non-White Moorish invasion in Spain, which took place in the same time span, a far better chance of success. The White race might have been exterminated between the Asians and the Moors—but it was not.

All these race wars recounted in that chapter and the following chapters—including 'The Fifth Great Race War: Genghis Khan' and 'The Ottoman Holocaust'—make fascinating reading. I will not quote further from these specific chapters to invite readers to obtain a hard copy of *March of the Titans*. The fact is that, unlike other races, whites as a people have been on the brink of extinction more than once; and this is of paramount importance for understanding our times. It is incomprehensible to me that so few

white nationalists are interested in the history of their race. Proof of this is that books like this one are not bestsellers in the community.

In a saner Western civilisation, the facts alone of the greatest genocide ever committed against the white race should have moved the West to target the Mongols and Muslims for complete extermination long ago, something that didn't happen when whites developed weapons of mass destruction because they have been under the sway of Christian standards of morality.

2 October 2013

Animal hell and white sin

by Editor

I am shocked. Tonight I went to the grocery store and saw a couple of typical Mexican children, one of them with a rabbit in his arms. After talking about rabbits, the younger boy, about eight years old, told me a horror story.

At school, his group was taken to a farm in Mexico to see all the farm animals. Unexpectedly, in one place he saw some little rabbits, alive, hanging by their ears on a wire. They were in excruciating pain and were desperately trying to escape by waving their tiny limbs in the air. The older boy, while still carrying the female rabbit, his pet, told me that his brother came back traumatised by what he saw. The owner of the shop, an older woman, commented that cruelty to animals was very common and that the owners of the farm probably didn't expect the children to go through that particular place.

Exterminable monsters like the perpetrators of such animal torture, whites are even worse. They are the ones who, like the children I interviewed today, have exactly the feelings of compassion that could potentially stop the crime. But they do nothing because of the Christian command to love their neighbour. With their weapons of mass destruction they could easily conquer Latin America, Africa and Asia to save the animals from hell. Whites are so sinfully blind that they deliberately ignore that, if their race goes extinct, that means hell—thousands upon thousands of years of hell—for farm animals that the peoples of colour treat so badly.

Scott Peck describes evil as 'militant ignorance.' White people like to militantly ignore that the radical Other is not like us. To paraphrase Peck, I would say that while most people are aware of self-deception on at least some level, evil white people actively and militantly refuse to *see* the radical Other or non-white cultures.

If anyone has any doubt about my final dream in ‘Dies Irae,’ that billions of humans must die to make the world less hellish, please imagine in your mind what these poor creatures are going through at this very moment here in Mexico, and other countries of colour.

Whites have been so astronomically idiotic, so evil; they want so desperately to believe that coloured people are like them, that they are under the impression that non-whites simply treat our animal cousins like them. If I were a lord, I would punish those with talents, as in the Gospel parable: whites. Instead of making good use of their talents (e.g., conquering the non-white lands à la *Turner Diaries*) whites simply ‘went and hid their talents in the earth.’ Such cruelty to adorable creatures should arouse, among the more emergent specimens of *Homo sapiens*, the same level of hatred that I feel.

Let’s put my philosophy this way: *Non-Nazis are evil.*

Why evil?

Because they allowed the more malevolent races to exist, breed and even conquer large parts of the world. If so many whites hadn’t become accomplices in the greatest crime in all history, what I call the Hellstorm Holocaust, by now the Third Reich would have become a huge Empire from the Atlantic to the Urals, whose culture and philosophy included the most elementary animal rights. As I have already repeated, the Nazis banned vivisection and declared that those who treat animals as objects would be sent to concentration camps. Had the evil Anglo-Americans not intervened, after the Soviet Union, China might have been conquered by the Germans as well. Today, China is the most notorious nation where our animal brethren are systematically and officially tortured on an industrial scale. The footnoted article⁶ is

⁶ When undercover investigators made their way onto Chinese fur farms, they found that many animals are still alive and struggling desperately when workers flip them onto their backs or hang them up by their legs or tails to skin them. When workers on these farms begin to cut the skin and fur from an animal’s leg, the free limbs kick and writhe. Workers stomp on the necks and heads of animals who struggle too hard to allow a clean cut.

When the fur is finally peeled off over the animals’ heads, their naked, bloody bodies are thrown onto a pile of those who have gone *before* them. Some are still alive, breathing in ragged gasps and blinking slowly. Some of the animals’ hearts are still beating five to ten minutes after they are skinned. One investigator

taken from People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA). I didn't want to put it in the main text because I didn't want to reread it during proofreading!

Unfortunately, the article's last line only reflects PETA's neochristian moral standards. The *only* way to prevent such cruelty is to simply exterminate the human Neanderthals who perpetrate these heinous crimes. There's no other way to solve the problem of evil.

24 October 2013

recorded a skinned raccoon dog on the heap of carcasses who had enough strength to lift his bloodied head and stare into the camera. Before they are skinned alive, animals are pulled from their cages and thrown to the ground; workers bludgeon them with metal rods or slam them on hard surfaces, causing broken bones and convulsions but not always immediate death. Animals watch helplessly as workers make their way down the row.

Undercover investigators from Swiss Animal Protection / EAST International toured fur farms in China's Hebei Province, and it *quickly* became clear why outsiders are banned from visiting. There are no penalties for abusing animals on fur farms in China—farmers can house and slaughter animals however they see fit. The investigators found horrors beyond their worst imaginings and concluded, 'Conditions on Chinese fur farms make a mockery of the most elementary animal welfare standards. In their lives and their unspeakable deaths, these animals have been denied even the simplest acts of kindness.'

On these farms, foxes, minks, rabbits, and other animals pace and shiver in outdoor wire cages, exposed to driving rain, freezing nights, and, at other times, scorching sun. Mother animals, who are *driven* crazy from rough handling and intense confinement and have nowhere to hide while giving birth, often kill their babies after delivering litters. The globalisation of the fur trade has made it impossible to know where fur products come from. China supplies more than half of the finished fur garments imported for sale in the United States. Even if a fur garment's label says it was made in a European country, the animals were likely raised and slaughtered elsewhere—possibly on an unregulated Chinese fur farm. The only way to prevent such unimaginable cruelty is never to wear any fur.

On my moral inferiors

by Editor

The whole issue of white survival depends on regaining a self-image that places them morally above other races, including empathy for children and our cousins, the animals. Recently, a regular visitor let me know by email that he was dismayed by my desire to exterminate those who trade in skinning poor animals alive. He just wanted to shut down the Chinese factories that supply more than half of the fur garments sold in the unhinged West. This is my response: I am not the monster. *Those who don't harbour exterminationist fantasies are the moral Neanderthals compared to me.*

Take my recent posts on pre-Hispanic Amerindians, for example. In the last one, the author of a scholarly article raised a disturbing possibility: Several Maya skulls show marks of sharp, unhealed cuts, particularly around the eye sockets, suggesting that some of these individuals may have been flayed before sacrifice. The presence of women and children among these skulls means that even they, and not just the mature men, could have suffered a horrible death, like what still happens today in Chinese fur factories.

I don't often get comments on my posts about the pre-Columbian era, perhaps because the data sheds light on history so gruesome that it is hard to digest. But if we dare to *see* the same thing happening today with some animals, the psychogenically emergent individual who approaches these issues can only *see* those who avoid it as intellectual cowards.

After my previous post on Maya sacrifice, I read another scholarly article in the book *El Sacrificio Humano* of 28 authors, this one by Vera Tiesler and Andrea Cucina, a chapter with nine pages of bibliographical references to specialised literature.⁷

⁷ 'Sacrificio, Tratamiento y Ofrenda del Cuerpo Humano entre los Mayas Peninsulares,' in López Luján, Leonardo & Guilhem Olivier (2010): *El*

Tiesler and Cucina let us know that modern Mayanists are using, in addition to Spanish chronicles and iconographic evidence from pre-Columbian art, the science of taphonomy (skeletal analysis) as tangible evidence of human sacrifice in Mayan civilisation. On pages 199-200 the authors mention the techniques the Maya used in their practices, now corroborated by taphonomy: the victim could have been shot with arrows or stoned, his throat or neck could have been cut or broken, his heart could have been extracted through the diaphragm or thorax; he could have suffered multiple and fatal lacerations, or have been cremated, disembowelled or flayed or dismembered. The bodily remains may have been ingested, used as trophies or in the manufacture of percussion instruments. The authors deduce this from direct, physical evidence from the skeletons studied (or other remains) and also mention a form of sacrifice I hadn't heard of: the offering of human faces in the context of the influence on the Maya of the Xipe-Totec deity, 'Our Lord the Flayed,' who was widely worshipped in northern, central Mexico.



Amerind flaunting
an inverted head

Tiesler and Cucina also point to another type of physical evidence in Maya civilisation (which I have already mentioned in *Day of Wrath*): many skeletons with sacrificial marks have been

Sacrificio Humano en la Tradición Religiosa Mesoamericana. Mexico City, published by INAH and UNAM.

found at the bottom of sacrificial cenotes. On page 206 they include an illustration of Mayan dignitaries wearing inverted heads on their 'uniforms' like the one above. A skeleton of an individual has also been found with a human mask hanging from his belt on his thorax.

On page 209 the authors let us know that the Maya even sacrificed animals, and include an illustration of a jaguar surrounded by flames. They don't say whether the animal was alive when it was sacrificed; and on page 211 they speak of 'a high percentage of child, adolescent and female victims whose corpses were also often the object of ritual manipulation.' On the same page is a Mayan representation of a decapitated woman, and on page 215 a photo of a perforated thorax is reproduced, suggesting that the bodily remains may have been used as mannequins 'to make a terrifying display of institutional power.' They also suggest that sacrifices may have continued to be performed long after the Spanish conquest, albeit 'clandestinely and with increasing recourse to animal substitutes.'

This proves my point beautifully. If a barbaric practice is banned in a primitive race, violence will be *displaced*, not eradicated. The sacrificial victims are now the animals. Remember my post where I mentioned the case of the recent torture of farm animals in Mexico? The reason I speak with haughty contempt of the non-extinctionists—'my moral inferiors'—is that they are afraid to take their premises to their logical conclusion. It is not enough to close down Chinese skinning factories or Mexican slaughterhouses. To put an absolute end to these practices without further *displacement*, you got to wipe out the entire psychoclass behind such cruelties. See my take on psychohistory in *Day of Wrath*.

8 December 2013

Turner Diaries climax

by William Pierce

I drove to the one place I was reasonably sure was still manned by Organisation personnel: the old gift shop in Georgetown. It was just outside the new Pentagon security perimeter. I arrived there as dusk was falling and pulled the pickup truck around to the rear service entrance. I had just climbed out of the truck and stepped into the shadows at the rear of the building when the world around me suddenly lit up as bright as noon for a moment. First there was an intensely bright flash of light, then a weaker glow which cast moving shadows and changed from white to yellow to red in the course of a few seconds.

I ran to the alley, so that I could have a more nearly unobstructed view of the sky. What I saw chilled my blood and caused the hairs on the back of my neck to rise. An enormous, bulbous, glowing thing, a splotchy ruby-red in colour for the most part but shot through with dark streaks and also dappled with a shifting pattern of brighter orange and yellow areas, was rising into the northern sky and casting its ominous, blood-red light over the land below. It was truly a vision from hell.

As I watched, the gigantic fireball continued to expand and rise, and a dark column, like the stem of an immense toadstool, became visible beneath it. Bright, electric-blue tongues of fire could be seen flickering and dancing over the surface of the column. They were huge lightning bolts, but at their distance no thunder could be heard from them. When the noise finally came, it was a dull, muffled sound, yet still overwhelming: the sort of sound one might expect to hear if an inconceivably powerful earthquake rocked a huge city and caused a thousand 100-story skyscrapers to crumble into ruins simultaneously. I realised that I was witnessing the annihilation of the city of Baltimore, 35 miles away, but I could not understand the enormous magnitude of the blast. Could one of our

60-kiloton bombs have done that? It seemed more like what one would expect from a megaton bomb.

The government news reports that night and the next day claimed that the warhead which destroyed Baltimore, killing more than a million people, as well as the blasts which destroyed some two-dozen other major American cities the same day, had been set off by us. They also claimed that the government had counterattacked and destroyed the 'nest of racist vipers' in California. As it turned out, both claims were false, but it was two days before I learned the full story of what had actually happened.

Meanwhile, it was with a feeling of deepest despair that I and half-a-dozen others who were gathered around the television set in the darkened basement of the gift shop late that night heard a newscaster gloatingly announce the destruction of our liberated zone in California. He was a Jew, and he really let his emotions carry him away; I have never before heard or seen anything like it. After a solemn rundown of most of the cities which had been hit that day, with preliminary estimates of the death tolls (sample: 'and in Detroit, which the racist fiends struck with two of their missiles, they murdered over 1.4 million innocent American men, women, and children of all races...'), he came to New York. At that point tears actually appeared in his eyes and his voice broke.

Between sobs he gasped out the news that 18 separate nuclear blasts had levelled Manhattan and the surrounding boroughs and suburbs out to a radius of approximately 20 miles, with an estimated 14 million killed outright and perhaps another five million expected to die of burns or radiation sickness within the next few days. Then he lapsed into Hebrew and began a strange, wailing chant, as tears streamed down his cheeks and his clenched fists pounded his breast. After a few seconds of this he recovered, and his demeanour changed completely. Anguish was replaced first by a burning hatred for those who had destroyed his beloved, Jewish New York City, then by an expression of grim satisfaction which gradually turned into an exultant gloating: 'But we have taken our vengeance against our enemies, and they are no more. Time and again, throughout history, the nations have risen up against us and tried to expel us or kill us, but we have always triumphed in the end. No one can resist us. All those who have tried—Egypt, Persia, Rome, Spain, Russia, Germany—have themselves been destroyed, and we have always emerged triumphant from the ruins. We have

always survived and prospered. And now we have utterly crushed the latest of those who have raised their hands against us. Just as Moshe smote the Egyptian, so have we smitten the Organisation.'

His tongue flickered wetly over his lips and his dark eyes gleamed balefully as he described the hail of nuclear annihilation which he said had been unleashed on California that very afternoon: 'Their precious racial superiority did not help them a bit when we fired hundreds of nuclear missiles into the racist stronghold,' the newscaster gloated. 'The White vermin died like flies. We can only hope they realised in their last moments that many of the loyal soldiers who pressed the firing buttons for the missiles which killed them were Black or Chicano or Jewish. Yes, the Whites and their criminal racial pride have been wiped out in California, but now we must kill the racists everywhere else, so that racial harmony and brotherhood can be restored to America. We must kill them! Kill them! Kill! Kill!...' Then he lapsed into Hebrew again, and his voice became louder and harsher. He stood up and leaned into the camera, an incarnation of pure hatred, as he shrieked and gibbeted in his alien tongue, gobs of saliva flying from his mouth and dribbling down his chin. This extraordinary performance must have been embarrassing to some of his less emotional brethren, because he was suddenly cut off in mid-shriek and replaced by a Gentile, who continued to give out revised casualty estimates into the early hours of the morning.

Gradually, during the next 48 hours, we learned the true story of that dreadful Thursday, both from later and more nearly accurate government newscasts and from our own sources. The first and most important news we received came early Friday morning, in a coded message from Revolutionary Command to all the Organisation's units around the country: California had not been destroyed! Vandenberg had been annihilated, and two large missiles had struck the city of Los Angeles, causing widespread death and destruction, but at least 90 per cent of the people in the liberated zone had survived, partly because they had been given a few minutes advance warning and had been able to take shelter.

Unfortunately for the people in other parts of the country, there was no advance warning, and the total death toll—including those who have died of burns, other wounds, and radiation in the last ten days—is approximately sixty million. The missiles which caused these deaths, however, were not ours—except in the case of

New York City, which received a barrage first from Vandenberg and then from the Soviet Union. Baltimore, Detroit, and the other American cities which were hit—even Los Angeles—were all the victims of Soviet missiles. Vandenberg AFB was the only domestic target hit by the U.S. government.

The cataclysmic chain of events began with an extraordinarily painful decision by Revolutionary Command. Reports being received by RC in the first week of this month indicated a gradual but steady shift of the balance of power from the military faction in the government, which wanted to avoid a nuclear showdown with us, to the Jewish faction, which demanded the immediate annihilation of California. The Jews feared that otherwise the existing stalemate between the liberated zone and the rest of the country might become permanent, which would mean an almost certain victory for us eventually. To prevent this they went to work behind the scenes in their customary manner, arguing, threatening, bribing, bringing pressure to bear on one of their opponents at a time. They had already succeeded in arranging the replacement of several top generals by their own creatures, and RC saw the last chance disappearing of avoiding a full-scale exchange of nuclear missiles with government forces.

So we decided to pre-empt. We struck first, but not at the government's forces. We fired all our missiles from Vandenberg (except for half-a-dozen targeted on New York) at two targets: Israel and the Soviet Union. As soon as our missiles had been launched, RC announced the news to the Pentagon via a direct telephone link. The Pentagon, of course, had immediate confirmation from its own radar screens, and it had no choice but to follow up our salvo with an immediate and full-scale nuclear attack of its own against the Soviet Union, in an attempt to knock out as much of the Soviet retaliatory potential as possible. The Soviet response was horrendous, but spotty. They fired everything they had left at us, but it simply wasn't enough. Several of the largest American cities, including Washington and Chicago, were spared.

What the Organisation accomplished by precipitating this fateful chain of events is fourfold: First, by hitting New York and Israel, we have completely knocked out two of world Jewry's principal nerve centres, and it should take them a while to establish a new chain of command and get their act back together. Second,

by forcing them to take a decisive action, we pushed the balance of power in the U.S. government solidly back toward the military leaders. For all practical purposes, the country is now under a military government. Third, by provoking a Soviet counterattack, we did far more to disrupt the System in this country and break up the orderly pattern of life of the masses than we could have done by using our own weapons against domestic targets—and we still have most of our 60-kiloton warheads left! That will be of enormous advantage to us in the days ahead...

We took an enormous chance, of course: first, that California would be devastated in the Soviet counterattack—and second, that the U.S. military would lose its cool and use its nuclear weaponry on California even though, except for Vandenberg, there was no nuclear threat there to be knocked out. In both cases the fortunes of war have been at least moderately kind to us—although the threat from the U.S. military is by no means over. What we lost, however, is substantial: about an eighth of the Organisation's members, and nearly a fifth of the White population of the country—not to mention an unknown number of millions of racial kinsmen in the Soviet Union. Fortunately, the heaviest death toll in this country has been in the largest cities, which are substantially non-White.

All in all, the strategic situation of the Organisation relative to the System is enormously improved, and that is what really counts. We are willing to take as many casualties as necessary—just so the System takes proportionately more. All that matters, in the long run, is that when the smoke has finally cleared the last battalion in the field is ours...

October 28. Just back from more than a month in Baltimore—what's left of it. I and four others from here hauled a batch of portable radioactivity-metering equipment up to Silver Spring, where we linked up with a Maryland unit and continued north to the vicinity of Baltimore. Since the main roads were totally impassable, we had to walk across country more than halfway, commandeering a truck for only the last dozen miles.

Although more than two weeks had passed since the bombing, the state of affairs around Baltimore was almost indescribably chaotic when we arrived. We didn't even try to go into the burned out core of the city, but even in the suburbs and countryside ten miles west of ground zero, half the buildings had

burned. Even the secondary roads in and around the suburbs were littered with the burned hulks of vehicles, and nearly everyone we encountered was on foot. Groups of scavengers were everywhere, poking through ruined stores, foraging in the fields with backpacks, carrying bundles of looted or salvaged goods—mostly food, but also clothing, building materials, and everything else imaginable—to and fro like an army of ants. And the corpses! They were another good reason for staying away from the roads as much as possible. Even in the areas where relatively few people were killed by the initial blast or by subsequent radiation sickness, the corpses were strewn along the roads by the thousands. They were nearly all refugees from the blast area.

Close to the city one saw the bodies of those who had been badly burned by the fireball; most of them had not been able to walk more than a mile or so before they collapsed. Further out were those who had been less seriously burned. And far out into the countryside were the corpses of those who had succumbed to radiation days or weeks later. All had been left to rot where they fell, except in those few areas where the military had restored a semblance of order.

We had at that time only about 40 Organisation members among the survivors in the Baltimore area. They had been engaged in sabotage, sniping, and other guerrilla efforts against the police and military personnel there during the first week after the blast. Then they gradually discovered that the rules of the game had changed. They found out that it was no longer necessary to operate as furtively as they had before. The System's troops returned their fire when attacked, but did not pursue them. Outside a few areas, the police no longer attempted to undertake systematic searches of persons and vehicles, and there were no house raids. The attitude almost seemed to be, 'Don't bother us, and we won't bother you.'

The civilian survivors also tended to take a much more nearly neutral attitude than before. There was fear of the Organisation, but very little overt expression of hostility. The people did not know whether we were the ones who had fired the missile which destroyed their city, as the System broadcasts claimed, but they seemed about as disposed to blame the System for letting it happen as us for doing it. The holocaust through which the people up there had passed had clearly convinced them quite thoroughly of one thing: the System could no longer guarantee their security. They

no longer had even a trace of confidence in the old order; they merely wanted to survive now, and they would turn to anyone who could help them stay alive a while longer. Sensing this changed attitude, our members had begun recruiting and organising among the survivors around Baltimore in semi-public fashion and meeting with sufficient success that Revolutionary Command authorised the attempt to establish a small liberated zone west of the city.

The eleven of us who had come up from the Washington suburbs to help pitched in with enthusiasm, and within a few days we had established a reasonably defensible perimeter enclosing about 2,000 houses and other buildings with a total of nearly 12,000 occupants. My principal function was to carry out a radiological survey of the soil, the buildings, the local vegetation, and the water sources in the area, so that we could be sure of freedom from dangerous levels of nuclear radiation resulting from fallout. We organised about 300 of the locals into a fairly effective militia and provided them with arms. It would be risky at this stage to try to arm a bigger militia than that, because we haven't had an opportunity to ideologically condition the local population to the extent we'd like, and they still require close observation and tight supervision. But we picked the best prospects among the able-bodied males in the enclave, and we do have quite a bit of experience in picking people. I'll not be surprised if half our new militiamen eventually graduate to membership in the Organisation, and some will probably even be admitted to the Order.

卐 卐 卐

Then we formed the people into labour brigades to carry out a number of necessary functions, one of which was the sanitary disposal of the hundreds of corpses of refugees. The majority of these poor creatures were White, and I overheard one of our members refer to what happened to them as 'a slaughter of the innocents.' I am not sure that is a correct description of the recent holocaust. I am sorry, of course, for the millions of White people, both here and in Russia, who died—and who have yet to die before we have finished—in this war to rid ourselves of the Jewish yoke. But innocents? I think not. Certainly, that term should not be applied to the majority of the adults. After all, is not man essentially

responsible for his condition—at least, in a collective sense? If the White nations of the world had not allowed themselves to become subject to the Jew, to Jewish ideas, to the Jewish spirit, this war would not be necessary. We can hardly consider ourselves blameless. We can hardly say we had no choice, no chance to avoid the Jew's snare. We can hardly say we were not warned.

Men of wisdom, integrity, and courage have warned us over and over again of the consequences of our folly. And even after we were well down the Jewish primrose path, we had chance after chance to save ourselves—most recently when the Germans and the Jews were locked in struggle for the mastery of central and eastern Europe.

We ended up on the Jewish side in that struggle, primarily because we had chosen corrupt men as our leaders. And we had chosen corrupt leaders because we valued the wrong things in life. We had chosen leaders who promised us something for nothing; who pandered to our weaknesses and vices; who had nice stage personalities and pleasant smiles, but who were without character or scruple. We ignored the really important issues in our national life and gave free rein to a criminal System to conduct the affairs of our nation as it saw fit, so long as it kept us moderately well-supplied with bread and circuses.

And are not folly, wilful ignorance, laziness, greed, irresponsibility, and moral timidity as blameworthy as the most deliberate malice? Are not all our sins of omission to be counted against us as heavily as the Jew's sins of commission against him? In the Creator's account book, that is the way things are reckoned. Nature does not accept 'good' excuses in lieu of performance. No race which neglects to insure its own survival, when the means for that survival are at hand, can be judged 'innocent,' nor can the penalty exacted against it be considered unjust, no matter how severe.

Immediately after our success in California this summer, in my dealings with the civilian population there I had it thoroughly impressed on me why the American people do not deserve to be considered 'innocents.' Their reaction to the civil strife there was based almost solely on the way it affected their own private circumstances. For the first day or two—before it dawned on most people that we might actually win—the White civilians, even racially conscious ones, were generally hostile; we were messing up their

life-style and making their customary pursuit of pleasure terribly inconvenient. Then, after they learned to fear us, they were all too eager to please us. But they weren't really interested in the rights and wrongs of the struggle; they couldn't be bothered with soul-searching and long-range considerations. Their attitude was: 'Just tell us what we're supposed to believe, and we'll believe it.' They just wanted to be safe and comfortable again as soon as possible. And they weren't being cynical; they weren't jaded sophisticates, but ordinary people.

The fact is that the ordinary people are not really much less culpable than the not-so-ordinary people, than the pillars of the System. Take the political police, as an example. Most of them—the White ones—are not especially evil men. They serve evil masters, but they rationalise what they do; they justify it to themselves, some in patriotic terms ('protecting our free and democratic way of life') and some in religious or ideological terms ('upholding Christian ideals of equality and justice'). One can call them hypocrites—one can point out that they deliberately avoid thinking about anything which might call into question the validity of the shallow catch-phrases with which they justify themselves—but is not everyone who has tolerated the System also a hypocrite, whether he actively supported it or not? Is not everyone who mindlessly parrots the same catch-phrases, refusing to examine their implications and contradictions, whether he uses them as justifications for his deeds or not, also to be blamed?

I cannot think of any segment of White society, from the Maryland red-necks and their families whose radioactive bodies we bulldozed into a huge pit a few days ago to the university professors we strung up in Los Angeles last July, which can truly claim that it did not deserve what happened to it. It was not so many months ago that nearly all those who are wandering homeless and bemoaning their fate today were talking from the other side of their mouths. Not a few of our people have been badly roughed up in the past—and two that I know of were killed—when they fell into the hands of red-necks: 'good ol' boys' who, although not liberals or shabbos goyim in any way, had no use for 'radicals' who wanted to 'overthrow the gummint.' In their case it was sheer ignorance. But ignorance of that sort is no more excusable than the bleating, sheep-like liberalism of the pseudo-intellectuals who have smugly promoted Jewish ideology for so many years; or than the selfishness

and cowardice of the great American middle class who went along for the ride, complaining only when their pocketbooks suffered.

No, talk of ‘innocents’ has no meaning. We must look at our situation collectively, in a race-wide sense. We must understand that our race is like a cancer patient undergoing drastic surgery in order to save his life. There is no sense in asking whether the tissue being cut out now is ‘innocent’ or not. That is no more reasonable than trying to distinguish the ‘good’ Jews from the bad ones—or, as some of our thicker-skulled ‘good ol’ boys’ still insist on trying, separating the ‘good niggers’ from the rest of their race.

The fact is that we are all responsible, as individuals, for the morals and the behaviour of our race as a whole.

January 1, 2014

Why I am not a neo-Nazi

by Editor

Almost all white men have been brainwashed about what happened in World War II. Moreover, they have been feminised. They are the antipodes of the Spartans, the Vikings or Himmler's SS men. Even white nationalists are reluctant to repudiate feminism, by which I mean not only allowing women to vote but allowing them to inherit wealth or property, and be in charge of the limits of the biological reproduction of the white race (cf. *On Beth's Cute Tits*).

I consider myself a priest of the fourteen words; that is, a spiritual heir of the National Socialist legacy. But I reject neo-Nazism because neo-Nazis are simply white nationalists plus Nazi paraphernalia. We have already seen that, unlike the Germans, these American groups love degenerate music, Judaised Hollywood and non-reproductive sex. Many are also anti-Nordists who dismiss the injunction quoted in Stellrecht's first *Faith and Action* lesson and quoted in *The Fair Race*: 'But if your blood has traits that will make your children unhappy and a burden to the state, then you have the heroic duty to be last.'

Even pure Aryans hate Nordicism. By contrast, what I love about Himmler is that, precisely because he wasn't handsome, he admired the hyper-Nordics of a Norwegian village that the SS visited, and harboured the idea that its people could become a biological template for the Reich. These are Stubb's words about white nationalists:


Not only does it [Nordicism in general and National Socialism in particular] retrigger all the anti-racist conditioning they thought they'd gotten rid of, but it makes them ask 'where does it end?' 'At what point can we finally stop paying attention to each others genetic (and non-genetic) flaws?'

The answer is that it doesn't end: that all life is struggle and hierarchy and that the Aryan race will never be perfected

nor entirely freed from threats. But that's not what they want to hear. Pierce made eugenics the core of his religious outlook as a means of protecting the eugenically-selecting society. But I see little concern for the subject among modern white nationalists. Can you imagine a racial state with a comprehensive eugenic policy that *didn't* consider the reversal of mongrelisation to be a major objective? [Stellrecht's advice]. That it *wouldn't* make its population look more like Swedes and less like Sicilians, as time goes on? It's hard to do so, which is why I believe 'anti-Nordicism' in white nationalism has, among other things, shut down much of the discussion on the subject.

In September 2013, on Harold Covington's blog, several commenters subscribed to political correctness in attacking Covington so as not to offend the feelings of contemporary Greeks. One more sensible commenter opined: 'Those among us who don't have the ability to look at a picture of half-Turks and tell they're not White weren't ever going to amount to anything on behalf of the White race.' The other side in Covington's 'revolutionary' forum ignore that DNA tests have even revealed black genes among quite a few Portuguese. This cowardly failure to acknowledge the basics of Indo-European studies isn't the only thing that bothers me about the internet movement known as white nationalism. I also resent the neo-Nazis demanding that I dismiss the Holocaust stories as a hoax.

As someone who has spent many years studying controversial subjects (the pseudoscience in both parapsychology and biological psychiatry), I know full well that you have to spend at least a decade of your life trying to digest the literature on both sides of an intellectual debate. I am now in my mid-fifties and have neither the time nor the motivation to research Holocaust claims and counter-claims. It is enough for me to point out that two former Holocaust revisionists, Mark Weber, director of the Institute of Historical Review, and David Irving, our best historian of the Third Reich, have changed their minds over the years, and both now accept that a couple of million Jews probably died during the war. Irving's forthcoming books on Herr Himmler cite historical records that prove that, although the figure of six million is an invention, two million Jews probably died as a result of harsh Nazi treatment.



David Irving in 2012

But I would like to go beyond Irving's scruples. A radical Swede commented on my site:

What is certain is that the Holocaust would not have produced any debilitating psychological effect on non-Christian whites. (By Christianity I mean 'Christian morality.' Most atheists in the West are still Christian, even if they don't believe in God or Jesus.) Being emotionally affected by the Holocaust presupposes that you think: (1) Victims and losers have intrinsically more moral value than conquerors and winners, (2) Killing is the most horrendous thing a human can do, (3) Killing children and women is even more horrendous and (4) Every human life has the same value.

None of these statements ring true to a man who has rejected Christian morality. Even if the Holocaust happened, I would not pity the victims or sympathise with them. If you told the Vikings that they needed to accept Jews on their lands or give them gold coins because six million of them were exterminated in an obscure war, they would have laughed at you.

Thank you Nietzschean of the North! Himmler too believed that the Germans' moral compass was misled by the forces of the Church. And let us never forget Hitler's own words in one of his after-dinner talks: 'The hardest blow that humanity has received was the arrival of Christianity.' If the neo-Nazis were true National Socialists they would be trying to prove that Himmler's 1943 Posen Speech is genuine, not a hoax as some of them claim, and would even find genocidal inspiration in the speech. (Rephrasing a passage from Peter Helmkamp in *Controlled Burn*, Joseph Walsh asserted on

my blog ‘The truth is that the glad stirrings of genocide lurk in the heart of every man, yet only the Nazis had the courage to acknowledge the truth.’)

I have read *The Turner Diaries* twice. When I first read it or rather listened to the audio version with Pierce’s voice, I was still struggling with the last remnants of my Christian programming. I didn’t like the cruelties like dispatching a whole bunch of pro-white warriors for not dealing with the Jewish problem in Toronto. And in the Day of the Rope, I was troubled by the description that many innocent white folks also die. Then I read Covington’s quartet and sensed a moral difference. Covington’s characters aren’t as genocidal terminators. I could imagine myself doing the things that we read in Covington’s novels, but in the past some passages in the *Diaries* made me doubt...

Now I have left the Christian ethics behind and can finally see that Pierce was ultimately right. As priests of the fourteen words, in the coming race wars we must be imbued with *gravitas* and *severitas*. The big difference between Covington’s saga and the *Diaries* is that in Pierce’s world not only an ethnostate is born: in the final pages it is described that only the Aryan race will inherit the Earth. In Covington’s world, such a scenario is ruled out because it would entail genocide on a scale not even performed by the Bolshevik Jews.

18 March 2014

On exterminationism

§ 1

No one, as far as I know, has written an exhaustive analysis of his parents. But what I said in *Hojas Susurrantes* about the murder of children's souls only lays the foundation for a deeper elaboration of psychohistory, which ultimately shows us that the human species is a failed species.

§ 2

From a careful reading of my books it cannot but be deduced that most of the human species should be exterminated, in addition to what is written there because, as Schopenhauer said, if the world is a hell, human beings are the devils of the animals. And if we want to save the animals from the human devils, we have no choice but to dispatch the latter.

§ 3

That only some of the most beautiful specimens of Nordic whites deserve to live on, so beautiful in body and soul that they have left human devilry behind, has become as evident to me as that the cow is a mammal.



23 September 2014

Second part

Jews genociding Germans

(an Amazon Books review)

Not for sixty years has a book been so brutally suppressed as *Eye For an Eye: The Story of Jews who Sought Revenge for the Holocaust*. One major newspaper, one major magazine, and three major publishers paid \$40,000 for it but were scared off. One printed 6,000 books, then pulped them. Two dozen publishers read *An Eye for an Eye* and praised it. ‘Shocking,’ ‘startling,’ ‘astonishing,’ ‘mesmerising,’ ‘extraordinary,’ they wrote to author John Sack. ‘I was riveted,’ ‘I was bowled over,’ ‘I love it,’ they wrote but all two dozen rejected it. Finally, BasicBooks published *An Eye for an Eye*. It ‘sparked a furious controversy’ said *Newsweek*. It became a best-seller in Europe but was so shunned in America that it also became, in the words of *New York Magazine*, ‘The Book They Dare Not Review.’

Since then, both *60 Minutes* and *The New York Times* have corroborated what Sack wrote: that at the end of World War II, thousands of Jews sought revenge for the Holocaust. They set up 1,255 concentration camps for German civilians—German men, women, children and babies. There they beat, whipped, tortured and murdered the Germans.

But presently, in this world of white cowards Sack’s book is out of print.

15 August 2016

Foundation myth

*by Felix Rex*⁸

Many if not all sedentary people have their foundation myth. For the Romans it began with Romulus and Remus. For the British it is a little more complex; but for the modern UK it goes all the way back to 1066, and for Americans it goes back to the days of the American Revolution and the Founding Fathers.

But the years 1914 to 1945 have irrevocably changed the nature and character of Western civilisation and her foundation myths. World War I and World War II were, if we look at it reasonably, a single conflict. One that started in 1914 but was not resolved in 1918 and for that reason the grievances created at Versailles were revisited in 1939 and ended with the utter destruction of not only Germany but, as an expressed intention of the Allies, the breaking of the German spirit.

But in the rush to make sure that Germans would never rise up again the same mental virus of cultural shame, self-loathing and contempt for what had come before was contracted by the so-called Western victors of that fratricidal war.

In the summer of 1914 Western civilisation, it could be argued, was at its Zenith. It stood across the world powerful, prosperous, growing and most importantly: confident. By the summer of 1945 and with the only beneficiary of the second bout of war in Europe being the United States, the continent itself was shattered, bankrupt, divided in two camps and in the state of psychological shock. And for the next twenty years the continent took the time to slowly rebuild itself. But it was the baby-boom generation born after that conflict, and beginning in the 1960s while

⁸ The video on which this text is based was uploaded in September 2017, when Felix Rex was using the pseudonym 'Black Pigeon Speaks.' YouTube deleted the video. Fortunately, I had patiently transcribed most of his words by hand.

they began to reject all of the history, morality and beliefs that have been bequeathed them by previous generations. This generation simply rebelled for the sake of it. And it was at this time that the foundation myth for the entirety of Western civilisation morphed into what we currently enact when we go to school, speak with friends, read the news and watch television. And what you're witnessing today is the result of the steady march and inculcation in our populace of our new cultural foundation myth with is profoundly negative.

But before I get ahead of myself, first of all what is a foundation myth and what functions does it provides a society?⁹ Well, first it comports and provides an origin, framework and superstructure for society and how it interacts with the world and itself. Second, it defines what is the ultimate good and conversely, ultimate evil for the reasons of defining values and from those to justify who holds power. And third it determines and defines what is held sacred in a society. For the modern West, from Australia to the US and back to the Old Continent, at least the countries that were not subsumed by the Soviet Union, the narrative of the Second World War has become our new foundation myth, and if you think about it, the reason is it fulfils all three functions. Whenever referring to modern history the line is drawn: we live in the post-war period. For the most part the lines on the maps, the institutions and more importantly how we define our era as a society—all find their origins in World War II.

You learn from a very early young age that the ultimate incarnation of pure evil were the Nazis and thus those that oppose Nazis are the ultimate good. From this stance of ultimate good Western civilisation drives its core values of anti-nationalism, unity being a weakness, and diversity being a strength. All measure of civilisational confidence is bigotry. Any questioning with regards to the differences in people, cultures and their compatibility is taboo. This is why for example the violence perpetrated by groups like Antifa can be morally justified at least to themselves. Anyone who is a nationalist; anyone who wants to retain tradition, anyone who wants to limit immigration or believes in things like gender roles is enacting, in their minds, the narrative of the ultimate evil. It is self-

⁹ *Editor's note:* It is imperative, at this point, that the reader keeps 'The Iron Throne' in mind: the last pages of *On Beth's Cute Tits*.

evident when you hear mobs of automatons screeching at any group or individual they disagree with ‘Nazis off our streets. Nazis off our streets.’ So now, maybe perhaps you might be able to understand how a gay, Jewish man who enjoys interracial sex, that would be Milo Yiannopoulos, could ever be so ridiculously labelled with a term like ‘Nazi.’ Basically at this point a ‘Nazi’ is anyone that disagrees with any aspect of the current World War II foundation myth.

The only real value, topic or event that is held a sacrosanct and cannot be mocked, joked about or even questioned on pain of imprisonment in many countries in Europe is the Holocaust. Throughout the Western world in its entirety, to question even the details of the Holocaust is to have yourself shun by society and made a social pariah. And it is here when we begin to understand the West’s self-loathing, and what really is a sincere desire for collective, cultural, physical and psychological suicide—because all three functions of our post-war foundation myth are negative in the extreme. Instead of the origin being of strength, fertility and of a new and blossoming beginning, it is one of violence, death and destruction. Instead of ultimate good taking the central position in the story, it is in fact occupied by ultimate evil. In the post-war world Adolf Hitler is the personification of pure, unadulterated evil. And it is he that holds the central position in our World War II narrative. Instead of the sacred being that is revered, venerated and mysterious in Nature, it is the Holocaust: a crime against humanity.

Simply put: Our new, World War II foundation myth is an extremely negative one, and has poisoned the spirit of Western civilisation, and has caused it to lose all confidence in itself, its values and even the reason for its very existence—and given time will destroy it, utterly. All thought and what is considered the bounds and topics one may speak and orient oneself in are all downstream from this myth. And as long as the West’s understanding of itself is determined by this negative foundation myth the only direction is down.

The power of myths is not a trivial thing. Lose your original foundation myth and you will lose your identity. Look at the United States. Before the World War II foundation myth supplanted its original foundation myth, its origins was settlers founding a new and just land. Ultimate good was central to the narrative and was cantered around freedom and the ability to pursue happiness; and

the sacred was encapsulated by family, community, country, God. America's foundation myth—since the adoption of the all-new encompassing Western World War II foundation myth and through its lands—sees America's origin in the theft of the land from peaceful and noble natives. Ultimate evil in the form of slavery is central to the narrative, and the sacred is the unquestioning belief in white supremacy and the need to dismantle it at any cost.

The entire West is not only losing their local but also its civilisational identity, and has been changed to this World War II foundation myth, which has born the West its new corrosive, self-hating and malignant identity, and will... utterly destroy it. Maybe now you can understand Germany's wild desire to destroy themselves as quickly as possible. They are the progenitors and genesis of this new foundation myth; whether truthfully or not, doesn't matter.

24 September 2017

Interview with Jake



This Flemish-style landscape signed by Antonio Zucchi (1726-1795) is now very close to the desk where I work. It has accompanied me since I was a child, and I am very pleased that this original Zucchi canvas is owned by my family.

Jake F. interviewed me a couple of years ago. These are his words: "The below text is of a scripted interview I was to conduct with César Tort of *The West's Darkest Hour*. Due to unforeseen circumstances we could not record. However, César graciously offered to allow this interview to be published on *The Right Stuff*."

卐 卐 卐

Jake: Hello, and welcome to *Manifest Destiny*! This is Jake and I'll be your host today. I have the privilege of bringing you a rare interview with César Tort of *The West's Darkest Hour*. What César brings to the table is a rare combination of principled fearsomeness and refined sensibility. This interview will serve as an exposition and clarification of his thought for an unfamiliar audience. Questions and answers were composed in advance for purposes of clarity. As always, thank you for listening and enjoy. César: please give us a brief overview of your background and journey to your

present ideological positions. Which books, authors, films, and music inspired you?

César: Thank you for having me here, Jake. I'll get straight to the point. Both my parents were artists, but from my mid-teens, they became abusive as hell, and I was the target of this abusive madness, which of course destroyed my young life. I explain the tragedy in two books, *Hojas Susurrantes*, another I have just finished, and I will soon start the third of the trilogy. My sister died this year. In my last book, I state that her death was probably related to the trauma we suffered in our adolescence. With my books, I think I am starting a new literary genre. If I manage to finish the third one, I will be the first writer in history to analyse his extremely abusive family in a complete trilogy.

As for the books and films that have inspired me, I would say that *2001: A Space Odyssey* was a major influence from the time I saw it in 1968. I was ten years old then: long before the abuse at home. After my family became so destructive, Arthur Clarke's *Childhood's End* had a big impact on my life. Later still, Alice Miller's books helped me to understand my incredibly destructive family. As for music, I listened to Mussorgsky and Stravinsky from an early age. Mussorgsky's *Dawn on the Moscow River* was my first love. It was only at puberty that I discovered Beethoven.

Jake: You seem to be heavily influenced by psychohistory. Could you briefly define it for our audience? What insights have you gleaned from it? What faults have you found with it?

César: This is my interpretation of psychohistory: Most adult children of extremely abusive parents go crazy. Literally crazy I mean: like the magical thinking of tribes since prehistoric times. And some cultures are much more abusive than others. Psychohistory is a term used by the American Lloyd deMause to investigate child abuse through recorded history. The meta-perspective that psychohistory provides helped me to contextualise what happened in my family. The problem with deMause is that he is a rabid liberal, some would even say he might be Jewish, like Alice Miller. In the only section of my trilogy that has been translated into English, *Day of Wrath*, I try to isolate the legit psychohistory from deMause's crazy liberalism.

Jake: You make incisive criticisms of psychiatry as a pseudoscientific field that often fails to draw upon or selectively draws upon neurological research. How specifically is it wounding our people? How deeply do such wounds go?

César: Interestingly, Kevin MacDonald used to teach child psychopathology at university before his recent retirement. I don't know if MacDonald knows that psychiatry is an iatrogenic profession, meaning that psychiatric drugs often cause a much more serious mental condition for the client than the original distress or disorder. For example, international studies show that people in third-world countries, with few resources to buy so-called antipsychotics, fare much better than those diagnosed with schizophrenia. In other words, so-called antipsychotics are iatrogenic: they only make the original disorder worse. My *Day of Wrath* contains academic references to support this claim, but it is something you will never hear in the media, not even in white nationalist outlets.

One of the things that infuriates me in trying to communicate with white nationalists is that, in addition to pseudo-scientific studies on race, gender and sexual orientation, there are other pseudo-sciences. Psychiatry is one of them. The nationalists have no idea that this pseudo-medical profession has as much scientific basis as the study of UFOs.

Let me expand on this a little.

Those plugged into the Matrix believe that schizophrenia is the product of a chemical imbalance. Unplugged dissidents know that mental disorders aren't biomedical conditions. A computer analogy is useful here. Imagine a technician who doesn't believe in the existence of computer viruses in software. This guy is always trying to fix computers by tinkering with the hardware. That is exactly what psychiatrists do: they deny the existence of 'software' in the human mind, so to speak. So they treat every mental disorder as a brain disorder. For psychiatrists, biology is destiny. Trauma doesn't exist or is irrelevant. Only genes matter. But psychiatry cannot demonstrate any biological markers, genetic, chemical imbalance or otherwise, in any of the major psychiatric disorders. That is why neurology, which is real science, is separated in universities from psychiatry, which isn't a science but a gigantic business. Moreover, all pseudosciences present their central tenets

as non-falsifiable hypotheses, i.e. hypotheses that cannot be disproved through the scientific method. What most people ignore is that psychiatry also presents its core tenet, mental illness, as a non-falsifiable hypothesis. This is explained in detail in the book mentioned above.

Jake: You've written extensively on child abuse and its racial implications. Chiefly, that non-Whites are much more likely to abuse their offspring and much more likely to do it in horrific ways. Besides obvious things (like removing Judeo-liberal media or moving to a Whiter area) what advice would you have for racially conscious White parents?

César: If you have abusive parents in mind, you can't educate them. They are simply unaware of their abuse. In my latest book, for example, I have published my mother's entire diary. It is shocking to see that throughout her diary, especially in the 1970s, she had no idea that she was driving her children mad. In an ethnostate, it would be possible for the child to find a window of escape from abusive families through the Hitler Youth. But even in an Aryan ethnostate, future parents would have to be taught not to abuse their children. Along with the Hitler Youth, the education of young couples about to marry is the only way I can think of to ensure that children are not abused in the future.

Jake: In the past, you have discussed a collapse scenario as presenting the best or only chance Whites will have to exercise the Fourteen Words freely. What if the collapse never comes? What do you think about the collapse as a mythical trope for 'fringe' political movements or causes?

César: I have referred to psychiatry as a pseudo-science that the average white nationalist is unaware of. But other pseudo-sciences are taught in academia that nationalists also ignore. Another example is Keynesian economics, which now influences not only academia but the Federal Reserve and the banking system. You cannot have a prosperous economy with the current system of huge debt and huge spending. The US is almost 20 trillion in debt and if the Fed starts Quantitative Easing 4 it will dwarf previous QEs combined. Quantitative 'easing,' of course, is inflation jargon: expansion of the money supply, paper dollars. Sooner or later the dollar will hyperinflate because of this astronomical expansion of

the money—or rather currency—supply. Economists who reject the crazy paradigm that rules the financial world predict a currency crash. And this means something like the depression of 1929. But unlike in 1929, there are millions of blacks, especially in the big cities. After the currency crash they will chimp out and contribute wonderfully to the collapse of the System. By the way, have you seen the Jewish film *Imperium*? There is a character in the film, Gerry Conway, the one betrayed by Nate Foster (played by Daniel Radcliffe, the Harry Potter actor). Well, with his group Conway attempts to produce what he calls ‘The Event,’ which is supposed to awaken whites, a great act of terrorism. In real life, this is unnecessary. The Event is coming anyway. And not from racists like us, but the mistakes of the Fed and international monetary policies.

Jake: Nordicism is a particularly loaded term. Who exactly are the Nordic peoples? Are they a distinct sub-race located only in certain White countries? Do they form the upper crust in every White society? Or are they something else entirely?

César: In my opinion white nationalism or the alt-right, whatever you want to call it, is phoney. The real thing is National Socialism. Unlike the National Socialists, the alt-right is like the Republicans: they have amnestied millions of non-whites in Mediterranean Europe. The Germans of the 1930s knew better: the standard of whiteness is the Nordic type.

A couple of Europeans have developed a new racial classification that clarifies this issue. According to them, the phenotype is as important as the genetic studies. Based on the phenotype we can say that many of us Meds are not properly white. *Some* are. I’ve seen girls in Spain as Aryan as in the Nordic countries, but not in the proportion that I’ve seen such women in purer countries. Many Meds are mudbloods, something the Germans knew quite well, so much so that marriage between mudbloods and National Socialists was discouraged.

As this is a scientific topic, I recommend those who want to understand Nordicism to study carefully the most erudite article on my blog. It is entitled *Gens alba conservanda est*, which in Latin means ‘the white race must be preserved.’ Unfortunately, most white nationalists are anti-Nordicists. They are still in the grip of the egalitarian ideology that is destroying the West. Most of them

sincerely believe that all whites are created equal. I would also recommend that you read William Pierce's *Who We Are*, to get my point. Pierce wasn't a white nationalist. Like the National Socialists, he was the real thing. The biggest surprise the reader will find in his book is that the founding stock of the ancient Greeks and Romans was Nordid, real white people.

Jake: Much like Dr William Pierce, you postulate a Witches' Brew (essentially a convergence of catastrophic trends) theory of factors leading to the gradual and sometimes rapid extermination of our race. What ranks near the top that most of our people are missing? Conversely, what are we greatly overestimating?

César: For those who accept the premises of *Who We Are* it is clear that the main enemy of whites is whites themselves, especially the civilisational decay that comes from the politics of wealth over race and the foundational myth after the Second World War. I have lived in Mexico for more than half a century. Latin America is a lot like Mexico if you visit the countries south of the Rio Grande. What the Spanish and Portuguese did in the Americas, mixing their blood since the 16th century, was the product of greed, the lust for gold. It was also the result of the universalist creed of the Catholic Church, which considered Amerindians as 'souls' to be 'saved.' The Iberians who conquered the continent also brought the Inquisition, which persecuted Jews and crypto-Jews. But even in New Spain these two factors, economic greed and universalist Catholicism destroyed the Spanish gene pool. White nationalists ignore the history of the American South because it breaks their little narrative. Their narrative is that Jewry alone is the factor in white decline. The fact is that there are other important factors besides Jewry that nationalists ignore. Christian ethics is the active substance in the witches' brew, as demonstrated in the history of Spain and New Spain (1521-1821).

Jake: On a related note, you've produced a volume of writing on different strains of Counter-Semitism. Could you go into more detail on this taxonomy of Counter-Semitism?

César: The Jewish problem is one of the most serious in the West. For centuries and even millennia, Jews have been a hostile minority in the West. There is no question about it. Just look at how they lobbied for a century to open the doors to non-white

immigration to the United States. Just look at the role they played in the Holocaust on non-Jews committed by Bolshevik Jews (cf. Solzhenitsyn's *200 Years Together*). Just look at who controls the anti-white media and how the Jews have tried to prevent whites from waking up. The problem itself cries out for a final solution of some kind. This is one aspect in which I don't differ much from the white nationalists. We both try to find radical solutions to the problem. We agree on the medicine.

But we disagree on the diagnosis. To me, it is clear that the Aryan problem caused the Jewish problem, not the other way around. Perhaps the best analogy would be to see Christianity as HIV, and the Jewish problem as an AIDS-related infection, like pneumonia. Kill the bacteria if you want. I won't complain about Alex Linder's solution. But if you don't remove the virus—Christian ethics—you can still have a relatively *Judenfrei* society that commits racial suicide, as happened here in Latin America. It is simply untrue, as Andrew Anglin of *The Daily Stormer* recently wrote, that 'physically removing the Jews will solve every other problem.' My ancestors expelled the Jews from New Spain and just look at the mess that is Mexico today: those ancestors still committed ethnosuicide, and on a continental scale!

Jake: From your research, what are the strengths and weaknesses of Nietzsche's thought in general and in furthering the Fourteen Words?

César: As far as I know, no National Socialist treatise mentions Nietzsche, but Hitler admired him to some extent. Before Nietzsche lost his mind, his concept of the 'revaluation of all values' was very useful. I use it a lot in my anti-Christian trolling. I'll talk about this later in the interview.

Jake: Blake asks: In your writing, you refer to temples and priests of the Fourteen Words. Please expand upon these concepts. What would be the vocation and training of such a priesthood?

César: Here we have to remember what my Spanish friend Manu Rodríguez told me: We have to create the Aryan community, an *ecclesia* that by the way, we have never had. *Ecclesia*, you know, was the main assembly of ancient Athens. Aryan *ecclesias* have to flourish in our towns and cities. Our priests, and here I quote Manu, will not be experts in theology but in history, anthropology

and Indo-European cultures. A priest of the 14 words must teach the Western tradition to his young students. Today, without money to build temples like those in Greece and Rome, we can only organise barbecue meetings like those of Gerry Conway, my favourite character in the movie *Imperium*.

Jake: Your upcoming work *From St. Francis to Himmler* has piqued my interest. Based upon the title alone, it is reminiscent of William Gayley Simpson's journey from being an itinerant Franciscan to a fanatical Aryan racist. To what extent are you familiar with his work *Which Way Western Man?* What is it actually about if not your own voyage?

César: I haven't read Simpson's journey, but Francis is the most beloved saint for many Catholics. When I was abused by my father, who admired him, as a defence mechanism I developed a kind of piety inspired by the Italian saint. After the heartbreaking abuse I suffered, the doctrine of eternal damnation that I internalised from my father destroyed my image of a benign God. The spiritual odyssey from my adolescent piety to Himmler's exterminationism is the journey of a long night of my soul. But only those who read my autobiographical books will be able to get an idea.

Jake: For you, White Nationalism was merely a stepping stone to a much sterner and more disciplined National Socialism. Many American White Nationalists enjoy National Socialist iconography and pageantry, as well. What is the line of demarcation between these two ideologies? Is White Nationalism even an ideology or could it more accurately be described as a sentiment? How can American Whites steeped in republican, individualist beliefs adapt to a more 'collective' or duty-oriented belief system? What if National Socialism is non-essential or merely adapted to Germanic norms? Finally, which National Socialist texts are American White Nationalists missing or refusing to read?

César: Instead of answering question by question let me say that the line of demarcation is what George Lincoln Rockwell did: he formed a fascist party. White nationalists do nothing of the sort. If Rockwell hadn't been assassinated, radicals like Dylann Roof would have found a warm home and a healthier way to channel their hatred. Individualistic Americans will change radically, and I mean radically when the convergence of catastrophes is already

underway: the apocalyptic, tectonic-plate convergence between energy devolution and a political crisis in the West. That collision will create a real mountain. If 'Our race is our nation' then, theoretically, a sort of National Socialism is feasible among Anglo-Saxons, not only among Germans. Rockwell saw it clearly and he was right. The most important book to wake up white people is the one written by Tom Goodrich: *Hellstorm: The Death of Nazi Germany*. I believe that any honest white person who reads it will shatter, in his mind, the foundational post-World War II myth. Once the media narrative is destroyed, I would recommend a National Socialist textbook for young readers, *Faith and Action*, by Helmut Stellrecht. It is available on the internet.

Jake: Blake asks: Many White Nationalists advocate the creation of an ethnostate or ethno-states for White-Aryans to seek refuge in. They often fail to mention whether this goal is their highest aim or merely a tactical one. Assuming White-Aryans had the capability to do with the Earth as they wish, what should they do? You've been called quite a few names for suggesting that Earth should be made a Whites-only planet. How do you respond to this?

César: In my last book in Spanish, I explain why the human race is a failed species. Most deserve extermination, except for the most beautiful Aryans with a good heart for nature, children and animals. Extermination is a theme that has only been partially explored in fiction, at the end of *The Turner Diaries*. It is time to speak out using the genre of non-fiction, as I have just done with my latest book. I had said that I was inaugurating a new literary genre. But I omitted to mention that, if completed, my trilogy goes far beyond that autobiographical genre and becomes a philosophical system. From this point of view, exterminationism is more than a bizarre subject: it is what we can call the *Significant A* of the coming overman. But let's shift the conversation to a more normal topic.

Jake: Rock music is controversial within racist spheres. You take an uncompromising stance against it for a host of reasons. Two that come to mind are its negro roots and repetitive notes. But rock has been so heavily appropriated by Whites that even negroes flee from it now. At what point does White ownership (in terms of content; we know Jews dominate the music industry) erase a genre's origins? Is this even possible? Are there any healthy modern White music genres? Many would defend folk and electronic music as the

latest resurgence of authentic White culture in music. Do you agree? Finally, which classical composers or performers would you suggest to a modern White wishing to expand his or her tastes?

César: Folk music is okay, but not what the National Socialists called ‘degenerate music.’ White nationalists have been unable to recognise that such music is used by the System to degrade the spirit of whites, to control them. A passage from 1984, written before the birth of rock, was prophetic. Music in the totalitarian world says Orwell, ‘had a wild, barking rhythm which could not exactly be called music, but resembled the beating of a drum... The proles had taken a liking to it.’ The alt-right people would be degenerate proles from the National Socialist point of view. As for classical composers, I would recommend starting with Walt Disney’s 1959 film, *Sleeping Beauty*. Its soundtrack contains a masterful edition of Tchaikovsky’s ballet music. But the real trick is not to add classical music to your repertoire, but to subtract degenerate music from what you listen to. I have always compared degenerate music to degenerate sex. A man cannot have a healthy marriage with a lovely wife and children and, at the same time, indulge in escapades in gay bars. The degenerate side of both sexual lifestyles and musical tastes must be completely cut-off from our way of life.

Jake: On several occasions, you’ve described the *Sublimis Deus* papal bull as the original sin committed in South America. Could you give us some background on this proclamation? Was it a logical extension of Christian doctrine or an aberration?

César: It was an extension of the universalism of the Church, where all races can enter a church. In fact, ‘catholic’ means universal. But the original sin of the Spanish and Portuguese was not the papal bull: it was the lust for gold and silver in Mexico and Peru. The Catholic bull that allowed the white Iberians to marry the brown Indians was a fatal sin, but not the original one.

Jake: Lately, the phrase ‘pathological altruism’ has been used to describe a weakness of the White-Aryan psyche. Is this valid and sufficient? Do you agree with Dr Sunic and Pierre Krebs that a universal Christian memplex is the source of our vulnerability, instead?

César: I don't know much about Krebs but Sunic is quite smart. He doesn't just blame Christianity as a more elemental factor in white decline than Jewry; he says capitalism is the main factor. But now I think the main factor is the new foundational myth, the story we have been telling ourselves about the Second World War.

Jake: Blake asks: How do we as a race combat our predisposition to choose wealth over a sound society? Alain de Benoist notes that critics of immigration must also critique capitalism lest they contradict themselves. What must be done to slay Mammon once and for all? Or, at the very least, restrain him?

César: Mammon will die a natural death in this century. I believe not only in the coming financial collapse but also peak oil and energy devolution in this century. Once the oil runs out, corporate capitalism can no longer be the economic paradigm, especially after the race wars turn bourgeois whites into blond warriors. The paradigm of the future is farming. To use an image from the penultimate chapter of *The Lord of the Rings*, I would say that the new paradigm lies in the return to the bucolic Shire. That all-important chapter, 'The Scouring of the Shire,' wasn't filmed in Peter Jackson's version of *LOTR*. In the book, that I have read, the war in the Shire occurs after the One Ring has been destroyed. The ring is a metaphor for the gold...

Jake: What are your thoughts on the so-called manosphere? How should Aryans approach courtship in a day and age where it's too early to procure Sabine women yet too late to find a young woman that isn't a pod person? On a related note, how should White-Aryans answer the homosexual question?

César: Degenerate though they may be, much of what is said in the manosphere is true. I have started to draw up a guide for the priests of the fourteen words. You shouldn't discuss with Jews or non-white people. You should even try to avoid discussing serious issues with white pod women. I recently discovered a blogger, Turd Flinging Monkey (TFM). I was surprised to learn scientific facts concerning all white men that I didn't find in Roger Devlin's more formal writings. Yes: TFM is clueless on the Jewish question and a total degenerate. But there's something about his manosphere rants

that merits analysis. When I finish the corrections to my book I will watch all his videos.¹⁰

Courtship is impossible at the moment, except if you move to an Amish or Mennonite community. So what can we do before the collapse of the rule of law, a rule that prevents Aryans from kidnapping and raping Sabine women? The degenerate TFM recommends masturbation with sex dolls. A priest of the holy words would never do such a thing! As for homosexuality, it's a shame that some open homosexuals on the alt-right aren't ashamed to speak publicly about their condition as if it were perfectly normal.

Jake: Unlike most pro-Whites, you stand by Heinrich Himmler with few reservations. What can we learn from him? How does he stand about more 'mystical' figures on the Right like Spengler or Yockey?

César: I know almost nothing about Spengler, except that he refused to support National Socialist ideas of racial superiority. Yockey was a great essayist but the style he chose for his famous book, the same one that gave its name to the recent film *Imperium*, is too philosophical for my taste. What I like about Himmler is that he volunteered to do the dirty work: extermination. I identify with Uncle Heinrich because, like him, I don't look Aryan. But when his SS visited Norway, he admired them very much for the purity of the Nordic stock there.

I believe that later in this century, when the population bubble bursts, Himmler-style exterminationism should become the religion of the Blond Beast. Only the best should survive. I imagine all over the Earth the beauty that Hitler and Himmler saw in certain Nordid peoples, a return to the Shire so to speak after the death of Sauron. Nietzsche's concept of the transvaluation of all values comes in handy here. When millions of white teenagers replace their Che Guevara T-shirts for Himmler ones, I'll know that the race is saved. I can only hope that my books will help young whites re-evaluate their values.

¹⁰ See how I summariaed TFM's ideas in the *On Beth's Cute Tits* article 'Our lycanthropic lust.'

Jake: Are pro-Whites approaching the subject of Holocaust revisionism correctly or incorrectly? How should it be approached and why?

César: Incorrectly. You have to start with the Holocaust committed by the Allied forces. I sincerely believe that any nationalist who hasn't read the abridged edition of Alexander Solzhenitsyn's *The Gulag Archipelago* and Tom Goodrich's *Hellstorm* is a historical fool. It isn't just that after World War II the Germans were dishonestly demonised. The greatest secret of our time is that the astronomical crimes of the Allied forces dwarf what the Germans did. What the Soviet Union and the United States perpetrated in peacetime was more monstrous than the crimes attributed to the Germans in wartime, precisely because the Allied Holocaust was perpetrated in peacetime. I refer to the crimes committed by Eisenhower and the Soviets between 1945 and 1947. Virtually all Westerners, including white nationalists, are unaware of this Holocaust because of the foundational myth that began after the war. I would predict that if whites don't atone for the genocide perpetrated against the German people, they will become extinct.

Jake: Looking North, what are your thoughts on Donald Trump and the alt-right? What advice do you have for the average alt-rightist? What ideological pitfalls should he avoid that we haven't already discussed?

César: The alt-right can have their 15 minutes of fame after Trump wins. But when things get ugly, the proles will look to the more masculine, hate-filled voices.

Jake: What is it like being a White or Aryan Man in Mexico? What has been lost in Mexico's de-Europeanisation process? Can the average 'race-neutral' or un-awakened American White fathom what a majority-coloured country is like day in and day out? More broadly, what do we have to lose that we don't know we have to lose?

César: Latin America is too far gone. You can't do anything here in the South. You Americans have half a *century* of polluting your blood, but there are still millions of pure whites in the US and Canada. Here we have half a *millennium* of miscegenation and in 500 years no intellectual voice has been raised against this soft genocide

of Iberian whites. I can speak at length on the subject, but one anecdote will suffice.

Recently a reunion was organised of my former classmates from the Madrid School in Mexico who graduated forty years ago. This was a school founded by those who fled from Francisco Franco after the civil war. Two of my whiter, blond and very handsome classmates four decades ago, married mestizo women and formed mud-blooded families. I was shocked. Nowadays, the teenagers at the Madrid school, who in my adolescence were mostly white, have turned light brown. The second generation! Practically all white Latin Americans are pod people. Even Argentina and Uruguay are goners. In the United States at least they have Fox News. In the Spanish-speaking countries, Spain included, there isn't a single media outlet that sides with Donald Trump. What's left of the Iberian whites are like Jeb Bush: happily marrying midget Latinas, easy sex. Our only hope is for a hardcore ethnostate to form in the North and then proceed to conquer so-called Latin America and turn it into New Scandinavia.

Jake: Where can our listeners find your work online? Where can they purchase your books? What parting message do you have for our listeners?

César: They can use the internet search engine Yandex and find *The West's Darkest Hour*. Our books and free PDFs are linked in the featured post. My parting words are simple: I am not a white nationalist. I am a guy to the right of Himmler. Currently only one of my books is in English, *Day of Wrath*, which I have dedicated to you. As the rest of my books will take time to be translated into English, read instead the books of William Pierce and see for yourselves how an American also rejected Christian ethics.



The interview was republished on my website on October 29, 2017, and lightly edited for this book.

Steiner's review

by Editor

At last, *Day of Wrath* (DOW) is once again available to the general public.¹¹ Today I also discovered that last September, Charles Steiner had written a very critical review of it, from which I will quote a few excerpts:

Due to the evil in his family, the author of this book hates humanity. The evil in his family was child abuse, which happened to the author when he was an adolescent, more than forty years ago. The book does not detail the circumstances...

Steiner doesn't mention that in the Introduction I say that DOW is merely a selection of chapters from my two thick autobiographical volumes in Spanish.

...the author asserts on page 373 of this 377-paged harangue [Steiner refers to the out-of-print, pocketbook edition of DOW], adding elsewhere that 'I know exactly no one with honour or true nobility of soul.'

Steiner's straw man omits my earlier phrase 'of Criollo men, for example' implying that I know of no Latin American male of a noble soul since they all seem to be blue-billed in this part of the continent. And he made another straw man when I spoke of the highway outside my house, that I would like all motorists to die. Steiner's prose misled the reader by implying that I wanted *that* for all humanity (which includes Aryans): something I didn't write since hardly any Aryans drive on that highway in the Mexican city where I live. He also said: 'The pessimism expressed in this book is similar to that which can be found in Arthur Schopenhauer's *World as Will and Representation*...'

¹¹ Note of 2022: The book has been censored, again, by Lulu Inc.

There is a problem here. Steiner speaks of the selection known as *DOW* as if it were my last word. The ending of my book *¿Me Ayudarás?* (and now of *El Grial*) could be interpreted as optimistic.

...or in David Benatar's *Better to Never Have Been: The Harm of Never Coming Into Existence*, Benatar's most current work, *The Human Predicament*, or E.M. Cioran's *The Trouble With Being Born*, with one large exception: the latter works are definitely better written, more literary and readable and are more concise and rely less on Wikipedia and online research.

But I am not an anti-natalist. See the article 'On solving the problem of evil' near the end of this book. Also, since it is very difficult for me to write in a second language, and since Steiner hasn't read the original volumes in Spanish, he doesn't know whether my philosophy appears in a bad style in the *original* language.

Literally, on every page of this fat, squat book there are grammatical errors, typographical errors, stylistic errors, and incomprehensible declarations that can only mystify because the author is not a native English writer and has trouble understanding basic English syntax.

I have only lived abroad for a few years. If I had a sponsor I would have paid the expenses of a native English speaker to proofread the whole manuscript.

Why the author did not choose to use Grammarly software or a grammar checker, why he did not find a copy editor, even one who is a college student, I do not know.

I didn't even know grammar checkers existed! Besides, in Mexico City, where I live, no native university student would have much better English syntax than mine.

The book stands largely on the shoulders of two of the author's mentors: Julian Jaynes, author of *The Bicameral Mind* and Lloyd DeMause, author of *History of Childhood*, among several others.

I rely much more on deMause than on Jaynes (but in *DOW* I also expose deMause's follies).

Nonetheless, as has already been hinted at, however, the author has little patience or tolerance with evolution's slow procession through time, the changes through history or

promulgation of education toward a more civilised human being. He wants all forms of violence against children and animals eliminated, which means the extermination of millions of adult human beings.

Assuming you have Star-Child powers like the ending of Kubrick's *2001: A Space Odyssey*, what's wrong with the immediate extermination of Neanderthals considering that thousands of animals are being tortured by humans at this very moment?

On page 12 is a black and white reproduction of Hitler contemplating the bust of Nietzsche. The author hints (incorrectly, I believe) that since Hitler tried to wipe out a subversive tribe so he wants to wipe out all those 'subversives' who do not serve his values for an idyllic society of empathic child and animal lovers.

I didn't imply such thing, only suggested that Hitlerism isn't entirely incompatible with Nietzsche's philosophy.

In the middle of the book, there's a huge chunk of data he dumps on the reader about ancient Mexico's infanticidal traditions as well as a diatribe on later historians who either overlook these atrocities or pretend they don't exist. He wants people to know the facts of the cruelties against children throughout the history of mankind, and he will tell you about them *ad infinitum* and repeatedly so as to force your consciousness to recognise the dark and savage history of men and women and the deceitful and psychopathic cooperation of historians who are willing to do the intellectual work to hide that history at the expense of their academic integrity and honesty.

That was indeed my intention, yes.

César Tort runs a website entitled *The West's Darkest Hour...* No children or animals are in evidence there either. Clearly, like his book, a high-strung, self-involved, and volatile temperament rules the blog as well as the book under review here.

Remember: I am a priest of the four words ('Eliminate all unnecessary suffering') and of the fourteen words ('That the beauty of the white Aryan women shall not perish from the earth'). In Spanish, I focus on the former and in English on the latter.

I feel that his website like his book is a fraud in that both are ruled by an emotional trope of pessimism based on his experience of child abuse and for which reasonings and facts, whether historical or moral, are later found to justify that stance instead of the other way around, and I'm embarrassed for having spent good money to purchase a book that really is not worth the money I gave, a book that he or an editor easily might convert into a powerful article at the author's blog to be read for free if he or an editor took out all the repetitious, Wikipedia dump of material and merely summarised the contents.

Again we see Steiner's claim that I based my research on Wikipedia. If I used a Wikipedia discussion in the chapter on 'Arc' (a single chapter), it was because the Arc exchange on a Wikipedia discussion page was the only discussion on psychohistory that I have found. I have on my bookshelf the books that allowed me to research child sacrifice: the bulk of *DOW*. If the Wikipedia articles on the subject resemble the *DOW* data it is because I was heavily involved in writing them, as can easily be seen by checking the diffs of, for example, the Wikipedia article 'Infanticide' that I edited ten years ago. I added there the scholarly references, not the other way around: the claim that I based my research on Wikipedia! (I also contributed to the bibliographical sourcing of some Wikipedia articles on child sacrifice in Mesoamerica.)

As a writer, César Tort has something I'm calling 'narrative voice authority' when he writes, and while I don't know quite how he pulls it off, it is this voice that convinced me to keep reading despite the many serious flaws within this book. It is a skill that hypnotises the reader temporarily to believe that what he has to say is more than his mere opinion, and that what he has to say is, in fact, knowledge, when there is no knowledge presented at all...

And what about what makes up the bulk of *DOW*: the exposure of pre-Columbian Amerindian sadism and serial killing, the exact opposite of what is taught in academia today? Is that mere opinion?

The warning is: if parents don't honour their children and teach them well, at least one of them will grow up to be an unhealed adult who will force unsuspecting adult readers to read an angry, vitriolic harangue with an almanac full of facts

and attitude all aimed against the offending parental predator and others like him or her, a harangue authored by the abused child who hadn't been lucky enough to have good parents. The work of Alice Miller needs improvement while also forging ahead so as to avoid the views and attitudes expressed in this volume by someone who was terribly, foully hurt.

The fact that I'm hurt like hell doesn't invalidate my point of view, just as the hatred of a hypothetical survivor who witnessed the ritual sacrifice of his most beloved sister in Tenochtitlan doesn't invalidate his longing for the Aztec world to be destroyed by Europeans. *DOW* is merely an invitation to read *De Jesús a Hitler*.

But one thing Steiner got right is that I will need funding to pay for a native English proof-reader!

4 January 2018

How awake are you?

by Maurice

Level 1:

Nazis are evil, Democracy is good.
Jews are Holocaust survivors.
Christianity is for idiots.

Level 2:

Nazis were misled by an antisemitic demagogue.
The Holocaust may be false.
Christianity is 'okay.'

Level 3:

Germans were fighting against Zionists.
The Holocaust is false, Zionism is evil.
Christianity is good.

Level 4:

White Nationalism is good.
Jews are evil.
Christianity is a White religion.

Level 5:

National Socialism is good.
America is evil.
Christianity has been corrupted by Jews.

Level 6:

National Socialism is the only solution.
All countries are evil.
Christianity has always been a Jewish Psy-op.

Level 7:

White segregation is the only solution.
Modernity is evil.
Anti-Christian Paganism is good.

Level 8:

There are no political solutions.
Civilisation is evil.
Blood and Soil is the only true religion.

Level 9:

Non-white exterminationism is the only solution.
Most Whites are not true Whites.
All Whites are spiritually flawed.

Level 10:

Ten per cent of Whites are true humans, and must survive.
Ninety per cent of Whites are defective humans, of which
fifty per cent must die (males).
A hundred per cent of non-Whites are sub-humans, and all
must die.

Personally I'm a level 9, verging on level 10. I've met some
level 4, and only a few level 5. The leap from 5 to 6 is astronomical
due to the Christian malware rejection. Feels lonely sometimes...

30 August 2018

The Christian Question

by Maurice

There is a convergence taking place. It's happening in many dissident blogs and channels—the Christian Question. It's been lurking around for years, mostly disregarded as trivial topic of debate. But this rising nigger terrorism is making the internet's Occam razor cut deeper and deeper.

White Nationalists will have to choose. Christian Question: Yes or No. If you choose Yes, you're out. You're not part of the White Revolution. If you choose No, welcome to Level 6. Now start concocting ways to solve the Christian Problem. You'll find that transvaluing moral values isn't so trivial after all.

There are those who come up with a third option, 'it doesn't matter,' like that Devon Stack from Black Pilled. They want to continue to ignore the Christian Question, and want to continue fighting the System without any regard to the morality of their movement. 'We're all brothers,' he said. 'We're united by reason.' I laughed when I heard that.

I'm reminded of *The Turner Diaries* when, after the secession of the western states from the US, there was one rebel General in charge of a movement that was less radical than Earl Turner. They completely fell apart from infiltration and in-fighting and got crushed by the System.

That's what these purple-pilled, Christian Question-ignorers don't understand: accepting Christians in your movement is the same as accepting Jews.

The time will come when the ship will sink, and you need to sever the hands that cling to the lifeboat. Christians can't do that. Quite the contrary, they will pull up even more people into the lifeboat.

So start cleaning your mental room of filthy moral garbage, because you'll need a clear head with a clear morality and a lot of

HATE to fight the war that's coming. The Christian Question is old news for those who have been preparing. Get updated or get outdated.

June 12, 2020

Lebensraum

by Editor



Anyone who has read Arthur Kemp's *March of the Titans* knows that, for centuries, the ancient Russians were invaded by Mongols who substantially dyed Slavic blood with non-Aryan genes. Therefore, to understand the Master Plan East we must always keep in mind both Kemp's book, and also Pierce's proposed solution to the mudblood problem. The following is an edited article about the Third Reich's Master Plan East. I am quoting and rephrasing two sources: one in English and one in Spanish without the anti-German spin of both sources.

The *Generalplan Ost* (translated as Master Plan East) was a secret National Socialist plan for the colonisation of Central and Eastern Europe. Its implementation would have required large-scale ethnic cleansing in these European territories, occupied by Germany during World War II. The plan, prepared in the years 1939-1942, was part of the *Lebensraum* policy of Adolf Hitler, the National Socialist movement and the fulfilment of the *Drang nach Osten* (Drive to the East) ideology of German eastward expansion, both part of the broader plan to establish a New Order.

The body responsible for drafting this plan was the Reich Security Main Office (RSHA in German), the SS security organ responsible for fighting the enemies of National Socialism. It was a strictly confidential document, and its contents were known only to the highest echelons of the National Socialist hierarchy. According to the testimony of SS-Standartenführer Dr Hans Ehlich, the final version was drafted in 1940. As a senior RSHA official, Ehlich was responsible for the drafting of the Master Plan East together with Dr Konrad Meyer, Head of the Planning Office of Himmler's Reich Commissar for the Consolidation of the German People. It had been preceded by the *Ostforschung*, a series of studies and research projects carried out over several years by various academic centres to provide the necessary facts and figures. The draft versions were discussed by SS Chief Heinrich Himmler and his most trusted colleagues even before the outbreak of war.

Almost all the wartime documentation of the Master Plan East was deliberately destroyed shortly before Germany's defeat in May 1945. Thus, after the war, no copies were found among the documents in the German archives. Apart from Ehlich's testimony, several documents refer to this plan or are supplements to it. Although no copies of the actual document have been preserved, most of the essential elements have been reconstructed from memoranda, summaries and other related ancillary documents.

One of the main documents that have made it possible to recreate the content of the Master Plan East is a memorandum of 27 April 1942 entitled *Stellungnahme und Gedanken zum Generalplan Ost des Reichsführers SS* (Opinion and Ideas on the Reichsführer-SS General Plan East), written by Dr Erich Wetzel (*Leiter der Hauptstelle Beratungsstelle des Rassenpolitischen Amtes der NSDAP*). This memorandum is an elaboration of the Master Plan East.

Phases of the plan and its implementation

The final version of the *Generalplan Ost*, essentially a grand plan for ethnic cleansing, was divided into two parts: the *Kleine Planung* (Small Plan), which covered actions to be carried out during the war, and the *Grosse Planung* (Great Plan), which covered actions to be carried out after the war was won, to be implemented gradually throughout twenty-five to thirty years. The Master Plan

East envisaged varying percentages of the various conquered nations being subjected to

I Germanisation. For example, 50 per cent of the Czechs, 35 per cent of the Ukrainians and 25 per cent of the Belarusians,

II Extermination,

III Expulsion, and other fates such as

IV Slave labour.

The net effect was to ensure the full Aryanization of the conquered territories. Within ten years, the plan effectively envisaged the Germanisation, expulsion, extermination and/or enslavement of most or all of the East and West Slavs living behind the front lines in Europe.

The 'Small Plan' was to be implemented as the Germans conquered the areas east of their pre-war borders. Thus, the plan for Poland was drawn up at the end of November 1939 and is probably responsible for much of Germany's expulsion of Poles (first to the colonial district of the General Government and, from 1942 onwards, also to Polenlager).

After the war, under the 'Great Plan', the Master Plan East envisaged the expulsion of forty-five million of un-Germanisable people from Central and Eastern Europe, of whom thirty-two million were 'racially undesirable': Jews (100 per cent), Belarusians (75 per cent) and Ukrainians (65 per cent) were to be deported to Western Siberia, and some fourteen million of them were to remain. On the other hand, up to 8-10 million Germans were to be settled in an enlarged 'living space' or *Lebensraum*. Since the number of Germans seemed insufficient to populate the vast territories of Central and Eastern Europe, peoples considered racially situated between Germans and Russians (*Mittelschicht*), i.e. Latvians and even Czechs, were also to be resettled there.

Attempts at Germanisation were to be carried out only in the case of those foreigners from Central and Eastern Europe who could be considered a desirable element for the future Reich from the point of view of their genes. The Plan stipulated that there should be different methods of dealing with certain nations and even certain groups within them. There was even an attempt to establish the basic criteria for determining whether a given group lent itself to Germanisation. These criteria were to be applied more liberally in the case of nations whose racial material (*rassische*

Substanž) made them more suitable than others for Germanisation. The Plan considered that there were a large number of such elements among the Baltic nations. Dr Wetzel considered that a possible Germanisation of the entire Estonian nation and a considerable part of the Latvians should be envisaged. On the other hand, the Lithuanians seemed less desirable, as they contained too great an admixture of non-Germanic blood.

In any case, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia were to be deprived of their statehood, while their territories were to be included in the eastern zone of German settlement. This meant that Latvia and especially Lithuania would be covered by the deportation plans, albeit somewhat more gently than the Slavic or 'voluntary' emigration to Western Siberia. Although the Baltic nations, like the Estonians, would be spared, in the long run National Socialist planners didn't envisage their existence as independent entities. Initial plans were for Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia to be Germanised in twenty-five years, but Himmler revised them to twenty years. In 1941 it was decided to redesign the Polish nation and many Polish children were abducted for Germanisation, as we shall see.

Lebensborn

Heinrich Himmler was happy. 7 October 1939 was a very special day for him. Not only was he turning thirty-nine, but Hitler had appointed him Reich Commissar for the Consolidation of the German People, which, among other things made him responsible for the inhabitants of Poland: a country Germany had occupied a month earlier.

Himmler wasted no time. He immediately ordered a report and, a month later, had a forty-page text on his desk. The document contained a detailed plan for the efficient use of manpower in the conquered areas in the east. Most of the population was to be displaced or used for work so that the Germans could settle and enjoy the living space called *Lebensraum*. Those who remained were to be bred in Germany and become part of the master race. The report recommended that selection should be mainly among the youngest: 'We must exclude racially valuable children from deportations, so that they grow up in Reich schools run by German families', and ended with another recommendation: 'They should be

no older than eight or ten years old because up to that age their national identity can be completely changed and their final Germanisation achieved.’ After reading the report, Himmler decided that the solution for the children of Poland and other countries had to begin as soon as possible, even if it meant handing these children over to parents in a foreign country. The acquisition of new Aryan citizens for the Third Reich had a top priority. Below, Herr Himmler examines a non-German child looking at his racial potential.



Four years earlier, in December 1935, the entity in charge of the project, *Lebensborn* (Source of Life, not to be confused with *Lebensraum*)—a social welfare organisation whose main purpose was to offer different kinds of facilities to single mothers and their babies—had been created. The German population had been declining for decades and the country was suffering from a serious demographic crisis. The birth rate, which had been healthy at the turn of the century, had fallen to unhealthy levels by the year Hitler came to power. Reversing this trend was essential to the Führer’s ambition to populate the eastern regions with purer Aryans. Himmler calculated that 120 million people were needed. Family life and childbearing were promoted in various ways, most notably with special marriage loans and birth grants to encourage Germans to

bring more children into the world. At the same time, all information on contraception was suppressed and contraceptives were banned. Abortion was also banned, which was described as ‘sabotage against the future of Germany.’ The idea of increasing the population with a large number of children of the superior race was firmly rooted in the party’s mentality. Hitler had stated with conviction at a party meeting in 1929: ‘If Germany had a million children a year and eliminated 700,000 to 800,000 of the weaker ones’—referring to the mentally retarded—, ‘the result would probably be an increase in her strength’. At this thorny point, it is worth interpolating a couple of vignettes from my own life.

Non-blood relatives (since my grandmother married again after my grandfather died) had a son who was born in the same year as me. But this boy is mentally retarded, so terribly retarded that he once bit off his sister’s finger. Another case: the only friend I used to talk disparagingly about the race of the country we were born in had a sister with Down’s syndrome whose retardation was so great that, if left within a few feet of her flat, she wouldn’t know how to get home: an IQ lower than a dog’s. These real-life cases show that you have to be brainwashed by Christian ethics to avoid what the ancient Greeks and Romans did with their defective children. Christian ethics has damaged the morals of these people I know, and millions of others like them.

Among my relatives, only Uncle Beto admired Hitler. He once said thinking, I believe, about one of my disabled cousins: ‘I would kill a daughter like that and then I would go to hell!’ He meant that he would kill her if she were his daughter. Although I didn’t witness this anecdote I suppose his sisters—my great-aunts—were shocked by such pronouncements.

Back to the Third Reich. ‘If we could establish the Nordic race and, from this seedbed, produce a race of 200 million, the world would be ours,’ Himmler said eloquently. A few months after its founding *Lebensborn* opened *Heim Hochland*, the first home for pregnant women. For this purpose, the National Socialists took over the building of a Catholic orphanage in the city of Munich. Initially, the institution could accommodate up to thirty mothers and fifty-five children, and the applicants were carefully selected. Only women who met the characteristics of the dominant race were admitted. Candidates had their skulls measured, and only those with the coveted elongated skull, typical of the Nordid type, could be

admitted. They also had to meet other requirements, such as blond hair, blue or green eyes and good health.

Those who passed the test were rewarded with the best care in exquisite surroundings. The living quarters were usually in stately homes which, as in the case of *Heim Hochland*, had often been taken from Hitler's enemies, and other mansions from Jews. The organisation's headquarters in Munich, for example, was in a house that had been owned by the writer Thomas Mann, who had six children with his Jewish wife. All the houses were equipped with modern medical equipment and staffed by medical personnel. These luxurious conditions took their toll. In 1939 Gregor Ebner, *Lebensborn*'s medical director, informed Himmler that a total of 1,300 women had applied. Of these, 635 had been deemed suitable because of their racial characteristics and state of health. Births went very well. While in Germany the mortality rate of newborns was six per cent, in the *Lebensborn* organisation's homes this figure was halved. 'Deliveries are easy, without major complications, which is attributable to racial selection and the quality of the women we take in,' Ebner wrote proudly. Of course, all this came at a high cost: 400 Deutschmarks per mother. 'It isn't a great sacrifice if we can save a million children with good blood,' Ebner concluded.

Mothers of healthy children were usually allowed to stay with them, but they had to follow certain rules, and in return for looking after their physical well-being *Lebensborn* controlled them ideologically. While there, the women had to attend indoctrination courses three times a week in which they were shown propaganda films; they read episodes of *Mein Kampf*, listened to talks on the radio and sang war songs. The staff was instructed to keep a close eye on the women and report on their behaviour in daily life, their bravery (or lack thereof) during childbirth, and the opinions they expressed about Hitler and National Socialism. To this end, each woman was given a book with the inscription RF—corresponding to the Reichsführer—which, after her stay there, was sent to Himmler and used to decide whether a *Lebensborn* home would be used again.

Himmler ran the homes in a very personal way, with all sorts of guidelines. One of his favourite subjects was diet, on which he had very strong opinions. The Reichsführer regularly visited the homes to follow the progress of the mothers and children. He was

so interested that children born on his birthday, 7 October, automatically became his godchildren. Each received a mug engraved with his name and that of the Reich leader. The households would then send him reports on the child's development. In one of them, Himmler was able to read that Ingemar Kurt, born on 7 October 1937, 'is developing well and is a strong and healthy boy.' Gerlinde, born on the same day two years later, had contracted severe pneumonia but was now recovered. 'Gerlinde has overcome her serious illness and is a happy girl,' the message read.



Before leaving home, the children went through the rite of pagan baptism, which served as an oath of allegiance to Hitler and the SS. At a table draped with a swastika flag and a bust or picture of Hitler, the mothers promised to raise their children to be good citizens of the Reich. The baby was then handed over to an SS officer, who gave him a kind of blessing. The words changed from home to home, but the content was the same: 'We believe in the God of all things. And in the mission of our German blood, which rejuvenates on German soil. We believe in the blood-bearing race. And in the Führer, chosen for us by God.' Then the officer held a dagger over the boy and read the words initiating him into the SS: 'We will welcome you into our community as a member of our corps. You will grow up under our protection and must give

honour to your name, pride to your brotherhood and glory to your inexhaustible race.’

My two cents

Just compare this National Socialist creed with the ancient Nicene-Constantinian creed and with the way American white nationalists baptise their children before a Semitic idol!

In order to found Rome, we have mentioned elsewhere the abduction of the beautiful Sabine women, who belonged to a people ethnically related to the Spartans. We have also talked about how the Spartan state nationalised young children for safekeeping. But neither Sparta nor Republican Rome had yet experienced the miscegenation that would befall Europe centuries later. Since extensive miscegenation with the mongrels was already well advanced in the last century, the Germans were forced to kidnap the most Nordid children from the conquered countries to educate them properly. If the white race is to be saved such measures must be resumed, and white nationalists who reject Nordicism must be repudiated.



Despite the successes, Himmler admitted that the *Lebensborn* households couldn't produce enough children to fulfil his dream. Even counting German speakers in the new regions, such as the Sudetenland, the population of the Third Reich was no more than seventy-nine million, far short of the 120 million he had aimed for. To increase the population, Himmler ordered soldiers in the

occupied countries to abduct Nordid-looking children. This strategy was carefully implemented in some areas of the East, especially Poland. Children were divided into two groups: those with Slavic features were deported to the East or became labourers; those with Aryan features were allowed to become Germans with all their privileges. The result was a veritable hunt for blond-haired, blue-eyed children. After this examination, they were classified into three different categories: desirable, acceptable or undesirable. Having Gypsy features automatically made a child undesirable, which in practice meant a death sentence. Many of them were sent to the camps. As for the desirable ones, the chosen children's past was thoroughly erased. They were usually told that their parents were dead and, after giving them a new name with Germanic resonances, they were sent to Germany. (At this point it is necessary to recall the quote from *Who We Are* in which Pierce criticises the grotesque American custom of giving Hebrew names to children.) There they entered a home where they were strictly forbidden to speak Polish. Those who could not learn German or didn't adapt to their new nationality were sent back to Catholic Poland.

This same fate befell the children of many other parents, including Czechoslovakia, Slovenia and parts of the Soviet Union. One of them was Alexander Litau, originally from Crimea, who was only twenty months old when, in 1942, Germany invaded the peninsula. With his blue eyes and blond hair, the little boy was exactly what the Germans were looking for. One day, SS officers saw him playing in front of his house and took him away. Alexander was first sent to Poland, where German doctors made sure he was healthy and met all the requirements. The examination was thorough, and the boy was found to have no Jewish traits. He was then placed in a *Lebensborn* home, *Sonnenwiese* (Sunny Meadow) in Kohren-Sahlis, Saxony. There, now with the name *Folker*—again, compare this with what the Judaised American have been doing with their children—, he was offered for adoption along with others. 'My first memory is of being in a room with thirty other children. People would come in there and line us up like we were puppies looking for a new home. Those people were going to be my parents. They left and came back the next day. My "mother" wanted a girl, but my "father" preferred a boy... I put my head on his knee and that was enough: I would be his son,' recalls Folker.

Latter-day Sabines

Abduction and aid to unwed mothers weren't the only methods used by the Germans to increase the population. In an unofficial document sent to all members of the SS on 28 October 1939, Himmler ordered his men to do their patriotic duty by becoming fathers. It didn't matter whether they were married or not. 'Beyond conventional bourgeois laws, which may be necessary for other circumstances, it may be a noble endeavour for German women and girls to become, even out of wedlock—and not lightly, but with deep moral seriousness—, mothers of children who will become soldiers and go to war; of whom only fate knows whether they will return or die for Germany,' Himmler wrote. At the same time, the Reichsfürer assured the soldiers that both mothers and children would be cared for as long as the war lasted, or if the men fell on the battlefield. 'SS soldiers and mothers of these children: Let's show that you are willing, out of faith in the Führer and for the sake of our blood and our people, to regenerate life for Germany with the same courage with which you know how to fight and die for Germany,' the Reichsfürer added.

Stories of sex in Hitler's Youth, which were already circulating, were revived. Rumours also spread that the *Lebensborn* organisation favoured sexual encounters between honourable women and members of the SS, causing a scandal among people who didn't yet fully understand the laws of sexual selection and positive eugenics. Himmler tried to soften things up, but only made the situation worse: 'We only recommend as conception assistants men who have no race problems.' He then had to clarify that the order didn't apply to the wives of soldiers and policemen. He also expressed his great faith in German women and claimed that he could decide for himself whether a potential mother was racially and ideologically appropriate. Unfortunately, none of this had much effect on a public that still needed decades of education in eugenics.

When the storm subsided, the Führer extended the *Lebensborn* programme to the occupied countries. Here soldiers were invited to have relations with the most racially pure women: a modern re-enactment of the Sabine rape albeit in a more formal, orderly and less brutal manner. If a pregnancy occurred, the mother-to-be was invited to a *Lebensborn* house, where the child would be born in a safe place. Such houses were opened in France,

Norway, Denmark, Austria, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg and Poland. In Norway, the programme was carried out with great zeal, as Norwegian women were very sympathetic to the National Socialist ideal. The German regime believed that the genetics of Norwegian women were superb and wanted them to have many children with German soldiers. They loved Nordic women, with their blonde hair and blue eyes, and therefore considered Norway to be a suitable country for *Lebensborn*. During the occupation, some 12,000 children were born to Norwegian mothers and German fathers.



Alas, due to the ultimate treachery of the Anglo-Americans, with time it became clear that Hitler and Himmler's Schutzstaffel couldn't achieve the dreams of increasing the Aryan race. Far more lives were lost in that unjust war than the *Lebensborn* programme could ever produce. But infinitely worse was their military defeat. On 1 May 1945 the troops of the vilest country the West has ever produced, the United States of America, arrived at the orphanage in Steinhöring, a community in the district of Ebersberg in Upper Bavaria, and found three hundred blond children between the ages of six months and six years. I don't want to recount what happened afterwards with the *Lebensborn* project: it pains me, especially where the children were most perfect: in Norway. Suffice it to say that the dream of the *Lebensraum* that would last a thousand years was aborted by the Allied forces as soon as it was born.

Stalin's Soviet Union wasn't an Aryan nation, as were most of the US and the UK. This why we priests of the fourteen words must hate the latter two countries with all our heart.

8 December 2020

Subtitle

by Editor

For a brief time the subtitle of this blog read *America delenda est*. I removed it when I remembered that Europeans want to beat America at its own ethnosuicidal game. One of those anecdotes concerns the vile way the Norwegians treated their *Lebensborn* children after 1945: toddlers who before the greatest betrayal in history had been destined to rule the expanded Reich...!

The hatred I promote for the Allies must extend to every contemporary white who has embraced ethnosuicide as his new religion after World War II. If whites were good people who didn't deserve my hatred, they would wake up dreaming every morning that the island of La Palma, close to another Canary Island where I lived, had collapsed in 1945 causing a kilometre-high tsunami that would have bounced the entire US fleet that was to invade the Normandy coast back to the American mainland; and they would also dream that the Tunguska event that hit the sparsely populated eastern Siberian Taiga had occurred in Moscow under Stalin.

But American racialists dream no such dreams. In my website we have insisted that the white man's moral compass has undergone a complete reversal from the Hyperborean North to the Orc South: an inversion of values that began with Constantine and culminates in this century. If whites were sane and good people, in this age that craves their extermination they would also dream about demolishing all the churches and imagine committing genocides such as humanity has never seen.

The priests of the fourteen words see white nationalism as a club of little women unable to see that a nation is only made by blood and iron. It is a pity that even the online encyclopaedia that claims to protect the white race is a platform for neochristian values. If one takes a look at the article on *Lebensraum* in Metapedia

it not only shows no enthusiasm for the Master Plan East: it questions its very existence! This only demoralises the Blond Beast.

To illustrate my point a little further, let us take the most radical case of a white nationalist in the United States. As we saw earlier in this book, Linder didn't feel the same way as I did when he read *The Turner Diaries* because, like all other whites, he is still subjected to a neochristian programming tail. On the other hand, Hitler and the SS leadership saw the world with a moral compass already transvalued to pre-Christian values: Nietzsche's dream come true. But after the Hellstorm Holocaust (see *Eye For an Eye: The Story of Jews who Sought Revenge for the Holocaust* reviewed in page 89 of this book) there are no more transvalued people, except for a couple of visitors to *The West's Darkest Hour*.

What I am getting at is something much deeper than simply telling Linder that we agree to disagree about the Master Plan East. Recall that Andrew Hamilton, one of Pierce's most serious readers, when he read the *Diaries* thought Pierce was shooting himself in the foot. Only later did he learn, to his surprise, that others had liked the novel. Even hard-core white nationalists have been programmed with the old axiology, which prevents them from seeing what was more than obvious to the National Socialist leadership: only with an exterminationist ideology was it possible to carry out the Master Plan East.

It is this mental virus implanted in our psyches since our ancestors accepted Christ that keeps all the people of the racist right axiologically stuck. Only if white nationalism dies—really dies!—and the spirit of the Germans who wanted to conquer the world for the children of the *Lebensborn* flourishes again, will our world be saved.

9 December 2020

Kalki the Avenger

by Savitri Devi



A short-sighted quest for indiscriminate individual enjoyment made him indifferent to the call to supermanhood. And he degraded himself ever more.¹² Now, at the *end* of the Dark Age, the Edenic picture is completely reversed. Upon the surface of this unfortunate planet, which is loosing with alarming rapidity its once so broad and thick mantle of forests; of this unfortunate planet, where whole species of proud wild creatures—the aristocracy of the animal world—have already been or are being, with no less speed,

¹² *Editor's note:* Savitri Devi refers to the degenerate westerner of today. These are excerpts from the final pages of 'Kalki the Avenger': the last chapter of Savitri's magnum opus, *The Lightning and the Sun*. In previous chapters, Savitri had explained the difference between the 'men of their time' and the 'man against his time'. To put it in 21st-century terms, the men of their time reminds us of the meme of non-playable characters who always 'support the current thing'. By contrast, a man against his time is someone like me: who doesn't even have a mobile phone in the big city where I live because I don't have a single friend (no one has transvalued their values).

wiped away—killed off to the last—one notices an increasingly obnoxious and steadily expanding swarm of dreary (when not positively ugly) vulgar, silly, worthless two-legged mammals. And the more worthless they are, the quicker they breed. The sickly and the dull have more children than the healthy and bright; the inferior races, and the people who have no race at all, definitely more than the hundred per cent Aryan; and the down-right rotten—afflicted both with hereditary diseases *and* racially undefinable blood—are, more often than not, terrifyingly fertile.

And everything is done to encourage that mad increase in number and that constant loss in quality. Everything is done to keep the sickly, the cripple, the freaks of nature, the unfit to work and unfit to live, from dying. One ‘prolongs’ as much as possible the lives of the incurable. One inflicts torture upon thousands of lovely, innocent, *healthy* animals, in the hope of discovering ‘new treatments,’ so that deficient men, whom Nature has, anyhow, condemned to death, might last a few months—or a few weeks longer; so that they be patched up, or artificially given an illusion of vitality... while remaining a burden to the healthy. And that, whoever they may be; just because they are ‘human beings.’ Hospitals and asylums—bluntly described as such, or politely christened ‘homes’ are full of such dregs of humanity, old and young... while the healthy are (physically and morally) made unhealthy, through the conditions of life imposed upon them by a false civilisation: through joyless work and over-crowded houses lack of privacy; lack of leisure; through compulsory inoculations and cleverly advertised unnatural food; through nerve-wrecking mass-music, not to speak of a soul-killing, brain-softening mass-propaganda exalting unnatural values. Hospitals and asylums are, after slaughter-houses, one of the most depressing features of the advanced ‘Kali Yuga’ or Dark Age; the one which would automatically provoke the greatest disgust in the heart of a strong man of the beginning of this Age not to mention one out of the preceding ‘Dwapara Yuga’ and *a fortiori* out of a remoter Age, if such men could come back as they once were.

But why speak of hospitals and asylums? The streets are full of dregs of humanity, at least full of bastards and of sub-men. One only has to look at the faces one sees in the over-crowded buses, or in the cinemas and dancing-halls and cafes in large towns, nay even in small ones, even in the *countryside*, everywhere, save in those lands

in which the dominant race is relatively pure. It is a pitiful sight; a pitiful world; a world up-side-down; a world in which the average cat or dog is, *as such*, immeasurably healthier, more beautiful—more perfect—than the average man or woman and *a fortiori* than the average post-1945 State ruler...

If only the ugly sub-men were capable of lofty thoughts—or simply of *thought*—that would be something! But they are not. And their leaders are worse than they, not better. True, they all *speak* of ‘free thinking’; speak of it, and write about it. They criticise their former friends (the Communists) for ‘killing individual thought.’ Yet they are themselves the first ones to lack both freedom of judgement and individuality. They all have the same views; and the same ideal. Their views are those of the ruling press. Their ideal is to ‘get on in life,’ i.e., to make money and to ‘be happy,’ which means: to enjoy tasty food, fine clothing, lodgings provided with the latest commodities; and, in addition to that, as often as possible, a little drink, a little light music, a little sport, a little love-making. Maybe, they call themselves Christians—or Hindus, or anything else. But whatever religion they might profess, their faith is skin-deep. Nothing, absolutely nothing more-than-personal—and, *a fortiori*, more-than-human—interests them. The one thing they all pray for, when they pray at all, is ‘peace’; not the unassailable, inner peace of the Best (of which they have not the foggiest experience), but peace in the sense of absence of war; the indefinite prolongation of a *status quo* which allows them to think of tomorrow’s little pleasure without the fear of today’s deadly danger; peace, thanks to which they will, undisturbed—so they hope—be able to go on rotting in the midst of that increasing comfort, which technical progress secures them; peace, thanks to which they expect to remain (or gradually to become) happy—in the manner pigs are *happy*, when they have plenty to eat and clean straw to lie upon.

Accelerated technical progress is, along with accelerated human degeneracy, an all-important feature of the advanced Dark Age.

It is, or seems to be, the ‘triumph of man’ over Nature. And it is interpreted and exalted as such by the sub-men, all the more proud of it that they have nothing else—no real, living culture; no disinterested work or knowledge-to be proud of. It is—or seems to be—the ‘proof’ of man’s superiority over all other sentient beings; the ‘proof’ of his superiority *en bloc*, *regardless of race*, for... a Negro

can drive a motorcar, can't he? And there are very clever Jewish doctors. It forwards or strengthens the age-old superstition of 'man,' which lies at the root of all decay. It is, or seems to be, the way to universal 'happiness'; the ideal of those increasing millions—and soon, billions—who have no ideal. In fact, it helps the ruling powers of the Dark Age, the skilful agents of the forces of disintegration, to keep the millions under their control. For, paradoxical as this may sound, masses who can read and write are easier to enslave than masses who cannot, and nothing is so easy to subdue and to *keep* down as masses who consider their wireless and television sets and cinema shows as indispensable necessities of life. (The modern men 'against Time' know that, as well as the men 'in Time.' Only they do not dispose of the inexhaustible financial resources of the latter.)

Technical progress, in all fields in which it does not automatically imply cruelty towards man or beast (or plant)¹³, is not a bad thing in itself. Actually, it is not it that makes the Dark Age. What *makes* the Dark Age is the fall of all but an extreme minority of men to the level of a brainless (and heartless) herd, and, at the same time, their endless increase in number. And technical progress is a curse only inasmuch as it is *the* most powerful instrument in the hands of all those who, directly or indirectly, encourage that indiscriminate increase and, consequently, forward that herd-mentality (even if they do not explicitly intend to); in the hands of the doctors who keep the weak and deficient and mongrels alive, and do nothing to prevent further such ones from being born: in the hands of the politicians 'in Time' who, precisely because they all share—like the doctors—the age-old superstition of 'man' and of man's individual 'happiness' at any cost, are opposed to any systematic selection in view of the survival and welfare of the healthiest, let alone to systematic *racial* selection *also*, in view of the survival and rule of an all-round biological human aristocracy.

As I said above, technical progress and its wonders could just as easily be put to the service of a decidedly 'life-centred' philosophy 'against Time'; of an aristocratic doctrine of personal and racial *quality*, such as National Socialism, if only the exponents

¹³ Destruction of forests, for instance.

of such a doctrine could maintain themselves in power in this advanced Age of Gloom—which they cannot.


The reason *why* they cannot is not that there exist electric trains and electric irons, radios and television sets, aeroplanes and washing machines and ‘electronic brains’ and all manner of major and minor commodities, products of technical skill, but that the overwhelming majority of *mankind* in this Age—the more and more numerous and duller and duller herd of all races, in process of general bastardisation—is against any and every aristocratic wisdom. The reason is that the millions and millions—soon billions—of sub-men feel themselves threatened in their dream of pig-like ‘happiness,’ nay, in their no less pig-like existence, by whoever embodies such a wisdom ‘against Time.’ The reason is that the increasingly powerful agents of the death-forces, natural leaders of this Age, *use* radio, cinema, television, and all technical means that money can secure, to excite the unthinking herd against the Best, while doing everything they can, through the advertisement of more and more wonderful commodities, to keep the average man’s slumbering mind away from higher things—away from every aspiration ‘against Time’; away from every aggressive criticism of the fundamental Dark Age dogmas and, in general, away from all impersonal problems... until its slumber ends in the definitive sleep of death.

It is not—surely not!—technical progress as such which so deeply shocks Kalki’s future *compagnons* at arms (or the fathers of such ones), those natural aristocrats of the youngest human race, whom I have described as ‘the Best.’ It is the glaring disparity between the perfection of modern technical achievements considered as ‘means’ and the worthlessness of the ends to the service of which they are put; it is the contrast between that wonderful Aryan intelligence, which stands and shines behind practically every discovery of modern science, every invention of modern technique, and the steadily increasing degeneracy of the sub-human multitudes who enjoy the products of its creative ingenuity in daily life, as a matter of course, nay, who, through their *misuse* of them, are sinking lower and lower into that brainless and soulless ‘happiness’—I repeat: that pig-like ‘happiness’—which is the ideal of our times.

That ideal is *the* one forwarded, under one form or another, more and more unmistakably in the course of centuries, by all

typical Dark Age leaders 'in Time,' in particular, by that most efficient of all agents of the Dark Powers during the last two thousand four hundred years (at least) and specially during the last three or four hundred years: the international Jew.

The advanced Dark Age of this present Time-cycle is the reign of the Jew—of the negative element; of the reverser of eternal values for the sake of 'human' ones, and, finally, for that of his own, selfish interests; the reign of the 'destroyer of culture,' as Adolf Hitler so rightly pointed out; of the age-old 'ferment of disintegration.' It is natural that 'ferments of disintegration' should become more and more active—more and more alive—as a Time-cycle nears its end...



They have preached meekness and forgiveness and pacifism (to all, save to their own people) in order to rob the young, warlike Aryan race of its stamina; in order to kill its healthy pride. They are, now more feverishly than ever, encouraging its adolescents to make fun of 'Nazi prejudices,' to despise purity of blood, and to marry outside their race (if thus be the impulse of 'individual love')—so that the race may disappear; encouraging them into perdition, both through the old superstition of 'man' under its various modern forms, and through the whole atmosphere of subtle corruption in which the post-1945 world is literally soaking.

They must win—and they shall win—*for the time being*. Otherwise, it would not yet be the End. They must—and shall—see their dream—their immemorial dream of easy domination over a peaceable, 'happy' hotch-potch of bastardised millions and ever more millions, that their long-drawn disintegrating action has rendered even more contemptible than they—at a hair's breadth from its complete materialisation. Otherwise, the measure of iniquity—the measure of *untruth*—would not be full. And it would not yet be time for 'Kalki'—the Avenger—to come...

It is impossible to say 'where' He will appear...

According to the laws of development in Time which are those of the logic of history, Kalki, the Avenger, the final Redeemer, can only belong to the youngest race of our Time-cycle: the Aryan...

Will He be none other than He whom I have described as the One-before-the-last Man ‘against Time’—Adolf Hitler—returning with more-than-human power? There is no reason why this should not be, provided the inspired Leader still be alive, and provided the world becomes, within his life-time, ripe for the great End (which would in no way be a wonder, at the rate decay has set in everywhere, after 1945). The terrible experience of defeat through treason, and the sight of the systematic degradation of his people through far subtler and deadlier means than the ridiculous ‘de-nazification’ rules and regulations, would probably be enough to rouse the Führer’s ‘Lightning’ qualities until they balance in him the ‘Sun’ ones and make him a new man—infinitely more merciless than he was in his first career...


And ‘Kalki’ will be nearer to and more intimately connected with the latest great Man ‘against Time,’ Adolf Hitler, than with any of the many former ones. For He—the last One—is, as I said in the beginning of this study, none other than *the* One of Whom the Führer spoke when, with that unfailing cosmic intuition that raises him so high above the cleverest of Dark Age politicians, he told Hans Grimm, in 1928: ‘I know that Somebody must come forth and meet our situation. I have sought him. I have found him nowhere; and therefore I have taken upon myself to do the preparatory work, *only the most urgent preparatory work*. For that much I know: I am not He. And I know also what is lacking in me.’¹⁴

He is that One. And He will, in the midst of the most hopeless circumstances, continue the old—the perennial—Struggle against the downward stream of Time—the Struggle which the disaster of 1945 has *apparently*, but only *apparently*, interrupted—and bring it to a victorious end for a few myriads of years; make Adolf Hitler’s dream, through means that were yet unthinkable during (or before) the Second World war, a glaring reality for a few myriads of years.

The means cannot be foretold, for things will have changed, by then. Things *are* changing—and the science of war, progressing—every day. One point is, however, as a main feature of every recurring ‘great End,’ beyond doubt: ‘Kalki’ *will act with unprecedented ruthlessness*. Contrarily to Adolf Hitler, He will spare not

¹⁴ Quoted by Hans Grimm in his last book, *Warum? Woher? Aber Wobin?*, page 14.


a single one of the enemies of the divine Cause: not a single one of its outspoken opponents but also not a single one of the luke-warm, of the opportunists, of the ideologically heretical, of the racially bastardised, of the unhealthy, of the hesitating, of the all-too-human; not a single one of those who, in body or in character or mind, bear the stamp of the fallen Ages.



As I said before, His *companions* at arms will be the last National Socialists; the men of iron who will have victoriously stood the test of persecution and, what is more, the test of complete isolation in the midst of a dreary, indifferent world, in which they have no place; who are facing that world and defying it through every gesture, every hint—every silence—of theirs and, more and more (in the case of the younger ones,) without even the personal memory of Adolf Hitler's great days to sustain them; those I have called 'gods on earth' and parents of such ones. They are the ones who will, one day, make good for all that which men 'against Time' have suffered in the course of history, like they themselves, for the sake of eternal truth: the avenging Comrades whom the Five Thousand of Verden called in vain within their hearts at the minute of death, upon the bank of the Aller River, red with blood; those whom the millions of 1945—the dying; the tortured; and the desperate survivors—called in vain; those whom all the vanquished fighters 'against Time' called in vain, in every phase of the great cosmic Struggle without beginning, against the Forces of disintegration, co-eternal with the Forces of Life.

They are the bridge to supermanhood, of which Nietzsche has spoken; the 'last Battalion' in which Adolf Hitler has put his confidence.

Kalki will lead them, through the flames of the great End, into the sunshine of the new Golden Age...



We like to hope that the memory of the One-before-the-last and most heroic of all our Men 'against Time'—Adolf Hitler—will survive, at least in songs and symbols, in that long Age of earthly

Perfection which 'Kalki,' the last One, is to open. We like to hope that the Lords of the new Time-cycle, men of his own blood and faith, will render him divine honours, through rites full of meaning and full of potency, in the cool shade of the endless re-grown forests, on the beaches, or upon inviolate mountain-peaks, facing the rising Sun.

But even if it be not so, still he will, like all his divine predecessors, live, throughout the ages in the faithful consciousness of the Universe, the life-rhythm of which he symbolises. Still the long and more and more intense and finally almost desperate aspiration 'against Time,' which characterises every recurring Time-cycle as soon as decay has set in obviously enough to be felt, will be, every time, a new expression of that self-same yearning after manifested Perfection for the sake of which he fought and lost; a new, long-drawn cosmic outcry, proclaiming that he was right in spite of all. And still every further Golden Age to come—every successive Dawn of Creation—will be the living materialisation of his highest dream; a further hymn of glory, proclaiming, every time for myriads of years, that he—He—has once more won.

August 2021
written in 1956.

Panentheism

by Editor

Savitri's literary style, with such long sentences that I sometimes lose her train of thought, is the opposite of mine. But discovering her was like finding a kindred spirit, even though I never met her. In the comments section of my website on a Savitri article, Krist Krusher commented:

One problem that I have with pantheism is, that if the universe itself is god, then would that mean insects, faeces and non-whites are also part of god? I find such an idea preposterous: such a realization undermines the entirety of the idea of God. It reduces it to simply mean anything and everything. Such is not worth worshipping or venerating to me. I was personally a little disillusioned when I read *Who We Are* and found that Pierce, using his Comostheistic logic, deduced that even Negroes were in a way brothers to Whites!

Krist Krusher refers to this particular paragraph: 'It is important to understand this, because with understanding comes freedom from the superstition of "human brotherhood" We are one with the Cosmos and are, in a sense, brothers to every living thing: to the amoeba, the wolf, the chimpanzee and the Negro. But this sense of brotherhood does not paralyze our will when we are faced with the necessity of taking certain actions—whether game control or pest control or disease control—relative to other species to ensure the continued progress of our own. And so it must be with the Negro.' Krusher continues:

The problem with this is that it ultimately creates another kind of Brotherhood, one which if coupled with the kind of thinking that slave morality produces, would result in something as asinine as Jainism: where all life has worth regardless if it is paramecium, slime mould or cockroach! It would be such an easy thing to bend to erroneous

beliefs. Some will argue that the end of [Pierce's] paragraph would guarantee that this would never be perverted, but I know many who would warp it to think non-whites can be 'Aryan' too.

This is my response: Did Hitler embrace the philosophy of the pantheists, or those *panentheists* who postulate an impersonal God who could intervene in history, although not through miracles since it is not a theistic god? In my humble opinion panentheism, rather than simple pantheism, may better correspond to the way Uncle Adolf described Providence favouring the Aryan people. One thing is certain: evolutionists claim that all creatures are connected by a common ancestor. If so, even arthropods and the crown of evolution itself have a common ancestor. Divinity is noticeable in some aspects of Nature such as the trees, the colour of the sky against the backdrop of the mountains and some cute mammals, including the lute players chosen for the cover of this book! And taking into account that the white man is still immersed in a psychotic age because of Christian ethics, only expanding the Master Plan East to the whole planet could ensure that the phenotype of those divine creatures would be perpetuated as long as the sun lives...

But yes: there are real monsters in Nature (spiders, etc.). And regarding monsters my solution at the end of my 640,000-word *De Jesús a Hitler* is extermination. Nature is the greatest exterminator in the universe: it has been exterminating ninety-nine per cent of its species for hundreds of millions of years. If I am a sort of apprentice of Kalki, I have to say that getting rid of obsolete species is central to this Hindu archetype: a theme on which Savitri got completely wrong. While she rightly impugned the primitive men of today, she idealised *all* animal species. We, on the other hand, want to exterminate most of them (you can imagine our little utopia with the city of Lys in Arthur Clarke's futuristic novella, *Against the Fall of Night*).

If Cro-Magnons exterminated the Neanderthals, all the more reason why we should exterminate the primitive versions of *Homo sapiens*. This doesn't contradict panentheism. On the contrary: it is an essential part of the phenomenology of the spirit.

10 August 2021

On solving the problem of evil

by Gaedhal

I get the 'Hell Planet' idea from Dr Robert Morgan who is an explicit atheist and an explicit determinist and an explicit 'eliminative materialist.' I on the other hand am a bit more of a Sheldrakean on these points. Morgan has read Sheldrake and rejects him, which is his right so to do. He has also read the antinatalist pessimist atheists Benatar and Schopenhauer more in-depthly than I have.

Pine Creek Doug once was asked if an asteroid were inbound that would destroy the Earth, and if he could press a button to restart abiogenesis and evolution on another planet he would do so. He initially said: 'yes' but then said 'no.' I would say 'yes'... However, in so doing, I will be fully cognizant of my calling into being all manner of evils: plagues, famines, paedophilia etc.

However, I would hope, that at the end of it all, intelligent sentient beings might find a way to solve the problem of evil. Instead of antinatalism, solving the problem of evil is a better use of our time because, for all we know, the Cosmos might call forth the phenomenon of life somewhere else. Antinatalism doesn't actually solve the problem of evil. It just turns this small corner of the Cosmos into a sterile place devoid of life. Benatar wants eventually for mankind to nuke itself out of existence. I hope that I am not misrepresenting his position. Type in 'Alex O'Connor' and 'antinatalism' on YouTube for a discussion between Benatar and O'Connor. I would link to it but I don't want to. Antinatalism terrifies me. I want to give it a wide berth.

I am not a classically theistic God, which is why it is okay for me to press the abiogenesis button on Earth 2 somewhere in the Cosmos. However, as Dr Robert Morgan correctly points out: a classically theistic God who would use evolution to bring about life would be a sadist. Robert Morgan links people to videos of animals being eaten alive. This truly is a Hell Planet, and if a classically

theistic God created it then he is evil by our reckoning; he is a sadist and a voyeur by our reckoning. With the misotheists, we should hate such a God.

I commented

Nice theological reflections from Gaedhal. As for what he says—that, instead of anti-natalism, solving the problem of evil is a better use of our time—I can't help remembering how my religion of the four words, which fits perfectly with Hitler's panentheism, is the solution to the problem of evil.

These days I have been revising my Daybreak Press books for publication as PDFs. But I will make an exception for most of what I have written in my mother tongue (*De Jesús a Hitler*). To read them, it will be necessary to obtain the printed volumes (fortunately they haven't been censored, and I plan to translate them into English). It is the only way to understand how, in the end, we plan to solve the problem of evil, at least on Earth. To what Gaedhal said above I would add that if there is one word that defines my religion it is exterminationism, but obviously we don't mean *all* creatures on Earth. Hence I prefer the term panentheism to the term pantheism used by Richard Weikart in his books on Hitler.

Gaedhal responded

Exterminationism is a huge part of my plan to solve the problem of evil, as well. Life unfit for life, as the Nazis put it, is a huge part of the suffering on this planet. Life unfit for life tortures itself and others, and particularly the poor defenceless animals.

It is Christian axiology that makes us see in Life unfit for life the image of God. If the botched of this planet are images of God then why would you worship such a god?

30 July 2022

Am I a psychopath?

by Editor

On my website Autisticus Spasticus asked me:

César, there's something I've wanted to ask you for quite some time. Do you, personally, have it in you to kill non-white women and children in cold blood? Imagine they were lined up before you, black and Arab women and children, sobbing, pleading desperately for their lives as you level a machine gun at them. Could you bring yourself to do it? I'm genuinely curious. Have you ever given it much consideration?

The best way to answer him and others who ask me similar questions is through an experiment of the imagination, already mentioned in the final pages of another of my books, originally written in Spanish:

It is enough to see the photographs of mammals in laboratory experiments that are carried out throughout North America and Europe to perceive that *the human being is truly a wicked species*. I will not incur the rudeness of adding those photographs in this text: a task I leave to my readers.

My exterminating fantasies would not seem unhealthy if we do another thought experiment. In *Dies Irae* I quoted a non-fiction book by Arthur Clarke where he talked about the 'judgment from the Stars' that earthlings could experience. If we imagine that in real life someone similar to a Karellen visited our planet, what is the first thing he would see from his distant silver ships, far above the human tingling? Urban spots. Industries that destroy the environment and, bringing his cameras closer, abject human misery and inconceivable suffering of the other species that share the planet with us. If, as in Clarke's novel, the visitor also possessed machines to open a visual window to the past to study the species, he

would perceive that, besides the hell that the naked apes subject their cousins, through history and prehistory they had behaved in an absolutely horrendous way with their own children. It does not hurt to summarize the revelations of the previous pages.

With his machines to literally *see* the human past this hypothetical extra-terrestrial would be taken aghast by the magnitude of infanticide: nine percent of all human births. He would see thousands of young children slaughtered ritually, offered to the goddess of Babylon. He would see the infant sacrifices of the Pelasgians, the Syrians, the sacrifices in Gezer and in Egypt of the centuries that the earthlings call 10th to 8th before Christ. And let's not talk about what the visitor would see with his machines when focusing on the ancient Semites of Carthage, where the burning of living children ordered by their own parents reached levels that surpassed the exclamation of Sahagún. Something similar could be seen by our visitor about other Phoenicians, Canaanites, Moabites, Sepharvaim, and ancient Hebrews: who in their origins offered their firstborn as a sacrifice to their gods. With his magic to see our past, the alien visitor would learn that both the exposure and the abandonment of infants continued in Europe until a council took action against the custom of leaving the children to die in the open.

With technology based on unimaginable principles the visitor would also see much worse behaviour in the lands of coloured people: thousands of babies, mostly women, abandoned in the streets of ancient China, and how those babies that were not abandoned were put in cold water until they died. He would see how in feudal Japan the baby was suffocated with wet paper covering her nose and mouth; how infanticide was systematic in the feudal Rajputs in India, sometimes throwing the living children to the crocodiles; and how in pre-Islamic Arabia they buried alive not a few newborns. The visitor would also see that the sub-Saharan inhabitants of Africa killed their children much more frequently than other races did. He would even see that the sacrifice of children in Zimbabwe was practiced as recently as the beginning of the century that the earthlings call the 20th century. The window to the past would also make visible the incredibly massive slaughter of infants among the natives of

the countless islands of Oceania, New Guinea and even more so among the extremely primitive aborigines of Australia, Tasmania and Polynesia. He would realise that in the American tribes, including the redskins, infanticide continued at a time when the practice had been abandoned in Europe. The same happened not only in Central American and South American tribes, but also in the civilizations prior to the Spanish conquest: where the ritual sacrifice of women and children suggests that they did it out of pure sadism. Finally, the visitor would see how, after the Conquest, the sacrificial institution of the Mesoamerican and Inca Indians was forbidden only to be transferred to the animals in the so-called *santería* in times when our visitor no longer has to use his devices to open the Complete Book of History and Prehistory of the species he studies.

It's clear where I want to go... If it is legitimate for this hypothetical extra-terrestrial to remove from the face of the Earth a newly-arrived species whose haughtiness blinds them from seeing their evil ways, how can it be pathological for an earthling to arrive at identical conclusions? Just because, unlike the ET visitor, he lacks technological power? The sad truth is that the infanticidal passion and cruelty of primitive humans have not been atoned, only transferred to our cousins.

In answering questions like those of Autisticus Spasticus, it is essential not to fall into stereotypes like the films that Jews make about Nazis. Unlike the archetypical Hollywood Nazi, in the real world the scenario I imagine would mean liberating various zones in the US, and, from there, launching calls for white males who want to fight in the Racial Holy Wars (RAHOWA in internet forums), and white women who want to procreate, to flee to the liberated zones—away from the archipelago of Gomorrahite cities that are about to be punished. Once those whites who want to survive take their families to the liberated zones, cut off electricity to the degenerates and deprive them of oil. It is obvious that those who stay in Gomorrah would start dying like flies. (In the sacred book of the Jews it is Yahweh who punishes by floods, and fires on Sodom exterminating sinners; in the RAHOWA it will be the Aryan Man who does it, whose religion won't longer be Judaic but panentheistic.)

As you can see, none of this resembles the stereotype of the Hollywood Nazi, especially if all this is done in the name of the Four Words, like the alien of our *Gedankenexperiment*. On the contrary: it is something that could be done with the utmost coolness and preferably without eye contact with those who are about to be exterminated, or with as little contact as possible. I call what the Gomorrahites would suffer *necessary* suffering (remember that the four words say something else: eliminate all *unnecessary* suffering). It's the same as starting to exterminate the gangs of killer whales that torture a whale calf for hours by drowning her slowly. By shooting them with Apache helicopters, the aim wouldn't be to make the killer whale gang suffer but to eliminate the unnecessary suffering of the calf. That a killer whale suffers after the slaughter—let's imagine that one of the gang dodges the rockets and ends up traumatised and without a family—is what I call *necessary* suffering. It goes without saying that after exterminating the offending species there will be no need to use Apaches in the oceans. With the Neanderthaloid versions of humans we would proceed in exactly the same way. The distinction between necessary and unnecessary suffering is fundamental to understanding the point of view of the priest of the sacred words...

Maurice commented

This Spasticus guy ('Do you, personally, have it in you to kill non-white women and children in cold blood?') certainly has never been in a Latin-American shanty town, or Brazilian favela: places where a sane person instinctively knows that a burnt, radioactive wasteland of ashes would be the best solution.

But here we have a scenario (common in Africa today) where you are tasked with two hundred nigger breeders and their niglets lined up for execution by machine gun fire. You'd have to steel your nerves against the residual Christian software's directives in your brain that are trying to stop you.

It's your first mass-execution, and the begging and bawling are making it hard to pull through; so having all the nigs' hands and feet tied up, mouths gagged and heads covered in a black bag will go a long way.

Then you pull the trigger and mow down the whole stinking lot in twelve seconds.

Then you wait for your team mates to dump the corpses in the nearby burial pit. Then you load another ammo belt in the gun. Then the second batch of two hundred nig women and children arrives. It will be easier this time. You won't need the black bags on their heads.

This 'pity-testing' scenario for nigger mass-shooting is pointless. It doesn't take into account the desensitization that a soldier will go through during the violence of the RAHOWA. It's also very clean-cut; it doesn't advocate torture, poisoning, starvation or slavery—just a clean, quick death by bullet, followed by a quick burial.

'Have you ever given it much consideration?'

I fantasize about this often. These are not the actions of a 'psychopath.' Imagine having to execute all these niggers back in the days of Sparta, with a sword thrust to the throat! Or the days of Vlad Tepes, with a wooden spear through the ass. What you realize after 'much consideration' is that gunpowder was a wonderful invention, and the Hollywood Nazis are, in fact, the nice guys of History.

I responded

Ha, ha! I answered this Spasticus guy that way because it reminded me of a 2010 bloodsport debate between Alex Linder and Hunter Wallace on a Radio Free Mississippi podcast.

Wallace wanted to put Linder immediately on the defensive with his Christian ethics, asking the perverse question: 'If you were in a room alone with a seven-year-old Jewish girl, would you shoot her?' It's annoying when a racist (although Wallace now describes himself as a 'neo-normie') asks you these kinds of questions. Linder responded that it sounded like someone from the SPLC.

But that's exactly the problem with the 'great defenders' of the white race in the US.

8 August 2022

