




[\[Special Collections\]](#) [\[Electronic Bookshelf\]](#) [\[Yggdrasil's Home\]](#)

## UNIVERSITY INTRODUCTION



This page is dedicated to electronically-accessible books that form the core literature of Western Civilization. Many of Yggdrasil's students wonder what it means to be 'white' - or European. Many are unaware of their own cultural heritage that stretches back over 4,000 years. I present to the sons and daughters of *Magna Europa* this collection as a tribute to that heritage.

All texts stored on this site are in the public domain unless explicitly noted and may be distributed freely. We recommend this resource for leisure reading, home schooling, or quick quotations for a college term paper.

- The [MLA Handbook](#) may come in handy if you are citing works in a research paper.
- Need style or grammar help? Try [Elements of Style](#) courtesy of Columbia University.
- Need to boost your vocabulary? Try Webster's Unabridged English Dictionary courtesy Univ. of Chicago:

**Search dictionary for:**

## SPECIAL COLLECTIONS

If you are having problems downloading a text, simply position mouse on desired copy, hold down the shift-key, and click the left mouse-button.

- Yggdrasil: Introduction to Keith

[HTML Document \(97k\)](#) 

- Keith, Sir Arthur: Evolution and Ethics†

[Plain Text \(221k ZIP\)](#)

[Rich Text \(228k ZIP\)](#) 

[WinWord \(238k ZIP\)](#)

- Keith, Sir Arthur: New Theory of Human Evolution† (Beta Version)

[WinWord \(398k ZIP\)](#) 

† Report from U.S. Copyright Office pertaining to above works: [\(GIF 27k\)](#)

## ELECTRONIC BOOKSHELF

Our gratitude goes to all linked pages, including the Gutenberg and Perseus Projects, that store electronic texts for free public use. All titles indexed by author. Click on letter to jump to that section. Use right-mouse button or 'back' link to get back here.

"Gentlemen, let's broaden our minds!" – *The Joker*

[ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ](#)

**-A-**

Adorno, Theodor: Culture Industry

[HTML Document \(142k\)](#) 

Aeschylus: Orestia Trilogy

- I. Agamemnon: [HTML Document](#)
- II. Libation Bearers: [HTML Document](#)
- III. Eumenides: [HTML Document](#)

## Aeschylus: Collected Plays

[HTML Index \(7 Texts\)](#)

## Aesop's Fables

[Plain Text \(66k\)](#)

## Alger Jr., Horatio: Struggling Upward

[Plain Text \(288k\)](#)

## Ancient Poems, Ballads and Songs of the Peasantry of England

[Plain Text \(381k\)](#)

## Andersen, Hans Christian: Gutenberg Collection

[Plain Text \(313k\)](#)

## Andersen, Hans Christian: Complete Fairy Tales

[HTML Index](#)

## Anonymous: Anglo-Saxon Chronicle

[HTML Index](#)

## Anonymous: Beowulf

[HTML Document \(188k\)](#)

## Anonymous: Dead Sea Scrolls

[HTML Index \(7 Partial Texts\)](#)

## Anonymous: Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen

[HTML Document \(6k\)](#)

## Anonymous: El Cid

[HTML Document \(3 Songs\)](#)

Anonymous: Nibelungenlied ('Children of the Mist')

[HTML Index](#)

Anonymous: Old Norse Sagas (Icelandic)

- Erybyggja Saga (Story of the Ere-Dwellers): [HTML Index](#)
- Grettir's Saga (Grettir the Strong): [HTML Index](#)
- Heimskringla (Chronicle of the Kings of Norway): [HTML Index](#)
- Kormak's Saga (Life and Death of Cormac the Skald): [HTML Index](#)
- Laxdaela Saga: [HTML Index](#)
- Njal's Saga (Story of Burnt Njal): [HTML Index](#)
- Volsungasaga (Story of the Volsungs): [HTML Index](#)

Anonymous: Song of Roland

[HTML Index](#)

Apollonius Rhodius: Argonautica

[HTML Index](#)

Aquinas, St. Thomas: Summa Theologica

[HTML Index](#)

Aristotle: Complete Works

[HTML Index](#)

Aristotle: Ethics

[HTML Document](#)

Aristotle: Politics

[HTML Document](#)

Augustine, St.: City of God

[HTML Index \(22 Books\)](#)

Augustine, St.: Confessions and Enchiridion

[Plain Text \(948k\)](#)

[Back](#)

**-B-**

Boccaccio, Giovanni: Decameron

[HTML Index \(10 Chapters\)](#)

Boole, George: Calculus of Logic

[HTML Document \(36k\)](#)

Burke, Edmund: Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful  
(Abridged)

[Plain Text \(31k\)](#)

Burke, Edmund: Reflections on the Revolution in France

[Plain Text \(560k\)](#)

Burns, Robert: Collected Verse

[Plain Text \(760k\)](#)

Burton, Sir Richard: Arabian Nights

[Plain Text \(1113k\)](#)

[Back](#)

**-C-**

Caesar, Julius: Gallic Wars

[HTML Document](#)

Calvin, John: Institutes of the Christian Religion

[HTML Index](#)

Calvin, John: Necessity of Reforming the Church

[HTML Index](#)

'Camelot Project' Resources

[HTML Index](#)

Carlyle, Thomas: French Revolution

[Plain Text \(1894k\)](#)

Carroll, Lewis: Alice in Wonderland

[HTML Document \(148k\)](#)

Carroll, Lewis: Through the Looking Glass

[Plain Text \(165k\)](#)

Cervantes, Miguel de: Don Quixote de la Mancha

[Plain Text \(2310k\)](#)

Chaucer, Geoffrey: Canterbury Tales

[Plain Text \(602k\)](#)

[HTML Index \(1320k\)](#)

Chaucer, Geoffrey: Troilus and Criseyde

[HTML Index \(521k\)](#)

Clausewitz, Carl von: Principles of War

[HTML Document \(85k\)](#)

Coleridge, Samuel: Rime of the Ancient Mariner

[Plain Text \(32k\)](#)

Conrad, Joseph: Heart of Darkness

[Plain Text \(207k\)](#)

[Back](#)

**-D-**

Dante: Divine Comedy

[Plain Text \(668k\)](#)

Darwin, Charles: Descent of Man

[Plain Text \(1577k\)](#)

Darwin, Charles: On the Origin of Species

[Plain Text \(1144k\)](#)

Descartes, Rene: Discourse on Methods

[Plain Text \(125k\)](#)

Descartes, Rene: Meditations on First Philosophy

[HTML Document \(174k\)](#)

Dickens, Charles: Collected Works

[HTML Index \(37 Books\)](#)

Dickens, Charles: Great Expectations

[HTML Index \(59 Chapters\)](#)

Dickens, Charles: Tale of Two Cities

[HTML Index \(45 Chapters\)](#)

Dostoevsky, Fyodor: Brothers Karamazov

[Plain Text \(1890k\)](#)

Dostoevsky, Fyodor: Crime and Punishment

[Plain Text \(1428k\)](#)

Dumas, Alexandre: Count of Monte Cristo

[Plain Text \(2687k\)](#)

Dumas, Alexandre: Three Musketeers

[Plain Text \(1345k\)](#)

[Back](#)

**-E-**

Einhard: The Life of Charlemagne

[HTML Document \(66k\)](#)

Erasmus: Praise of Folly

[Plain Text \(198k\)](#)

Euclid: Elements

[HTML Index \(13 Books\)](#)

Eusebius: Church History

[HTML Index \(10 Books\)](#)

[Back](#)

**-F-**

Ford, Henry, et. al.: The International Jew

[HTML Index](#)

Franklin, Benjamin: Autobiography

[Plain Text \(379k\)](#)

[Back](#)

**-G-**



Ganjakets'i, Kirakos: History of the Armenians

[HTML Document](#)

Gibbon, Edward: Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire

Plain Text: [Volume 1](#) [Volume 2](#) [Volume 3](#) [Volume 4](#) [Volume 5](#) [Volume 6](#)

Gildas: Concerning the Ruin of Britain

[HTML Document \(30k\)](#)

Gödel, Kurt: On Formally Undecidable Propositions

[HTML Index](#) 

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von: Collected Verse

[Plain Text \(604k\)](#)

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von: Faust

[HTML Index](#)

Grant, Madison: The Passing of the Great Race

[HTML Document \(500k\)](#)

Gregory of Tours: History of the Franks

[HTML Document \(598k\)](#)

Grimm, Brothers: Fairy Tales

[HTML Index \(209 Stories\)](#)

[Back](#)

**-H-**

Hale, Matthew: History of the Common Law

[Plain Text \(344k\)](#)

Hamilton et. al.: Federalist Papers

[Plain Text \(1196k\)](#)

Hammurabi: Babylonian Law

[HTML Document \(69k\)](#)

Herodotus: History

[HTML Document](#)

Hesiod: Homeric Hymns (includes Shield, Theogony, Works & Days)

[Plain Text \(513k\)](#)

Hesiod: Theogony

[HTML Document](#)

Hesiod: Works and Days

[HTML Document](#)

Hitler, Adolph: Mein Kampf

[HTML Index \(27 Chapters\)](#)

Hobbes, Thomas: Leviathan

[Plain Text \(1140k\)](#)

Homer: Illiad

[Plain Text \(787k\)](#)

[HTML Document](#)

Homer: Odyssey

[Plain Text \(595k\)](#)

[HTML Document](#)

Hume, David: Human Understanding

[HTML Document \(306k\)](#)

Huntington, Samuel: Clash of the Civilizations (Ch. 12)

[HTML Document \(67k\)](#)

Huntington, Samuel: West Unique, Not Universal  
[HTML Document \(38k\)](#)

[Back](#)

**-J-**

Jefferson et. al.: Anti-Federalist Papers  
[Plain Text \(814k\)](#)

Jefferson, Thomas: Declaration of Independence  
[HTML Document \(8k\)](#)

Jordanes: Origin and Deeds of the Goths  
[HTML Index](#)

Josephus, Flavius: The Jewish War  
[HTML Document](#)

[Back](#)

**-K-**

Kaczynski, Theodore: Industrial Society and Its Future  
[HTML Index \(28 Sections\)](#)

Kant, Immanuel: Collected Works  
[HTML Index \(7 Books\)](#)

Kant, Immanuel: What is Enlightenment?  
[Plain Text \(16k\)](#)

Keith, Sir Arthur: [Special Collections Section](#)

Kempis, Thomas à: Imitation of Christ  
[HTML Index](#)

Kierkegaard, Søren: Fear and Trembling

[HTML Document \(279k\)](#) 

King James Version of The Holy Bible

[Plain Text \(4435k\)](#)

King John of England et. al.: Magna Carta

[HTML Document \(29k\)](#)

Kipling, Rudyard: White Man's Burden

[HTML Document \(3k\)](#)

Knox, John: Order of Excommunication and of Public Repentance

[HTML Document \(61k\)](#)

[Back](#)

**-L-**

Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm: Monadology

[Plain Text \(36k\)](#)

Livy: History of Rome

[HTML Document](#)

Locke, John: Civil Government

[Plain Text \(290k\)](#)

Locke, John: Concerning Human Understanding

[Plain Text \(1566k\)](#)

London, Jack: Call of the Wild

[Plain Text \(188k\)](#)

Lucan: Pharsalia (Roman 'Civil War')

[HTML Index](#)

Luther, Martin et. al.: 'Project Wittenberg' Resources

[HTML Index](#)

Luther, Martin: Jews and Their Lies

[HTML Document](#)

[Back](#)

**-M-**

MacKay, Charles: Memoirs of Extraordinary Popular Delusions

Plain Text: [Volume 1 \(578k\)](#) [Volume 2 \(595k\)](#) [Volume 3 \(592k\)](#)

MacDonald, Kevin: Jewish Involvement in Shaping American Immigration Policy, 1881-1965:

[PDF Document \(182k\)](#)

Machiavelli, Nicolo: Prince

[Plain Text \(169k\)](#)

Madison et. al.: U.S. Constitution

[Plain Text \(36k\)](#)

Madison et. al.: U.S. Bill of Rights

[Plain Text \(11k\)](#)

Marx, Karl et. al.: Communist Manifesto

[HTML Index \(4 Parts\)](#)

Medieval Jewish Kingdom of the Khazars

[HTML Document \(16k\)](#)

Metsobets'i, T'ovma: History of Tamerlane

[HTML Document](#)

Mill, John Stuart: On Liberty

[Plain Text \(281k\)](#)

Mill, John Stuart: Representative Government

[Plain Text \(567k\)](#)

Mill, John Stuart: Utilitarianism

[HTML Index \(5 Chapters\)](#)

Milton, John: Paradise Lost

[Plain Text \(470k\)](#)

[HTML Index \(10 Books\)](#)

Milton, John: Paradise Regained

[Plain Text \(93k\)](#)

[HTML Index \(4 Books\)](#)

More, Sir Thomas: Utopia

[Plain Text \(223k\)](#)

[HTML Document \(231k\)](#)

[Back](#)

**-N-**

Nietzsche, Friedrich: Thus Spake Zarathustra

[Plain Text \(509k\)](#)

Nilus, Sergyei: Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion

[HTML Document \(164k\)](#)

[HTML Document \(164k\)](#)

[Back](#)

**-O-**

Oliver, Revilo Pendleton: Origins of Christianity

[HTML Document \(105k\)](#)

Orczy, Baroness: Scarlet Pimpernel

[Plain Text \(505k\)](#)

Orwell, George: Animal Farm

[HTML Document \(171k\)](#) 

Ovid: Metamorphoses

[Plain Text \(910k\)](#)

[HTML Document](#)

[Back](#)

**-P-**

Paine, Thomas: Common Sense

[Plain Text \(121k\)](#)

Paine, Thomas: Rights of Man

[HTML Index](#)

Pascal, Blaise: Pensées

[Plain Text \(539k\)](#)

Plato: Collected Works

[HTML Index \(36 Works\)](#)

Plato: Republic

[Plain Text \(666k\)](#)

[HTML Document](#)

Plato: Trial of Socrates

I. Crito: [HTML Document](#)

II. Apology: [HTML Document](#)

III. Phaedo: [HTML Document](#)

Poe, Edgar Allen: Complete Works

[HTML Index](#)

Procopius of Caesarea: Secret History (of Byzantium)

[HTML Document \(227k\)](#)

[Back](#)

**-R-**

Robespierre, Maximilien: On the Principles of Political Morality

[HTML Document \(13k\)](#)

Robespierre, Maximilien: Terror and Virtue

[HTML Document \(9k\)](#)

Rockwell, George Lincoln: White Power

[HTML Index](#)

Rostand, Edmond: Cyrano de Bergerac

[Plain Text \(241k\)](#)

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques: Social Contract

[HTML Index](#)

[Back](#)

**-S-**

Saxo Grammaticus: Danish History

[HTML Index \(Books I-IX\)](#)

Schiller, Friedrich von: Aesthetic Education of Man



[HTML Document \(197k\)](#)

Schiller, Friedrich von: History of the Thirty Years' War

[Plain Text \(857k\)](#)

Schiller, Friedrich von: Ode to Joy

[HTML Document \(5k\)](#) 

Schiller, Friedrich von: Wilhelm Tell

[Plain Text \(185k\)](#) 

Schumpeter, Joseph: On the Concept of Social Value

[HTML Document \(39k\)](#)

Scott, Sir Walter: Ivanhoe

[Plain Text \(1135k\)](#)

Scott, Sir Walter: Rob Roy

[Plain Text \(1083k\)](#)

Shahak, Israel: Jewish History, Jewish Religion

[HTML Index](#)

Shakespeare, William: Complete Works

[HTML Index](#)

Shelley, Mary: Frankenstein

[Plain Text \(425k\)](#)

Smith, Adam: Theory of Moral Sentiments

[HTML Index \(7 Parts\)](#)

Smith, Adam: Wealth of Nations

[HTML Index \(5 Books\)](#)

Sophocles: Oedipus Rex

[HTML Document](#)

Spencer, Herbert: First Principles

[HTML Document \(1013k\)](#)

Spencer, Herbert: Man Versus the State

[HTML Document \(273k\)](#)

Spencer, Herbert: Progress

[HTML Document \(13k\)](#)

Spinoza, Benedict de: Ethics

Plain Text: [Part 1 \(92k\)](#) [Part 2 \(112k\)](#) [Part 3 \(140k\)](#) [Part 4 \(137k\)](#) [Part 5 \(70k\)](#)

Stoddard, Lothrop: Revolt Against Civilization

[HTML Document \(450k\)](#)

Stoddard, Lothrop: Rising Tide of Color

[HTML Index \(12 Chapters\)](#)

Stoker, Bram: Dracula

[Plain Text \(858k\)](#)

Swift, Jonathan: Gulliver's Travels

[Plain Text \(557k\)](#)

Swift, Jonathan: Modest Proposal

[Plain Text \(16k\)](#)

[Back](#)

**-T-**

Tacitus: Annals

[HTML Index \(12 Books\)](#)

Tacitus: Germania

[HTML Document \(30k\)](#)

Tacitus: Histories

[HTML Index \(5 Books\)](#)

Tennyson, Alfred Lord: Locksley Hall

[Plain Text](#)

Tennyson, Alfred Lord: Collected Works

[HTML Index](#)

Texas Declaration of Independence

[HTML Document \(11k\)](#)

Thucydides: History of the Peloponnesian War

[Plain Text \(1154k\)](#)

[HTML Document](#)

Toqueville, Alexis de: Democracy in America

[Plain Text \(1204k\)](#)

Twain, Mark: Adventures of Huckleberry Finn

[Plain Text \(567k\)](#)

Twain, Mark: Adventures of Tom Sawyer

[Plain Text \(391k\)](#)

Twain, Mark: Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court

[Plain Text \(643k\)](#)

Tzu, Sun: Art of War

[Plain Text \(336k\)](#)

[Back](#)

**-V-**

Verne, Jules: Collected Works

[HTML Index \(8 Books\)](#)

Villani, Giovanni: Florentine Chronicle

[HTML Document \(53k\)](#)

Virgil: Aeneid

[Plain Text \(592k\)](#)

[HTML Document](#)

Voltaire: Candide

[Plain Text \(201k\)](#)

[Back](#)

**-W-**

Wells, H.G.: Collected Works

[HTML Index](#)

Wagner, Richard: Das Judenthum in Der Musik (Jewishness in Music)

[HTML English Translation](#)

World War II Propaganda Posters

[HTML Index](#)

[Back](#)

---

If you're still searching for a book, but can't find it here, check out:

**The On-Line Books Page**

---

**BACK**

Design © 1998,1999 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Additional consulting work by Siegfried.  
All links verified 7/19/99.

# YGGDRASIL'S LIBRARY



[\[Click here for an introduction to Yggdrasil and this site.\]](#)

## INDEX OF YGGDRASIL'S ESSAYS

1. [The Ten Lessons: Preserving Western Civilization \(11\)](#)
2. [Politically Correct Racism \(42\)](#)
3. [Resistance: Nationalism \(15\)](#)
4. [The Jewish Role \(32\)](#)
5. [Campus Follies \(10\)](#)
6. [Awakenings \(48\)](#)
7. [Conceptual Breakthroughs \(9\)](#)

8. Money and Markets (12)

9. The Culture Wars (9)

10. New Additions (7) 

11. Nationalist Comments on the News - Updated 12/24/02 

## YGGDRASIL UNIVERSITY

• NOW ENROLLING •  • NOW ENROLLING •

Check out Yggdrasil University, a fresh concept in higher learning:



- Featuring two exclusive works by renowned anthropologist Sir Arthur Keith, and Yggdrasil's Introduction to Keith.
- Yggdrasil and Siegfried have collaborated to bring you the finest in Western literature and science! Recently published on the Electronic Bookshelf are Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell*, Orwell's *Animal Farm*, and Gödel's *Undecidability Theorem*.

## RELATED SITES


For a list of related sites, visit Yggdrasil's Links.

## E-MAIL

If you have any comments, suggestions, thoughts or ideas that you wish to address to Yggdrasil, you may contact him via E-mail by clicking on his address below:

[ygg@ddc.net](mailto:ygg@ddc.net)

---



Yggdrasil's WN Library has been accessed  times since 2/15/97.

This site is designed and maintained by Yggdrasil. Last updated: 04/29/01.  
Everything © 1994-2001 Yggdrasil, unless otherwise noted. All rights reserved.





## WELCOME!

Greetings, newcomers! This library is a collection of over 150 writings that all deal with the problems facing European-Americans in this age of racial quotas, reverse discrimination, and cultural breakdown. They are separated into 8 different categories. Anyone new to this site should consider beginning with the Ten Lessons. Classic, must-read essays are marked with a  tag for your convenience. New material will be marked with a new  tag.

Copy and distribute these writings! If you like what you see, be sure to tell your friends and co-workers about this site: (<http://home.ddc.net/ygg/>). Yggdrasil's Library is intended as a research tool with a right-wing perspective for those with an appetite for hard data.

This site contains:

1. An exclusive collection of essays by Yggdrasil;
2. An electronic bookshelf including works exclusive to this site;

### 3. And a list of links to other sites with a right-wing perspective.

- A brief note on Windows™ fonts:

This site depends heavily on text material. I recommend you download the Verdana font to enhance the readability of our texts. Even though it may seem a hassle, the default font on many browsers (Times or Times New Roman) makes reading long essays quite difficult on the eyes. This font should already be installed if you are using Microsoft I.E.

Probably more important is finding a good monospace font for reading text files on the internet. Microsoft's Typography web page has a truetype font called Monotype.com that works well. Choose it as the default font in your favorite text editor or web browser for best viewing.

- If you are having trouble managing ZIP archives in Windows™, visit the Winzip Home Page.

## WHO IS YGGDRASIL?

- **Yggdrasil** *n. Myth* The great ash tree that holds together earth, heaven, and hell by its roots and branches in Norse mythology. [Courtesy of the American Heritage Dictionary.]

Otherwise known as the Tree of Life, or the World Tree, this mythical tree connects the nine different regions of the universe. In the context of White Nationalism, one can assume that Yggdrasil binds together different classes of Europeans and reminds them of their ancient (and modern!) tribal obligations.

Yggdrasil is the pen name of a middle-aged European-American. Feel free to address all constructive thoughts to ygg@ddc.net. I will not bore the casual reader by an elaboration of my hopes for a Greater Europe, when Schiller's Ode to Joy will say them much better.

MAGNA EVROPA EST PATRIA NOSTRA

---

BACK



# THE TEN LESSONS: PRESERVING WESTERN CIVILIZATION

Yggdrasil's Ten Lessons are an introduction to the problems facing multi-racial empires in general, and the United States in particular. A main point is the universality of ethnic violence.

## Introduction to the 10 Lessons

1. Multi-Racial Empires
2. World-Wide Racial Strife
3. World-Wide Racial Preferences
4. Demographics and Revolt
5. Myth and Reality
6. What is a Race?
7. Exploitation
8. Objective Measures of Racism
9. Self-Destructive Group Behaviors
10. A Call to Action: Secede

---

**BACK**



## **Yggdrasil Presents the Ten Lessons in Securing the Survival of Western Civilization**

Each week, **Yggdrasil** discusses the forces and movements that bear on the fate of European-Americans as a people and as a culture.

**Yggdrasil's** students include many who are angry at the United States Government and at the costs and disadvantages it imposes on European-Americans. The legal and economic burdens fall predominantly on the young and politically weak; those seeking college admission, first time job seekers, and entrepreneurs starting up businesses.

While anger is understandable, ancient symbols of that anger do not speak to the needs of our people. They tend to energize opponents of European-American self-determination.

There are recognizable forces and patterns that create and maintain the burdens imposed on European-Americans. These weekly lessons are intended to illuminate those forces and patterns, so that the angry youth of our nation will understand that we have realistic opportunities to free ourselves.

---

**BACK**

© 1996-1998 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



## **Multi-Racial Empires**

### **Lesson One**

**Yggdrasil** says:

"Multi-Racial Empires everywhere crumble.

They are a bad idea."

The reading for this week comes from the Pages of the [Wall Street Journal](#).

The article is written by an Economics Professor at Harvard.

He makes a very important point about racial groups using the government for advantage:

"Although it may be an unpleasant commentary on human nature, a central driving force in defining a state is the desire to have a reasonably homogeneous population within its borders. It is clear from observing the places where secessionist movements tend to occur, such as Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union or Spain and Canada, that ethnic identity is a central driving force. . .

"Political economy explains some of the benefits from having a homogeneous population within a given state. If diversity is great - measured say by the inequality in potential earnings - then there is a strong incentive for people to spend their energies in efforts to redistribute income rather than to produce goods. In particular, a greater dispersion of constituent characteristics leads to the creation of interest groups that spend their time lobbying the central government to redistribute resources in their favor."

The author suggests that there may be benefits to secession - the splitting of a multi-racial empire into several racially homogenous states.

Do racial minority "interest groups" lobby to redistribute resources from European-Americans in the United States?

Might it be possible for interested European-Americans to form their own country within the borders of the United States?

Does the article suggest anything that might motivate the average European-American to support secession?

Might the typical, middle class European-American view this as a means to escape the burden of supporting groups who lobby for advantages and government handouts?

Might secession be a peaceful means of achieving self-determination for European-Americans?

Robert Barro suggests that the institution of slavery could have been ended at far less cost without fighting the Civil War.

Is he suggesting that some other agenda was at stake?

The above quotes suggest that racial competition to use the political system for advantage can be analyzed in economic terms.

However, it is far from clear that any sort of economic model can predict the outcomes of racial competition in multi-racial empires.

An economic model implies equilibrium. It implies that the political process will find that point at which costs to the non-preferred group equal the benefits of remaining in the empire, and that political resistance by the non-preferred group will stop the preferences from going to extremes. But that is not what we observe in real life. Looking at the examples from Malaysia, Sri Lanka, and Africa in [Yggdrasil's Lesson 3](#), you will see that once a race gets hold of the political process and imposes preferences, the political process goes to extremes, with resulting flight of Chinese from Malaysia and Vietnam, expulsion of whites from Africa, deadly conflict in Sri Lanka, and slow genocide in Tibet.

Not a pretty picture.

It might also be tempting to analyze self-destructive behaviors of races in a multi-racial empires in economic terms. James Baldwin in "The Fire Next Time", describes the "slowdown" in which blacks decrease their work effort to avoid benefitting whites on the other side of any labor transaction.

But here also, the racial motive for sliding onto welfare and the pathologies associated with the welfare system demonstrate movement to self-destructive extremes, rather than movement to an equilibrium point as economic theory would suggest.

Surely, it makes no economic sense to destroy one's own race as a means of denying the benefits of economic interaction to some other race. But that is what we see in the real

world.

Something more powerful than economics seems to be at work in these situations. In these multi-racial empires, people seem unhappy with inter-racial economic transactions in which both parties benefit. The other race must lose, or it isn't "fair".

Indeed, if the economic model worked, then we could argue that multi-racial empires should reduce socialism, because the only effective tactic for reducing disproportionate economic transfers between races would be to attack all governmental wealth transfers in universal, non-racial terms.

But in actual practice, once the modern "therapeutic state" becomes aware of race, and perceives "imbalances", the remedies it applies accelerate the centrifugal forces to the point of breakup.

Despite some inherent limitations in applying the tools of economic analysis to racial conflict in multi-racial empires, nevertheless, Professor Barro recognizes an ultimate truth that contradicts the fundamental sustaining myth upon which the United States has been built.

**Yggdrasil** recommends that you to read, with interest, the following excerpts:

---

## **Oct. 11, 1991 Wall Street Journal Small is Beautiful**

BY ROBERT J. BARRO

The U.S. government is instinctively opposed to secession. It has not supported the Kurds in Iraq, the Croats in Yugoslavia the Ibos in Nigeria or the Quebecers in Canada. We were pretty much the last major country to sign on to sovereignty for the Baltic states, and we have not endorsed the independence movements of any of the other Soviet republics.

There seem to be two main reasons for this opposition. The first is the potential trouble from changing borders. Even borders that were drawn in an arbitrary manner sometime in the past-such as in Yugoslavia, Iraq and much of Africa-may reasonably be defended because the process of change involves disruptions, possibly including armed conflict. Of course, the attempt to maintain unsatisfactory boundaries may cause even more disruption.

The intense opposition of the U.S. government to secession also reflects the specifics of American history. The U.S. Civil War-by far the most costly conflict ever fought by Americans-was waged primarily to maintain the union. The war caused more than 600,000 military fatalities and an unknown number of civilian deaths, and severely

damaged the southern economy. Per-capita income in the South fell from about 80% of the northern level before the war (using the sketchy data available for 1840 ) to about 40% after the war (based on the more complete data for 1880 ). The fall in per-capita income reflected the destruction of capital-plant and equipment, livestock and educated labor-and the end of the plantation system based on forced labor.

### **War's True Cost**

Although only the first part of the fall in measured per-capita income represents a true cost of the war, the overall setback to the economy was striking: It took more than a century after the war's end in 1865 for Southern per-capita income to reattain 80% of the Northern level. This rate of convergence of the poor South to the rich North may seem slow, but the pace is typical of regional growth processes observed in other times and places.

If the U.S. government were to support the right of secession in some other part of the world, such as the Soviet Union, then it might seem indirectly to be challenging the basic premise of the Civil War. Why is it desirable for Soviet republics to have the right to secession when it was undesirable for U.S. states to have the same rights? We would then force ourselves to reconsider whether the enormous cost of the Civil War was worth it. Instead of being the greatest of American presidents, as many people believe, Abraham Lincoln may instead have presided over the largest error in American history.

\* \* \*

Everyone would have been better off if the elimination of slavery had been accomplished by buying off the slaveowners -as the British did in the West Indies in the 1830s-instead of fighting the war.

Whether the blacks would have been better or worse off if the North had accepted the secession of the South requires a forecast of how the institution of slavery would have fared in an independent South. Some relevant information is that slavery was abolished without war in the other parts of the Western hemisphere where it had existed (except for Haiti in the 1790s ) and that the last country to act, Brazil, began the process in 1871 and finished it in 1888. Thus, the experience of the rest of the hemisphere suggests that slavery in the U.S. south would have been eliminated peacefully in not very many years.

If we put the experience of the Civil War behind us and also abstract from the transitional problems of redrawing borders-that is, the stability issue-then the evaluation of a secession depends on whether, starting from scratch, reasonable borders would have been drawn very differently from those that currently prevail. Some of the arguments that have been used in this context to criticize the breakup of states are wrong.

For example, it is often said that a potential new state is too small to be economically viable: Soviet Georgia or Croatia-or Quebec or Catalonia-could not make it on its own. The empirical evidence about the economic growth of countries conflicts sharply with this



view. There is no relation between the growth or level of per-capita income and the size of a country, whether measured by population or area. Small countries, even with populations of as little as a million, can perform well economically, as long as they remain open to international trade. In fact, smallness tends to encourage openness because the alternative really would be a nonviable economy.

A related specious argument is that a state cannot prosper if it lacks a key natural resource, such as oil or fertile land. The experience with economic growth across countries reveals little relation between economic performance and the presence of natural resources. Japan and the Asian tigers, as well as most of Western Europe, have done fine without domestic sources of oil. With access to international markets, a country can specialize in what it does well and then trade its goods for the commodities, such as oil or agricultural products, that it lacks domestically. A characteristic that does promote economic growth is good government in the sense of maintenance of property rights, avoidance of trade barriers and absence of other market distortions including excessive tax rates and regulations. Thus, in evaluating a change of international borders, a key issue from an economic standpoint is whether the new government would be better or worse in terms of these growth promoting traits. In the case of the Baltics, Croatia or Kurdistan, there is little question that secession would lead to improved government.

Although it may be an unpleasant commentary on human nature, a central driving force in defining a state is the desire to have a reasonably homogeneous population within its borders. It is clear from observing the places where secessionist movements tend to occur, such as Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union or Spain and Canada, that ethnic identity is a central driving force. There are cases in which governments have dealt more or less successfully with sharp ethnic diversities, such as Switzerland and even the U.S., but problems are easier to pinpoint than triumphs.

Political economy explains some of the benefits from having a homogeneous population within a given state. If diversity is great--measured say by the inequality in potential earnings--then there is a strong incentive for people to spend their energies in efforts to redistribute income rather than to produce goods. In particular, a greater dispersion of constituent characteristics leads to the creation of interest groups that spend their time lobbying the central government to redistribute resources in their favor.

We can think of a country's optimal size as emerging from a tradeoff: A large country can spread the cost of public goods, such as defining a legal and monetary system and maintaining national security, over many taxpayers, but a large country is also likely to have a diverse population that is difficult for the central government to satisfy. The reason that small countries perform reasonably well in practice is that the public-goods argument may not be so important. For instance, a larger country has more property to protect from foreign aggressors and therefore requires larger outlays for national defense than a small country. Empirically, the ratio of defense expenditures to gross national product is uncorrelated with the size of the country: If the public-goods argument were compelling, then larger countries would tend to spend less on defense as a share of GNP. No doubt, it is inefficient for sovereign states to be too small, but the minimum size for a viable state seems not to be very great.

## **Self-Determination**

The bottom line is that political separation is sometimes a good idea: The benefits can outweigh the losses, including the transitional costs of changing borders. We can usually judge whether the benefits from change exceed the costs by relying on self-determination. After all, most of the costs from changing governments and establishing institutions are borne by the secessionists--if a clear majority of residents in an area indicates their desire to become independent, then they are saying that the benefits exceed the costs.

\* \* \*

Mr. Barro, a Wall Street Journal contributing editor, is a professor of economics at Harvard.

---

[BACK](#)

© 1996-1998 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



# **World-Wide Racial Preferences**

## **Lesson Three**

**Yggdrasil** says:

"Racial preferences and quotas are not unique to the United States. They exist in multi-racial empires around the world.

"Uniformly, racial preferences are imposed by the politically strong upon the politically weak."

In our first lesson, we reviewed an article written by an Economist from Harvard University arguing that when diverse ethnic or racial groups fall under a power of a single government, they tend to use the political process as a means of extracting advantages for their own group at the expense of others.

In our second lesson, we reviewed dozens of examples of racial and ethnic strife around the world. Racial animus is a natural, normal and expected phenomenon whenever races are placed in the same country.

This week, we will read a collection of excerpts from the Wall Street Journal about specific racial preference schemes from around the world.

As you review the cases from Kenya and Nigeria, you will notice that the racial preferences are aimed at complete displacement of working class Europeans with blacks. In effect, it becomes illegal to hire any Europeans in certain occupations.

These types of preferences are aimed at Europeans as an economically prosperous minority living in "diaspora" (away from home). The preferences have a differential impact on Europeans depending on their socio-economic status. Those in critical, high income occupations are permitted to stay.

In the two articles on Sri Lanka (the Island of Ceylon, in the Indian Ocean) we see that the preferences have led to violence.

In the two articles on China, we find a glowing description in 1977 of Chinese university admissions quotas from a U.S Secretary of Education, and a second article 10 years later

with, perhaps, a more realistic view of what is going on in China.

As you read these articles, you may wish to consider the following questions:

1. Do racial preferences aimed at exclusion of lower-income Europeans, while allowing the more prosperous to stay, tell you anything about the sincerity of the egalitarian socialist rhetoric common in the African countries?
2. Could racial preferences aimed at exclusion of lower-income Europeans, while allowing the prosperous to stay, be a method of dividing Europeans by economic interest, so as to lessen resistance to imposing these preferences?
3. Do racial preferences in the United States also primarily effect the young, the inexperienced, and the lower paid occupations?
4. Will the effects of existing preferences in the U.S. grow steadily more burdensome as European-Americans become a smaller fraction of the younger age group?
5. Will racial preferences in the U.S. become more drastic; or do the racial lobbies imposing them have a sense of "fairness" that will tell them when to stop?
6. Do the politically powerful who impose such schemes in the rest of the world have a sense of "fairness" that tells them when to stop?
7. Can you recognize any political party, lobby, or other organization that might assert the interests of European- Americans and stop these preferences from growing more burdensome in the U.S.?

The last article in the group talks about how American managers of multi-national corporations implement these programs around the world. The article was written in 1978 and concludes that most countries see ethnic preferences as temporary.

At this point you may wish to re-read the article on Kenya, with an eye toward the attitudes of "diaspora" European managers allowed to stay.

8. Is there any evidence in 1994 that racial preferences are "temporary"?
9. In a democracy that reacts only to the demands of business lobbies and organized racial lobbies, can European-American business executives be relied upon to oppose racial preferences in any meaningful way?
10. Is it possible that many European-American corporate managers have the same mind set as do the "diaspora" Europeans resident in Kenya? - That residence might be temporary, and that the fate of less fortunate members of your own tribe is of no concern?

11. What, if anything, do these attitudes of corporate managers tell you about the probability of discrimination in favor of their own kind in an economy with no legislated racial preferences?

**Yggdrasil** recommends that you to read, with interest, the following:

---

### **Aug. 26, 1974 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

Malaysia's governing party, the pro-Western National Front led by Premier Tun Abdul Razak won a landslide victory in elections for parliament and state assemblies. The National Front is committed to favoring the disadvantaged Malay majority over the wealthier Chinese 35% minority. In the previous elections five years ago, gains by Chinese parties led to racial bloodshed.

---

### **May 8, 1979 Wall Street Journal P1 C1 Ethnic Upheaval**

**Malaysia Torn by Drive For More Malay Rights At Expense of Chinese  
So Far, No One Is Satisfied By Government's Actions In Commerce, Education  
'Better if British Had Stayed'**

BY BARRY NEWMAN

Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal

KUALA LUMPUR, Malaysia--This is a lucky country. It has a small population, rich cropland, abundant natural resources, an efficient civil service and capable planners. Through 20 years of independence, only one thing has held Malaysia back: the race problem.

It isn't an ordinary race problem. The Malays, on the one hand, have nearly half the population and most of the political power, yet they have very little of the money. The Chinese, on the other hand, are a minority and hold very little power, yet they have most of the money.

The Malays find themselves in an enviable position for economic underdogs: They can do something about it. With the government under their control, the Malays set about adjusting their anomalous situation a few years ago with an affirmative-action program so forceful it would probably astound black activists in the U.S.

In the process, the concept of equal protection under the law was qualified, racial

discrimination in school admissions was legalized, and questioning of the government's racial policies was made an act of sedition.

## **Widespread Discontent**

The result so far is that practically everyone is dissatisfied. Some Malays have made visible strides, but many others haven't seen any benefit. The Chinese, for their part, have encountered palpable privations--most notably their near exclusion from Malaysian universities.

The Chinese are being asked to cooperate, but many here wonder how long they can tolerate the discrimination. "This is my country too!" a Chinese cabby yells at his passenger.

"This feeling of frustration and dissatisfaction with the government," says a Chinese chamber of commerce internal memorandum, "is an unhealthy state of affairs."

Malay leaders defend the changes. "Our leaders have to think how to make this country safe for 2,000 years, not just 20 years," says Abdul Kadir Fadzir, a politically active Malay lawyer. "A lot of people have to make short-term sacrifices. It's a temporary, transitional phenomenon."

## **The British Influence**

The Chinese account for 35% of Malaysia's 12.2 million people. They arrived at their unlikely position of economic might and political impotence through a quirk of colonialism. They flocked to Malaysia's tin mines from the north in the late 1800s, and under the British, who didn't leave until 1957, came to control just about everything the Westerners didn't. But because the Chinese were immigrants, they were kept off the land and out of the government.

The Malays, meanwhile, had been here; for centuries. The British ruled through the Malay sultans, granting the "sons of the soil" preferred rights of citizenship and land ownership. With independence, the government was passed on to the Malays, who now make up between 45% and 50% of the population. People from India and a variety of jungle dwellers make up the rest of the population. The Malays preserved their favored status in the new constitution and, in an unabashed gerrymander, guaranteed their own political dominance.

But the Malays were poor. Their agrarian ways and Islamic gentility were no match for the aggressive, urbanized Chinese. There was little hope for the Malay to break into the clannish domain of Chinese business; he stayed on the farm, tethered to a line of credit from a Chinese merchant.

## **Language Barrier**

The races never got along. In America, blacks and whites at least speak the same

language, wear the same clothes, eat the same food and often go to the same church. The Chinese and Malays haven't any such common ground. To the Chinese, Malays are indolent and incompetent. To the Malays, the Chinese are ruthless and unprincipled. Racial remarks roll off the tongue in Kuala Lumpur as readily as they did in America's Deep South in the 1950s. Years after the Malays gained control of the government, they remained in the economic back seat. Malay households earned only half as much as Chinese households 65% of the Malays lived in poverty, compared with 25% of the Chinese. In 1969, about the time affirmative action for blacks was coming into vogue in the U.S., the Malays rioted in Kuala Lumpur.

In a bloody amok (a Malay word) about 250 Chinese were murdered, along with 50 Malays and Indians. It was an explosion of Malay resentment that exposed, the government later concluded, "an area of weakness which undermined the very foundations of the nation."

A year later, affirmative action came to Malaysia in earnest. The government proclaimed a "New Economic Policy." Its objective: to "ensure the creation of a Malay commercial and industrial community in all categories and at all levels of operation, in order that within one generation Malays and other indigenous people can be full partners in the economic life of the nation."

By 1990, the government resolved, Malays' participation in every educational, professional and commercial field would match their share of the population- about half. And Malays would own 30% of the country's capital. If they couldn't buy it themselves, the government would buy it for them.

\* \* \*

Two years ago, the government gave itself a more persuasive tool: a sweeping law, tied to the racial policies, requiring licenses for most factories. A manufacturer who doesn't make an effort to comply might end up making nothing.

\* \* \*

When the British were here, for more than a century, they sent Malays to Malay primary schools and taught them in the Malay language. Education ended there. The British "protected" the Moslem Malays from Christian missionaries; the Chinese, unprotected, went to mission schools taught in English. The University of Malaya used English from the start and, naturally, the student body was overwhelmingly Chinese.

In 1969, the government decided to make Malay the language of instruction; the switch will be complete in 1982. The university population has since multiplied tenfold, to 31,000, and new students have been predominantly Malays. They now account for 70% of the student population. Of 5,700 freshmen admitted this school year, only 1,200 were Chinese.

## **The No Merit System**

The mechanism for doing this makes American affirmative action pale by comparison. The constitution was simply amended to allow Malays a "reasonable proportion" of every entering class. The quality of the competition doesn't matter. "On strict merit, we could give all our places to non-Malays," says Rahim Mohkzani, deputy vice chancellor at the University of Malaya. As it is, thousands of qualified Chinese are being turned away.

\* \* \*

While Malay unemployment is down to about 7%, Chinese unemployment is up to around 8%. Domestic investment (most of it from Chinese industrialists) is dropping. Wealthier Chinese students--about 25,000 of them--have departed in droves for universities in the West. Some Chinese with marketable skills are said to have left the country; many others say they would like to.

### **Potential for Backlash**

The government is all too aware of the potential for backlash. Lately, it has softened its rhetoric on Malay privilege and placed fresh emphasis on the need for national unity. Yet, at the same time it is being pulled in the opposite direction by impatient Malays who see the government's programs as benefiting a small group of well-placed entrepreneurs and doing little for the majority still trapped in rural poverty.

\* \* \*

---

## **Nov. 29, 1994 Wall Street Journal p A24 Quota System In India Is a Killer**

BY A.S. ABRAHAM

BOMBAY--Some 130 demonstrators were reported trampled to death last week after a clash with police in the city of Nagpur. Most of the 50,000 protesters were members of the Gowari-Gonde caste and were demanding that New Delhi declare them a protected "tribe" entitled to their own quota of government jobs. The protest was organized by the conservative Bharatiya Janata Party, which in the past opposed quotas as harmful to Hindu unity. But the BJP faces elections next month and knows a vote-winning issue when it sees one.

So does the ruling Congress Party, architect of India's free market reforms. Under its tutelage, preferences have been steadily ratcheted up until some 75% of Indians are eligible for special treatment. As last week's killings show, affirmative action is becoming India's most dangerous and volatile issue. There are even signs of a brain drain as uppercaste families worry about narrowing opportunities.



India's ancient caste system should be on the way out, or so the modernizers argue. Economic reform and global competition mean that men and women will be judged by their skills and productivity, not by social background. Under the market-oriented program of Finance Minister Manmohan Singh, India has become a popular destination for multinational investors. Indeed, U.S. Commerce Secretary Ron Brown is expected to lead a big delegation here early in the new year.

But the modernizers may underestimate the power of democratic politics wedded to deep cultural attitudes. All over India, a bidding war is breaking out for the support of underprivileged groups. Caste is becoming the determinant of what kind of education or job one gets, and how quickly one is promoted. As a political lodestar for the major parties, it promises to become more important than the Hindu-Muslim religious divide.

India may be disintegrating into a battlefield of minorities engaged in a zero-sum contest for special privileges. In 1950, the constitution required the government to reserve 22.5% of jobs for "untouchables," the despised low-caste individuals who made up 22.5% of the Hindu population. Of course, only a few actually had the education and opportunity to benefit from these quotas, but soon this small elite lobbied successfully for their privileges to be extended indefinitely beyond their original 1960 expiration date.

Since then, there has been a steady expansion of eligibility. In the late 1970s, "other backward classes," or OBCs, who make up 52% of the Hindu population, began to attract official favor. In 1990, V.P. Singh's Congress Party government formally reserved 27% of job and education slots for them. The current Congress Party welfare minister, Sitaram Kesari, wants to provide quotas next for all minorities, including Muslims, Christians and Sikhs.

While the number of eligible people has expanded, the Supreme Court has sought to cap the share of opportunities that may be awarded by quota. In 1992, it reasserted that no more than 50% of government jobs and education slots may be reserved for various castes, tribes and other backward classes. The rest should be left open to free competition. But state politicians seem little inclined to observe this limit, and the central government isn't enforcing it.

Ironically, these quotas have not improved the lot of the groups they target, except for a privileged few. And so far the quotas haven't seeped beyond India's dominant state sector to infect the emerging private sector. But the symbol of the quotas has become a passionate political issue for the groups involved.

Party politics increasingly revolves around caste or tribal identity. In the southern state of Tamil Nadu, for instance, the quotas now cover 69% of job and education slots. The federal government has not opposed the Tamil Nadu legislation, because the ruling Congress Party needs to stay popular with Tamil voters.

\* \* \*

Mr. Abraham is a Bombay-based writer. [The quote above is an excerpt - entire article

**Review & Outlook (Editorial): Race and Blood**  
**05/05/93 Wall Street Journal (J), p A22**

Many people are struggling to understand what is going on in Bosnia. Here's some help, but it's not very pleasant reading.

You may have seen that the president of Sri Lanka was blown up over the weekend. Violence has taken a high toll in the beautiful country once known as Ceylon. At least 23 others were killed in the attack on President Ranasinghe Premadasa. The opposition leader was killed the week before. In October, 182 Muslims were shot or hacked to death by ethnic Tamil militants. At least 17,000 people have been killed since the Tamil insurgency began in 1983.

In Sri Lanka, the politics of race has gone mad.

Indeed, the successive tragedies that have visited a country that was once known as a model democracy deserves much thought from those who would promote rights and jobs on the basis of race.

Fired by a long-simmering sense of grievance, the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam have pressed for 10 years their bloody fight for an independent homeland in the north and east of the island of Sri Lanka. It is not certain that the Tamil Tigers were responsible for the death of Mr. Premadasa Saturday. But the Tamil grievances derive from the policies of ethnic preference that Sri Lanka established soon after its independence in 1948.

At that time, Sri Lanka -- then Ceylon -- "was an oasis of stability, peace and order," wrote Sri Lanka historian K.M. Silva. "More important, one saw very little of the division and bitterness which were tearing at the recent independence of the South Asian countries." In 1956, with the election of Solomon Dias Bandaranaike, all that changed.

Though he grew up as an English-speaking Christian, Mr. Bandaranaike became a crusader for preferential treatment for the 75% Sinhalese Buddhist majority. As prime minister, he made Sinhalese the official language, limited university opportunities for non-Sinhalese and generally polarized Sri Lankan society on ethnic grounds.

Succeeding governments took over Christian schools, forced many Tamils out of the civil service and eliminated the section of the constitution that guaranteed minority rights. Race riots became a recurring phenomenon.

The Tamils' response to being made inferior citizens of the country that many of their families had lived in for generations was initially moderate. But as their grievances grew, so did their anger. The final result was the emergence of the Tigers, whose fanaticism

and willingness to commit the most depraved acts of violence has won them comparisons to Peru's Shining Path guerrillas. The government's heavyhanded approach in dealing with the Tamils, which appeared to include random killing and casual torture, has further deepened divisions.

\* \* \*

Race and ethnicity in our time have become a fascinating subject. They are said to be a source of great pride, but they are also demonstrably a source of bitter, and seemingly endless, retribution.

---

### **July 12, 1976 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

LAGOS - Nigerian authorities said they have decided to curtail the freedom of residence of foreign - chiefly Western - businessmen and that only top officials of foreign companies operating in this western African nation will be allowed to reside here.

A Lagos radio announcement said lower-ranking foreign employees of foreign business concerns will be granted only temporary permits to force these companies to replace them with Nigerian nationals.

---

### **Dec. 10, 1976 Wall Street Journal P14 C4 Rhodesia, as Viewed From Kenya**

BY BOWEN NORTHRUP

NAIROBI -- In the pre-independence days a certain Mau Mau vowed to kill Sir Michael Blundell. Now they meet and laugh about it.

\* \* \*

So how are race relations in Kenya now? "People from all over Europe and North America are living happily and comfortably here," says Brian Tayleur, who retired as a colonel in the British army to live here. William K. Wood, a breezy Californian who is general manager of Commercial Bank of Africa Ltd. here (as a nominee from Bank of America, part owner), says, "I'm as happy as a mongoose at a cobra rally."

The mix has changed, however. Of the 60,000 or so whites here, an estimated 45,000 are "two year wonders" (multinational employees) or technical experts here on contract, or others not considered permanent. There are only about 5,000 "white Kenyans"--those who took Kenyan citizenship--plus another 10,000 or so whites living here more or less

permanently.

\* \* \*

The settler whites who took Kenyan citizenship are aware that their numbers are aging, and dwindling. "There are opportunities for older men here," says Mr. Tayleur, who has become office manager for the area's biggest law firm, "but this is no place for a young white African male."

A prime reason for that is Kenyanization, the pressure to turn over jobs held by whites to trained Africans. The older men, who have specialties, find niches to fill. Not so for many just out of college. Mr. Tayleur notes another social fact: There seem to be few "lower class" whites living here; all the jobs they might take are held by blacks.

### **Kenyanization's Goals**

The government's Kenyanization Bureau scrutinizes each white-held job yearly, and requires the employer to justify keeping it in white hands rather than turning it over to a black understudy. Also, the yearly fee for most "expatriate" work permits has been raised to about \$1,000 a year from the previous \$50, says Mr. Wood.

The goal of Kenyanization, says an economist here, "is to proceed as fast as they can without inhibiting growth." An American notes that General Motors (Kenya) Ltd. is making a major expansion here. "I hear they're having a hell of a time with the Kenyanization Bureau," he remarks.

\* \* \*

So Kenyanization means a dwindling number of jobs for whites. But the increasing sophistication of the economy means continuing, if temporary, jobs for whites with various technical specialties. And the expansion of the economy keeps creating new jobs. "This place epitomizes free enterprise," says Mr. Wood, the banker. "This is the easiest, most realistic market I've ever functioned in." An American embassy official says U.S. investment here has a total book value of about \$125 million. "It's rising-- a growth market," he comments.

\* \* \*

Mr. Northrup is a member of the Journal's London bureau.

---

**Nov. 30, 1977 Wall Street Journal P32 C1**  
**Asides - The Horse's Mouth**

Ms. Mary Berry is Assistant Secretary for Education in the Department of HEW and thus

the Carter administration's top official in charge of the republic's educational well being. Recently she paid an eight-day visit to China, and afterwards she described her impressions of the Chinese educational system to The Washington Post. She said we have much to learn from the Chinese. For instance, they are "moving rationally and realistically" by openly basing university admission on regional, class and ethnic quotas.

"The Chinese talk about this in a much more straightforward way than we do," she reported. "They have a healthy attitude toward disadvantage. It's 'let's have quotas to make sure we have a percentage of different groups. They're not concerned about the subtleties like we have to be.'" For example, "They don't talk about affirmative action' and 'reverse discrimination.'" She added, "I tried to explain the difference to them between quotas and goals, but they couldn't follow all that."

---

## **Aug. 24, 1987 Wall Street Journal 15**

### **China and Tibet: Conquest by Cultural Destruction**

\* \* \*

Moreover, population transfer has been China's preferred means for absorbing conquered territory: In Manchuria, the ratio of Chinese to Manchus is 35 to 1; in Mongolia it's five Chinese to every Mongolian. Behind the Disney World diorama of rebuilt monasteries and caretaker monks intended to offset international criticism while attracting the tourists Beijing hopes will support its growing community-Tibet, as a returned Western aid worker ruefully noted, "is finished."

If so, the final blow will come from Chinese apartheid. Rampant unemployment on top of an annual inflation rate of 300% has rendered Tibet's annual per-capita income just \$110. Not only does this represent one of the poorest incomes on the planet, it is two-thirds less than that of a Chinese settler there. Living in antiquated houses often lacking heat, running water or electricity, tibetans have an average life span of 40 years and an infant mortality rate of one in six. Seventy percent of the adults remain illiterate; only one in five children completes primary school.

In contrast, Chinese immigrants receive guaranteed jobs and modern housing. Up to two-thirds of the limited school seats are reserved for their offspring, while sufficient diet and medical care is provided to make their average life span 25 years longer than that of Tibetans.

The Sinocization of Tibet is no more accidental than its military occupation. Given the region's chronic unrest, typified by ongoing executions of political dissidents, the internment of almost 4,000 political prisoners in the capital city of Lhasa, and the presence of one Chinese soldier for every 10 Tibetans in central Tibet alone, Sinocization is the requisite corollary to open force; a subtle but effective means to submerge the identity of Beijing's most intransigent subject race.

## **Dec. 18, 1978 Wall Street Journal P26 C3 Ethnic Demands Abroad**

BY DONALD L. HOROWITZ

The author, an authority on ethnic problems abroad, is also author of "The Courts and Social Policy" (Brookings Institution).

A new wave of ethnic sentiment seems to be sweeping across the continents bringing with it a host of new problems for corporate managers.

The civil war in Lebanon. Basque terrorism in Spain, the endless violence in Northern Ireland are all signs of how murderous ethnic feelings can become. In these and other countries, the goals of ethnic movements are political: creation of separate states, domination of existing states or a new set of relations among ethnic groups that have coexisted uneasily.

Dramatic political demands of this kind have made us aware that most countries of the world are not homogeneous. They are divided into various, usually competing, ethnic groups. The politics of many countries reflects this competition, as groups demand more power, more representation in government offices, official recognition of their language, and the like.

Increasingly, ethnic groups are also making demands that affect the private sector-- indeed, to a far greater degree than has been recognized. At a recent seminar, a vice president of a large American corporation with far-flung interests overseas explained that his firm had worked out agreements to employ members of one ethnic group in preference to another in one country and to begin hiring by ethnic quotas in another. His corporation, a producer of primary products, had also been asked to conduct its business in the official local language and to divide up tasks among various ethnic groups represented in the labor force. It was a complex matter to work out, but compromises were reached.

The experience of this executive is hardly unique. as other seminar participants attested.

Many governments have imposed employment preferences and quotas for groups "underrepresented" in commerce and industry. Some have gone even further. In a carefully drawn plan, Malaysia has laid down explicit targets for Malay representation in share ownership and employment, so that Malays will be able to catch up with the advantaged Chinese and Indians. Many other countries have attempted the same thing

with far less candor and openness. Demands for programs of this kind are not likely to abate. They affect the ethnic structure of the labor force, of the local management cadre, of the local share of ownership, as well as the language of the workplace and the ethnic identity of local contractors and licensees.

In Quebec, for example, the provincial government has adopted a policy of "Frenchifying" business. Companies are required to obtain government certificates, to be granted only if French is used "at all levels of the firm." The government has shown some willingness to compromise with foreign firms in Quebec. One purpose of the policy is to increase employment opportunities for French Canadians.

Such measures raise many problems for management. Almost inevitably, firms have been and will continue to be drawn into ethnic conflict, against their will. If they resist ethnic preferences, they will be accused of uncooperativeness. If they accede, the gratitude they earn may be temporary. Resentments will build up among members of the "overrepresented" ethnic groups that are not in the preferred category. These resentments could prove costly in the long-run.

Preferential employment policies seem easy and attractive to adopt because they get the multinational firm off the hook on a sensitive political issue.

Nevertheless, preferential policies are hard to implement, even with the best of will. When firms throughout a country are enlisted in the effort, the supply of qualified candidates, especially at the managerial level, quickly runs out. Businesses begin to bid up the price of available talent. They may end by paying salaries to unproductive executives and directors' fees to figurehead ethnic representatives.

\* \* \*

---

**BACK**



# World-Wide Racial Strife

## Lesson Two

**Yggdrasil** says:

"Racial Strife seems universal where diverse races are placed in a single country.

"Strife can be minimized through dividing such countries into homogeneous nations."

In last week's lesson, we reviewed excerpts from an article written by an Economist from Harvard University arguing that when diverse ethnic or racial groups fall under a power of a single government, they tend to use the political process as a means of extracting advantages for their own group at the expense of others.

To avoid conflict, it sometimes makes sense to split countries into smaller, more racially homogeneous nations.

The economist then argued that many very small states are economically viable, and their formation should be encouraged. Students in the United States are rarely exposed to such ideas, nor are they taught just how universal ethnic strife is throughout the world.

The reading for this week consists of examples of racial strife from around the world collected from the pages of the [Wall Street Journal](#) and the [Los Angeles Times](#) over the 20 years preceding 1995. The list is by no means complete.

As you review these examples you may wish to consider the following questions:

1. How does one tell the good guy from the bad guy in these conflicts?
2. Are outnumbered races always the "good-guys" in these conflicts?
3. Is it a bit hypocritical to criticize "white racism" in America when there are so many examples throughout the world?



4. Is "white racism" stronger or milder than the versions practiced in other parts of the world?
5. Could the combination of intense criticism of "white racism" plus the extensive legal privileges or "quotas" for "non-whites" amount to a program of anti-white racial aggression?
6. Is it always true that majorities dominate minorities?
7. Can we view the Mandela government of South Africa as an effort by the minority Europeans and minority Xhosa to dominate the majority Zulu?
8. In Rwanda, how can the Tutsi, comprising only 10%, dominate the Hutu, comprising 90%?
9. Is it easier to figure out how the minority Kimbundu thwart the majority Ovimbundu in Angola?
10. Does the experience of the economically dominant Chinese living in Viet Nam and Malaysia, or Europeans in Nigeria suggest conclusions about economically dominant minorities living in "diaspora"?

**Yggdrasil** recommends that you read the following excerpts:

---

### **April 15, 1993 Wall Street Journal A1**

Indian security forces killed eight suspected Muslim militants in the northern state of Jammu-Kashmir, and separatist guerrillas killed five people in retaliation, according to news reports.

### **Aug. 22, 1990 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

The Indian parliament approved presidential rule in the state of Jammu and Kashmir, and gave the armed forces special powers there, according to local radio reports. Indian officials said tanks and troop reinforcements were dispatched to the frontier with Pakistan, where soldiers from the two countries clashed this week.

\* \* \*

### **Jan 12, 1993 Wall Street Journal A-1**

Thousands of Muslims jammed a railway station in Bombay waiting to flee the city, where six days of Hindu-Muslim riots have killed at least 137 people. Police said 15 areas have

been placed under curfew, and about 2,800 people have been arrested amid widespread looting and arson.

### **Dec 8, 1993 Wall Street Journal A1**

Eight Hindu politicians were arrested after challenging the Indian government to take them into custody over the destruction of a 16th-century mosque in Ayodhya a year ago. The top officials of the nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party were arrested in Lucknow, capital of Uttar Pradesh state, where the disputed mosque is located.

### **Aug 24 1990 Wall Street Journal A10**

\* \* \*

The largely Moslem people of Indian Kashmir are rebelling violently against the authorities in New Delhi. They complain that they were taken into India against their will in 1947 and that New Delhi has systematically rigged elections in the province to keep nationalists out of power. The Indian military is suppressing the rebellion in its usually bloody and incompetent way. Hundreds have been killed. Pakistan, which occupies a chunk of Kashmir itself, is, if not arming the rebels, at least turning a blind eye to arms smuggling.

It's exactly the same pattern as in the rich Indian province of Punjab. There too New Delhi goaded a religious minority, this time the Sikhs, into political extremism. The Sikh extremists committed horrible atrocities. The Indian government reacted even more atrociously. An ensuing anti-Sikh pogrom in New Delhi claimed 3,000 lives.

\* \* \*

### **Jan 31, 1991 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

Sikh militants killed at least 23 people in India's northern state of Punjab as the government made another peace overture to the rebels, saying that it was willing to hold talks with Sikh leaders as early as March, news reports said.

### **Aug. 29, 1989 Wall Street Journal P1, C3**

Sinhalese radicals brought nearly all businesses and transportation to a halt in most of Sri Lanka on the first day of a planned weeklong general strike. The radicals charge the Sinhalese-dominated government has granted too many concessions to ethnic Tamil rebels and hasn't done enough to force Indian troops to pull out.

### **Feb. 1, 1991 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

Riots erupted in India's southern state of Tamil Nadu as news spread of the imposition of

direct presidential rule in the state, which has been accused of permitting gun-running by Sri Lankan rebels. Police said they arrested at least 1,000 people as violence broke out in the state capital, Madras, as well as other towns.

### **April 5, 1993 Wall Street Journal A1**

Hundreds of Pakistanis defied army warnings and pressed toward the disputed Kashmiri border. The anti-Indian demonstrators were seeking to storm the Indian defended cease-fire line dividing Kashmir. The Pakistan government, fearing another confrontation with India, vowed to send troops to halt the marchers.

### **May 6, 1977 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

Pakistani troops fought a battle with mountain tribesmen who are holding several thousand Chinese road workers hostage to back demands for the resignation of Prime Minister Bhutto. The Associated Press said the clash killed five soldiers and 30 of the tribesmen, known as Kohistanis. The Chinese are building a highway through the mountainous Pakistani-Chinese border.

### **Mar. 24, 1992 Wall Street Journal P16 C1**

\* \* \*

In northern Iraq, three heavily armed Iraqi divisions are reported to have resumed Saddam Hussein's genocidal assault against his Kurdish population. In neighboring Turkey, a new spate of violence began over the weekend, instigated by the Kurdish Workers Party and precipitating swift retribution from the Turkish security forces. Some 45 people lost their lives in the clashes in Turkey.

\* \* \*

### **Aug. 30, 1989 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

The U.S. recalled its ambassador to Bulgaria for consultations in response to human rights abuses involving Bulgaria's ethnic Turkish minority. The State Department also said it may provide aid to help Turkey cope with 310,000 Bulgarian Turkish refugees who have fled across the border.

### **Sep. 4 1974 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

Turkish Premier Bulent Encivit warned that his country would take "serious measures" if Turkish Cypriots continued to be massacred. The number of civilians found in a grave in a Turkish Cypriot village Monday grew to 72. And a man from another village said he survived a separate mass execution by Greek Cypriots at the time of the Turkish invasion.

## **Aug. 8, 1990 Wall Street Journal P1, C3**

Hundreds of people rampaged through Jerusalem, dragging Palestinians from their cars and beating them as mourners buried two Jewish teen-agers who were found stabbed to death Monday in a ravine near a village in the West Bank.

## **Mar 18, 1993 Wall Street Journal A1**

Clashes continued in Israel as more Palestinians were wounded battling Israeli soldiers at a Gaza Strip refugee camp. West Bank settlers burned an Arab-owned gas station in further retaliation for the deaths of two settlers struck and killed by a car this week. Officials remain unsure whether the fatal incident was an accident or not.

## **Jan 24, 1994 Wall Street Journal A1**

\* \* \*

The idea of peace between Israel and Palestinians may be in the air, but Israel's 800,000 Arab citizens - almost all living within Israel proper, not in the occupied territories - still feel like second-class citizens. Says Mr. Darawshe: "I'm not sure this government, or any other government, will ever give us real equality."

\* \* \*

## **Jan. 19, 1976 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

LEBANON'S PREMIER QUIT as new fighting raged across the country. Rashid Karami, Lebanon's top Moslem official, gave up a seven-month effort to stop the vicious sectarian fighting that has taken an estimated 8,000 lives since last spring. "I have to announce that the government has no more effectiveness," Karami said in a broadcast speech announcing his resignation. Lebanon's Christian-dominated army recently defied Karami by attacking a Moslem camp.

Karami said he knew the government was powerless when he arranged a new cease-fire over the weekend and both sides violated it within an hour.

Christian forces demolished a Moslem and Palestinian slum neighborhood in Beirut, driving out its defenders in hand-to-hand fighting. Nearby, the Phoenicia Intercontinental hotel was set afire. Thousands of Druze Moslems and Palestinians besieged the Christian village of Saadiyet, 15 miles south of the capital, trapping Camille Chamoun, the interior minister and head of one Christian militia. At least 100 persons were killed.

\* \* \*

## **Mar. 3, 1992 Wall Street Journal P1, C3**

Yeltsin signed a decree that will allow ethnic Germans living in Russia to settle in two regions along the Volga River where their families had lived decades ago, according to news reports. The move is part of gradual rehabilitation of Germans who in 1941 were deported by Stalin to Siberia, Central Asia and Kazakhstan.

### **Mar. 25, 1991 Wall Street Journal p A11**

\* \* \*

To the east, the Russian empire is disintegrating as Armenians, Azerls, Georgians, Moldavians, Ukrainians, and Uzbeks struggle successfully to loosen Moscow's grip on their republics.

Because of the untidy borders, no nation in this region lacks an aggrieved, and often oppressed-minority. Few parts of the world can claim more hostility among peoples living in close proximity to one another. Bulgaria, for example, has a large Turkish minority that was persecuted by the communists, causing an exodus to Turkey. Turkey, Iran, Iraq and Syria all have Kurdish minorities, who number some 20 million to 30 million people in all and retain a strong sense of national identity.

Moldavians in the Soviet Union consider themselves to be Romanians. Serbs look upon Serbs living in the borders of Croatia as kith and kin, and that could be a causus beli if Croatia persists in its efforts to separate from Yugoslavia. The Albanians who predominate in Yugoslavia's Kosovo province resent Serbian communist suzerainty, Hungarians in Romania chafe under the rule of Bucharest, where a "socialist" government retains many communist characteristics. Turks in Thrace are not especially happy about being a part of Greece. Then, of course, there are the Palestinian Arabs, who are second class citizens not just in Israel, but wherever they live, whether it be Syria, Kuwait or Jordan. Reading the news from this part of the world, one might get the idea that peace is impossible, that ancient hostilities will never die and that man's inhumanity to man will be the defining characteristic of the region for many years to come.

\* \* \*

### **May 21, 1994 Los Angeles Times A8**

TIBILISI, Georgia. Less than a week after the signing of a truce, Georgian troops battled Abkhazian separatists along the Inguri River in the breakaway province, the two sides reported Friday. More than 3,000 people have been killed and tens of thousands have become refugees since the fighting broke out in mid-1992, I when Georgian leader Eduard A. Shevardnadze sent troops to quell the separatist movement.

The Abkhazanis, an ethnic group that traces its lineage hack many centuries, want to become independent or possibly part of Russia.

\* \* \*

### **April 5, 1993 Wall Street Journal A1**

Armenian troops consolidated their control over Azerbaijan's western Kelbajar region in a significant turn in the five-year-old war for control of the Nagorno-Karabakh enclave. The fall of Kelbajar opened a second corridor from Armenia into Nagorno-Karabakh, an area in Muslim Azerbaijan that is populated mainly by Christian Armenians.

### **Mar 10, 1992 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

Violence erupted throughout the Caucasus region of the former Soviet Union, with troops under attack in Armenia, an explosion in western Georgia and militias pressing attacks in the disputed enclave of Nagorno-Karabakh. Former Soviet troops have come under attack throughout the region.

### **Mar. 4, 1992 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

Police in western Azerbaijan said they had recovered the bodies of 120 Azerbaijanis killed as they fled an Armenian assault in the disputed enclave of Nagorno-Karabakh and said they were being blocked from recovering more bodies. Armenian officials denied as a "gross exaggeration" claims that 1,000 died in last week's attack.

### **July 20, 1989 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

Soviet troops clashed with warring bands of Georgians and Abkhazians, as rioters attacked a hydroelectric dam in the Black Sea resort region of Abkhazia, official sources said. Explosives and firearms were confiscated during the ethnic violence.

\* \* \*

### **Feb. 14, 1994 Wall Street Journal A1**

\* \* \*

This rocky peninsula in the Black Sea is one of such places as Kazakhstan and the Caucasus where the Soviets redrew borders and shuffled populations to fragment dissent. When the Soviet Union shattered in 1991 into 15 independent nations, the result was that many ethnic Russians were marooned in foreign states such as Ukraine.

Crimea is a natural target for Russia's acquisitive itch. Some 70% of Crimea's 2.5 million people are ethnic Russians, indeed, Crimea was part of Russia for the better part of two centuries after Catherine the Great pried it from the Turks in 1783.

### **Aug. 3, 1993 Wall Street Journal A1**

North Ossetia's security chief blasted Ingush separatists for Sunday's slayings of the military governor and military commander of the disputed southern Russian region, where Russian troops are deployed.

### **Sep. 21, 1993 Wall Street Journal A1**

Separatist fighters broke through the outer defenses of Sukhumi, capital of Georgia's breakaway Black Sea province of Abkhazia. The rebels demanded that the forces of the Shevardnadze government abandon the city, saying further resistance was useless. A night of missile attacks left houses along Sukhumi's shoreline in flames.

### **Aug 9, 1989 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

Lawmakers in Soviet Estonia approved a law tightening residency requirements for voting and running for office. The move was aimed at stemming the influence of the republic's Russian minority, which is about a third of the region's 1.6 million people. Some Russian workers briefly went on strike last month to protest the legislation.

### **Sep. 5 1989 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

In a separate ethnic dispute, Russian-speaking workers in the republic of Moldavia stayed away from their jobs to protest a law making Moldavian the official language.

### **Aug. 3, 1979 Wall Street Journal P8 C4**

SAN SEBASTIAN, Spain - The Basques who live in the narrow valleys and on the conifer-covered mountains of northern Spain say they're different from the Spaniards who live on the sear brown plateaus in the south. They're generally taller and fairer than other Spaniards. They have their own strange language, their own dances, cuisine and flag.

\* \* \*

### **Aug. 1, 1975 Wall Street Journal P1**

Spanish police killed two suspected Basque terrorists in gunbattles in downtown Madrid, the worst such fighting in the Capital in years. Six policemen have lost their lives in clashes with Basque separatists of the northern provinces so far this year.

\* \* \*

### **Feb. 23, 1976 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

Separatist violence In Spain's Catalan region continued despite a visit by King Juan

Carlos Police in Catalonia and the Basque provinces broke up demonstrations for autonomy and better living conditions. The situation could become more tense soon, as the government is reported planning new luxury taxes and a rise in the price of gasoline.

### **Sep. 2, 1975 Wall Street Journal P1**

Corsicans demanding home rule and an end to alleged oppression by French police called a 20-hour general strike, closing businesses and transportation.

\* \* \*

### **Aug. 1, 1975 Wall Street Journal P1**

Protestant vigilantes in Ulster killed three members of an Irish dance band returning to Dublin after a performance in Northern Ireland. Two of the Protestants also died when a bomb they were carrying exploded prematurely.

\* \* \*

### **Nov. 20, 1975 Wall Street Journal P1**

BRITAIN'S GOVERNMENT proposed partial self-rule for Scotland and Wales. Outlining legislation it will try to enact in a new session of Parliament, the ruling Labor Party moved to defuse independence movements by offering the Scots and Welsh regional assemblies. But the proposal, strongly opposed by many Conservative Party members of Parliament as well as some from the Labor Party, failed to satisfy nationalist lawmakers because it didn't include dates.

\* \* \*

### **Mar. 23, 1992 Wall Street Journal P1 C4**

MARSEILLE, France - The powerful showing of an ultra-right party in French elections yesterday has left outsiders struggling for explanations. How could Jean-Marie Le Pen's National Front, the xenophobic party that wants to throw foreign workers out of France, nearly outpoll the Socialist Party of France's president, Francois Mitterrand?

### **Feb. 7, 1977 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

Three Bombs damaged buildings in the Brittany area of France on the eve of a visit by President Giscard d Estaing. An outlawed group seeking autonomy for Brittany claimed responsibility for one of the blasts.

### **April 9, 1993 L.A. Times P1**



ANTWERP, Belgium--In mainstream Flemish politics the Vlaams Blok's kick-out-the-immigrants policy remains beyond the pale. But in another manifestation--fierce disdain for the French-speaking half of Belgium--the Vlaams Blok's politics of exclusion is entirely acceptable.

The Vlaams Blok favors a Czechoslovak solution for Belgium's regional rivalries. It would split Belgium into two nations, Flanders on the north and French speaking Wallonia on the south. Although the mainstream Flemish political parties stop short of demanding independence, they are engineering a highly decentralized Belgium.

\* \* \*

### **Dec. 28, 1992 Wall Street Journal A-9**

\* \* \*

In Hungary, the incidents started with attacks by roving bands of teenage skinheads on Asian and African students and diplomats. Sometimes a European or American tourist who wasn't lily-white was beaten severely enough to require hospitalization. Others were harassed cursed and spit upon in the street or in railway stations.

\* \* \*

### **Dec. 6, 1993 Wall Street Journal A1**

A letter bomb blast injured Vienna's mayor, Helmut Zilk, who has been an outspoken proponent of minority rights in Austria. Zilk, 66, was rushed to the hospital with injuries to his left arm. Later, police defused another bomb sent to a legislator, bringing to six the number of explosive devices sent to human-rights activists since Friday.

### **March 31, 1975 Wall Street Journal P1**

The Yugoslav vice consul in Lyon, France, was seriously wounded in an assassination attempt. Belgrade newspapers blamed a right-wing movement fighting for the secession of Croatia from Yugoslavia. The wounded diplomat is Lادن Dugovic.

\* \* \*

### **Jan. 4, 1993 Wall Street Journal A8**

\* \* \*

Kosovo is mythical to the hypernationalists directing the Serbian government and armies. Back in 1389, it was the heart of the medieval Serbian kingdom. In that year the flower of Serbian manhood fell in an epic battle with the Turks, and Serbia became part of the

Ottoman Empire. The ensuing six centuries have not erased the grudge, but have decisively changed the population of Kosovo. By now 90% of its residents are preponderantly Muslim Albanians. "Ethnic cleansing" to re-establish the ancient Serbia would involve killing or displacing of some 1.6 million people. Precisely this dream, incredible as it seems to the non-Balkan mind, weighs heavily in Serbian politics. In 1990 Serbia revoked the region's local autonomy, abolished its parliament, killed 300 protesters, closed 2,000 Albanian shops and banned the use of Albanian in schools. The seething population is close to revolt. The independent Serbian newspaper Borba predicts violence soon in Kosovo.

\* \* \*

### **Mar 4, 1992 Wall Street Journal p12 C1**

\* \* \*

Bosnia-Hercegovina, a poor, mountainous region of 4.2 million inhabitants, is a microcosm of what was formerly Yugoslavia. There is no such thing as a Bosnian-in either nationality or language. Muslim Slavs, who converted to Islam during 400 years of Ottoman rule, account for about 44% of the population. Orthodox Serbs make up 31% and Roman Catholic Croats 17% of the republic.

Long before it became part of the Yugoslav federation in 1918, the region was the center of fierce tugs of war between the competing Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman empires, and the Roman Catholic and the Byzantine churches.

\* \* \*

### **Undated 1993 Article, WSJ A1**

\* \* \*

Then Czechs eliminated Germans. Eduard Benes, the pre-Communist postwar president, decreed their expulsion in 1945. At Potsdam, the Allies approved. As Germans fled toward Bavaria, Czechs took revenge: They murdered 40,000; many died at the end of a rope.

\* \* \*

### **Dec. 31, 1992 Wall Street Journal A-1**

\* \* \*

Now Czechoslovakia, whose people seemed joyously united while toppling the Communist government three years ago, is splitting. "Europe, it is changing," shrugged Vladimir

Meciar, the Slovak leader, who won an election last June after a populist campaign espousing Slovak independence. For the past six months, these two ambitious politicians have been managing the divorce caused by their irreconcilable differences over economic reform (the poorer Slovaks, their heavy Industries battered, want to go slower than the Czechs on privatization) and over Mr. Meciar's campaign to pull the Slovaks out from under the rule of Prague, the Czech capital.

\* \* \*

### **Jan. 7, 1994 Wall Street Journal A1**

MEXICO CITY - The uprising by ethnic Indians in the southern state of Chiapas has stirred up old problems - stark poverty, vast disparities in wealth, political corruption - at a critical time.

### **Sep. 27, 1990 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

A group of armed Mohawks surrendered to the Canadian Army, ending an 11-week siege that grew out of a land dispute in a town west of Montreal. The Indians had, been holed up in an alcohol treatment center, surrounded by soldiers and police.

\* \* \*

### **Feb. 24, 1977 Wall Street Journal P20 C1**

#### **The Roots of Tolerance**

\* \* \*

Prime Minister Trudeau correctly sees that Quebec nationalism is in many ways an attack on the liberal value system that has held together diverse societies such as Canada and the United States.

\* \* \*

### **May 28, 1993 Wall Street Journal A1**

Jury deliberations began in the retrial of a Miami police officer who shot a speeding black motorcyclist, igniting a 1989 race riot. The jury in the Orlando, Fla., manslaughter retrial will decide if the officer, William Lozano, 33, was criminally negligent or acted in self defense. His original conviction was overturned in 1991.

### **Dec. 14, 1993 Wall Street Journal A1**

Racial segregation is spreading in U.S. public schools to a degree unseen since the

1960s, according to a study by the Harvard Project on School Desegregation. The study found that two of every three black children attended schools where minorities were more than half of the student population during the 1991-92 school term.

### **Sep. 17, 1993 Wall Street Journal A1**

Indians pushed their way into Brazil's Congress to protest constitutional reforms that could halt the demarcation of indigenous areas. The Indians fear that if the lands aren't marked off they will be taken over by miners, loggers and ranchers. The Yanomami tribe has alleged that miners killed over a dozen Indians in July.

### **Mar. 1, 1978 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

Nicaraguan Indians battled government troops and tanks with handguns and homemade bombs in Masaya, pledging to fight for "liberation" from the regime of President Somoza. In Managua, the rector of Ruben Dario University denounced the government for "brutal aggression" after troops stormed the campus. At least 22 persons have died in political violence in the past three days.

### **Nov. 26, 1975 Wall Street Journal P1**

Surinam became independent of the Netherlands, which got the territory on the Caribbean coast of South America from the British 300 years ago in a trade for Manhattan island. The new nation is rich in natural resources but plagued by poverty and racial conflict that has prompted 100,000 residents of East Indian ancestry to flee to Holland. Premier Hench Arron heads the government.

\* \* \*

### **Aug. 4, 1994 Los Angeles Times A5**

#### **5 French Citizens Slain in Algeria; Militants Blamed**

ALGIERS--Three French military guards and two French consular workers were shot dead here Wednesday in an attack blamed on a Muslim insurgency that is targeting foreigners.

### **April 14, 1993 Wall Street Journal A14**

#### **Angolan Endgames**

\* \* \*

Mr. Savimbi spoke the values of his American supporters, while the MPLA called itself the Leninist vanguard. For the people of Angola, though, the battle was palpably one of race, ethnicity and the perquisites of control. Angola is a vast territory, and ranks near the

bottom of the scale ethnologists use to measure ethnic homogeneity. Mr. Savimbi's followers, the Ovimbundu, inhabit the remote and forested provinces of south and central Angola. The Soviet sponsored MPLA was the party of Luanda's Portuguese- educated intellectuals. Though largely white or mestizo, they had their populist allies, the Kimbundu people, whose ethnic hinterland lies to the north and east of the capital.

\* \* \*

### **Dec 17, 1993 Wall Street Journal P1**

Dozens of decomposing bodies lined a mile-long stretch of railway outside Congo's capital, Brazzaville, according to witnesses who escaped from the fierce ethnic fighting that erupted a week ago. The official death toll was 81, but police officers said the actual count was much higher.

\* \* \*

### **Dec 17, 1993 Wall Street Journal P1**

An Islamic group claimed responsibility for slaying 12 Christian Croat and Bosnian technicians Tuesday in Algeria, saying the attack was to avenge the killing of Muslims in Bosnia and to drive foreigners from the country. In other violence, a senior judge was shot dead yesterday in Algiers.

### **Jul 31, 1993 Los Angeles Times A3**

\* \* \*

After one false start, Ronald Muwenda Mutebi II is expected to be crowned today the 36th kabaka (king) of Buganda, homeland of the Baganda people. His coronation will be a largely symbolic restoration of the dynasty that ruled Uganda's most powerful kingdom for nearly six centuries.

While other African nations are turning to democracy, Uganda is reviving its traditional monarchies in a nostalgic mood that supporters say will ease tribal and ethnic tensions. For many Bagandans, Uganda's largest ethnic group, the kabaka represents a return to civility after the brutal dictatorship of Idi Amin and former President Milton Obote.

\* \* \*

### **Feb. 15, 1994 Wall Street Journal A1**

Ethnic fighting in Ghana has grown into a virtual guerrilla war over the past two weeks that has killed hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of people and destroyed dozens of villages in the north, military officials said. The attacks have been carried out with

poisoned arrows, machetes and automatic weapons, the officials added.

### **Aug 22, 1990 Wall Street Journal A8**

\* \* \*

South Africa, we pointed out, has four major and 23 minor languages. The largest group, the Zulus, consists of about 200 tribes. There are 11 other black ethnic groups. The second largest is the Xhosa. Nelson Mandela and his wife, Winnie, come from aristocratic Xhosa families.

\* \* \*

### **Aug 23, 1990 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

The death toll rose to over 500 in 10 days of street clashes in South African black townships near Johannesburg, police said, as the violence spread to Vosloorus and Kagiso townships. The fighting pits Zulus loyal to the conservative Inkatha movement against Xhosas, most of them supporters of the African National Congress.

\* \* \*

### **April 2, 1993 Wall Street Journal A1**

Two white South Africans were set afire and killed in a black township near Cape Town and a third was in serious condition after part of his tongue was cut off, police said. The violence flared after Saturday's slaying of a black leader, Chris Hani, apparently by a white right-winger. At least one black man was killed in a clash with police.

### **May 19, 1976 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

Thousands of Ethiopian peasants recruited by the army and armed with old rifles began moving toward the northern province of Eritrea for a government showdown with the separatist guerrillas in that largely Moslem region. But the guerrillas reportedly blew up five bridges along the march route. They apparently have rejected concessions that the government offered last week in an effort to end the 14-year independence campaign.

### **Aug. 9, 1977 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

Ethiopia said the Ogaden Desert conflict has escalated into full-scale war with Somalia and vowed to punish the aggressor. A special Organization of African Unity conference on the issue again stalled as Somali delegates walked out. They claim Somali backed guerrillas hold 90% of the ethnically Somali Ethiopian region but deny their regulars are fighting.

## **March 25, 1975 Wall Street Journal P1**

Three guerrillas in Somalia who kidnapped the French ambassador Sunday night said they will release him only if France frees two of their imprisoned colleagues and provides \$100,000 and an escape plane. They want to be flown to South Yemen. The guerrillas seek independence from France for the Afars and Issas territory on the northeast African coast.

\* \* \*

## **March 7, 1974 Wall Street Journal P1**

A massacre in a Chad town 300 miles south of Ndjamena, capital of the African nation, may have left as many as 800 persons dead, diplomats said. Christian and animist adherents in Moundou reportedly killed hundreds of Moslems in a rampage touched off by rumors of an Islamic plot to seize power.

\* \* \*

## **Mar. 29, 1978 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

South-West African police turned back hundreds of Herero tribesmen seeking to avenge the murder of pro-South African Chief Clemens Kapuuo, who was a likely first president of independent Namibia. Their target was the rival Ovambo tribe, which largely supports the pro-Soviet South-West African Peoples Organization, blamed for the shooting.

## **May 21, 1994 Los Angeles Times A19**

BIRENGA, Rwanda-- It is impossible to verify who was responsible for the slaughters, but those who escaped say it was militiamen from the majority Hutu tribe who attacked with the intent of leaving no survivors. Tutsis--the minority tribe leading the rebel movement--were the main target, survivors said. But any villages resisting the militias or considered sympathetic to the rebels were hit, they said.

## **June 2, 1976 Wall Street Journal P4 C1**

### **Plight of the Witnesses**

\* \* \*

The plight of the Witnesses is closely bound up with the wider persecution and harassment of unpopular minorities in Third World nations, not just religious minorities but ethnic and racial minorities as well. Some 50,000 Asians were expelled from Uganda, 30,000 Portuguese, Pakistanis and Greeks were expelled from Zaire, another 10,000 Europeans were forced out of Ethiopia after the military junta seized their enterprises. And

Tanzania's President Nyerere frankly warned white settlers they were unwelcome in his country.

\* \* \*

### **July 12, 1976 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

LAGOS - Nigerian authorities said they have decided to curtail the freedom of residence of foreign - chiefly Western - businessmen and that only top officials of foreign companies operating in this western African nation will be allowed to reside here. A Lagos radio announcement said lower-ranking foreign employes of foreign business concerns will be granted only temporary permits to force these companies to replace them with Nigerian nationals.

### **May 8, 1979 Wall Street Journal P1 C1**

\* \* \*

It isn't an ordinary race problem. The Malays, on the one hand, have nearly half the population and most of the political power, yet they have very little of the money. The Chinese, on the other hand, are a minority and hold very little power, yet they have most of the money.

The Malays find themselves in an enviable position for economic underdogs: They can do something about it. With the government under their control, the Malays set about adjusting their anomalous situation a few years ago with an affirmative-action program so forceful it would probably astound black activists in the U.S.

### **May 30, 1978 Wall Street Journal P6 C1**

HONG KONG--Relations between Asia's two largest Communist powers, China and Vietnam, have deteriorated sharply, with the erstwhile allies against the U.S. trading charges regarding Vietnam's treatment of its ethnic Chinese minority.

China says it has had to resettle in southern China more than 90,000 Chinese "refugees" who have been "driven out" of Vietnam since early April.

\* \* \*

### **Aug 19, 1975 Wall Street Journal P1**

Moslem rebels in the Philippines who have been fighting for self- rule for three years denied that they had authorized anyone to negotiate a cease-fire. The Philippine government said last week it had reached a truce with the group.



\* \* \*

### **Dec. 27, 1976 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

The Philippine government, attempting to end a guerrilla war by Moslem secessionists in the southern islands, agreed to hold a plebiscite on forming an autonomous Moslem region within the predominantly Roman Catholic country. Moslems would be able to organize their own legislature, courts and schools. Guerrillas and the government reached a cease-fire three days ago.

### **Dec. 29, 1993 Wall Street Journal A1**

Suspected Christian militants fired grenades at two mosques, and gunmen kidnapped an American as violence again rocked the Philippine city of Davao. The mosque attacks apparently were in reprisal for a bombing that killed seven at a cathedral Sunday. A senator warned of re-ignition of Muslim-Christian clashes of the 1970s.

### **Aug 26, 1975 Wall Street Journal P1**

Refugees from Timor, a Portuguese colony in the Pacific that is embroiled in civil war, said more than 200 persons had been killed in fierce fighting that wrecked much of the capital city of Dili. A leftist independence group wanting to cut all ties with Portugal at once appeared to be in control of the city. About 1,400 persons have been evacuated by ship so far.

\* \* \*

### **Mar. 9, 1992 Wall Street Journal P1 C3**

A Muslim region in China announced a crackdown on subversive activities, according to an official news report. The leader of the western Xinjiang Autonomous Region charged that a "handful" of secessionists and outsiders are engaging in sabotage.

### **Aug. 24, 1987 Wall Street Journal 15**

\* \* \*

Moreover, population transfer has been China's preferred means for absorbing conquered territory: In Manchuria, the ratio of Chinese to Manchus is 35 to 1; in Mongolia it's five Chinese to every Mongolian. Behind the Disney World diorama of rebuilt monasteries and caretaker monks intended to offset international criticism while attracting the tourists Beijing hopes will support its growing community-Tibet, as a returned Western aid worker ruefully noted, "is finished."

If so, the final blow will come from Chinese apartheid. Rampant unemployment on top of

an annual inflation rate of 300% has rendered Tibet's annual per-capita income just \$110. Not only does this represent one of the poorest incomes on the planet, it is two-thirds less than that of a Chinese settler there. Living in antiquated houses often lacking heat, running water or electricity, tibetans have an average life span of 40 years and an infant mortality rate of one in six. Seventy percent of the adults remain illiterate; only one in five children completes primary school.

In contrast, Chinese immigrants receive guaranteed jobs and modern housing. Up to two-thirds of the limited school seats are reserved for their offspring, while sufficient diet and medical care is provided to make their average life span 25 years longer than that of Tibetans.

The Sinocization of Tibet is no more accidental than its military occupation. Given the region's chronic unrest, typified by ongoing executions of political dissidents, the internment of almost 4,000 political prisoners in the capital city of Lhasa, and the presence of one Chinese soldier for every 10 Tibetans in central Tibet alone, Sinocization is the requisite corollary to open force; a subtle but effective means to submerge the identity of Beijing's most intransigent subject race.

\* \* \*

## **July 25, 1978 Wall Street Journal P20 C4 'Hands Off - This Is Australia'**

BY BARRY NEWMAN

\* \* \*

The Northern Territory reserves its racism for the Aborigines. Down the track, toward Australia's "red heart," there has always been trouble between "black fellas" and "white fellas." With passage last year of a Land Rights Act and a push by Aborigines to win a slice of uranium revenues, things have gotten worse. A "rights for whites" group has been formed in Katherine. An Aborigine was pistol-whipped in Pine Creek.

"The whites," says a Darwin political worker, "have visions of groveling in the dust before a naked savage holding a spear." Territorians claim their trepidation about Asians tying up their boats and strolling ashore aren't racially defined, even though it's been only 13 years since the country as a whole abandoned the "White Australia Policy" that had kept Asian immigration to a minimum since 1901.

\* \* \*

---

BACK

© 1996-1998 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



## Demographics and Revolt

### Lesson Four

**Yggdrasil** says:

"The premise that many races can and should live together in harmony will be rejected in the United States within 20 years."

"While the precise shape of this rejection is unclear, the forces compelling it are clear and irreversible."

This is the fourth in a series of articles examining the issue of race in the United States

By now, you might be asking:

"Ok, Yggdrasil, many of the news clips reprinted in your lessons are 20 years old. You have known about these problems for a long time. So, why have you come to life and begun speaking to us now?"

This installment will answer that question.

In our [first lesson](#), we reviewed an article written by an Economist from Harvard University arguing that when diverse ethnic or racial groups fall under a power of a single government, they tend to use the political process as a means of extracting advantages for their own group at the expense of others.

In our [second lesson](#), we reviewed dozens of examples of racial and ethnic strife around the world, and recognized that racial hostility is a natural and expected phenomenon whenever different races are placed in the same country.

In our [third lesson](#), we examined racial preference schemes from around the world, and came to the conclusion that they are a prelude to larger conflict.

The readings for this week illuminate three trends which make deepening racial conflict in the United States inevitable.

---

## **1. The Changing Nature of the Public Sector.**

Below is an excerpt from an article entitled "Tales from the Oppressed Class" about the impact of racial preferences on European-American males. But we are not really interested in the reactions of European-American males. The impact of racial preferences on employment in the public sector is far more important.

The article notes that racial quotas are far more severe in the public sector than in the private sector. An inevitable consequence is that white males are forced to find employment almost exclusively in the private sector. Over the next 20 years, private sector business will become or remain overwhelmingly the preserve of European-American males.

There is simply no other place for them to go.

A second effect is that public sector bureaucracies will become overwhelmingly black, brown and female over the next 20 years.

Successful private sector participants can avoid contact with non-European peoples by living in exclusive suburbs. But increasingly, every contact with government will become contact with non-Europeans over the next 20 years.

Most encounters with government, including police, the judicial system, university disciplinary boards, tax authorities, licensing and registration of all kinds, are quite unpleasant. Increasingly, these encounters will take on racial overtones for middle class European-Americans.

The impersonal anger directed at government now by many European-Americans will change in character and depth over the next 20 years. It will become a major force for rebellion by middle class European-Americans against government.

### **11/11/91 Wall Street Journal (J), p A12 Tales From an Oppressed Class**

BY FREDERICK R. LYNCH

How many white men have been affected by affirmative action -- and how have they reacted? Few experts in the press or academe wanted to probe this most politically incorrect topic until Louisiana's David Duke seized the issue and became a political force.

General population polls conducted by Gordon Black Associates in 1984 and by the National Opinion Research Center in 1990 suggest that 1-in-10 white men has been injured by affirmative action. This figure alone adds up to millions. Circumstantial evidence suggests even larger numbers.

Preferential policies were instituted during an intensely competitive era when huge cohorts of baby boomers crowded job markets increasingly constrained by international competition, lean-and-mean downsizing movements, and tax revolts. Thus, affirmative action often occurred in zero-sum contexts; someone was quota-ed in at another's expense.

My research indicates that reverse discrimination's bite has varied by age, geography, occupation, and private or public sector. Most vulnerable have been public-sector white men under the age of 45 with people-oriented skills. Their phone calls flood radio talk-show programs on this topic.

Many more white men may not have been fully aware that they were being injured by behind-the-scenes tactics such as "race-norming" of employment tests by public testing agencies, and many private ones. (The EEOC only recently stopped pressuring corporations to use such procedures.) Nor have they been told of the drive to tie managers' bonuses to affirmative action hiring and promotion records.

I became curious about the impact of affirmative action while working in the increasingly quota-crazy higher education systems of California -- where policies moved far beyond the Supreme Court's 1978 Bakke dictum that race could be considered as one of several factors in selection processes.

During the 1980s, a state mandate for the community college system (AB1725) ordered a 30% minority-faculty hiring "goal" until the year 2005 -- when faculty must mirror the ethnic diversity of the entire state; the University of California began advertising "targets of diversity" faculty positions and substantially boosted minority-female representation in administrative staff positions to 72%; and the California State University system implemented set-aside faculty positions, set-aside grant and fellowship programs for graduate students -- while the politically correct faculty union lobbied (successfully) for higher pay for "underrepresented" junior faculty. And "parity goals" for the entire state work force were monitored in annual reports by the State Personnel Board.

As my quiet interest in affirmative action leaked out -- a professionally dangerous development -- students, colleagues, friends and relative strangers began to report encounters with reverse discrimination. In 1984-85, two graduate assistants and I supplemented this rising tide of informal data -- and scattered press reports -- with 32 in-depth interviews with California-based, mostly middle-class white men who reported that preferential policies prevented them from obtaining jobs or disrupted or ended extant careers.

Some findings:

-- A community college instructor repeatedly lost tenure-track appointments to less qualified minorities after he moved to California from Michigan. "At first, you think it's you," he said. "You blame yourself." (He finally obtained an appointment at another college.)

-- A mid-management bank administrator -- and an ardent liberal -- began to have second thoughts as he watched women he'd hired the year before move by him on the affirmative-action fast-track. (Rapid increases in female mid-management employees in his bank and at others lent credence to his account.)

-- Public-sector workers reported that affirmative action barriers eventually became obvious and quietly acknowledged by most employees. After 13 years of being bypassed by minorities or women, one upper-middle-management California state official reported being offered a promotion -- with some public fanfare -- only to have the appointment rescinded because, as an agency head told him, "Let's face it, you're not the right color."

Most of these men avoided open complaints or protests out of fear they wouldn't be believed or would be labeled racist. (No one said he feared being thought sexist.)

Six resigned from the organizations that discriminated against them. Three circumvented reverse discrimination problems through various organizational means. Three filed suits, none of which was successful. No government agency offered redress. (EEOC guidelines effectively insulate employers from reverse discrimination complaints if the employer has taken "reasonable" voluntary affirmative action to remedy "deficiencies" in minority representation.)

The majority of our subjects simply acquiesced in their treatment with varying degrees of bewilderment, resignation or anger. Most subjects voiced temporary, if not long-term, frustration and cynicism about social institutions. "A lot of us were sold a bill of goods," complained a California state middle-management worker. "We were told if you went to college you could write your own ticket. But . . . affirmative action has lowered standards to the point where education counts against you."

No subject expressed hostility toward minorities per se, but many felt alienated from a society that refused to acknowledge whites' victimization. A teacher, transferred to a distant school in a racial balancing plan, commented: "My friends couldn't handle this. They experienced cognitive dissonance. They didn't want to be seen as racists." Another teacher noted: "I found out what it was like to be a victim. Nobody likes a victim."

Research sponsored and then suppressed by the Democratic Party in 1985 and 1987 suggests a possible class split in white reactions to affirmative action. Political analyst Stanley Greenberg's "Report on Democratic Defections" by blue-collar white "Reagan Democrats" in Michigan found fury over quotas for blacks and immigrants. (This anger, Mr. Greenberg concluded, undercut Democratic campaign themes of "fairness" and "justice.") These data, in combination with the record of lawsuits filed by blue-collar groups (overtly or covertly aided by unions), indicate a more militant, angry working-class response. This is perhaps because of more intense zero-sum problems wrought by a shrinking blue-collar jobs market.

Until Pete Wilson, Jesse Helms and David Duke began to attack quotas in statewide election campaigns last year, a curious bipartisan paralysis thwarted any open political response to rank-and-file whites.

Radicals and liberals have neutralized whites' complaints with swift, categorical denials, such as "white males can't be victims." Indeed, much liberal and multicultural theory today embodies a colorized version of Marx's class struggle. White men (regardless of individual backgrounds) are regarded as a privileged modern-day "bourgeoisie," while women and people of color (again, regardless of individual or subgroup circumstances) are the oppressed "proletariat." Any mention of a white working class -- once prominently represented in labor histories -- is simply met with more rationalizations or with awkward silence.

\* \* \*

The stereotype of "racist" working-class white men has made most journalists, academics and politicians fearful of acquiring a "racist" label themselves if they even raise the white-male problem. Thus, most of the recent debate over affirmative action has focused on the safer topics of costs to employers and the stigmatization of officially favored groups.

Unwanted, inadvertent findings about whites and affirmative action have been buried. Just as the Greenberg studies were suppressed in the mid-1980s, a 1990 study by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, designed to provide impetus for the 1991 civil rights bill, was bottled up. News leaks indicated the study uncovered substantial white anger toward affirmative action preferences.

\* \* \*

Mr. Lynch is visiting associate professor of government at Claremont McKenna College in California, and author of "Invisible Victims: White Males and the Crisis of Affirmative Action" (Praeger Paperbacks, 1991).

---

## **2. Repudiation of the intergenerational compact.**

A vast, stabilizing influence in United States politics is the disproportionate voting of retirees. In most states, approximately 30% of all votes cast are by those above the age of 60, even though they comprise a much smaller percentage of the total population.

The American Association of Retired Persons ("AARP") lobbies this group to write their Congressmen in favor of free immigration on the theory that new immigrants will pay Social Security taxes needed to fund Social Security payments to retirees in our "pay-as-you-go" unfunded Social Security System.

An unspoken premise of free immigration is that the new arrivals will be willing to pay this tax.

Current retirees deeply believe in the idea (myth, if you prefer) of racial integration and harmony - the "melting pot". In opinion surveys, it is difficult to detect any



understanding of the impact of racial preferences or of high employment taxes on younger European-Americans. Without the votes of European- American retirees, working age European-Americans cannot protect themselves through the political process. The numbers simply do not work!

This dynamic of American Electoral politics will change dramatically.

Twenty years from now 60 million post-WW II "baby-boomers" now in the work force will begin retiring and drawing Social Security benefits. Employment taxes amount to 15% of payroll now, including both employer and employee pieces. In twenty years, these taxes must rise to 25% to fund the retiring baby boomers.

Over 70% of these "baby-boom" retirees will be European- Americans. But in 20 years, 55% of the people entering the workforce between the ages of 20 and 30 will be people of color.

It is inconceivable that members of this group, accustomed as they are to racial preference and to block racial voting, will sit by and watch 25% of their earnings go to fund retirement benefits for European-Americans. It won't happen!

Because "minority" racial interests will be at stake, Social Security benefits will be cut for all except the indigent, among whom such "minorities" will be over-represented.

This trend has already begun, with the taxation of benefits for those with annual incomes above \$30,000.

The difference between the current retirees and the "baby boom" generation is that the baby boom has been subjected to racial quotas. Once the social compact to care for the aged becomes threatened by the same racial lobbies that created employment preferences, many of these baby boom retirees will lose faith in the multi-racial empire and begin voting their racial interests in the same way as African Americans do now.

American politics will never be the same.

---

### **3. Emergence of a new class of European-American.**

It was the appearance of the following article in the Wall Street Journal on October 29, 1993 which aroused YGGDRASIL from a long period of stillness.

As outlined in the two preceding sections of this lesson, all of the ingredients for radicalizing European-Americans in the private sector and European-American retirees will be in place in 20 years.

But in 20 years a very large group of young whites will emerge for whom the ballot box

may not be a speedy enough. This group will have little to lose by resorting to violence.

As you will see from the following article, there is nothing we can do to stop the emergence of this group. Its members are now being born to young, unwed teenage girls.

In 1980, 9% of all births to European-Americans were illegitimate. By 1991, that figure has increased to 22%.

This group will have no middle class aspirations and no loyalty whatever to middle class values. In all probability, it will inhabit neighborhoods that bring it into direct and violent competition with people of color.

This group will be so large that the middle class will be forced to abandon the manners and social restraints that make life in a multi-racial empire such as ours possible.

We cannot look to the past to predict the consequence of the emergence of this class. It has never before existed, not even in regimes such as the Third Reich.

However, forceful political action will be necessary to transmit the values of western civilization to this new class of European- American and to channel its energies into positive political change.

The assault on traditional religions and upon middle class values by the liberal multiculturalists has finally had its effect. The full consequences will be felt in 20 years.

## **10/29/93 Wall Street Journal(J) The Coming White Underclass**

BY CHARLES MURRAY

Every once in a while the sky really is falling, and this seems to be the case with the latest national figures on illegitimacy. The unadorned statistic is that, in 1991, 1.2 million children were born to unmarried mothers, within a hair of 30% of all live births. How high is 30%? About four percentage points higher than the black illegitimacy rate in the early 1960s that motivated Daniel Patrick Moynihan to write his famous memorandum on the breakdown of the black family.

The 1991 story for blacks is that illegitimacy has now reached 68% of births to black women. In inner cities, the figure is typically in excess of 80%. Many of us have heard these numbers so often that we are inured. It is time to think about them as if we were back in the mid-1960s with the young Moynihan and asked to predict what would happen if the black illegitimacy rate were 68%.

Impossible, we would have said. But if the proportion of fatherless boys in a given community were to reach such levels, surely the culture must be "Lord of the Flies" writ

large, the values of unsocialized male adolescents made norms -- physical violence, immediate gratification and predatory sex. That is the culture now taking over the black inner city.

But the black story, however dismaying, is old news. The new trend that threatens the U.S. is white illegitimacy. Matters have not yet quite gotten out of hand, but they are on the brink. If we want to act, now is the time.

In 1991, 707,502 babies were born to single white women, representing 22% of white births. The elite wisdom holds that this phenomenon cuts across social classes, as if the increase in Murphy Browns were pushing the trendline. Thus, a few months ago, a Census Bureau study of fertility among all American women got headlines for a few days because it showed that births to single women with college degrees doubled in the last decade to 6% from 3%. This is an interesting trend, but of minor social importance. The real news of that study is that the proportion of single mothers with less than a high school education jumped to 48% from 35% in a single decade.

These numbers are dominated by whites. Breaking down the numbers by race (using data not available in the published version), women with college degrees contribute only 4% of white illegitimate babies, while women with a high school education or less contribute 82%. Women with family incomes of \$75,000 or more contribute 1% of white illegitimate babies, while women with family incomes under \$20,000 contribute 69%.

The National Longitudinal Study of Youth, a Labor Department study that has tracked more than 10,000 youths since 1979, shows an even more dramatic picture. For white women below the poverty line in the year prior to giving birth, 44% of births have been illegitimate, compared with only 6% for women above the poverty line. White illegitimacy is overwhelmingly a lower-class phenomenon.

This brings us to the emergence of a white underclass. In raw numbers, European-American whites are the ethnic group with the most people in poverty, most illegitimate children, most women on welfare, most unemployed men, and most arrests for serious crimes.

And yet whites have not had an "underclass" as such, because the whites who might qualify have been scattered among the working class. Instead, whites have had "white trash" concentrated in a few streets on the outskirts of town, sometimes a Skid Row of unattached white men in the large cities. But these scatterings have seldom been large enough to make up a neighborhood. An underclass needs a critical mass, and white America has not had one.

But now the overall white illegitimacy rate is 22%. The figure in low-income, working-class communities may be twice that. How much illegitimacy can a community tolerate? Nobody knows, but the historical fact is that the trendlines on black crime, dropout from the labor force, and illegitimacy all shifted sharply upward as the overall black illegitimacy rate passed 25%.

The causal connection is murky -- I blame the revolution in social policy during that period, while others blame the sexual revolution, broad shifts in cultural norms, or structural changes in the economy. But the white illegitimacy rate is approaching that same problematic 25% region at a time when social policy is more comprehensively wrongheaded than it was in the mid-1960s, and the cultural and sexual norms are still more degraded.

The white underclass will begin to show its face in isolated ways. Look for certain schools in white neighborhoods to get a reputation as being unteachable, with large numbers of disruptive students and indifferent parents. Talk to the police; listen for stories about white neighborhoods where the incidence of domestic disputes and casual violence has been shooting up. Look for white neighborhoods with high concentrations of drug activity and large numbers of men who have dropped out of the labor force. Some readers will recall reading the occasional news story about such places already.

As the spatial concentration of illegitimacy reaches critical mass, we should expect the deterioration to be as fast among low-income whites in the 1990s as it was among low-income blacks in the 1960s. My proposition is that illegitimacy is the single most important social problem of our time -- more important than crime, drugs, poverty, illiteracy, welfare or homelessness because it drives everything else. Doing something about it is not just one more item on the American policy agenda, but should be at the top.

Here is what to do:

\* \* \*

[policy prescriptions for restoring family life to people below the poverty line omitted]

\* \* \*

Three decades after that consensus disappeared, we face an emerging crisis. The long, steep climb in black illegitimacy has been calamitous for black communities and painful for the nation. The reforms I have described will work for blacks as for whites, and have been needed for years. But the brutal truth is that American society as a whole could survive when illegitimacy became epidemic within a comparatively small ethnic minority. It cannot survive the same epidemic among whites.

Mr. Murray, a fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, is the author of "Losing Ground" (Basic, 1984).

---

**BACK**

© 1996-1998 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



## Myth and Reality

### Lesson Five

**Yggdrasil** says:

"The United States is built on one central moral ideal or paradigm - that many different racial groups can and should live in harmony in a single country.

"The time has come for us to ask whether this central ideal of American political life describes reality. Does it work? Should it be abandoned?"

For purposes of this lesson, we will call this moral ideal or paradigm "integrationism".

To be valid, a secular ideal or theory must have predictive value. In other words, the theory must accurately predict the future consequence of an action such as, in our case, gathering several races within a single country.

Even if a theory lacks predictive value it will be believed (for a time) if it has descriptive value - if the theory or generalization at least describes the current trend.

Does the integrationist moral paradigm accurately describe what is happening now, if temporarily?

This lesson reprints excerpts from four articles from the pages of the Wall Street Journal. The first excerpt is about the demographics of white flight from high immigration states, and the consequent trend toward regional segregation and balkanization. The second is an excerpt about the emerging importance of "global tribes" based on ethnicity. The third is a survey on the job hunting practices and results for "minorities" in the class of '94, and the final excerpt documents the migration of the black middle class to a few cities.

Upon reviewing those articles, one may wish to consider the following questions:

1. Does the integrationist moral paradigm describe reality in multi-racial countries or empires around the world?
2. If the paradigm fails everywhere else in the world, (see [Yggdrasil's Lesson #2](#)) isn't its failure probable here in the U.S as well?

3. Is the integrationist paradigm really moral?
4. How does one determine the morality of this paradigm? Does integrationism reduce conflict? Does it reduce human suffering? Does it increase human happiness?
5. Is it possible that the integrationist paradigm is a product of self interest, motivated by reducing labor costs, expanding markets, and dividing populations so as to facilitate political control, and has nothing to do with minimizing human misery?

The integrationist paradigm did not exist until the industrial revolution. It seems that the paradigm is not believed anywhere in the world but in Western Europe, the U.S., Canada and Australia. The rest of the world is bristling with self-determination, secession, and ethnic cleansing.

6. Is it possible that the integrationist paradigm is a "host specific" ideology applied only to middle class Europeans capable of generating an economic surplus (much like the lamprey eel attaches to a bass)?
7. Have you joined a "global tribe" yet?

**Yggdrasil** recommends that you read the following:

---

### **Jan 18, 1994 Wall Street Journal p B1 Migration Trends Hint At 'Balkanizing' Pattern**

MIGRATION patterns grow ever more complex-and potentially troublesome.

University of Michigan demographer William H. Frey analyzed 1990 census data to see how immigration and migration flows within the U.S. affected states and regions between 1985 and 1990.

Dr. Frey found that Hispanic, Asian and black immigrants from abroad predictably clustered in the half-dozen easily accessible states with large minority populations: California, New York, Texas, New Jersey, Illinois and Massachusetts. At the same time, however, residents of these states were leaving in droves. And all but California lost substantially more people to other states than they gained from them. Even California, long a mecca for residents from other states, had an unusually small increase of population gain from internal migration.

Those leaving the six states included strikingly large numbers of less-skilled, lower-income whites. Some had lost their jobs, often to immigrants, but Dr. Frey believes many

were seeking to distance themselves from the newcomers, often moving only to neighboring states.

At the other end of the scale were states, largely in the Southeast and the West, where people coming in from other states far outnumbered those leaving. Biggest gainers were Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Virginia, Washington and Arizona. Strong economies and/or good climate were the main attractions. Except for Florida, most had comparatively low immigration from abroad- even in Florida, the net gain from internal migration was almost three times that from abroad.

And the economically depressed states in the upper Midwest and oil patch saw minimal immigration from abroad and other states but had large outflows of residents. Michigan, Ohio, Iowa, Oklahoma and Louisiana were among these states. The exodus included substantial numbers of better-educated men and women heading for greener pastures in the Southeast and Pacific coast.

Dr. Frey worries about a "Balkanizing" pattern emerging from these trends. He warns that "the continuation of these processes - a minority-dominated immigration coupled with an internal migration 'white flight' - could lead to sharply divergent race and sociodemographic structures across broad regions and states."

\* \* \*

---

## **Turning Point**

### **Even U.S. Politics Are Being Reshaped By a Global Economy American Optimism Is Tested By Growing Competition That Fosters Divisions Politicos as Museum Guards?**

BY DENNIS FARNEY

Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal

\* \* \*

...Those divisions are deepened by what the political process has become. Ideally a force for community, national politics now is a force of fragmentation. Washington is gridlocked. What is less evident, however, is the potential of the global economy to intensify the forces of national fragmentation.

The reason, argues Harvard's Mr. Reich in an interview, is that the global economy disproportionately benefits a minority of American workers - about one in five, he thinks - while the remaining 80% benefit only modestly or even fall behind. American cities, he says, are starting to divide between "the people in glass towers"-and everybody else.



The glass-tower people are highly skilled knowledge workers in sleek office buildings. They are worldly in the literal sense of the word, part of a global communications web. Cosmopolitan, they may have more in common with their counterparts in Germany and Japan than with their fellow Americans who work the assembly line across town. The glass-tower people are upward bound; the people outside may not be.

### **'Global Tribes'**

Everywhere the global market is undermining the nation-state as a socially integrating force, argues author Joel Kotkin, a senior fellow for Denver's Center for the New West. In America, Mr. Kotkin continues, "the global economy is dragging different parts of the country in different directions. Los Angeles has stronger ties to Taipei than to Kansas City. The Puget Sound region, with its ties to Asia, doesn't relate to Japan-bashing in the District of Columbia."

The future Mr. Kotkin foresees in a forthcoming book, "Tribes," is one of "cosmopolitan global tribes" - sophisticated global subcultures based on ethnic identity--jetting and faxing and doing business across ever-less-important national borders. Inside America, he says, the loose 18th century Articles of Confederation may eventually become a more appropriate organizing principle than the Constitution that replaced them. And the Democratic and Republican parties? They may go the way of the guaranteed annual raise.

"Ethnicity and regional ties are a lot more important than political parties," he says. "Parties are anachronisms. Anachronisms disappear."

Politicians, suggests GOP consultant Todd Domke, are becoming "custodial" figures, rather like museum guards, and less and less a part of creating anything. "Voters see creation in the private sector and their private lives," he says. "In politics, to paraphrase Camus, they hear the same words telling them the same lies."

---

### **Sept. 7, 1994 Wall Street Journal p B1 Minority Hires Mapped Their Own Paths to Jobs**

\* \* \*

THE TOP NEW hires of color began their career searches before their successful white classmates and conducted their searches by different rules, according to a study of the class of '94.

Nearly 25% of the minority hires began looking into potential employers before their junior year of college, compared with 6% of whites, according to the study by Hanigan Consulting Group, New York. Three of four non-white graduates participated in corporate

internship or co-op programs, compared with two of three whites. All the minority hires said they were planning to go to graduate school, compared with 82% of whites.

"The minority students who make it are determined not to lose the credential game," says Maury Hanigan, president. In focus groups, black, Hispanic and Asian students said their estimation of a firm's racial environment far outweighed its name or industry position. To gather and share information about potential employers, they develop extensive grapevines among their ethnic group with internship or employment experiences.

"All companies make claims of having diversity as a priority, and the students know it's not equally true in all places," Ms. Hanigan says, "so they discount what the companies say and turn to each other for credible information." Thus, one bad minority internship experience can damage a firm's reputation among many desirable nonwhite candidates, she notes.

These strategies may be paying off, the study suggests. Nonwhite hires received an average three job offers, compared with two for whites, and reported slightly higher average starting salaries.

---

## **May 22, 1990 Wall Street Journal P1 C1 Reverse Exodus**

### **Middle-Class Blacks Quit Northern Cities And Settle in the South Many Cite Isolation, Racism As Reasons for Moving To Places Like Atlanta A 3-Year-Old's Self-Esteem**

BY JAMES S. HIRSCH and SUZANNE ALEXANDER

Staff Reporters of The Wall Street Journal

PITTSBURGH--Justin L. Johnson had the name, the credentials and the talent to write his own ticket in Pittsburgh. The problem was that his hometown never felt like home.

He attended an elite local prep school and the University of Chicago. After he graduated from Harvard Law School, he returned to Pittsburgh, where both his father and uncle are judges. The mayor appointed him to the civil service commission. A local newspaper named him "one of 20 people to watch" in 1988.

But Mr. Johnson wasn't happy here. As a successful young black with a privileged background, he saw himself caught between two worlds: a white corporate establishment and a struggling black working class. He felt isolated as the only black lawyer at his firm. He felt guilty and frustrated when he drove through poor black neighborhoods, and he believed that residents there resented his champagne-colored Nissan Maxima, his Brooks

Brothers suits and silk ties. He had few peers.

### **Sense of Well-Being**

So the 27-year-old Mr. Johnson moved to Atlanta, a city with a thriving, self-assured black professional class. "I had every advantage in Pittsburgh but I really feel much more comfortable here," he says over a steak dinner at a downtown club, above the cooing of a jazz singer on stage. "In Pittsburgh I was always in a white environment, and I had the feeling of isolation. Down here, you see successful blacks, and you feel a sense of well-being and pride."

Mr. Johnson's move is part of a historical reversal: Northern blacks are continuing to return to the South that their parents or grandparents had fled in an exodus from oppression and economic hardship.

Since 1970, Atlanta, with its strong black political leadership and high-profile black colleges, has become a magnet for professional blacks in the North. Other Southern cities, among them Birmingham Ala., Little Rock, Ark., and Raleigh, N.C. and even parts of the rural South, are also attracting Northern blacks. For the first time in more than a century, according to the Census Bureau, the proportion of black Americans living in the South has risen; 56% of them lived in the region in 1988, up from 52% in 1980.

Northern cities with large populations of middle-class black people, such as New York and Chicago, have experienced no huge exodus. But census figures tell a different story in other cities-Milwaukee, Detroit, St. Louis, Buffalo, Pittsburgh and San Francisco. The data show that more black residents moved away than moved in during the 1980s, says James Johnson, a geography professor at the University of California at Los Angeles.

### **A Larger Community**

For years, black residents of Northern cities have been moving to the suburbs for better housing and to escape inner-city crime and deprivation. Others have joined the white migration to the Sun Belt for largely economic reasons. But among black professionals already established in their careers-lawyers, executives, accountants, bankers and others-moving South seems often motivated by a desire to become part of a larger community of successful black residents with a richer cultural and social life than they had experienced in the North.

\* \* \*

Edward Barnette, also from the Boston area, is in the process of transferring to Atlanta for the sake of his daughter. While in the Boston area, Mr. Barnette lived in a spacious house on a six-acre lot in suburban Boston, earned a six-figure salary for a large corporation, employed a nanny for his three-year-old daughter, Camille. She has attended a private suburban preschool, where she has been one of only a handful of black children.

'I'm Not Smart' When Mr. Barnette recently complimented Camille for an accomplishment, she replied, "I'm not smart, Daddy. Don't say I am." Mr. Barnette was stunned. He believes she had picked up signals that She wasn't as intelligent as her white class mates. "If all the people she comes in contact with are white, she won't have an appreciation for her own people," he says. "Camille is somewhat standoffish when she's around black people. It absolutely crushes me."

Eric Thompson quit his job last year at a Mellon Bank office in Pittsburgh, where he says, he was the only black in a 60-employee division, and he took a job in Atlanta. The 29-year-old accountant previously had worked at Price Waterhouse in Pittsburgh, where he was the only black among 300 employees, he says. (Price Waterhouse says there were actually five blacks among 275 employees when Mr. Thompson left in 1986.) Mr. Thompson says he visited many companies in the area when he worked for Price Waterhouse, "and I never saw any blacks. I saw one in Dayton, Ohio, and she was a secretary."

At Mellon, Mr. Thompson rarely joined his colleagues for happy hours. For one thing, he doesn't drink. But he also felt awkward as the only black customer in bars that played country and Western or rock music. He prefers jazz.

His evenings and weekends weren't much better. There isn't much nightlife that appeals to black professionals in Pittsburgh. One of the few nightclubs catering to them is 15 miles outside the city. Singles often have a hard time finding one another. The soft-spoken Mr. Thompson would roam shopping malls by himself to kill time. Or he would go to movies. "That was prime time on my calendar," he says. Then there was midnight bowling with a friend or two. But since he moved to Atlanta last year, he has been so busy with jazz concerts, church events and other activities that he hasn't been to the lanes.

\* \* \*

Mr. Thompson found a very different South when he walked into the Coca-Cola Co. headquarters last year for a job interview. His first impression: the throng of black professionals in the building. During the interview, he asked what positions high-ranking blacks filled. Back at Mellon, he says, he was dismayed that blacks didn't work in revenue-generating Jobs. While Mellon can't provide numbers, the bank says the notion that no blacks work in revenue-producing jobs is absurd.

In any case, Mr. Thompson says that at Coke "you see blacks in positions where they have an effect on the bottom line." And in Atlanta, there is comfort in numbers. The city's black population has increased by 24%, to 605,000, since 1980.

At Coke, Mr. Thompson is one of six blacks in a 30-member department, which also includes Hispanics and other minorities. The corporate culture gets high marks all around; the cafeteria, Mr. Thompson says, serves Southern food-fried chicken and greens.

Mr. Thompson met his girlfriend in the company's legal department. He lives in a luxury

apartment with a swimming pool and tennis courts. Dressed in a dark suit, he sips cranberry juice in Mr. V's, an elegant and very crowded nightclub that attracts mostly black patrons. "I would have had to be a pioneer in Pittsburgh to make a mark," he says above the din of rhythm and blues music. "but in Atlanta, there were some doors that were already wide open."

Says Willie Thornton, an assistant professor at Emory University, who recently moved to Atlanta after receiving a Ph.D in finance at Harvard University: "In Atlanta there is a very visible black middle class. When someone sees you on the street, you could be a city councilman just as easily as a mugger. In Boston, people are less quick to think of you as a professional."

Some see a danger in the migration of black professionals from Northern cities. "My greatest despair is to see those who see racism and flee," says Harry Johnson, manager of corporate communications at Polaroid Corp. in Cambridge, Mass. "If Boston is as impoverished of black professionals as they say, then we need them . . . to bring new ideas, new commitment and passion." Lawyer Justin Johnson's decision to leave Pittsburgh bewildered his father, state Judge Justin M. Johnson, who felt the Johnson name would have opened many doors in Pittsburgh- A lifelong Pittsburgh resident, Mr. Johnson never felt he had to leave the city for a better life, and he doesn't understand his son's captivation with Atlanta's social scene. "I was brought up to understand that the greatest value was in doing hard work and doing a good job, and if you got pleasure, that was incidental," he says from his office, the walls lined with family photos. "I can't imagine moving from one community to the next because there's not a lot of people from a particular group to have quality relaxation time." Nonetheless, he knows that times have changed. He has seen pictures of his son laughing with friends on a boat in a lake. Those experiences are important, he says, "but I never had that."

For his part, the younger Mr. Johnson, who works for Alston & Bird, one of Atlanta's largest law firms, knows he is taking a professional risk. "When I came back to Pittsburgh (from law school), there was all this good will I could draw on," he says, "but the city still couldn't make me happy."

[Each of the above sets of excerpts are from longer articles that may be obtained in full from [Dow Jones News Retrieval](#).]

---

BACK



## What is a Race?

### Lesson Six

This is the sixth a series of articles examining the issue of race in the United States.

By now, you might be saying:

"Ok, Yggdrasil, you talk about race and you talk about secession. These are scary topics. Stop being coy! What exactly are you going to do to 'rationalize borders'? Is it ethnic cleansing? Race violence? Who stays and who goes?"

Fair questions! This installment will answer them.

**Yggdrasil** says:

"There are two concepts of race: a descriptive concept based on physical characteristics and genetic inheritance, and a functional concept based on the tendency of groups sharing physical or cultural affinities to fight or use the political process for shifting resources in their favor.

"For the purpose of drawing rational borders around competing groups to minimize conflict, the functional definition is useful. The descriptive definition is not."

If our reason for defining "race" is to reduce conflict, then that purpose suggests a functional definition: - Races are groups that tend to band together based on common physical or cultural characteristics and fight or compete with groups having different physical or cultural characteristics.

Thus, functionally, races tend to be voluntary associations. The combatants know perfectly well which side they are on. There is no need for genetic testing, family trees, or hair and eye color tests.

Examples of racial strife from around the world demonstrate that the characteristics that separate races or ethnic groups vary widely (See [Yggdrasil's Lesson #2](#)). In some instances, such as in Northern Ireland or Bosnia, it would be impossible for outsiders to tell which was which, based on a visual inspection.

The point is a simple one. The combatants define their "race" based on whatever characteristics they choose. Invariably, they have no trouble recognizing each other. Whether those characteristics correspond with any scientific or genetic definition of a "race" is irrelevant.

In the United States, the "European-Americans" eligible for citizenship in any breakaway nation would closely correspond to the category of "other" on the racial identity portion of the typical college admissions or public employment application. It would be a nation for losers in the contest for governmental preference.

The information age has given us the technological means of rationalizing borders with very little movement of people.

The same computer programs that create racially concentrated gerrymanders under the Voting Rights Act can be used to draw new national boundaries. There would be no need to guard such irregular borders. Taxation, voting rights and access to the social safety net of the breakaway state would be enforced with a national ID card. Once the political system, identity card and tax mechanisms are in place, there would be no reason to force people to move against their will based on skin color.

The question of who stays and who goes in a secession, or rationalizing of borders, is largely voluntary. The borders are redrawn with an idea of isolating the greatest number of potential combatants or competitors in each resulting country. Individuals who get "caught" on the wrong side of the border should be free to choose whether to stay or move.

People can make choices. There is no need beat up on anyone or kill people to accomplish the objective.

Remember, Yggdrasil is the tree of life, not death!

It is imperative that European-Americans fashion a secession strategy that protects them from racial exploitation, while respecting and preserving their heritage of individual liberty and respect for life.

While the objective can be accomplished peacefully, as it has been in Czechoslovakia, the principle of self-determination cannot be compromised. It is a moral imperative. It is worth fighting for.

No people anywhere on earth should be compelled to submit to public policy formed by races that hate them. In this respect, it makes no difference whether the policy is imposed by a majority upon a minority, or by an organized minority upon a majority, through racially motivated block voting.

European-Americans have an absolute natural right to live in a nation in which government can function and make decisions on the merits of policy, without having policy distorted by hidden agendas concerning the relative benefits of that policy to

competing races.

Those who hate European-Americans, or feel uncomfortable around them, will tend to leave of their own accord, much as they are doing now in the United States on a regional and voluntary basis. (See [Yggdrasil's Lesson #5](#)). Secession would merely complement the existing demographic trends.

Inevitably, a few individuals would have to be expelled from the breakaway state. Any European-American who might elect to remain in the breakaway state because of its practical advantages, such as its low taxes, low crime rates and favorable work ethic, but who has publicly looked down on his own kind, felt he is above race, attacked traditional religions, encouraged immigration of potentially hostile races for personal gain, advocated taxing fellow European-Americans to pay tribute to other races in exchange for votes, or advocated adopting racial quotas will be expelled based on his actions, and not the color of his skin.

Secession will make honest men and women of those who, irrespective of skin color, hate or look down upon European-Americans. They are going to have to live in the company of those with whom they have more in common. Surely, they will be happier there.

However, it is not the purpose of this lesson to set forth detailed secession plans. Rather, this lesson reprints an excerpt from the pages of Newsweek and another from the San Fernando Daily News that illustrate this functional concept of race in rather unexpected ways.

In the Newsweek excerpt, "two historians from the University of Alabama have elaborated the controversial notion that the Civil War was a continuation, on new turf, of the ancient struggle by the Anglo-Saxons to subdue the wild Celtic tribes of Scotland, Ireland and Wales."

As you read this article, you should consider a number of questions.

1. Is it possible that the ethnic differences between Northern and Southern whites motivated the average white to fight in the Civil War?

Remember that despite immigration, 70% of the people in 1860 never traveled more than 50 miles from their place of birth. Remember also that there was no television, that photography had just been invented, but there were no pictures in newspapers. In addition to different types of Englishmen, there were pockets of European Americans in 1860 who still spoke German and French. However, one searches in vain for any references to conflict or competition between these groups based on national origin in the popular press of the time, or even in the private correspondence of Civil War veterans. Railroads were just beginning to increase mobility.

2. How would the average White farmer in the North be aware of the ethnic differences between himself and Whites in the South if he had never seen them, or even pictures of them?



3. In an economy where 80% of the population lived on farms, how could there have been enough contact between groups for the awareness of difference to ripen into hatred sufficient to motivate starting a war?
4. Suppose that there had been national television in 1860. Would the ethnic differences between Northerners and Southerners likely have been a major factor in motivating soldiers to enlist and fight?
5. Is it possible that the ethnic differences between Northerners and Southerners provoked the war making urge in the white elites who did travel and certainly were aware of the differences?
6. Do the problems associated with the thesis of this article suggest that popular or mass racial conflicts in multi-racial empires are strictly modern phenomenon, caused by the contact and awareness of racial difference created by trains, planes, automobiles, magazines and television? Many Americans believe that "prejudice" or "bigotry" arise from lack of contact with members of other races.
7. Do the problems associated with the thesis of this article suggest that racial conflict results from too much contact, and not too little?
8. Could the rapid advance of television and transportation explain the accelerating worldwide trend of racial and ethnic conflict in the final quarter of the 20th century? (See Yggdrasil lesson #2).
9. Does the modernity of racial strife suggest that the integrationist paradigm cannot survive in the U.S. without segregated middle class suburbs?
10. Is it possible that belief in "integrationism" is the result of ignorance that flows from the carefully controlled contact with other races afforded by suburban life?
11. Under a descriptive definition of race, the Yankee and Rebel "WASPs" can be claimed to constitute different ethnicities. However, if they themselves made nothing of that difference are they separate races or ethnic groups in any sort of functional sense? The second article is a column by Robert Sowell, arguing that conservative students (primarily European-Americans) should not sacrifice their academic and professional careers by protesting campus propagandists.

If you were to look at Thomas Sowell's picture, you will conclude that he is an African-American. He cares passionately about the welfare of his fellow African-Americans, and argues that socialist rhetoric is a thinly veiled guise for policies of racial repression.

After reading the article below, you will notice that he also has a passionate commitment to the survival of Western Civilization, a commitment that runs far deeper than that of the average European-American business executive. He is genuinely concerned about the well-being of conservative European-American males.

12. Would there be any objective reason for excluding Thomas Sowell from a breakaway European-American nation?

13. If he happened to live within the boundaries of a new breakaway European-American nation, why should he not be free to remain and claim full citizenship?

14. If he lived outside the boundaries of a new breakaway nation, and wished to emigrate, claiming that he was a European-American, what functional grounds would anyone have for disputing his claim?

**Yggdrasil** recommends that you read the following:

---

## **Newsweek/August 10, 1981 P70**

\* \* \*

In explaining the American Civil War, historians have explored every imaginable political, economic and cultural conflict between North and South, invoked high abolitionist ideals and cited the noble tug of regional loyalty. They have all but ignored the possibility of an ethnic explanation, largely because it appeared so plain that the antagonists were the common descendants of British settlers--a thoroughly homogeneous lot compared to the immigrants who followed them to American shores.

But in a series of papers and articles, two historians from the University of Alabama have elaborated the controversial notion that the Civil War was a continuation, on new turf, of the ancient struggle by the Anglo-Saxons to subdue the wild Celtic tribes of Scotland, Ireland and Wales. Southerners, say Forrest McDonald and Grady McWhiney, are nothing but transplanted Highlanders who have traded their bagpipes for country fiddles, while keeping alive the contradictory mix of qualities-- easygoing yet proud, clannish but elaborately polite and hospitable--that have made them so creative and intractable.

Industry: The two researchers maintain that eighteenth-century British immigrants were anything but homogeneous. While Englishmen typically landed in Massachusetts Bay and colonized the nearby areas, Irish, Welsh and Scottish settlers more frequently arrived in Philadelphia, then spread south and west along the valleys and spilled over onto the Carolina piedmont.

The two groups took with them old-world characteristics: the Englishman's industry and thrift and the Celtic disdain for tilling the soil-- and for other strenuous occupations. The Celts and their descendants "thought people were crazy to work if they didn't have to," says McDonald. "If one could get a cow or a hog to earn a living for him, why grow plants?" McWhiney believes that big plantations worked by slaves were less important to the Southern economy than is commonly thought. The value of Southern livestock in 1860 was more than twice as great as that of the cotton crop. Most Southerners

depended, like their ancestors, on their herds of cattle and swine, which roamed freely and grew fat off the land.

It is a view that has the potential to redden quite a few necks: in effect, Jeeter Lester's Tobacco Road is a far more valid symbol of the Old South than Scarlett O'Hara's Tara. The authors are sensitive about calling fellow Southerners lazy, and so they say "leisure orientated" instead.

\* \* \*

Other historians agree that the pair have done valuable work in emphasizing the importance of livestock to the Southern economy, but they are skeptical of the ethnic connection. Still, McDonald and McWhiney believe they have found an important key to the Civil War. Inheriting a tradition of clan loyalty, Southerners put their local interests ahead of the Union. Their reluctance to enter the nineteenth century made war with the forward-looking North inevitable. In an article published last week in a new historical journal called "Continuity," McWhiney compares the Confederates' reckless charges at Gettysburg with the Scots' doomed sallies against the entrenched English at Culloden in 1746. Celtic warfare from the first century to the nineteenth was characterized, the authors say, by daring, imagination, courage, and ultimate defeat by a better-organized enemy. Celts make better heroes and poets than farmers or bankers--and McDonald and McWhiney would be the first to say that it would be a poorer world without them.

Jerry Adler with Holly Morris in Tuscaloosa, Ala.

---

## **Nov. 5. 1993 Daily News p23 Small Papers Target Academic Brainwashers**

BY THOMAS SOWELL

STANFORD, Calif. -- If sanity ever returns to the academic world, part of the credit will go to a small newspaper called "Campus Report," which has exposed innumerable incidents of brainwashing replacing education on college campuses, stormtrooper tactics being accepted and rewarded by "responsible" college administrators, and academic and behavioral double standards being applied according to the group to which one belongs, rather than one's own behavior or performance.

"Campus Report" has now been taken over by a former professor, Mark Draper, who has started off with a bang by trying to organize conservative students on various college campuses to challenge left-wing brainwashing professors in their classrooms, even though they know that this could result in a failing grade. "Flunk for Freedom" is his motto.

If you choose "this unnerving path," he says, "we will stand by you. We will help you. We

will counsel you."

It is a bad idea, Professor Draper--and an idea whose time I hope will never come. Sending conservative students on academic suicide missions is all too reminiscent of left-wing academics who use students as cannon fodder in their various crusades. Fighting fire with fire may sound good, but most fire departments use water. For critics of the left-wing ideologues to imitate their tactics and their mind-set is corrupting, not ennobling as Dr. Draper tries to portray it.

Just what does it mean to have Campus Report "stand by you," after you have put a needless blemish on your academic record? Will "Campus Report" alter transcripts? File lawsuits'?

The problem of brainwashing professors who use their grades as ideological rewards and punishments, rather than as measures of students' academic performance, is a very serious problem and a very serious indictment of institutions that let them get away with such unprofessional and dishonest self-indulgence. But having students carry on a running debate in the classroom throughout the term is not the answer.

For an individual student to spontaneously challenge some of the idiocy that is taught in brainwashing courses is fine. But for adults on the sidelines to egg them on to do this all term long is something else.

\* \* \*

It is only on those campuses where a second, independent student newspaper has sprung up, often surviving precariously on alumni donations, that there is some hope of letting the truth leak out to the real world, whose money supports the academic world. As things now stand, students who challenge the campus ideologues in print run a danger of retaliation that can range from ostracism to harassing phone calls to trumped-up charges on some campuses and even threats of violence.

At Dartmouth, the administrators tried to destroy "The Dartmouth Review" before its first issue appeared in print, by threatening to sue them if they used the "Dartmouth" in their name. Since then one tawdry retaliation after another has been directed at the newspaper and at individual students who write for it.

At Vassar, students who wrote for "The Vassar Spectator" were forced to spend hours in hearings during the final exam period, when they needed to be studying, on vague charges of "political harassment." Any newspaper's editorial page can be considered "political harassment." It was the students who were being harassed.

Students who write for independent campus newspapers are risking enough already. The real call should go out to adults off campus to back them up with financial support for those papers, to support them also with letters to college officials, and-- most important of all--by refusing to give money when the gutless administrators ask for annual donations to alma mater.

What is needed are trustees worthy of trust, who see their position as imposing responsibilities, not simply conferring a glow of status through association with an academic institution. The last thing anyone needs to do is to urge students on to more dangers. "Flunking for freedom" is a slogan that itself flunks the test of responsibility.

Thomas Sowell writes a column distributed by Creators Syndicate

---

[BACK](#)

© 1996-1998 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



# Exploitation

## Lesson Seven

**Yggdrasil** says:

"As evidence of exploitation, we have discussed governmental race preferences. They are merely the tip of a very large iceberg. Economic exploitation of European-Americans is big business.

"Governmental race preferences in the United States are the symbolic and official confirmation of a much larger underlying economic reality."

Imagine yourself an impartial visitor from an isolated civilization studying the United States.

The popular press and politicians recite that majority European-Americans exploit and oppress people of color. Yet people of color, by the boatloads and by the hundreds of thousands, are clamoring to get into the U.S. If the word "oppression" has any meaning, you would expect that people of color would be moving in the opposite direction.

The popular press claims that European-Americans exploit and oppress people of color. Yet tax dollars, on balance, flow disproportionately in the other direction - from European-Americans to people of color.

U.S. history texts and Supreme Court opinions state that majorities always oppress and exploit minorities. And yet, if the proverbial visitor from an isolated civilization were to pick a group to exploit based on economic motives, the visitor would choose the group that is the most productive and the most numerous. After all, that is where the money is.

The popular press constantly excoriates rich "WASPs" (or European- American Protestants) as the prime movers in this exploitation of people of color. Yet when you measure actual income and education levels, you find out that Jews are the most prosperous ethnic group, followed by Japanese and Chinese Americans. European-American Protestants rank below European-Americans of Italian, Polish and Irish descent, and are only marginally above African-Americans.

Many civilizations have their myths. Ancient Greeks and Romans were taught, and perhaps believed, that their secular rulers were descended from gods.

But the myths which America recites every day are contrary to easily observable fact. Any myth that is contrary to clearly observable fact must be very important to the elites it serves. For such a myth takes a great deal of energy to sustain, and can serve as grounds for dangerous rebellion when overthrown.

In this lesson we will "deconstruct" the housing industry in the United States. Many readings could support this lesson. But the attached article, "Marquette Park" has such unique power that it deserves to stand alone, with no distractions.

Housing and automobiles, with their ancillary industries such as furniture, appliances, carpets, oil and auto repair, account for about half of our GDP.

Much of that GDP growth following WW-2 has been driven by the creation of suburbs, led by pioneering builders such as Kaufman & Broad.

Initially, this boom in residential construction was fed by demand from returning veterans following the War. Although this boom has continued more or less unabated through the present, its character changed significantly in the early 1960s.

The building industry in California faced boom times not only in the 50's, but continuing on into the 60's and 70's from a wave of migration from other states.

But as the 60's arrived, the building industries in the Midwestern and Eastern cities were faced with a mirror opposite of the California image, - static or very slow growing populations with little real demand for new suburban housing.

Once pent up demand was satisfied in the 1950's, new sources of demand had to be created. Many Americans were perfectly happy living in charming, older ethnic neighborhoods in these Midwestern and Eastern cities. The builders needed a way to make these people unhappy with those neighborhoods.

To generate continued demand for more and more suburban housing developments, the developers needed "white flight".

As if by happy coincidence, the 60's obliged, with race riots and busing. The popular press (the same press who's coffers were filled by revenue from ads for new housing developments) presented European Americans with a new image of the angry and violent African-American. European-Americans fled their old neighborhoods in droves.

The first to move into suburbs did very well. Prices tended to rise in the first 5 years of a development's life. However, those who lacked the means to flee to the suburbs, did very badly, and that is what this week's reading is about.

In the 60's, HUD began its program of "urban renewal". HUD tore down housing in center-city ghettos and replaced that housing with freeways and offices, as well as a few scattered housing projects. The Nobel Prize winning economist, Milton Friedman, referred to the program as "Negro removal".

These displaced African-Americans took the federal money they received for their old homes and went shopping for homes in the surrounding ethnic neighborhoods and older suburbs. Each wave displaced by "urban renewal" prompted a whole new wave of "white flight".

With the welfare system producing increased rates of illegitimacy and escalating crime rates, the stage was set to keep the whites moving and the economy growing for quite some time. Billions were made in profits.

Meanwhile, in California, as real estate prices escalated in the late 70's and the migratory rush from other states slowed down, the housing industry discovered a new and more powerful catalyst for white flight, illegal immigration.

In Southern California, the creation of suburbs reached its logical extreme. Developers created new cities of tract housing and sold it to middle class European-Americans. The developments were so dense that once urban decay gained a toe-hold, the entire city turned very quickly. Within the space of 15 years, new suburban cities in Orange County and the San Fernando Valley have come full circle, with stories of declining schools, crime and gang wars cropping up in their local papers.

White flight has created a lifestyle in which commuters spend three hours per day on the freeways, while every last penny of their income is tied up in mortgage payments for small, flimsy houses that would be a laughing stock in other parts of the country. These suburbanites have no disposable income and no time to read or organize to change the system. They have no time to create or maintain their own culture. The only thing they have is their TV sets, telling them to be happy and keep on spending. They are indeed modern serfs.

Above the vast herds commuting to work on the freeways, one can spot on the bluffs of Beverly Hills and Newport Beach, developers in their Mercedes with their cellular phones putting together the next deal in between month-long vacations. It is the Wild West writ large, but with European American suburbanites as the cattle. The developers build, while the politicians, the press and the illegal immigrants just "keep em movin'."

The profits are personalized, the costs, socialized.

The process drives the better half of our GDP, and produces much of our government's tax revenue. Dependent on permits and zoning variances, the housing industry almost singlehandedly funds the campaigns of local county and city politicians. These local politicians learn early that restrictive general plans, requiring low density development, are for public appearances.



Voters may believe these plans are real. But variances and amendments allowing higher densities are the strokes that keep the mother's milk of campaign contributions flowing, and set the tripwires for rapid neighborhood change. It is a splendid training ground from which to graduate to Congress, where border guards and immigration laws are also for public appearances.

Without drugs, violence, and urban decay, white flight might slow. That would sour the economics of housing construction, and the press, advertising and political industries it supports. Our welfare system subsidizes pathologies which our housing industry needs. Unchecked illegal immigration fuels the fire.

Academics write countless books about the destructiveness of welfare. What they fail to recognize is who wins and who loses. The collateral consequence (white flight) of a senseless policy (aid to dependent children) is much more significant than the direct consequence (urban decay) and is the real reason that the seemingly senseless policy persists. Follow the money flows and you will arrive at the truth!

White flight channels energy and productive effort in directions that it might not otherwise flow. It renders urban mass transit impractical, stimulating vast demand for automobiles and the oil to run them. It stimulates enormous amounts of debt creation, and economic stimulus. It channels virtually all middle class wealth and savings into suburban housing and automobiles. Policies of moderate inflation turn this excessive consumption by the European-American middle class into what feels to them like investment.

This excessive consumption renders the European-American middle class utterly dependent on their jobs for survival, and utterly unwilling to think or speak thoughts that might be unpopular with the boss, or a potential customer.

Small wonder that the social policies driving white flight become moral imperatives.

The article below is about the fate of those European-Americans who are the last to leave their decaying neighborhoods. It is a classic of the journalistic art.

**Yggdrasil** recommends that you read the following:

---

**Mar. 2, 1977 Wall Street Journal p. 16**  
**Racial Change in Marquette Park**

BY JONATHAN R. LAING

CHICAGO--The Marquette Park neighborhood on this city's southwest side has long been a prototypical white ethnic enclave. Named for the pleasant park in its midst, the neighborhood has been a haven for waves of European immigrants--Germans, Irish,

Poles and most recently Lithuanians--each of which has left its stamp on the area's architecture and stores.

It's a place where old world values are unashamedly embraced. Families are close-knit and suspicious of outsiders. Their modest brick bungalows and woodframe houses are painted every two years whether they need it or not. The weekly visit to deposit money at the savings and loan association takes on the trappings of a sacrament.

The future of the community is bleak, however. Chicago's relentlessly expanding black ghetto has engulfed the eastern fringe of the neighborhood. Petty crime and building abandonments are already a problem in the transition zone. Property values are falling. A & P and other major stores there have moved out. Jobs are fleeing to the suburbs.

Here as in many working class white communities in other cities the overriding issue is race. For increasingly in recent years whites are being pushed out of communities where they have long lived because of racial change and the rise in crime and blight which often accompany it. Those whites who can afford to typically flee to the suburbs and the protection that higher property values and restrictive zoning laws afford. Others either grimly hang on, often living under virtual house arrest, or move farther from the ghetto, only, in some cases, to have to move again.

Moreover it's urban whites who often bear the brunt of school desegregation orders, racial hiring quotas, minority housing plans and other melioristic social programs that grew out of the civil rights era. For they often find themselves in the same school systems or competing for the same jobs and housing as blacks and other minorities.

The whites in Marquette Park are particularly embittered over the Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance program which they claim is causing neighborhood deterioration by subsidizing home purchases by blacks too poor to maintain them. Long conservatively run and an engine of the post-World War II suburban housing boom, the FHA program was liberalized shortly after the 1968 urban riots to encourage lower-income black home ownership ("if they own it they won't burn it" was the maxim of the time). Downpayment requirements for FHA mortgages were all but eliminated and lending standards were relaxed.

### **A Complicated Situation**

Many observers are quick to dismiss Marquette Park's whites as bigots and therefore unworthy of concern. In truth, racism runs deeply in the community. Last summer a mob of jeering, rock throwing whites injured several dozen blacks and policemen during a civil rights march in the neighborhood. Black families living in the area periodically have had the windows of their homes shattered. Several black homes have been firebombed.

But the situation is more complicated than that. For every generalization there is a host of exceptions. It's a drama largely without heroes or villains--just people, white and black- urban dynamics. Here are some stories and impressions gleaned from a number

of interviews with Marquette Park's residents.

Joann Hanahan says that she was on edge from the moment a year ago that blacks began moving on her block in the eastern section of Marquette Park. "Like a lot of people around there, my husband and I had seen the neighborhood we grew up in wrecked after blacks moved in, so naturally we were worried," recalls the 40 year-old warehouse worker's wife. At first there were no problems, according to Mrs. Hanahan. "Most of the blacks who moved in were nice people like the cement finisher who bought the house directly across the street from us. They were running from the ghetto too," she says.

But things changed last summer. In June, a black youth robbed an acquaintance of Mrs. Hanahan of \$100 while she was on her way to the beauty parlor.

A daughter of one of Mrs. Hanahan's neighbors was jostled and robbed of her school lunch money a few weeks later by a gang of black girls. Finally in August, Mrs Hanahan's 13-year-old daughter and a friend had their bicycles stolen by two black teenagers who knocked one of the girls off her bike in the process. The Hanahans put their house on the market three days later.

The sale proved traumatic. A black family bought the home for \$14,000, which was about the price the Hanahans had paid for the six-room frame house 11 years before. "We were sick about the price because we'd spent a lot of money siding the garage, panelling bedrooms and putting on a new back porch. Now we have to live in an apartment because we didn't make enough money on the sale to buy a house in a white area," Mrs. Hanahan observes bitterly.

As often as not, whites living in the transition area of Marquette Park can cite few personal difficulties with blacks. But racial change breeds hysteria. Stories of racial incidents become vastly overblown. In such an atmosphere, often all it takes is some trivial incident to trigger a decision to move. This was the case with Pat Salmon, an officer of a neighborhood savings and loan who moved his family to a white area of Marquette Park several months ago. He says he decided to move one day last fall after noticing that the name of a black youth gang had been spray-painted on the stadium wall of the local Catholic high school.

Says Mr. Salmon: "I know that it is really a small thing but the Graffiti really burned me up. I mean the white people who have lived in the neighborhood for years have more respect for property. I was suddenly struck with the hopelessness of the whole situation and the fact that my wife and I had been talking about nothing else but the blacks for the last six months. Mentally, I just couldn't handle it any longer."

The black families moving into Marquette Park also are beset by various fears. Tommie Johnson, an unemployed mechanic in his late 30s, tells of white neighbors kicking several of his family's wardrobe boxes and muttering about "the niggers moving in" when they moved into their apartment three months ago. Since then, garbage has been dumped in their backyard several times. Says Alfred Williams, a muscular black 25-year-

old body and fender repairman, "I really hope that the white families will stay on the block because if it goes all black the neighborhood will go bad. In black areas, there are just too many kids hanging around breaking in houses and messing things up." Mr. Williams purchased a home in the area last November for no money down under a government mortgage program.

It's difficult to determine whether the influx of blacks into the eastern fringe of Marquette Park has resulted in a rise in crime there, as many white residents claim. A watch commander at the local district police station says that comparative crime statistics aren't collected on a block-by-block basis so that he doesn't know. However, a white police sergeant later tells a visitor privately that beat car coverage in the mixed area has been increased because of a rise in the number of calls. "It's mostly small stuff--car thefts, broken windows and other petty vandalism. But if the area follows the pattern of many of the all-black neighborhoods nearby, major index crime will start to rise soon."

A focus of racial tension in Marquette Park has been Gage Park High School, one of two public high schools serving the neighborhood. Rioting there first erupted four years ago when blacks moving into the area bordering Marquette Park began enrolling in the school in large numbers. Before it was over, hundreds of policemen had to be called in to quell the violence and the school closed for several days.

### **Cultural Life Imperiled**

Many of the white residents of Marquette Park fear racial change because they feel that it imperils their community and cultural life. A case in point is the neighborhood's 15,000 residents of Lithuanian descent.

At present, the area boasts its own Lithuanian ballet and opera companies, folk dancing troupes and even a cultural museum. In the summer, Lithuanian soccer leagues abound in the park just like in the old country. And perhaps most impressive in an area where the median family income is less than \$13,000 a year, the Lithuanian community has managed to build a major hospital complex and several schools. A large Lithuanian cathedral where masses are still offered in Lithuanian, presides over all.

"Of course we'll lose most of this if the blacks take over because the Lithuanians will scatter to the suburbs and other neighborhoods and lose interest in the community." Dr. Juozas Meskauskas, a 70-year old physician who lives and works in Marquette Park, observes sadly. Many of us who lived through the Russian and Nazi invasions of Lithuania feel we are being invaded again."

To Marquette Park's whites, government is frequently an alien force with its array of social legislation favoring minorities, racial quotas and antidiscrimination policies. The principal target of their ire, the FHA mortgage insurance program, permits persons unable to qualify for conventional financing to purchase homes through mortgages provided by private lenders but insured against default by the federal government.

"All you need to qualify for an FHA mortgage on most of our homes is a down payment of \$200 to \$300 and marginal income," says James Capraro, executive director of the Greater Southwest Development Corp., a company formed by a group of Marquette Park financial institutions to rehabilitate buildings there. Consequently FHA ends up pumping a lot of blacks into the neighborhood who can't afford to maintain their homes and frequently have to abandon them. It's like somebody owning a used car he doesn't have much money invested in. If something serious happens like a major repair, a job layoff, or a divorce, people are inclined to just walk away from their homes."

And, indeed, there are signs of decay in the racially-changing section of Marquette Park, where more than 80% of the sales in the past year have been financed through government insured mortgages. On almost every block at least one home sits vacant and boarded-up, the telltale sign of an FHA foreclosure. Many of the vacant homes have been vandalized. A heavy blanket of snow only partly hides the litter in the streets of the once carefully-maintained neighborhood.

What does the future hold for Marquette Park? "We hope that the area can survive as a pleasant, middle class community for whites and black alike, but only time will tell," ventures Mr. Capraro. "After all, neighborhoods should be more than disposable products."

Mr. Laing is a member of the Journal's Chicago bureau.

[Because of its antiquity, the article above is not available on Dow Jones News retrieval and has been reproduced in its entirety for your convenience.]

---

[BACK](#)

© 1996-1998 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



## Objective Measures of Racism

### Lesson Eight

This is the eighth a series of articles examining the issue of race in the United States.

**Yggdrasil** says:

"Racism is simply conflict or aggression by one group against another based on group identity.

"There are two precursors of armed combat. One is violent assault. The other is the visible pursuit of racial advantage through political activity, or the ballot box."

In [lesson six](#) we asked the question whether belief in the American moral paradigm of "integrationism" and racial harmony could be sustained or believed except by European-Americans raised in racially segregated suburbs.

In [lesson seven](#), we noted that the social pathologies subsidized by the welfare system drive "white flight" and the creation of new suburbs. This phenomenon of white flight and suburban development has resulted in U.S. consumption and savings patterns that are different from those seen in other, more homogeneous developed countries.

In [lesson two](#) and [lesson three](#), we saw that racial hostility was a universal human characteristic. It is inconceivable that these feelings of hostility and aggression disappear merely because a group happens to be a minority.

However, if you think about it, a minority is going to have to be very careful about how, when and where they express these feelings. Obviously, crude expressions of hostility toward a majority could result in disastrous political consequences. Rather, the focus of minority aggression and hostility must be carefully cloaked from the view of the majority.

Expelling or exterminating a majority is an unrealistic objective for a minority. Even if it were possible for a minority to accomplish such an act, the economic cost would be too high. Rather than expulsion or extermination, minorities will seek to dominate the majority, or at the very least, to dictate the terms of their interaction with the majority.

Within any multi-racial empire, the aggression of minorities will ordinarily be confined to efforts to control public opinion, particularly about racial matters, and to weaken the cultural norms of the majority. Thus, you would expect minorities to seek employment in advertising, the news media, entertainment, and politics to ensure a measure of control over public opinion and public discourse.

Being outnumbered places obvious limits on the rhetorical devices minorities may use in controlling public discourse. They must advocate universalisms like "equality" or "compassion" or some other values or ideals that justify imposing a practical burden on the majority and the acceptance of that burden. If a minority claims that it is a superior race, conflict with the majority would escalate very quickly. Thus, it is important for minorities, even very successful and dominant minorities, to claim victim status and argue for "equality" as a means of distracting majority attention from politically imposed burdens.

But to be successful, this aggression of minorities must be carefully controlled. To keep the empire stable, minorities must accept the satisfactions of this indirect aggression. Once members of the minority groups become alienated enough to demand the more direct satisfaction of openly angering the majority, the game is close to an end.

While it may be very easy for minority elites to conceal their feelings and motives, they are typically less successful at controlling the hostility of all of the members of their group. It is this popular hostility of minorities that tends to escalate tension and move conflict beyond the legislatures and into the streets.

These visible symptoms of popular hostility are beginning to appear in the United States. Criminal violence is the most destabilizing.

In the media and in history books we constantly read about European-American violence toward African-Americans. But what the average European-American actually sees in everyday life is the opposite - attacks on European-Americans by African-Americans.

Ordinary people would conclude from this everyday experience that the attackers hate us. But European-Americans cannot be allowed to believe that. They are taught instead that distant and unseen members of their own race are guilty of the racism and hate, and that this discrimination justifies and explains the violence they actually see in real life.

The myth goes like this:

"Social preferences of European-Americans in free-market transactions devalue minority contributions. Absent these preferences, we would see proportionate representation of African-Americans at all economic levels. Thus, the actual aggression you see in your everyday lives is provoked and justified by discrimination. European-Americans are the real racists."

Under this economic determinist theory, the wealthier the racial group, the more racist it is. To measure "racism" all we need do is measure the economic status of an ethnic or racial group.

But free markets have rewarded Jews, Japanese and Chinese more than any other ethnic or racial groups in the United States. If racism is a function of wealth, then these must be the most racist groups. That conclusion is false not because these groups lack feelings of fear and exclusivity, but because the premise of "unfair markets" is false.

As Thomas Sowell, a black sociologist, points out in his book, "Race and Economics," there is a cost associated with a private employer discriminating against someone who can earn him a profit. Very few private employers will bear this cost. According to Sowell, employment discrimination has always taken place at institutions shielded against these costs, namely governmental employers and regulated utilities. That is precisely where we see the most intense effects of present day quotas. (See [Yggdrasil's Lesson #4](#)).

The Marxist explanation for Black aggression fails because it fingers other minorities who themselves claim to be the victims of racism.

Crime statistics also disprove the "economic determinist" model of racism. Since 1973, the first year that the Justice Department began its annual crime surveys, the rate of personal thefts has declined 31.9%, household burglaries have declined 47%, and household larcenies, 22%.

The rate of crime involving non-confrontational theft motivated by economic need has declined dramatically over the last 21 years, and in greater proportion for blacks than for whites. At the same time, violent crime - assaults, rapes and robberies have increased.

If crime rates were a function of economic need, then we would expect the "non-confrontational" crimes of personal theft and burglary to hold steady or increase in relation to the number of violent crimes.

Much is made in the popular press about the fact that Blacks are the main victims of Black crime. That is certainly true for murder. But there were only 25,000 murders in 1992 in the United States, and only 141,000 forcible rapes. (From BJS surveys, and not just reported crime numbers).

In contrast, there were 1.2 million robberies, and 5.3 million assaults. An assault is an incident in which someone comes up and punches or kicks you, just to humiliate and frighten you. Economic gain is not a motive. It is the quintessential "hate crime". 5.3 million attacks is a truly staggering number. 11% of all assaults or about 580,000 are by blacks against fellow blacks. 15% of all assaults or about 795,000 are by blacks against white victims. 71% of all assaults are committed by whites, but only 2% of all assaults, or 106,000, were committed by whites on black victims.



Thus, while blacks commit 2.7 times the number of assaults as whites per capita, there are fully 7.5 times as many assaults by blacks on whites as by whites on blacks. It is 49.7 times more likely that any randomly selected black has assaulted a white, than that any randomly selected white has assaulted a black.

Blacks are well aware of these probabilities, as evidenced by a quote from the Dec 17, 1993 edition of the Wall Street Journal:

Jesse Jackson said the other day that "there is nothing more painful to me . . . than to walk down the street and hear footsteps and start thinking about robbery--then look around and see somebody white and feel relieved."

The statistics raise all sorts of interesting questions.

1. Given the concentration of those 795,000 annual black-on-white assaults in neighborhoods adjacent to black neighborhoods, is white flight to distant suburbs the likely product of racism or simple fear?
2. Suppose that instead of constituting 12.1% of the population, blacks were 35%. In that circumstance, would the existing rates of aggression have already provoked civil war or secession?
3. Is it an accident that the social engineers of the "therapeutic state" have never attempted to dismantle white suburbs?
4. Could Marxism be a manipulative device designed to dissuade groups from asserting their own racial interests while concealing racial aggression on the part of Marxists themselves?
5. Is it possible that "hate crime" laws serve a critical symbolic purpose? - That assaults by whites against blacks are so rare that each case must be made into a "show trial" to reinforce the myth of white racism?
6. Isn't black violence useful to the black middle class? Aren't quotas based on numbers inflated by a black underclass rendered unemployable by drugs and crime disproportionately generous toward the small number of middle class blacks?
7. Can one make the argument that by voting to support black dependency on welfare, the black middle class is pursuing its own narrower self-interest at a hideous cost to the less fortunate members of its own kind?

The second intermediate form of conflict is block voting. Minorities can conceal racial agendas by supporting politicians from behind the scenes in exchange for a limited agenda of items. But when majority politicians are forced to make race-based appeals for block votes of minorities, then minority aggression becomes impossible to conceal.

In the United States, the European-American majority tends to split evenly, with approximately 45% voting for liberals and Democrats.

Asians and Americans of Hispanic origin tend to split as well, with about 55% to 65% of their votes going toward liberals and Democrats. These vote splits are healthy, and indicate that the groups involved are considering the merits of the question, or the policy preferences of the candidates, and are correlating those policy preferences with factors and interests other than just racial identity.

Not so with Blacks.

They routinely cast 80%-90% of their votes for Democratic candidates. The evidence is overwhelming that the only question they consider is which candidate will provide the greatest resource transfers from European-Americans.

Voting has special significance because it is an expression of the racial motivations of the middle and upper-middle classes. Generally, persons most likely to commit assaults have very low voter turnout rates.

8. Based on the above objective measures of racial aggression, are European-Americans, as a group, racist?

Reprinted below is a selection of excerpts which deals with the problem of black alienation in the United States. Curiously, this alienation is a recent development, having arisen during a 30 year period of vast intervention by government to "overcome" the effects of past segregation. The programs run the gamut from race preferences and quotas, integration of schools, federal expenditures on programs such as "Headstart" and massive support from the "social safety net".

9. We should ask whether the minority elites can keep control of the popular hostility of their own groups. Will conflict escalate?

10. Has the governmental effort at "integration" been a failure? Should it be abandoned?

11. Has the black population in the United States already partitioned itself psychologically and socially? Have governmental programs aggravated the problem?

12. Would a formal partition of the United States into two countries be consistent with underlying reality? Is it consistent with the trend?

13. Would partition or secession draw much racial opposition? (It surely would draw economic opposition, but for reasons intimated in Yggdrasil's Lesson Seven).

YGGDRASIL recommends that you read the following:

---

**Dec. 7, 1978 Wall Street Journal P22 C4  
A Long Look at Our Large Crime Problem**

BY DAVID IGNATIUS

**The Bookshelf**

"Criminal Violence, Criminal Justice" By Charles E. Silberman. Random House. 540 pages. \$15

\* \* \*

Mr. Silberman set out to write what might be called, in the current fashion of the publishing industry, "The Complete Book of Crime." It's all here, neatly divided into two sections.

The first, "Criminal Violence," examines the causes of contemporary crime and the burden of fear that it imposes on law-abiding citizens. He argues, forcefully, that while America has always been a violent country, much of the crime that frightens people of all races today is black crime, and that this black crime wave is a relatively recent phenomenon. What's more, it isn't explainable simply by black poverty; Crime rates for blacks are higher than those for other disadvantaged minorities such as Puerto Ricans and Mexican Americans, and they don't decrease as rapidly as might be expected with rising incomes.

"In the end," writes Mr. Silberman. "there is no escaping the question of race and crime." He argues that poor black men are today acting out the fantasies of violence and revenge that have haunted their forebears since slavery". Especially in adolescence, they enjoy being "bad niggers," in Mr. Silberman's words, and there's no reason to believe things will change soon.

"What has happened in the last 15 years in good measure, is that the cultural devices that kept black violence under control have broken down. and that new cultural controls have not yet emerged: While Mr. Silberman is extremely sensitive to the trauma of the black experience in America, his observations about race and crime are likely to startle some liberal readers.

\* \* \*

---

**Mar. 24, 1992 Wall Street Journal P1 C1  
Bronx Cheer**

**Inner-City Jurors Tend To Rebuff Prosecutors And to Back Plaintiffs  
They Identify With the Poor And Dislike the Powerful, Say Lawyers on Both  
Sides  
No Negligence, but Pay Up**

BY ARTHUR S. HAYES

Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal

NEW YORK - Perhaps the Bronx County Courthouse should post a warning: People who get sued here run an increased risk of suffering staggering losses.

Or maybe it doesn't need to put up any signs: Tom Wolfe spread the word in his novel "Bonfire of the Vanities," in which he declared, "The Bronx jury is a vehicle for redistributing the wealth."

Bronx juries, the data show, find the defendant liable in a lopsided 72% of civil cases, compared with a national average of 57%. Damage awards in this New York City borough average \$1.2 million, double those in mostly suburban and affluent Westchester County to the north, according to the New York Jury Verdict Reporter.

But lawyers are learning through research and experience that the Bronx-jury phenomenon isn't unique. Juries in many other urban areas also tend to favor civil plaintiffs and go easy on criminal defendants. Lawyers think such juries identify with people they perceive as victims, to the detriment of police, prosecutors and deep-pocket civil defendants.

**Factors at Work**

It's possible the underlying reason has something to do with race - New York's borough of the Bronx is mostly black and Hispanic--

\* \* \*

Similar results are evident in such cities as Washington, St. Louis, Philadelphia and Chicago. Juries in suburbs of these cities side more often with civil defendants.

In St. Louis, for example, data for 1989 show that plaintiffs won 80% of the verdicts in personal-injury trials in the city but only 48% in the suburbs. The gap was still evident in 1991, but narrower-a 62% plaintiffs' success rate in the city, 53% in the suburbs. Judy A. Riley, managing editor of Jury Verdict Reporting Service in St. Louis, believes plaintiffs lost ground in the city for three reasons: Gentrification over the past 10 years put more affluent whites on juries, rule changes made it tougher to avoid jury duty, and

insurance companies mounted an advertising campaign against high damage awards.

In Chicago's Cook County in the first eight months of last year, juries awarded winning plaintiffs an average of \$675,012, compared with \$194,021 in eight mostly white suburban counties, according to the Chicago Jury Reporter.

### **Differing Views of Justice**

Why the disparities? Lawyers for both plaintiffs and defendants say urban poor and working-class minorities have a different sense of justice than wealthier jurors. To the poor, lawyers contend, the powerful and the affluent seem alien and often inimical, and so such jurors tend to side with plaintiffs, whom they see as fellow victims.

\* \* \*

---

### **July 22, 1994 Los Angeles Times p A1 The Gap Between Black and White**

**The gulf in the way people of different races view events can create flash points over everyday issues and the handling of big problems such as crime and drugs.**

BY SAM FULWOOD III

Times Staff Writer

WASHINGTON--As the O.J. Simpson case has dramatically illustrated, vast differences exist between the way black and white Americans view everyday reality.

Many whites have expressed surprise and bafflement over opinion polls showing a majority of African Americans sympathetic to Simpson and highly skeptical of the evidence against him while the same polls suggest most whites see things the other way around.

However, such findings come as no surprise to many blacks and to numerous social critics, political scientists and other experts who study black American attitudes. They say a similar gulf splits blacks and whites as they interpret other facets of society. Such polarized views of reality inhibit the nation from effectively dealing with health care, crime, drugs, welfare, gang violence, out-of-wedlock births and a host of debilitating social problems.

Many blacks are so instinctively mistrustful of white society that some automatically reject any idea or judgment whose origins are not easily traced to the black community.

Some whites find black suspicions so extreme and far-fetched from their own mainstream views they make no effort to understand the differences.

"Blacks and whites are more politically estranged from each other than they have been in the last 20 to 30 years--since the era of the civil rights movement," said Melvin Oliver, a sociologist at UCLA's Urban Poverty Center.

\* \* \*

While some people of all races try to bridge this gap, many whites and minorities are so far apart in their basic perceptions of the problems that seeking common action against them is almost impossible.

\* \* \*

---

**08/22/90 Wall Street Journal (J), p A10**  
**Politics & Policy: Black Voters Are More Disapproving Than Whites**  
**Of the Deployment of U.S. Forces to Middle East**

BY JAMES M. PERRY

Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal

WASHINGTON -- Most Americans line up solidly behind President Bush's Middle East policy. But there's a major exception -- black voters.

In The Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll conducted last weekend, black and white voters agree on many propositions -- that the nation is heading for a recession, for example. But they diverge sharply on the question of sending American military forces to the Middle East. On that point, 74% of white voters support the military action, but the approval rate among black voters is only 41%.

**Why is there such a stunning split?**

Perhaps the most commonly voiced explanation by black politicians and scholars is that the conflict in the Middle East may divert desperately needed money for social programs here at home.

\* \* \*

---

## **May 11, 1993 Wall Street Journal A16 A Black Thing: Quiet Discontent Over the System**

THE ELECTION-YEAR debate over America's social problems seemed to hit its low point a couple of weeks back. That's when the House of Representatives voted to remove weight-lifting equipment from federal prisons, on the theory that weights make inmates stronger and therefore more dangerous when they get out.

That kind of superficiality suggests America's political leaders aren't in the right frame of mind to grasp complex social problems not given to glib solutions. Maybe that's why nobody is confronting one particularly disturbing phenomenon: the deepening political discontent of a whole generation of black Americans.

There's mounting evidence that blacks, particularly young blacks, see less and less value in working within the current political and social structure and instead favor breaking out of that system. Those sentiments are finding their voice in the growing numbers of African-Americans who favor forming a black political party, and who identify with a rising tide of black nationalism. These aren't sentiments voiced only by the black underclass or Louis Farrakhan followers, but also by successful black professionals and intellectuals. The political implications of this trend are profound. More important, so are the implications for American society.

The most stark portrait of these sentiments comes from a recently completed survey by Michael Dawson of the University of Chicago and Ronald Brown of Wayne State University. They oversaw in-depth, 45-minute interviews with 1,206 randomly selected African Americans, and found what Mr. Dawson calls "a more radical black America than existed even five years ago."

\* \* \*

[Each of the above excerpts is part of a much longer article which can, excepting the article written in 1978, be obtained in full from [Dow Jones News Retrieval](#).]

---

### **The following are direct quotes from various reports of the BJS.**

You also need to know that, according to the 1990 Census, blacks comprise 30,000,000, or 12.1% of the population, while whites (a category that includes about 50% of Hispanics) comprise 199,000,000 or 80% of the population. - **Yggdrasil**

\* \* \*

During 1992 both the theft rate and the rate of household crimes reached all-time survey lows. BJS attributed this to significant declines in personal thefts without contact as well as household larcenies and burglaries.

However, the number of violent crimes has increased. There were 6,621,000 violent offenses last year--34,000 more than the year before and 1,271,000 more than in 1973. The percent change for 1974-92 represented the largest increase for simple assault rates [of any year] (14.3%).

In 1992, there were 6.6 million violent victimizations, including 141,000 rapes, 1.2 million robberies, and 5.3 million assaults.

Victims of violence in 1992 report that about 33% of offenders were less than 21 years old, about 86% were male, and 29% were black. About a third of the victims reported that they were attacked by multiple offenders.

\*Victims report that in most violent crimes, the victim and the offender were of the same race. In 1992, in 73% of the violent crimes against whites, the offender was also white; in 84% of violent crimes against blacks, the offender was black.

Sources: BJS, Criminal Victimization in the United States, 1992, March 1994, NCJ-145125.

\* \* \*

This analysis of data from the National Crime Survey (NCS) shows that between 1979 and 1986;

Of all rapes, robberies, and assaults committed by single offenders, 69% involved a white offender and a white victim, 15% a black offender and a white victim, 11% a black offender and a black victim, and 2% a white offender and a black victim. About 3% involved offenders of other races.

\* \* \*

Homicide data were reported on 25,180 offenders in 1992. Of these offenders for whom sex, age and race were reported-- \*90% were male \*50% were age 15-24 \*55% were black.

---

BACK





## **Self-Destructive Group Behaviors**

### **Lesson Nine**

**Yggdrasil** says:

"Multi-racial empires stimulate self-destructive behaviors within races.

"It is a most grievous flaw."

In [lesson eight](#), we considered violent crime as a neutral index of racial hostility. If members of one group assault members of another disproportionately, then it is strong evidence that the group as a whole engages in racial aggression. Ultimately this type of aggression provokes a response.

Similarly, block voting is a symptom of racial aggression. While non-rationally motivated groups split on the merits of an issue or candidate, the racially motivated group will vote 80% or more in favor of the candidate that will shift the most resources in its favor. Again, this is a symptom of racial aggression, and will provoke a response.

One clear symptom of racially motivated block voting is the election or reelection of candidates jailed for crimes. This is also a type of self-destructive behavior, and is the subject of this week's lesson.

If a racial group lives within its own borders and governs itself, then it can choose from among competing candidates on their individual merits. But if the racial group fears losing representation to a member of a different race within the multi-racial empire, then it will vote for the candidate of its own kind even if that candidate is a criminal. Democracy is not supposed to work that way. Racial groups are better off with their own nations, where their racial feelings will not cause them to corrupt their own governments.

James Baldwin, an early writer of the civil rights era noted the phenomenon of self-destructive behavior of minorities in his book "The Fire Next Time" when he spoke of the "slowdown".

Blacks will slow down their work effort to avoid conferring an economic benefit on a white employer, as a method of protest, according to Baldwin. But by deliberately lowering their own performance, blacks make other participants in the economy much less inclined

to hire them. This is powerful self-destructive behavior.

Impoverishing your own race hardly seems a rational way of punishing some other race. But that is the destructive power of the multi-racial empire.

It is time to stop deceiving ourselves with myths about the destructive power of "white racism". All multi-racial empires around the world suffer the same dysfunction. The problem is with the multi-racial empires, not with the members of any particular group within those empires. Self-determination is the solution.

Excerpts from five articles have been reprinted this week to illustrate this concept with specific examples. Perhaps the saddest is from an article about Evanston High in suburban Chicago.

As you read these examples, ask yourself whether the multi-racial empire is humane.

1. Wouldn't blacks be better off in their own nation?
2. Would a separate nation be less expensive for European-Americans?
3. Would a separate nation be more productive for African Americans?
4. If everybody wins from secession, why don't we just do it?!

**Yggdrasil** recommends that you read the following:

---

## **June 25, 1991 Wall Street Journal P A16 Memories of Marion**

BY ANDREW FERGUSON

### **Bookshelf**

\* \* \*

"Marion Barry: The Politics of Race"

By Jonathan I.Z. Agronsky

Except for a little riot a while back, civic life has been eerily quiet for Washingtonians since the public demise of Marion Barry. Our new mayor, following Mr. Barry's 12 unbroken years of sleaze and dissembling, has shown herself to be an intelligent public

servant who sets high standards of integrity and competence, which she in turn expects each and every employee of the District of Columbia to meet.

And it is a drag. Already some of us pine for the days, not so long ago, when reading the metro sections of the local papers offered the same roller-coaster dramatics as "General Hospital" or "Days of Our Lives," even if the story line always seemed less plausible. Sex, drunkenness, venality, a daisy chain of back- stabbing. Mr. Barry's administration was riveting. We therefore owe a debt of gratitude to Jonathan I.Z. Agronsky, whose "Marion Barry: The Politics of Race" (British American Publishing, 380 pages, \$21.95) serves as a useful concordance to our memories of the most entertaining and cynical American politician since William Marcy Tweed.

\* \* \*

To be fair, this is a larger task than you might think, for Mr. Barry's public career - in fact, he never had a private one - stretches back 30 years. After a fatherless childhood in rural Mississippi and Memphis, Tenn., Mr. Barry first made the papers in the early days of the civil rights movement, as a founder of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. At lunch counters he was spat upon and drenched in ketchup by local cretins. He took a brief detour into academic life working toward a graduate degree in chemistry and later accepting a teaching job at the University of Kansas at Lawrence. He lasted a month in the Midwest.

\* \* \*

"He was hitting on everybody in those days," a colleague notes." His first marriage, in 1962, did nothing to cool his ardor, and his frequent travels allowed him to perfect the bird-dogging skills that later dazzled the waitresses and exotic dancers in Washington. They were not the only ones bedazzled. When Mr. Barry moved to the city in 1965 as an "organizer" for SNCC, he immediately sensed that Washington~s ruling elite-affluent white liberals who had flattered themselves into believing they were guilt ridden was likewise ripe for plucking.

At this point in his narrative Mr. Agronsky kindly refers to the future mayor's "grantsmanship"; readers more familiar with the ways of the welfare state will recognize it as "poverty pimping." With his second wife, Mary Treadwell Barry, and a man aptly named Catfish, he founded an organization dedicated to "catalyzing" black capitalism. The Johnson and Nixon administrations were so taken with Mr. Barry's commitment to self-help that they gave him more than \$10 million in federal money over the next few years. In between fact-finding missions to the Caribbean, Mrs. Barry bought a new Mercedes for herself and a new Volvo for her less ostentatious husband. This is nice work if you can keep out of jail, which Mrs. Barry couldn't. After Marion divorced her, she was convicted and imprisoned for misappropriation of funds.

No scandal could dim the establishment's affection for Mr. Barry. Fifteen months after assaulting a police officer and starting a brawl in a station house, he was asked by the department to help recruit police officers. The Volvo was constantly festooned with parking tickets, which were never paid. When Mr. Barry ran for a seat on the school

board, his aides taped his opponents' speeches, which he then appropriated as his own. "That's sophistication," he said when asked about it. The Washington Post ran editorials praising his "savvy" and boomed him for mayor.

The Teflon didn't wear out until the final scandal. The videotape evidence was hard to ignore, and the city's white establishment, including the Post's fickle editorialists, turned against him with fearsome brutality. To this day, Mr. Barry attributes his downfall to tricks and betrayals. I don't blame him. It was a particularly ugly case of parents eating their young.

\* \* \*

---

## **April 16, 1974 Wall Street Journal A Problem at Evanston High**

BY DAVID M. EISNER

CHICAGO -- The test scores were what educators had come to expect from the ghetto high schools of New York, Chicago or any other large city.

On a standardized aptitude test, the average black sophomore scored in the eighth percentile, meaning that 92 out of 100 students in the entire country did better than he did. Achievement test scores were a bit better; on a nationwide basis, the average black sophomore fell in the 20th percentile. But these black students weren't from a run-down, segregated school in a desperately poor neighborhood. They went to Evanston Township High School, situated in one of Chicago's more affluent suburbs and generally regarded as one of the nation's best public high schools.

What's more, most of them had been going to integrated schools for most of their lives. Evanston High has been integrated for 90 years and the elementary and junior high schools that feed it have been integrated through busing for nearly a decade. On the whole, the city's black population is much better off than the average, although poverty does exist in spots. There has been little of the headline-making violence or acrimony that has attended school integration elsewhere. "If integration can't work here, it probably can't work anywhere," says James Nelson, one of the four principals at the school.

So far, integration at Evanston isn't working--at least in the way that educators and social scientists of the 1950s and '60s envisioned it would. While Evanston blacks were scoring so dismally low on the national tests, their white classmates were doing quite well, with an average score in the 88th percentile on the aptitude test and the 80th percentile on the achievement.

### **No Academic Benefits**

The disparity in the results, which school officials say is too large to blame entirely on culturally biased testing, carries over to classroom work. Both challenge a basic assumption made by legislators and courts that blacks would benefit academically from going to school with whites in a thoroughly integrated situation. Integration and achievement, it now seems, have little relationship to one another.

One reason that Blacks fail at Evanston is that they appear to want to. "No way I'm going to do things The Man's way," says Ben, a black senior who says he is failing most of his courses and doesn't particularly care. Teachers say Ben isn't Untypical. "Many of the black kids feel it's just not hip to study and they put pressure on others to conform," notes: Lucia Peele, a high school guidance counselor who also is black.

Ira Everett, for example, is a black senior whose family moved into the Evanston system three years ago from Chicago. He is an above-average student and will go to college. (Most black students who do well at Evanston came there from outside districts, teachers note.) Ira says he doesn't feel any peer pressure not to study, but, then again, he admits, "I don't have too many friends: I go pretty much by myself. "

There are other forces that compel black students to give something less than the old college try. "Why should I care?" asks a black freshman in a class set up for students who have reached high school without learning how to read "It ain't going to do me no good anyhow."

"I run across this all the time." says Mrs. Peele, the guidance counselor. "A white student has plenty of examples of how school can pay off with a good job, a good life, but a black student sees a society that will discriminate against him even if he does well."

The black-white split on academics extends to social life as well. Blacks made up 20% of Evanston's 4,700 students, yet students say there is little socializing between the groups, except on athletic teams. One of the several student lounges has become established as the blacks' lounge and a white face seldom is seen there, conversely, blacks don't often visit the "white" lounges.

Similarly, the hallway in front of the school's central office has been staked out as black territory. White students say they feel free to pass through, but won't linger to chat with friends. "I wouldn't stop and talk unless you were here," says Vicki, a white sophomore, to a reporter whose suit and tie mark him as something other than a student. "We might be desegregated, but I don't think you could say we're integrated," she adds.

Teachers also are blamed for black students' lack of academic success. Some are accused of being racist and others are accused of being overly lenient.

"The greatest enemy of the black kid is the white liberal teacher who pats him on the head but doesn't expect anything from him," says Dorothy Magett, a black administrator at the high school. "If you demand nothing, you get less than nothing."

Some students agree with this assessment. But others, like Henry Hammel, a black

senior who says he "messed around" quite a bit before he "found religion" and decided to get serious about school, say that some teachers discriminate against blacks. Says Henry "I had teachers say to me: 'I can see right now that you're not going to make it. By the time you're 21 you're going to be either a bum on the streets or dead.' "

David Rogers, who graduated from Evanston last year as one of the school's few black honors students, says that when he tried to get into the all-white advanced science program, "some teachers didn't want to let me in."

### **"Nervous as Cats"**

Others criticize some teachers for not enforcing classroom discipline. "White teachers are as nervous as cats around blacks," asserts a school board member who requested anonymity. "Many of them say to themselves: 'If I say anything at all to a black kid, I'm in trouble.'" In truth, many white teachers haven't given much attention to the problems of black students. A reporter, seeking explanations of the low test scores, recently attended a meeting of about 15 teachers. It quickly became apparent that most of them hadn't talked about the problem before, although they welcomed the chance to do so. "Not everyone's willing to admit we even have a problem," says one.

Finally, the average black student at Evanston doesn't appear to get the support at home that his white classmate gets. For example, relatively few black parents attend parent teacher association meetings. School officials say they think that's because the city's black population, on the whole, still is considerably poorer than the white population. Both parents in a black household often are forced to work, leaving them little time to encourage or supervise their children's school work, they say.

Home environment might be the major factor in a black student's success, or lack of it. James S. Coleman is a professor of sociology at the University of Chicago and his 1966 study, "Equality of Educational Opportunity," persuaded many that blacks would be better off going to school with whites. Now, he isn't as sure.

"All the data assembled in the last few years tends to show that family level of education and family background in general are the single most important factors relating to academic achievement," he says.

"Whether a school is integrated or not by itself, just doesn't seem to have that much to do with it." Mr. Eisner is a member of the Journal's Chicago Bureau.

[Because of its antiquity, the above article is not available from Dow Jones News Retrieval and is reproduced in full for your convenience.]

\* \* \*

Black Managers Reject White Bosses' Criticism BLACK MANAGERS often shrug Off negative performance reviews from white supervisors, a recent study shows. But by ignoring such feedback, they may help fulfill their own expectations that they will be treated badly by white managers, says Herdie Baisden, a psychologist who conducted the study.

Mr. Baisden, a vice president with Personnel Decisions in Arlington, Va., looked at how 500 black and 3,600 white managers rated themselves and how they were rated by their supervisors. The black managers tended to get lower grades than their white counterparts. And although all the managers thought they did better than their supervisors thought they did, the perception gap was significantly higher for black managers.

Mr. Baisden, who is black, concluded that black managers "discount some of the feedback they get . . . and say 'consider the source' " to protect themselves in workplaces they consider to be hostile. Even positive feedback is discounted. "We end up with a view of ourselves that clearly is not shared by the boss, which increases the level of conflict," Mr. Baisden says.

"We still don't know why the white managers are rating them lower in the first place," Mr. Baisden says. But instead of closing down to feedback, black managers should "try their boss's boss or peers or subordinates and see how their views line up," he says. White managers, he adds, should be frank, consistent and specific in their evaluations of black subordinates to overcome inherent mistrust.

\* \* \*

---

## **Mar. 20, 1992 Wall Street Journal A12 C4 Blacks Who Use 'Racism' as Their Excuse**

BY ROBERT L. WOODSON

A black congressman is arrested for driving drunk the wrong way on a main thoroughfare. He charges racism. A black federal judge is found guilty of accepting bribes to lower the sentence of a convicted drug dealer. He charges racism. Two black deputy mayors go to jail for stealing money intended for the poor. Again, the charge is racism. A state senator was caught setting up a scheme to defraud the food stamp program intended for his low-income constituents. He too cries racism and upon release from jail attempts to run again to represent his district.

And now, Mike Tyson's rape case is just one more unhappy episode in the erosion of the moral legacy of the civil rights movement. Leading black ministers and civil rights groups

organized a support group for Tyson--not to demand equal justice before the bar, but to exonerate him before his trial and exempt him from punishment after he was found guilty (by a jury that included blacks).

Of course, now we know -thanks to the press- that the bottom line for the ministers was money. They were simply protecting a major donor. The National Baptist Convention, and its president, T.J. Jemison, had a building campaign to complete. As one of the denomination's pastors explained to the Washington Post, "It was a dollar-and cents proposition--Tyson can't give money when he's in jail."

It is becoming increasingly clear that corruption, greed and personal indiscretions have become "entitlements" for black celebrities and elected officials. The message being sent to young blacks is also clear - "Rape your sisters; it's the racist society's fault! Rob and plunder your brothers; you have an exemption! And, you can rip hell out of the social contract if you'll help us with our fundraising!"

\* \* \*

But, today, an eclipse has fallen across the shining examples of moral leadership that once distinguished the civil rights movement. Today's molders of black opinion have scorned and abandoned that great legacy and are descending into a moral and spiritual sinkhole where skin color, celebrity, and political status have become substitutes for character and integrity. When they wonder why inner city youths will beat a pastor to death in front of his congregation and kill women and children if they stand in the path of a drug transaction, they should look no further than their own example. There is truth in the saying that our children listen to nothing we say, but are guided by everything we do.

My worst nightmare is for America to turn back to those days when we were judged, not by the content of our character, but the color of our skin. In addition to abusing the trust given to them, many black leaders are ignoring the dangers of the precedents they are setting. The door they have unlatched can swing both ways. Immunity from justice by virtue of race, when expanded, can result in tragedies as horrendous as those perpetrated by Idi Amin, who terrorized and murdered millions of his people in Uganda, only to be defended by black activists who labeled the reaction of the world community against him as "racist."

\* \* \*

Mr. Woodson is president of the National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise. in Washington.

---

**Nov. 2, 1992 Wall Street Journal p1  
Ex-Judge Is Likely To Join the Congress That Impeached Him**



\* \* \*

## **Blacks See Florida's Hastings As a Victim of Injustice; Establishment Is Appalled**

By JOE DAVIDSON Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

HOLLYWOOD, Fla. -- Indeed, Alcee Hastings's bid for Congress is a most unusual one in many ways, not least among them this: He is now expected to be elected tomorrow to the same U.S. House of Representatives that impeached him three years ago. "You can't change the system from the outside," says Mr. Hastings, 56.

Alienation and Hope Beyond the irony, though, is an unusual union of alienation and hope among Mr. Hastings's many black supporters. "This is a very American drama," says Donald Jones, a University of Miami law professor. "This is someone who was pressed down, who rose again. Every black person would like to think Alcee's story is their story."

The Hastings story is a remarkable riches-to-rags-to-riches political saga. A brilliant lawyer, he was a state Supreme Court judge before being appointed Florida's first black federal judge in 1979. But two years later, he was accused of conspiring to accept a \$150,000 bribe. Although he was acquitted, a panel of federal judges concluded that he had lied and had manufactured evidence. That led to his impeachment by the House - by a vote of 413 to 3-and removal by the Senate in 1989.

Through it all, Mr. Hastings traveled all over the country defending himself with a thumping oratorical flair more reminiscent of a fundamentalist preacher than a federal judge. The result has been a deep well of support among black people who feel Mr. Hastings is just another victim of a system bent on destroying the best and brightest blacks. And he has tapped that well in his run for Congress from a new district designed to increase black representation. After winning the Democratic primary and a runoff, he is widely expected to win Tuesday because the district is half black and overwhelmingly Democratic.

\* \* \*

That's certainly evident at a rally at Antlers Temple 39 Elk Lodge in Miami. As Mr. Hastings strides into the hall, he greets Andrew Young, the former Atlanta mayor and congressman, and the crowd erupts into a standing ovation. The former judge is introduced as a man who "has been beaten, but he has not been broken" - and the crowd erupts again, chanting "Alcee, Alcee, Alcee."

Mr. Hastings captivates the crowd with his powerful and dramatic voice. He waves his fist in the air and declares: "I said what I wanted to say as a federal judge, and I'll damn well say what I please now." The audience bursts into applause. "Alcee will be the next Adam Clayton Powell, a people's congressman," says Mr. Teele, who is supporting the Democratic candidate even though he is a Republican Dade County commissioner and co-chairman of the local Bush-Quayle effort.

Mr. Hastings, divorced father of one, lives with his mother in a double-wide trailer and now earns a living as a defense attorney.

He has always taken special delight in tweaking the local establishment, some of which is appalled by the most recent turn of events in the Hastings saga. The Miami Herald feels he is unfit for office and has endorsed his Republican opponent. "He is not in jail, and for that he can thank a jury," the newspaper declared in an earlier editorial.

But Mr. Hastings's impeachment "carries no weight in our community at all," says H.T. Smith, a black Miami attorney. In fact, he argues, the impeachment generated support for Mr. Hastings from those who felt it unfair for the congressional prosecution to proceed after he had been acquitted by a jury.

Ganging Up Al Portee, a 50-year-old shoeshine man who waits for business in the middle of the Hollywood Mall, thinks Mr. Hastings's legal troubles increase his affinity for the problems of the average person. "Just to go through that system on that end of it" puts him in touch with the grass roots, Mr. Portee says.

\* \* \*

Mr. Young compares Mr. Hastings's problems with those that led him to resign as the Carter administration's ambassador to the United Nations after he talked with members of the Palestinian Liberation Organization. "I did not want anybody to think they could tell me to tuck my tail between my legs and be a good nigger," Mr. Young tells the Elks gathering. "I see that in the man you are about to elect as your congressman."

If they do elect him, Mr. Hastings will be part of a group that will significantly increase black membership in the next Congress. Three blacks are likely to sit in the House next year from Florida, which currently has none. Mr. Hastings's district, which covers parts of seven counties and 1,600 square miles, was one of several drawn with increased black representation in mind.

There are now no blacks in the Senate and 26 in the House, including John Conyers of Michigan, who was chairman of the House subcommittee that impeached Mr. Hastings and acted as prosecutor in the Senate trial.

\* \* \*

[Except as noted above, the forgoing excerpts are part of longer articles that may be obtained in full from [Dow Jones News Retrieval.](#)]

---

BACK

© 1996-1998 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



## **A Call to Action: Secede**

### **Lesson Ten**

For ten weeks, **Yggdrasil** has discussed the forces and movements that bear on the fate of European-Americans as a people and as a culture.

We finish these lessons with a call to action - a call for each of you to begin your own personal process of seceding from the multi-racial empire in which you live.

- **First, download these lessons, copy them on to floppies, and pass them out to friends or acquaintances who may not have seen them.** You don't need to say you agree with them. Just say that it is "wild and different".
- **Second, watch what you purchase.** Every time you spend a dollar, you are voting. Whether you like it or not, you are casting that dollar vote either for or against the multi-racial empire. The most leveraged votes in favor of your own serfdom are the easiest to avoid if you just stop and think before you spend.

The primary vehicle for holding European Americans in their place is advertising. Avoid the products with the big TV ad budgets and you will cripple the communications network of the multi-racial empire. Why buy Coke when you can buy an identical generic cola for 40% less? You save money and you weaken the empire at the same time! Double bonus!

Only about 30% of the products in the grocery have big TV ad budgets. Just avoid them. Unlike our manipulated elections, your vote really counts in the marketplace. Broadcasters and marketers fight over tenths of a percent share of the market. A very small number of you can dictate behavior of the advertisers and the messages that advertisers convey. Use your power!

Those of you who have jobs should cancel your cable subscriptions. You pay \$400 a year for basic service and you get garbage. Why bother? If you have children, they will be much better off without TV. They will read, raise their SAT scores, and interact with friends rather than becoming couch potato losers to the consumerist fantasy served up to them by Hollywood. Instead, rent videos so YOU control what you watch!

TV advertisers purchase programming with powerful homogenizing messages in the vain hope that a single set of commercials can appeal to all races and cultures. It is called

"broadcasting". In contrast, radio has given up trying to appeal to all with a single message. Rather, radio stations battle for market share within a single racial category. To do this they purchase programming with real particularist bite. It is called "narrow casting". This is why you get Howard Stern in New York and Robert Morgan in Los Angeles. Listen to radio. It is a force for fragmentation. When TV stations begin to "narrow cast" programming to us, then you may renew your cable subscriptions.

● **Third, minimize your money income while maximizing the economic value of do-it-yourself efforts.** Every time you spend a dollar in the transaction economy, it boosts GDP and government tax collections. Maximize what you do for yourself, and minimize what you must purchase in the transaction economy. That will lower tax revenues and weaken the government.

People exhibit irrational economic behavior. For example, they will spend 45 minutes driving to a car wash and pay \$10 for someone else to wash the car, when they could wash the car themselves in the same amount of time. Remember, the status trip of watching someone else wash your car strengthens government and weakens you.

Similarly, when a second spouse works, most of the income of the second spouse will ordinarily be used up by new expenses of clothing, daycare and automobiles. By electing to work in the transaction economy, the second spouse abandons his or her do-it - yourself activities that are non-taxable, and sells his or her labor which is taxable. Not only is much of the income of the lower-paid spouse absorbed by new expenses, but the government takes 40% right off the top in payroll taxes, plus local state and federal income tax. There isn't much left for you.

Worse still, what the spouse used to do for the family, he or she must pay others to do, generating a multiplier effect of taxable income in the larger economy beyond the family.

If couples really want two incomes, that is fine. Just remember how marginal the economic benefit may be after expenses and taxes, and how much the additional taxable income strengthens those who are attacking European-Americans. If remaining at home is boring or unfulfilling, perhaps there are other activities, like distributing copies of Yggdrasil's Ten Lessons to High- School students, that will get one spouse out of the house without generating taxable income of the kind that strengthens our enemies.

● **Fourth, become a part of the separatist migration trends that are already firmly in place.** If possible, move to a low immigration state. Set up your business or find a job there. By following the separatist migration, you avoid paying state and local taxes to groups that hate European Americans.

● **Fifth, learn how to invest.** In the long run, you gain power only through financial independence. Start young. Let your money begin working for you, so that you will have the resources to support institutions that will protect you from the multi-racial empire. Investing is simple. Financial assets such as stocks and bonds go up during those long periods when Government lowers interest rates or leaves them alone. Stocks and bonds go down during those brief periods when the Government pushes interest rates up. Just

keep your eye on the ball, and you will gain independence. Finally, learn to make political contributions. Within the next few years, political action committees, foundations and other institutions will arise that seek to protect European-Americans through support of political candidates who support secession. Understand that nobody gets representation in our democracy unless they are organized and contribute. Tiny minorities can control the outcome if they are willing to organize and make modest contributions.

The above list sounds a lot like those homely virtues of hard work, family and thrift that Europeans have always relied upon to protect themselves. Well, those virtues are needed again.

We conclude this tenth and final lesson with some observations about the practical interests that drive modern nation-splitting and two additional readings that emphasize the universality of this process as the Twentieth Century comes to a close.

National power no longer depends on large land masses and large numbers of people. Rather, national power requires only a core of a few million people who can create the information base that powers modern weapons and modern economic services. National power also depends on having a relatively cohesive population that will not destroy economic productivity by generating unreasonable demands for wealth transfers. A nation also needs a population that is cohesive enough that it can recognize and respond in a unified manner to external threats.

The two great multi-racial empires, the United States and the Soviet Union, learned in Viet Nam and Afghanistan that you cannot extract enough at gunpoint from colonial possessions to justify the cost of having your own troops carry the guns.

The problem, of course, is that the same lessons apply to disparate racial or ethnic groups within these empires. Hostile ethnic groups within the Soviet Union and the United States are nearly as nettlesome and expensive as were the populations of occupied Viet Nam and occupied Afghanistan.

As long as a multi-racial empire defines itself and its power as dependent in some manner on holding these disparate groups together, then it is an easy blackmail target for any group that wants to stop contributing and begins to demand "reparations."

Further, the instruments of modern power such as cruise missiles have very little industrial content (aluminum and explosives) but enormous information content (program code, flight path terrain data and satellite targeting data). You can decapitate an enemy and neutralize it with information. You do not need vast land armies of soldiers.

Thus, the advent of the information age has made the multi-racial empire militarily obsolete.

The advent of free trade has stripped the multi-racial empire of its economic advantage.

The popular press describes the breakup of the former Soviet Union as the "liberation" of ethnic groups in the newly autonomous republics. In the popular press, it is as if those small ethnic republics were somehow in control. That description fails to recognize Russia's powerful motives for sponsoring the breakup. The elites in the KGB and the military recognized that the captive ethnic republics were a burden. The empire splitting process was an inevitable result of the racial conflicts between groups. The problem, of course, is that before the political representatives from these ethnic republics would go along with a Russian policy objective, they would demand concessions. Policy objectives that were clearly beneficial to Russia became the object of constant blackmail by the surreptitiously hostile republics. The hostility was never couched in overt terms. Rather, the demands were always couched in terms of "equality" for the "impoverished" areas of the Soviet Union.

In a sense, the ethnic republics learned to pull James Baldwin's "slow down". Russia sensed that it would be better off without these constant demands. In the end, it was Russia that "seceded" from the Soviet Union out of clear self interest.

In one sense, the secession was sloppy. There are many ethnic Russians "caught" in the newly independent republics living as minorities. You can expect to see Russia interfere in the affairs of these republics to protect its own interests and to protect the interests of the ethnic Russian minorities. But the trend is clear. Russia does not want to pay the costs of "owning" these Republics.

In the final quarter of the 20th century, nations want to keep the populations that are the most productive and the best equipped to master the information age technologies.

Nations say in public that they want to take care of the weak and save the poor. In private, the wealthy countries want to make the poor racial groups independent, and leave them in separate nations to fend for themselves. In a mirror image, the poor nations push their unemployed to migrate illegally to industrialized nations in an effort to reduce their own welfare costs.

The great events of the final quarter of the twentieth century have been driven by these practical interests.

It is these interests that drive the trends described in our two readings for this week. The first is a rather surprising article about the attempts by a town in South Carolina to secede from one county and join a different one. The final article describes this modern world-wide trend toward secession.

The article on the Carolina town is fascinating. You will note that a Euro-American minority recognizes its disproportionate payment of the County's costs. When European-Americans are in a clear minority, as here, the consequence is inevitable. The perceived cost is too high because the minority that pays the bills cannot control the amount, nor are they guaranteed peace in exchange. Their fate is not terribly different from European minorities in Africa. Pay a disproportionate price or leave! Once European-Americans are allowed to see this, the drive for secession is not far behind.

The second article summarizes the global economic forces that propel racial and ethnic groups toward secession.

**Yggdrasil** recommends that you read the following:

---

**Dec. 10, 1993 Wall Street Journal A1  
Carolina Town, Seeks A Brighter - Some Say Whiter - Future**

**It Wants Out of a County That Is Largely Black, But the Plan Draws Fire**

BY HELENE COOPER

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

HEMINGWAY, S.C.--White flight from cities to suburbs is one thing. But what happens when a predominantly white town attempts to secede from a predominantly black county?

It isn't quite civil war - though civil lawsuits have begun to fly, as have accusations of uncivil attitudes.

"The audacity of these white folks to attempt to do this," fumes Stanley Pasley, who heads a community group at a Williamsburg County hospital. "These people want to break their association with us. What's wrong with us? We're not desirable?"

Indeed, emotions have run high ever since this low-country hamlet began earnestly to press forward with a bold - and, critics say, brazenly racist - attempt to cut its legal ties with Williamsburg County. Hemingway township, population 2,500, is 80% white; Williamsburg County, population 38,000, is 65% black. Hemingway, accusing Williamsburg's government of poor delivery of services, has petitioned the state to join predominantly white Florence County to the north.

**Stacking the Deck?**

Fueling the controversy, Hemingway in recent years has been rapidly annexing predominantly white areas around it while declining to consider black ones. Hemingway residents nonchalantly admit the move is aimed at shoring up Hemingway's chances of getting the two-thirds majority it needs in an upcoming secession vote. A 1985 secession attempt failed by a mere 112 votes when Hemingway's blacks, then about 35% of the population, rejected it.

The new vote had been scheduled for January but has been postponed by a barrage of



legal actions. For one, the U.S. Justice Department is investigating whether the secession, given the racial overtones of Hemingway's annexation efforts, violates the federal voting-rights act. Williamsburg's school district has sued to block the move as a segregationist ploy, as has the NAACP.

NAACP protesters, led by its president Benjamin Chavis, recently marched through Hemingway. Their chant: "Hemingway, Hemingway, have you heard? This is not Johannesburg."

The stakes are more than psychological. If Hemingway secedes, it would take 10% of the county's tax base, 546 manufacturing jobs and three of the county's best schools, displacing 1,100 students now bused in from other, mostly black county areas. For a county already the second poorest in South Carolina, the blow would be devastating.

Even some Hemingway residents who favor secession muster sympathy for the dire economic and educational impact it would bring. "I feel sorry for the people that would be left here, if we make it. This county's going to die if we leave," says Elaine Hays, a Hemingway nurse and mother. "But I don't feel like anything's ever going to change. The blacks around here feel like they can't vote for a white even if he's best, because that would be going against their kind." Before passage of the federal voting-rights act in 1965, Hemingway whites played an influential role in county government. But these days blacks control the county's major elected positions, including a state legislative seat and the county school board.

The official line in Hemingway is that the secession movement is motivated by economics, not race. With 38,000 people, the county is a hodgepodge of mostly downtrodden towns, tin-roofed shacks and potholed roads across a checkerboard of sprawling cotton and tobacco fields north of Charleston. Per capita income is \$10,255 - \$5,000 less than the state average. For work, residents mainly craft plastic containers at a Tupperware plant near Hemingway, scrub floors and make beds in nearby coastal resorts like Myrtle Beach, or get seasonal work picking cotton or processing tobacco leaves. Twenty-four percent of county families live below the poverty line - the state average is 11%.

Hemingway is everything Williamsburg County is not. Its roads are smooth and many of them four-lane; its tidy brick houses sport manicured lawns. With its compact but active business district, its two supermarkets and a Coachman Inn, the town has an air of prosperity.

Hemingway residents chronically complain that the township gets shortchanged on county services while paying a disproportionate amount of county taxes. One example, they say: Hemingway's only ambulance is often sent to cover Kingstree, the county seat 29 miles away, leaving Hemingway without protection.

Some residents also think property values suffer here because the county has a reputation not only of being poor, but also of being ineptly governed. "The executives who work for Tupperware will not live in Hemingway because we're associated with Williamsburg County," says Tim Harrelson, a local businessman.

The solution: an alliance with more prosperous Florence County. "Better to be on the tail end of a rich county than on the tail end of a poor county," says Jeffrey Lawrimore, Hemingway's mayor.

## **Schools of Controversy**

But it is Hemingway's three schools, now 88% black, that seem to be the real sore spot for whites here. Every weekday morning, a line of yellow school buses rumbles through town streets, bringing with them 1,067 black students. Until 1985, Hemingway's schools were predominantly white; in fact, the proposed busing of hundreds of new black students to town schools that year precipitated Hemingway's first secession effort.

Statistically, at least, the county-run system seems to be doing a credible job given modest resources: Per-pupil spending, at \$4,235, is near the median for districts statewide, and is \$2000 more per student than per capita spending in Florence County. While the Florence dropout rate for 1992 was 5.2%, Williamsburg County's dropout rate was 2.5%.

Yet white Hemingway residents paint a dire picture of Hemingway schools. "The schools here are really disappointing," says Mr. Harrelson, who sends his son to a nearby private school. The Florence County schools "at least appearance-wise, really seem to have a good, wholesome atmosphere," he adds.

Mrs. Hays, the nurse and lifelong Hemingway resident, concurs. She says buildings have fallen into disrepair, and she frets about drug abuse at the high school and about a majority black school board. She is also critical of a black school superintendent who she says "thinks he's God."

\* \* \*

## **Deep Trouble**

\* \* \*

"Where would we put all those students?" he says. "They'll be taking our best facilities." School officials estimate the cost to build replacement schools would be more than \$10 million - money the county doesn't have.

Over at Hemingway High, black students find the whole matter disconcerting. "Since this annexation stuff started, it's like I don't trust the white kids now," says Barvetta Singletary, a 10th-grader.

Some, in fact, have already felt the sting of white flight. Letia Cooper, a senior, says two of her best friends in elementary school were white. But in sixth grade, their parents, using a loophole in local law, sent them to a predominantly white public school in

Florence county. The girls still live in Hemingway, and Miss Cooper, now 17, still sees them occasionally. But the relationship isn't the same. "We speak to each other," she says. "But we're not friends anymore."

---

## **June 20, 1994 Wall Street Journal A1 Global Paradox**

### **Growth of Trade Binds Nations, but It Also Can Spur Separatism Dissident Groups Worry Less About the Economic Cost Of Going Their Own Way A World of 500 Countries?**

BY BOB DAVIS

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

It's a paradox of global proportions: the closer that trade and technology bind nations together, the bolder the moves to break nations apart.

- In Montreal, Rita Dionne-Marsolais by day plots global energy strategies as a Price Waterhouse consultant. By night, she plots Quebec's independence. "We want to position ourselves in the world market," she says. "The rest of Canada is just another business partner."
- In Brussels, the capital of economically unified Western Europe, Guy Verhofstadt, a Flemish opposition leader, proposes turning over most of Belgium's social-security system to the nation's three regions - even if the country breaks apart over the issue. "We'd be three independent regions in the European Union," he says.
- In cyberspace, Tamil activists use a global computer network to swap plans for an independent Tamil state in northern Sri Lanka. Building a free-trade zone around Trincomalee harbor would anchor the new country in the world economy, they say. This optimistic economic outlook "has strengthened the Tamils' argument to fight for independence," says Amita Shastri, a political-science professor at San Francisco State University.

### **Errant Predictions**

Who would have expected all this? Following World War II, many predicted that a global economy and global communications would lead to a world-wide community. Nationalism, they said, would decline as ever more people saw us all as passengers on lifeboat Earth.

But the growth of the global economy and of more powerful transnational institutions is producing the opposite effect. Instead of fading away, nationalism is flourishing, and not

just in the war-ravaged Balkans. Now even tiny groups of people can contemplate breaking away from the central state and plugging into the world economy on their own. Regions nursing ancient grievances are claiming independence, or at least autonomy, confident they aren't committing economic suicide. At the same time, the big corporations and institutions shaping the world economy seem so remote that many people turn to local ethnic groups and obscure languages for their identity, furthering the world's political fragmentation.

"This is a world we didn't expect to happen and we haven't planned for," says Paul Goble, a specialist in ethnic movements at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Over time, he believes, the world may fracture into 500 states from the current 200. Others put the ultimate number lower but talk of a new kind of state - something akin to a corporate holding company - with the Central government little more than a shell and power residing in the regions.

### **A Global Village**

The swirl of events is captured by Cable News Network and other global media, which bounce images and ideas from region to region. Separatists in Quebec track events in the Baltics, and Baltic leaders watch Latin America. All see a world of increasingly open, interdependent economies - and a world no longer threatened by the huge military apparatus of the former Soviet Union. The conclusion: The world is now safe for separatism.

"There's a lot of incentive to make your own deal with the world economy," says Charles Tilly, an expert on nationalism at the New School for Social Research in New York. "We've created an international structure where you can assert you're a nation, and the rest of us will recognize you have a right to political autonomy."

Belgium may foreshadow what is ahead. The Maryland-sized nation has already split into three regions - Wallonia, Flanders and Brussels - and three language groups - French, Dutch and German. The regions control trade, industry and technology, and they lobby the European Union for money. The language groups control education and culture. Brussels now is the site of the EU's government, Belgium's government, Brussels' government, Flanders' government and various language-group committees.

As complicated as all that sounds, some Israeli academics are studying Belgium as a model for power-sharing in ethnically and religiously divided Jerusalem.

### **A Changed Approach**

In the past, separatist movements were inward-looking and chauvinistic. But the new ones see themselves as internationalists and free-traders, who count conservative economist Milton Friedman and globalist John Naisbitt as heroes. And the new nations network at every opportunity. Early this year, in the Alpine splendor of Davos, Switzerland, the prime ministers of Estonia and the Czech Republic - two nations that didn't exist five years ago - huddled with Argentina's finance minister to discuss

economic strategy.

Argentina had shucked protectionism and curbed inflation, and the new nations are doing the same. In April, Czech Prime Minister Vaclav Klaus traveled to Argentina to propose a free-trade zone between the nations. This summer, Mr. Klaus and Argentina's finance minister plan to visit Estonia, which is selling off state-owned factories and farms.

In Spain, Catalonia's regional president, Jordi Pujol, is due in Montreal to meet with Quebec separatists next spring. Slovakia's deputy prime minister, Brigita Schmognerova, met with leaders from Flanders and Wallonia when she visited Belgium before taking office. She believes the breakup of Czechoslovakia shows that "if both sides agree to separation, it can be done without violence and without any especially negative effects."

But an outward orientation hardly protects against turmoil. Trade between China's southern coastal provinces and foreign nations is growing faster than in China's vast interior, widening regional disparities. In the coastal region of Guangdong, government officials have occasionally threatened poorer provinces with military action if they don't ship enough rice.

More power is likely to flow to China's regional centers, says Gerald Segal, a scholar at London's International Institute for Strategic Studies. He even raises the possibility that China could break apart, amid civil war and mass migration. "In the longer term, you can argue that China is better managed in a looser way," he says. "The difficulty is getting there without a lot of bloodletting."

The former Yugoslavia brings daily reminders of just how brutal nationalist movements can become. And even in Canada and Western Europe, where few expect the separatists to go to war, minorities in newly assertive regions complain of discrimination, and businesses consider fleeing rather than face disruption. When Quebecers first discussed independence, a slew of corporations reduced their staffs in Montreal or moved outright to Toronto. The global challenge, says Oleh Havrylyshyn of the International Monetary Fund, is to find a "satisfied nationalism" that frees regions to set their own destiny without sparking a violent breakup.

Barcelona shows how a balance can be achieved. The Mediterranean city, the capital of an independent Catalonia during the Middle Ages and in brief periods afterward, was smothered by the Franco dictatorship, with the Catalan language suppressed and the regional government disbanded. Now, with democracy and considerable autonomy restored, Barcelona remains part of Spain but looks to Europe and the global economy for its future. To finance local projects, Catalonia borrowed one billion French francs (\$17 million) in Europe's capital markets. Joan Vallve, until recently Catalonia's secretary for foreign initiatives, is leading a trade mission to Indonesia and talks about Europe and North Africa replicating the North American Free Trade Agreement. Catalonia's growing autonomy has sapped the drive for full independence; the secession party polls in single digits, and Barcelona has suffered none of the violence plaguing the Basque region.

Meanwhile, the multinational companies that helped build the global economy find some regional differences a nuisance. Solvay SA, a Belgian chemical company, says that

although the growth of global markets enables it to charge a single price for certain plastics anywhere in the world, it must now wrestle with a kaleidoscope of environmental rules. "Sometimes it's ridiculous," says Baron Daniel Janssen, chairman of its executive committee. "You have local, incompetent people dealing with very large problems."

Big food companies, after long catering to ethnic tastes, are well positioned to cope with greater regionalism. In Switzerland, Philip Morris Co.'s Jacobs coffee unit sells three types of coffee - to satisfy the differing tastes of the country's Italian, German and French regions. In the U.S., CPC International Inc. imports its Mexican soups to the Southwest and its Puerto Rican soups to New York City.

\* \* \*

But Slovenia, which broke off from Yugoslavia, moved quickly to replace the lost Yugoslav market by strengthening ties with Germany and negotiating free-trade pacts with the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary. "We have to be flexible," says Mitja Gaspari, Slovenia's finance minister.

The changing face of separatism can be seen in Quebec. In the 1970s, the movement was fed by complaints of blue-collar French speakers that the best jobs were reserved for English speakers. But in recent years, separatist leaders have become more sophisticated. "The fundamental discovery of our time," says Jacques Parizeau, who heads the Parti Quebecois, is "that a small country can prosper so far as it exists within larger markets." The separatists broke with their labor supporters to back the Canadian-U.S. Free Trade Agreement in 1988 and Nafta last year. The reason: Nafta offers Quebec an economically viable way out of Canada. So long as Quebec faces no tariff barriers, it can continue trading with the rest of Canada as well as with the U.S., Mexico and any other countries that eventually join the trade zone.

\* \* \*

Until the fall of the Berlin Wall, only a few separatist movements were recognized internationally: Singapore's break from Malaysia and Bangladesh's from Pakistan.

But the Soviet Union's demise spawned more than a dozen new nations and freed others from the fear of military conquest. The peaceful reunification of Germany persuaded Slovenians that they could redraw their borders without a major war, Finance Minister Gaspari says. And expanded trade opportunities enabled them to secede without terrible economic costs. Separatists, though, may underestimate post-Cold War dangers. Regional military powers could threaten the newly fragmented, weak countries. "What happens in the future if there is a threat to the nation-state?" asks Robert Hormats, vice chairman of Goldman Sachs International. "Has it been so weakened that it can't coalesce to meet a national threat?"

That's a risk that separatists seem willing to take. More than any one region, Central Europe is a laboratory of how to split nations apart. A day's drive from the grisly Balkan breakup, the Czech Republic and Slovakia negotiated a peaceful divorce with 40 separate

agreements that divided pensions, social security, the military and foreign-treaty responsibilities.

But not without cost. Even though the two new nations didn't put tariffs on each other's goods, trade between them fell 16% last year as each tried to sell more to Western Europe. The Czech Republic has been far more successful at stabilizing its currency, curbing inflation and selling off state companies than Slovakia, which is saddled with big, state-owned arms manufacturers. "We paid a high price for separation," says Ms. Schmognerova, Slovakia's deputy prime minister. "but it was a historic chance to have our own state."

In the end, the wealthier Czech Republic may be seen as the winner, having jettisoned a costly southern flank. Elsewhere, wealthier regions also may become a force for fragmentation, says Piero Gastaldo, director of the Agnelli Foundation, in Turin, Italy. Some Italians in the prosperous north favor a break from the laggard Mezzogiorno. In Spain, self-determination is on the rise in the industrial center around Barcelona: in China, it's in the booming coastal provinces.

Joining the global economy isn't automatic, however. Several states of the former Soviet Union have either bungled such efforts or found foreign markets less open than they had hoped. As a result, struggling Belarus and Russia signed a treaty that calls for a monetary union and may lead to Belarus's eventual loss of independence. Moldova may follow suit.

Both small states are agricultural producers hurt by stiff trade barriers in Western Europe. "In desperation, they're turning back" to Russia, which can offer them markets and cheap energy, says Basil Kavalsky, a World Bank adviser to former Soviet states.

But the global economy doesn't just make the world safer for many breakaway movements; it also reinforces their desire to assert regional identities. International bureaucracies don't create a sense of belonging, and many people fear ceding control to them. In India's high-tech center of Bangalore, which benefits from growing international contacts, Hindu fundamentalism is on the rise. So is the Sons of the Soil movement, which wants to reserve local jobs for local workers. Opponents of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade have organized protests by hundreds of thousands of people who see the recent trade pact as global encroachment, fear it will harm farmers and complain that any benefits won't be shared equally.

But many others see globalization as an opportunity. Tamil emigres, driven from Sri Lanka by discrimination and civil war, use the very symbol of globalization - the personal computer - to plot their future. Through the Internet system, they link up their widely dispersed community and swap ideas for organizing an autonomous region if not an independent state.

\* \* \*

[The excerpts above are from longer articles that you may obtain from the [Dow Jones](#)

BACK





## POLITICALLY CORRECT RACISM

This is Yggdrasil's Race Bias series. Every installment documents the extent of government and private racial preferences in this country. A must-read for anyone who wants to learn about reverse discrimination.

1. [Blissful Ignorance](#)
1. [Index of the Race Bias Series](#)
3. [Minority Engineers](#)
4. [Bidding War for Black Students](#)
5. [Race Based Private Scholarships](#)
6. [Race Conscious Private Hiring](#)
7. [Race Norming](#)
8. ['Separate Pool' Executive Hiring](#)
9. [Quota Beneficiary Survey Results](#)
10. [Minority Recruiting Industry](#)
11. [Minority Layoff Protection](#)
12. [Sensitivity Training](#)
13. [Minority Promotion Networks](#)
14. [The Weber Case Revisited](#)
15. [Why 'The Bell Curve' is so Dangerous](#)
16. [Minority Business Bootstrapped](#)
17. [The Minority Franchise](#)
18. [A 'Boost' for Black Media](#)
19. [Dole's 32 Page List](#)
20. [Contract Set-Asides](#)
21. [Private Quotas - Law](#)

22. Pressure Your Suppliers
  23. Finding Minority Suppliers
  24. Billions in Set-Asides
  25. Quota Enforcement Police
  26. The Racial Spoils System
  27. Legalized Graft
  28. The 'Birmingham' Model
  29. Tax Breaks for Minorities
  30. Colin Powell and O.J. Simpson
  31. Jim Crow Returns
  32. Caste Effects of Preferences
  33. Affirmative Action and the Supreme Court
  34. Business Opposes Quota Repeal
  35. Consulting and the Information Elite
  36. Employment Quotas and Real Estate
  37. Bias in Rules of Procedure
  38. Democratic Delegate Selection
  39. Whites as 'Filler'
  40. White-Bread
  41. What do They Know?
  42. Erocide 🍌
- 

**BACK**

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Race Bias #1 - "Blissful Ignorance"

I began the "Race Bias" series in 1995 in response to a post on the alt.politics.nationalism.white newsgroup to the effect that there was no discrimination in employment, university admissions, or otherwise, against European-Americans.

I was stunned that the regular posters to the group had no instant supply of material to post in reply.

Most regular posters and "lurkers" on the newsgroup, have some first-hand experience with anti-White race preferences. But very few of them are aware of just how pervasive these anti-White preferences have become. Unfortunately, the primary weakness of our defensive political movement is that a commanding plurality of \_Whites\_ are utterly unaware of it. They have no clue that the nice sounding phrase "Affirmative Action" means the systematic disfavor of Whites and race based preferences for non- whites.

Indeed, it is hard to imagine how a White can grow up in this society and not be aware of the legal and social impediments imposed on him, but a recent survey from the Washington Post found that 41% of Whites think "affirmative action" included benefits for white men. (Affirmative Action for White Guys? Washington Post, Oct. 22, 1995, p. C5.)

A Harte-Hanks Texas Poll conducted for media outlets by UT's Office of Survey Research and reported in the June 29, 1996 Austin American-Statesman (p A1) is consistent with the Washington Post results:

"A vastly lopsided percentage of Texans, eight of 10, oppose giving any consideration to race when admitting students to college. But when asked about affirmative action in general, respondents were more positive than not."

However, when asked "whether affirmative action for minorities and women "has had a positive effect on Texas," the response indicated that most had no clue what the words "affirmative action" really mean:

"Forty-seven percent of the 1,000 respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that affirmative action for minorities has had a positive effect, while 33 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed."

"When asked about affirmative action for women, 59 percent agreed it has had a positive effect

on Texas and 23 percent disagreed. The higher percentage favoring affirmative action for women is not surprising, experts said, because women make up half of the population."

Of course, the issue is not whether "affirmative action has had a positive effect on \_Texas\_" - a proposition that asks the interviewees to speculate on the impact of race preferences on an inanimate parcel of real estate, but whether affirmative action hurts or harms the interviewee.

But the survey itself highlights one of the means by which large institutions hide the truth from Whites. By selecting the term "affirmative action," conjuring images of a little extra recruiting effort to overcome any "information deficit" that non- whites might have in the marketplace, most Whites are kept in the dark.

Only the minority of Whites who read newspapers will know the truth. Those who get their information from TV will be blissfully ignorant.

The problem is that nearly half of this nation's Whites lack the basic vocabulary and the rudimentary facts needed to defend themselves in the political process.

With this in mind, I produced the "Race Bias" series.

I am a firm believer that the people of the Euro-American nation need facts more than they need ideologies. With that in mind, the series has been reorganized and lengthened from the original 30 to a revised 42 posts.

Copy them and circulate them to others!

Yggdrasil-

(As a P.S., I am indebted to "American Renaissance" magazine for reporting the Washington Post survey [Volume 7, Number 4, April, 1996] Subscriptions to American Renaissance are \$20.00 per year. Make checks payable to: American Renaissance, P. O. Box 1674 Louisville, KY 40201.)

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Race Bias #2 - "Index of the Race Bias Series"**

I receive frequent e-mail from lurkers who collect all of the Yggdrasil posts.

To facilitate this collection process, I made an index to the entire series. You can e-mail me at [ygg@netcom.com](mailto:ygg@netcom.com) to get posts that you may be missing.

In the introductory post entitled "Blissful Ignorance" I complained that "nearly half of this nation's Whites lack the basic vocabulary and the rudimentary facts needed to defend themselves in the political process." It occurred to me while preparing this index that the titles themselves constitute the "vocabulary" that every White must understand and learn to use.

Yggdrasil-

- Race Bias #1 - "Blissful Ignorance"
- Race Bias #2 - "Index of the Race Bias Series"
- Race Bias #3 - "Minority Engineers"
- Race Bias #4 - "Bidding War For Black Students"
- Race Bias #5 - "Race Based Private Scholarships"
- Race Bias #6 - "Race Conscious Private Hiring"
- Race Bias #7 - "Race Norming"
- Race Bias #8 - "Separate Pool Executive Hiring"
- Race Bias #9 - "Quota Beneficiary Survey Results"
- Race Bias #10 - "Minority Recruiting Industry"
- Race Bias #11 - "Minority Layoff Protection"
- Race Bias #12 - "Sensitivity Training"
- Race Bias #13 - "Minority Promotion Networks"
- Race Bias #14 - "The Weber Case Revisited"
- Race Bias #15 - "Why 'The Bell Curve' is so Dangerous"
- Race Bias #16 - "Minority Business Bootstrapped"
- Race Bias #17 - "The Minority Franchise"
- Race Bias #18 - "A Boost for Black Media"
- Race Bias #19 - "Dole's 32 Page List"
- Race Bias #20 - "Contract Set-Asides"
- Race Bias #21 - "Private Quotas - Law"
- Race Bias #22 - "Pressure Your Suppliers"
- Race Bias #23 - "Finding Minority Suppliers"

Race Bias #24 - "Billions in Set-Asides"  
Race Bias #25 - "Quota Enforcement Police"  
Race Bias #26 - "The Racial Spoils System"  
Race Bias #27 - "Legalized Graft"  
Race Bias #28 - "The 'Birmingham' Model"  
Race Bias #29 - "Tax Breaks for Minorities"  
Race Bias #30 - "Colin Powell and O.J. Simpson"  
Race Bias #31 - "Jim Crow Returns"  
Race Bias #32 - "Caste Effects of Preferences"  
Race Bias #33 - "Affirmative Action and the Supremes"  
Race Bias #34 - "Business Opposes Quota Repeal"  
Race Bias #35 - "Consulting and the Information Elite"  
Race Bias #36 - "Employment Quotas and Real Estate"  
Race Bias #37 - "Bias in Rules of Procedure"  
Race Bias #38 - "Democratic Delegate Selection"  
Race Bias #39 - "Whites as Filler"  
Race Bias #40 - "White Bread"  
Race Bias #41 - "What Do They Know?"  
Race Bias #42 - "Erocide"

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Race Bias #3 - "Minority Engineers"

In much of the racial dialogue in the U.S., integrationists dispute the simple fact of anti-white bias in the system. Of course, the media generally propagate our national myths; - myths intended to hide the ball from the majority. But there is one major daily newspaper that consistently reports facts that are inconsistent with our national myths.

So you white-nationalists and ultra-conservatives will want to save every one of Yggdrasil's \_daily\_ posts in this series, each with excerpts from a different article on the operation of race preferences in the United States.

The following article inaugurates this series on private anti- white bias by U.S. companies.

A tidbit on private racial preference schemes from

Yggdrasil-

BUSINESS & RACE

----

By Leon E. Wynter

04/18/91 WALL STREET JOURNAL (J), PAGE B1

Minority Grads Remain In Demand Despite Slump

THE recession is crimping job offers for college seniors, but competition will remain stiff for talented minority graduates, consultants say.

About 225 companies, filling all available slots, are vying for this spring's 125 engineering graduates at Howard University. Slots to see non-engineers are still available, but the black university is demanding more from companies that have visited for years but left few job offers behind.

"We have to ask them, `Why are you coming?'" says Samuel Hall Jr., placement director. To

improve their chances of landing Howard graduates, Mr. Hall says, employers should commit to work with faculty and support the school with money and resources.

Maury Hanigan, a New York consultant who devises recruiting strategies for Polaroid, Colgate-Palmolive and other firms, cautions, "If a company is just starting to get active and serious with minorities, it may be too late." Especially on black campuses, Ms. Hanigan says, a company's record in hiring and promoting blacks plays a major role in determining recruiting success, making it hard to play catch-up. After summer internships, returning students quickly research others' experiences at various companies "as if it were another course," Ms. Hanigan says. \* \* \*

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

# YGGDRASIL

## Race Bias #4 - "**Bidding War for Black Students**"

The statistics show that there are more European-Americans below the poverty line than African-Americans.

On page 46 of "The Bell Curve" Herrnstein and Murray reprint a graphic showing that the number persons having IQs at or above 140 who do not attend college still exceeds the number with IQs above 140 who do attend. While colleges are doing a better job at identifying high-ability students than they did in 1930, there is still a long way to go.

Only four tenths of one percent of Americans have IQs above 140, (approximately 12,000 out of the 3 million babies born live each year). What "The Bell Curve" makes clear is that more than half of these super-bright children are "missed" entirely by the system and never get to college.

Now three guesses as to the racial group in which these "missed" children are concentrated!

As you will see from the article below, enormous sums are spent by colleges on the children of wealthy blacks. None is being spent on identifying the brilliant children of ordinary working European-American parents who cannot afford college tuition.

America has developed a rather strange concept of justice!

Yggdrasil-

-----  
Oct. 7, 1992 Wall Street Journal p B1 Education: Black Students Become Targets Of Bidding War

by Gary Putka Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

A financial-aid bidding war for top black students has broken out among colleges, yielding generous scholarships and some knotty questions of equity in an era of scarce academic resources. Eager to diversify the racial profile of their student bodies, colleges are offering unprecedented sums to academically talented blacks, admissions officers say. Many of the awards are not based on need but on merit, causing some colleges to question whether the trend

is diverting aid dollars from poorer students. \* \* \*

Instead of partial scholarships, awards covering all costs - more than \$20,000 a year at some private schools - are becoming more common. Although academic merit scholarships are available to students of all races at many colleges, Harvard and other schools say such awards are being made with increasing frequency as a recruitment tactic in a heated competition to tap a small pool of top-achieving blacks.

And while the big aid awards may be lifting black enrollment at some schools, overall black participation in higher education remains stubbornly frozen at levels below the 12% proportion of blacks in the general population. Nationally, blacks accounted for 9.2% of freshmen in the fall of 1991, down from a peak of 9.8% in 1984.

Harvard, disturbed by a sharp drop in black enrollment in this year's freshman class, says that many black students it accepted were wooed away by other schools offering aid packages that far exceeded financial need.

Of 172 blacks accepted for admission at Harvard this fall, only 94 are attending-- the lowest number in the 24 years since affirmative action policies began taking hold at the school. Harvard has 1,606 first-year students. Last year, the school enrolled 132 black freshmen.

Harvard surveyed the black students who rejected it, and "what we found is quite provocative," says William Fitzsimmons, dean of admissions. "There is an awful lot of money being spent out there."

Mr. Fitzsimmons says that one student who went elsewhere reported receiving an \$85,000, four-year scholarship that covered tuition, fees, room and board - and an additional \$10,000 in stipends to cover "travel or any project of her choice" during summer vacations. Many of the students reported getting "full ride" scholarships covering all costs, including one whose family's income was \$140,000 a year according to Mr. Fitzsimmons. Harvard which makes awards only on the basis of need, declined to name students or the schools they chose.

Mr. Fitzsimmons says students with family incomes as high as \$164,000 reported receiving aid elsewhere, while a "reasonable number" of those in the survey had incomes above \$80,000, a level at which little need-based aid is generally available. He says he doesn't have complete income data because some of the students didn't apply for financial aid at Harvard.

\* \* \*

Many colleges, of course, also lure students with athletic scholarships that aren't based on need. But abuses in athlete recruitment have led to award limits and other regulation by the National

Collegiate Athletic Association. No such regulation governs academic-merit awards.

Competition for the best black students has become especially heated, schools say, because more colleges are pursuing racial heterogeneity as a goal. "Colleges nationally want diversity, and to get diversity, you have to make your aid packages very attractive for incoming freshmen," says Emmett Griffin, admissions director at Howard University, an historically black college in Washington, D.C.

Another factor is the relatively small pool of black students with high college entrance test scores. Colleges typically buy the same recruitment lists from test sponsors, focusing in on groups according to ethnicity, scores and geography. The list of last year's black high school seniors scoring between 600 and the maximum of 800 on the verbal part of the Scholastic Aptitude Test contained only 1,493 names; in mathematics the number was 3,404. Schools rated in the top rung in college guides generally prefer students with scores higher than 600.

Richard Shaw, Yale University's dean of admissions, says many students in the top tier receive multiple offers of admission, with colleges increasingly willing to negotiate aid packages to match others. The danger, says Mr. Shaw, is that students will be "bought off" and will make their decision based strictly on money, rather than the school that might make the best educational fit.

But not everyone is upset. Indeed, the U.S. Department of Justice, in an antitrust case against the Ivy League and others, argued that students should be free to negotiate the best deal they can get from a school, irrespective of need. The case resulted in the demise of a practice called overlap, under which aid awards were fixed by the schools so that multiple admission students were denied any price advantages. Now that Overlap has collapsed, black students and others "are finally getting what they deserve," says John Katzman, who owns Princeton Review Inc., a test-coaching company.

\* \* \*

Dr. Rudenstine, Harvard's president, says he may take steps to reduce the growth of merit-only awards if the school continues to lose black students "or any other category of students" for financial reasons in the spring and next September. Despite the legal sensitivity of the issue, he says he may request that colleges exchange information on financial aid after students are enrolled to see whether awards are actually draining money from needy students. If that is the case, he says it may be possible to argue that the schools should curb excessive awards.

But if that fails, Dr. Rudenstine says Harvard may have to consider providing merit scholarships of its own. Any such move would have widespread implications for other schools' aid policies, since Harvard's \$5 billion endowment would make it, a formidable competitor in merit awards. Dr. Rudenstine stressed that Harvard would do this only as a last resort.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Race Bias #5 - "Race Based Private Scholarships"**

Apparently, preferential admissions aren't enough. American corporations also provide money on explicit race-based criteria to minority students just in case the race-based financial aid programs provided by the universities are not enough.

Notice that this money is not made available based on economic need or objective criteria of cultural or economic deprivation.

With more European Americans than blacks under the poverty line, it seems that this type of aid should be directed to those from deprived economic backgrounds without regard to color.

But then this is America!

Yggdrasil-

BUSINESS & RACE

----

By Leon E. Wynter

05/01/90 WALL STREET JOURNAL (J), PAGE B1

Seed Clouds Spread Over Engineering Pool

CORPORATE CASH is starting to flow to the nation's fastest-growing pool of engineering talent -- black and Hispanic students.

General Electric Co. has committed \$35 million over 10 years for minority students and faculty. And General Motors Corp. has almost doubled its support for minority engineering students since 1984 to \$1.9 million last year. "We're trying to make sure we have enough engineering talent," says Richard O'Brien, a GM personnel official.

Meanwhile, the National Action Council for Minorities in Engineering, which distributes corporate funds to schools and minority engineering students, says it's running \$500,000 ahead

of last year's \$5 million budget.

In 1989, blacks received only 2,122, or 3%, of the 68,291 engineering degrees awarded, about the same share as Hispanic students. On the bright side, U.S. engineering school enrollments turned up last year after a seven-year slide, with black and Hispanic students accounting for more than half the increase.

Of course, some professionals believe corporations haven't done enough. "Imagine at one point there was no money running," says Tyrone Taborn, who publishes three magazines for black and Hispanic engineers. "Now there is a trickle."

\* \* \*

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

## YGGDRASIL

### **Race Bias #6 - "Race Conscious Private Hiring"**

More evidence of explicit minority racial preferences in hiring by large corporations is reprinted below.

Might the executive recruiting industry have a powerful vested interest in lobbying for continuation of the race-based hiring policies that our Media calls "affirmative action?"

Yggdrasil-

\* \* \*

Jan 26, 1993 Wall Street Journal p B-1

Seeking Minority Talent For Higher Levels DEMAND for minority managers is heating up, executive recruiters say.

Richard Clarke Associates, a New York-based firm that specializes in searches for minority managers reports its minority-search assignments jumped 50% in September from a year earlier. Amanda Fox, a vice president in the Chicago office of recruiters Paul R. Ray & Co., says businesses request minorities and women in 65% of the firm's executive searches, up from 40% a year ago.

One reason for the increase: Corporations that haven't successfully promoted minorities now are looking outside for qualified candidates to fill senior positions. Richard Clarke, president of the search firm bearing his name, says companies realize they must diversify their top ranks to remain competitive in recruiting lower-level talent.

Recruiters say most searches for minority executives are to fill director and vice presidential positions in the sales, marketing and computer fields.

The increased demand is prompting many search firms to set up separate arms for minority recruiting. Ward Howell, a New York firm, established a diversity practice last year. Though it focuses mainly on finding minority talent, the unit also advises companies on retaining and promoting minority employees, says Larry Poore, its head. \* \* \*

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Race Bias #7 - "Race Norming"**

When European-Americans take employment skills tests, they are scored differently than other groups. They seldom realize that this is the case.

Race norming is the practice of giving every applicant for employment the same skills test, but then grading the test differently depending on the applicant's race.

The test is "normed" for the race of the taker by adding points to the score of any minority applicant equal to the difference between the average result for European-Americans and the average result for the minority group of which the test taker is a member.

It may surprise you to know that even tests measuring hand-eye coordination must be race normed!!!

Everyone inside and outside of government admits that higher scoring whites are likely to be much more productive employees than lower scoring whites. They admit also that higher scoring blacks and hispanics will be more productive than lower scoring blacks and hispanics.

Before the advent of affirmative action, most companies used to hire employees without requiring skill tests. But the new-found popularity of tests raises fascinating questions:

Has affirmative action caused a loss in productivity that has driven employers to administer tests as a means of compensating for that loss?

Does this need for higher skill and productivity levels among Euro-Americans and Asians mean that members of those groups must now work harder and smarter to compensate for the effects of affirmative action?

In other words, are there costs of affirmative action that are imposed not only on the unsuccessful white job applicants, but the successful ones as well?

Now if anyone were to accuse employers of doing such a thing, many of you would be inclined not to believe it. So, I have reprinted excerpts from an article from the Wall Street Journal that describes the practice.

Philip Morris is a believer in "Race Normed" tests that discriminate against European-

Americans. Remember that the next time you are tempted to buy a pack of Marlboro cigarettes or Miller Beer.

Yggdrasil-

Apr. 26, 1991 Wall Street Journal, p B1

Job Tests Scored On Racial Curve Stir Controversy

By TIMOTHY NOAH Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.

WASHINGTON -- Question: Should scores on job-placement tests be adjusted to account for an applicant's race?

Answer: In some instances, they already are. For more than a decade, hundreds of companies have been hiring workers partly on the basis of test scores that are "race-normed," or ranked on a percentile basis in comparison only with the performance of others in the same ethnic group. This practice has stirred some controversy, but the debate generally has been confined to a small band of experts in corporate personnel departments and various state and federal agencies.

\* \* \*

Supporters of race-norming say unadjusted test results don't accurately predict job performance. Charles Stephen Ralston, a lawyer for the NAACP Legal Defense Fund in New York, defends race-norming as a "necessary tool" that "corrects for the bias that's in the test."

But even some supporters of race-norming say it can compromise hiring standards. "When you adjust the test scores, you're passing people who are less qualified," says Charles Wonderlic Jr., vice president of E.F. Wonderlic Personnel Test Inc., Northfield, Ill., which sells tests that can be race-normed. The use of race-norming has been shrouded in secrecy. Companies are reluctant to discuss their race-norming policies, possibly fearing they will attract reverse discrimination lawsuits.

Officials at various state employment services, which administer what is probably the most widely used race-normed test, offer only sketchy details about how businesses have fared using race-norming. The officials cite either a lack of information or a need to protect the confidentiality of the companies to which they refer job applicants.

"Our feedback is that employers are very satisfied," says Tom Chesar, supervisor of test research for New Jersey's state employment service.

The trend toward race-norming has been led by the Labor Department, which has worked closely with state employment services to match job seekers with private sector jobs. To screen job applicants, the state agencies have used the General Aptitude Test Battery, or GATB, a Job-skills test developed by the department more than 10 years ago.

The GATB measures a potential employee's hand-eye coordination as well as his or her cognitive skills in such areas as arithmetic, reasoning and vocabulary. Before 1981, race wasn't a factor in calculating the scores. Since then, however, many states have had the option of scoring the GATB on the basis of how well an individual performs compared with others in the same ethnic group. Test takers are placed in one of four categories: black, Hispanic, Native American and "other."

Labor Department officials say people who score well on the GATB tend to be successful on the job, a view backed by a 1989 report from the National Academy of Sciences. But when the agency moved to expand the use of the test in the early 1980s, it feared the results would discriminate against blacks and Hispanics.

"Whites on the whole perform above Hispanics, Hispanics above blacks, Asians above all three groups," says Robert Litman, deputy director of the Labor Department's U.S. Employment Service. If employers hired solely on the basis of raw GATB scores, says Mr. Litman, "we would be discriminating significantly" along ethnic lines.

To avoid potential discrimination, the Labor Department began a race-norming pilot program that eventually spread to 44 states. "I don't know that there ever was a policy decision" to proceed, says one Labor Department official.

\* \* \*

Mr. Wonderlic says race-norming isn't for everybody. "It's really the larger companies, where they want to meet affirmative-action goals," that are likeliest to race-norm, he says. A spokesman for Philip Morris Cos., New York, says the company uses race norming because it is "one way we have of recruiting qualified minority candidates for jobs."

Employment specialists say race-norming can help companies avoid so-called disparate-impact civil rights cases charging that an employment test is an indirect form of discrimination, because a normed test is theoretically bias-free. Race-norming has also been imposed by the courts as a legal remedy in some employment-discrimination lawsuits and has been pushed by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (though the commission is currently split over whether to allow race-norming ).

But some opponents of race-norming argue that it can be deceptive. Many employers, they

charge. are unaware that a black applicant's GATB score of 85% - may not reflect the same test performance as a white or Hispanic's score of 85%.

A Labor Department official says states have made an "honest effort" to notify employers who use GATB about the race-norming, but "saying something and having that message comprehended are two different things."

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

## YGGDRASIL

### **Race Bias #8, "'Separate Pool' Executive Hiring"**

The following quotes from an article from the Wall Street Journal give you a bird's eye view of preferences in action at the very highest levels in Corporate America.

You will notice that Pepsico maintains separate pools by race and sex for recruiting senior executives in its "Designate" program.

This practice is precisely what the Supreme Court supposedly outlawed in the Bakke case. Apparently, corporate America recognizes Bakke for what it is - window dressing by our highest Court to maintain the impression of fairness. Apparently, there were enough winks and nods in that badly split opinion to convince corporate America that they could continue discriminating against European-Americans in any way they please under the Civil Rights Acts.

One thing you will never find is the very top brass resigning to make room for their new-found favorites.

You may also want to take a look at the stock charts for Xerox, Merck and the other star performers in minority executive preference and ask yourselves whether they might be short sale candidates.

Yggdrasil-

Wall Street Journal Nov. 13, 1991 p 1 C1

Room at the Top

PepsiCo's KFC Scouts For Blacks and Women For Its Top Echelons Fried-Chicken Chain Seeks Well-Seasoned Managers Like Lawrence Drake, 37 The \$150,000 Onion Breeder

By JOAN E. RIGDON

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

When Larry Drake found himself mixing mashed potatoes at a Kentucky Fried Chicken outlet in a suburb of Pittsburgh last winter, he worried that his friends wouldn't understand. Months

earlier, Mr. Drake had worn tailored suits and cuff links to his job at Coca-Cola Co., where he managed \$100 million of bottler accounts. A 10-year veteran of Coca-Cola, and one of its highest-ranking black executives, Mr. Drake earned more than \$100,000 a year, including bonuses. He had just received his master's degree in business and was aiming for a vice presidency.

Then he got an offer he couldn't refuse. The Kentucky Fried Chicken unit of archrival PepsiCo Inc. was looking for senior executives who could run a business. There was just one hitch: No senior position was immediately available. Despite that Kentucky Fried Chicken offered Larry Drake the title of Vice President, annual compensation of more than \$150,000 and the promise of an executive position within a year. Meanwhile, he would train in the company's restaurants, learning the business from the kitchen up.

This is the fast track, Kentucky Fried Chicken style. For two years, the fast-food chain has been looking across industries, snapping up other companies' seasoned managers for its so-called Designate program. In addition to attracting fresh thinkers in general, Kentucky Fried Chicken uses the program to try to correct one of corporate America's most intractable problems: attracting and keeping female and minority-group executives. The company makes no bones about its goal. "We want to bring in the best people," says Kyle Craig, president of Kentucky Fried Chicken's U.S. operations. But "if there are two equally qualified people, we'd clearly like to have diversity." The program is achieving noteworthy results: In 1989, none of the company's 17 senior U.S. managers were minority or female; today, seven are.

### Slow Climbing

That is a better record than at many American corporations, where, despite widespread efforts, women and members of minority groups have made slow progress climbing the ladder. American companies have tried many strategies for integrating their ranks, including recruiting at minority-group job fairs, hiring diversity consultants and, more recently, retaining search firms owned by women and members of minorities. Gilbert Tweed Associates, a New York executive search firm reports that 14% of this year's searches were dedicated to finding women and minority candidates, double the 7% of 1987. Other companies have proved that however difficult the task of integrating management, it can be done. As of last year, 14% of Xerox Corp.'s managers at the vice president level and above were blacks, up from 3% in 1980. Merck & Co. had 11% minority-group managers by last year, up from 7.2% a decade ago. But these are the exceptions. Among companies with 100 or more employees, whites still account for 90% of managers, with white men outnumbering white women by almost 3-to-1, according to a 1990 study by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Black men account for just 2.9% of managers; black women, 2.1%; Hispanics, less than 3%; and Asians, less than 2%.

### Calling Every Week

Companies say slow progress in minority-group hiring and advancement is caused partly by a limited hiring pool. Many minority-group executives fend off calls from companies once a week, says F. Hassan Shariff, a recruiter for the Johnson Group, another New York search firm. "There's not a lot of them out there," he says. Indeed, Kentucky Fried Chicken's Designate program draws on the same small pool of high-ranking minority- group and women managers that would attract many other companies. But KFC points out that it actively promotes women and blacks into its middle-management ranks, and that its Designate executives help train future executives within the company.

Adding to the struggle to integrate America's executive suites is a series of challenges to affirmative action programs and hiring quotas. Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas has loudly denounced affirmative action programs. Whites say they are being unfairly deprived of jobs by minority-group candidates who are less qualified. Others says affirmative action stigmatizes people by focusing on race instead of talent. Stephen Carter, a Yale University law professor and author of "Reflections of an Affirmative Action Baby." calls affirmative action "racial justice on the cheap" because it is less costly than broad-based social programs. But for Kentucky Fried Chicken, aggressively recruiting minorities and women makes good business sense. The company, which ranks No. 5 in sales in the U.S. among fast-food concerns, says it is second only to McDonald's Corp. in number of black customers. And of its 161 middle managers,. 31% are members of minorities and 26% are women. Kentucky Fried Chicken finds candidates for its Designate program by retaining search firms owned by minority members and women as well as by white men. Armed with the same criteria, each recruiter is asked to produce a different slate of candidates: all white men, all women (white and minority ) or all black men. One person is hired from each search; Mr. Drake competed for his slot against six other black men. Of the 13 people that have been brought in under the program, two are white women, two black women, three black men and six white men.

\* \* \*

Women and minority members who reach the executive suite are "always on stage and on guard," says Nathaniel "Toby" Thompkins, a diversity consultant at Harbridge House, a Boston-based training firm. For Mr. Drake, that's a tough mandate. "I can't be the standard bearer for the entire race," he says. Coca-Cola made no counteroffers when Mr. Drake left because he told them he wouldn't consider any. he says A CocaCola spokesman says Mr. Drake was a "fast-track" manager who was slated for more responsibility within the bottler operations division, though not necessarily an officership. If Mr. Drake felt frustrated at Coke, he had to fasten his seat belt for his ride at KFC. His promotion started in November 1990 with the unlikely task of breading onion rings in inner-city Pittsburgh restaurants, where he later scrubbed floors beside his colleagues in the middle of the night. Then he managed clusters of restaurants and, by last June. entire markets. By July, five months ahead of schedule, Mr. Drake got what he wanted. Now 37 years old, he is KFC's most senior black executive- a vice president and general manager for the Midwest region. He is responsible for 259 company and 805 franchise

restaurants with combined revenues of about \$800 million. Mr. Drake reports to Mr. Craig, KFC's U.S. president, and is considered a candidate for senior positions at PepsiCo's other divisions. \* \* \*

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Race Bias #9 - "Quota Beneficiary Survey Results"**

Here is a snippet from the Wall Street Journal indicating that beneficiaries of quotas and preferences admit to benefitting from them notwithstanding the political utility of denial.

Note also how long this has been going on.

When will it end?

Yggdrasil

-----

Aug. 28, 1979 Wall Street Journal p 1 c 3

**RACE AND SEX** can help more than hinder efforts to get an education.

That view emerges from a survey of 20,000 young persons who finished high school in 1972 and went on to college. Asked in late 1976 if they had been treated unfairly or received special advantages because of race, about 19% of the blacks said they had been treated unfairly, but 25% felt they had special advantages. Among Hispanics, the differential was 13% saying they had been hindered and 22% saying they had been helped.

The study, conducted by Research Triangle Institute of North Carolina, also indicates that being a female was considered a liability by 9% of black women, 8% of Hispanic women and 3% of white women. But it was considered an advantage by 28% of blacks, 22% of Hispanics and 11% of whites.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Race Bias #10 - "Minority Recruiting Industry"

In much of the racial dialogue in the U.S., integrationists dispute the simple fact of anti-white bias in the system. Of course, the media generally propagate our national myths; - myths intended to hide the ball from the majority. But there is one major daily newspaper that consistently reports facts that are inconsistent with our national myths.

This is a fascinating tidbit on the wining and dining of minority executives by corporations recruiting them. Call it the scarcity factor. Note that these searches entail higher costs, with the greatest successes occurring in the absence of real need.

The recommendation is that companies hire before there is a need.

But of course! Once a position is open, competition based on qualifications becomes the prime determinant of the outcome! Much better to hire the minority when there is no opening, no real need, and no embarrassing competition!

Are you surprised?

Yggdrasil-

-----  
[Dec. 23, 1993 Wall Street Journal p B1]

Find the Candidate Before Panic Sets In

COMPANIES SHOULD actively recruit minorities for top executive posts even when there are no openings, says search firm Wesley. Brown & Bartle.

Some 85% of chief executives surveyed by the New York firm say they're committed to hiring high-level minorities, but 62% report a tough time finding such candidates when searching to fill an opening says recruiter Wesley Poriotis.

"Diversity hasn't got a chance once a position is open," Mr. Poriotis says, because the employer isn't likely to make the extra effort to seek out the right minority candidate under the "stress and

angst" of a formal search.

To improve the odds, Mr. Poriotis tracks minority candidates for clients before jobs open and brings the candidates and employers together in informal meetings. For both sides "it's like shop 'til you drop, without the pressure to buy or sell," Mr. Poriotis says.

"Whenever you're recruiting, the more immediate your need, the greater pressure you're under and the more it limits the extent of your search," says Gerald DePalma, senior vice president for human resources at Schieffelin & Somerset Co. a New York beverage marketer. Mr. DePalma says Mr. Poriotis's approach has helped him recruit minority managers because, when he has an opening, "I already have someone who's been tracked.

" \* \*

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Race Bias #11 - "Minority Layoff Protection"

The following excerpt is a classic. Seniority as a criteria for layoffs is abandoned by American business when it results in dismissal of new minority hires. Translation - We now have race-conscious layoff policies as most large corporations.

A long list of bad guys raise their heads up out of the foxhole including General Motors (again), GM Hughes, AT&T, Honeywell, Nynex Corp. and DuPont.

But the shift to performance reviews to select who stays and who goes raises fascinating questions:

Can performance reviews be objective when their purpose is to select white males for dismissal? Is the shift to performance reviews recognition that you must increase the competence of the remaining pool of whites, and make them work harder, to limit the economic damage to the company inflicted by retaining less competent minorities?

Are the costs of early retirement window programs really a cost of diversity efforts?

The focus of the excerpt below is on older white males being discharged in corporate downsizings. But note the charmingly frank quote from an EEO officer at DuPont that "women and minorities must constitute at least 45% of all new hires."

The sad truth is that nearly all large corporations have rigid quotas, just like DuPont's. Those hurt most are young White males who have never enjoyed any of the "benefits" of the system, and who have never had any opportunity to discriminate against anyone.

In fact, you will never see top executives give up their positions. And that, dear reader, is what makes quotas work in this country. As long as the top bosses jobs aren't threatened, look for them to turn their backs on their own kind without a peep of protest!

Yggdrasil-

\* \* \* \* \*

Companies Alter Layoff Policies to Keep Recently Hired Women and Minorities

Sept. 18, 1992 Wall Street Journal p B1

- By JULIE AMPARANO LOPEZ

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

When companies lay off employees these days the last person hired isn't automatically the first one fired.

That's a big boost for women and minorities--but it can leave senior white men out in the cold and employers in a quandary. Major corporations are dropping their "last hired, first fired" rules in order to preserve their carefully cultivated ranks of women and minorities, typically the newest hires. Employers don't want to risk job-bias suits from women and minorities nor jeopardize government contracts tied to affirmative-action efforts. Business leaders say they also must retain women and minorities to compete for an increasingly multi-ethnic and female customer base.

"Many companies are finding a 'last hired, first fired' policy is too damaging to minorities and women," explains Judith Katz, vice president of Kaleel Jamison Consulting Group, a management-consulting firm in Cincinnati. "They're having to resort to other means when downsizing." Among them: sweetened pensions to encourage voluntary retirements, job sharing, reduced workweeks and performance appraisals.

'Only Fair Way'.

\* \* \*

But many businesses that once cut jobs largely through seniority - including Honeywell Inc., Du Pont Co. and American Telephone & Telegraph Co. --say they must trim differently today to protect women and minorities. Honeywell for instance, now uses performance appraisals rather than seniority.

AT&T employed an early-retirement sweetener in 1989 to usher 12,500 managers, largely white males, out the door. It isn't alone. About 40% of the nation's largest companies offered early-retirement programs to employees during 1990 and 1991, according to an August survey by consultants Wyatt Co.

\* \* \*

Caught in the Crunch

The changing corporate strategy means that older white men like James J. Klinikowski, who is 61 years old, are often caught in the crunch. The former AT&T technical-staff engineer and 12-year veteran says he was laid off in 1990. "I won't take anything away from women and minorities," Mr. Klinikowski says. "But there are lots of people like myself who are getting squeezed out. It doesn't seem fair."

Even some white males who survive job cuts feel disheartened. This can be seen at Nynex Corp., which launched an aggressive diversity program in 1986 and which has eliminated 1,700 jobs over the last year through performance reviews and cutting out unnecessary positions. The downsizing largely has affected senior white men. One 52-year-old white Nynex operations manager who remains says he lives in constant fear of losing his job. "You can't help but feel that no one cares about us," he says.

That feeling is also likely to be strong among senior white men at General Motors Corp.'s Hughes Aircraft Co. unit, especially since its new chairman, C. Michael Armstrong, laid down the law. Last June, Hughes announced plans to cut 9,000 jobs over the next 18 months. But the proportion of minority and female employees won't decrease during the layoffs, Mr. Armstrong later told senior management, according to company officials.

\* \* \*

On top of this, the big defense contractor is eager to retain its lucrative federal and state government contracts, which usually require hiring goals for women and minorities. Hughes plans to use performance appraisals and other non-seniority strategies in making job cuts, Mr. Barclay says. The company is providing severance packages that will cost about \$17,000 per terminated employee.

Honeywell, which began restructuring its operations in 1987, has relied on its performance-appraisal system to reduce employment. Under this approach, the Minneapolis controls-systems concern first determines that a particular department is overstaffed. After exempting critical jobs, Honeywell managers decide which positions can be performed by others or are unnecessary. Then they cut posts based on individual performance.

\* \* \*

"Performance appraisals are a fairer process" than seniority, explains Barbara Jerich, Honeywell's director of work-force diversity. "They help weed out insidious biases against women, minorities or people with disabilities," she explains, adding that the performance appraisals "have concrete criteria on which everyone is judged."

Still, Honeywell's practice disturbs some white male managers, who contend that they are being

dismissed disproportionately. Ms. Jerich recently met with a group of these managers to allay their anxieties. She spelled out Honeywell's layoff strategies and explained why a diverse work force is important. Other companies, such as AT&T, are setting up special classes and programs to help these demoralized white male managers.

But hostility can get intense. A black female banker in Los Angeles found that she was the only one in her 12-person department who didn't get laid off last year. All of her other colleagues were white men. Since transferred to another division, she says her new white male colleagues are angry that she was given a job.

"I don't get asked to join them for lunch. They look at my work harder. They don't think I deserved to keep my job," she says. In some cases, a new approach to layoffs has helped to boost the ranks of female and minority employees. Philadelphia Electric Co. reports that the share of its supervisors who are women has increased to 12% from 5% in 1989 while the proportion who belong to minority groups has risen to 9% from 6% three years ago. In 1989, the utility largely abandoned its seniority-based policy in favor of an early retirement program.

When Du Pont drafted its downsizing plan in mid-1991, the Wilmington, Del., chemical maker largely wanted to reduce staffing costs by \$1 billion without destroying its 13-year effort to recruit more women and minorities.

"Historically, in manufacturing plants a seniority system has been used to reduce the work force," says Faith Wohl, who manages Du Pont's diversity and family programs. But with a corporate policy that women and minorities must constitute at least 45% of all new hires, she adds, "we weren't eager to lose something that we had worked on so carefully" since 1979.

Du Pont wants to cut 700 of its 72,427 U.S. jobs by the end of 1993 through a sweetened early-retirement program. The company is looking for excess positions in each unit and then asking eligible individuals to retire early.- Company wide, Du Pont's early-retirement push has trimmed 7,600 jobs since summer 1991, saving about \$700 million. \* \* \*

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Race Bias #12 - "Sensitivity Training"

You may have noticed in Race Bias #11 the following statement:

"Still, Honeywell's practice disturbs some white male managers, who contend that they are being dismissed disproportionately. Ms. Jerich recently met with a group of these managers to allay their anxieties. She spelled out Honeywell's layoff strategies and explained why a diverse work force is important. Other companies, such as AT&T, are setting up special classes and programs to help these demoralized white male managers."

Don't be fooled by the soothing words. "Special classes and programs to help demoralized white male managers" are the new version of the corporate "mailed fist."

Indeed, these programs intended to "help" white males are a new form of corporate terrorism. They are run by the EEO police at each company, and their primary purpose is to humiliate white males and show them how powerless they are.

These "special classes and programs" are intended to induce fear and produce conformity - at penalty of losing your job - a sanction that is made quite explicit in the excerpt below.

The diversity consultants tell CEOs and other top managers to avoid presenting at these sessions. The presence of the CEO or other top manager is likely to provoke a challenge by lower level managers, and a demand that the CEO defend the morality of what he is doing to his own "male hunting group." They work far better if run by "aliens" - outside consultants or an internal EEO policewoman. Then the white male managers know it is pointless to talk back, because the presenter has no power to reverse the policy.

That way, there is nothing for the white male managers to do but grovel and accept the humiliation of having to repeat politically correct nostrums in front of his fellow serfs.

Here is a typical example of private corporate "reeducation" efforts directed at white males.

Again, these types of efforts are not mandated by government, but are pursued by corporations to ensure compliant managerial ranks.

The next time you buy a copier, remember to avoid "Xerox".



Yggdrasil-

## BUSINESS & RACE

----

By Leon E. Wynter

04/18/91 WALL STREET JOURNAL (J), PAGE B1

### Theater Program Tackles Issues of Diversity

AT Xerox, "Gloria," a new black engineer, knits her brow in frustration after a meeting with her white male boss, "Charles." He had paired Gloria with a black secretary for six weeks and then dismissed her bid to join a new product team. He explained he was too afraid of affirmative action backlash to risk giving her a shot.

Worst of all, Charles did this while a room full of Xerox executives looked on in horror.

Gloria and Charles are actors in a unique interactive theater program designed by Cornell University's theater department to help executives face the challenge of managing a diverse work force. After each short play, the actors stay in character for questioning. The action seems so real, a Xerox employee recalls, that after one scene, a Xerox manager jumped up, pointed at Charles and announced, "You're history!"

Xerox has presented the show to 1,300 managers. The company has long stressed affirmative action; the half-day program is a refresher that supplements video training tapes. "You can't ask {a videotape} questions," says Jim Stoffel, a Xerox vice president.

The program succeeds by touching feelings, says Cornell's Janet Salmons-Rue. A scene in which a Hispanic manager's heavily accented words are ignored by whites makes one participant recall his unease with asking a Hispanic employee to repeat things slowly. "I'm not quite sure if I'm embarrassing him," the manager says. The answer, a Xerox trainer tells him, is to ask.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Race Bias #13 - "Minority Promotion Networks"**

The excerpt below gives us another list of American corporations employing preference schemes. In this case, the schemes involve the curious practice of encouraging exclusive minority "networks" in which minorities are encouraged to "strategize" about promotions. - Not the company's success, but \_promotions\_.

You see, some organizations have several parallel corporate objectives. Some employees and managers are expected to get the goods out the door to customers. Other employees and managers - now officially - have the job of getting themselves promoted.

In these corporate cultures, non-preferred employees charged with getting the goods out the door are expected to ignore the blatant promotion seeking activity of the preferred employees, - pretend it doesn't exist - and press on with the company's economic business. Managers running this system have developed a wonderful set of code words, described below, to mollify non-preferred employees who might perceive unfairness in all this.

In any event, we get a nice list of short-sale candidates from this article.

Good luck to Xerox in its drive to show the monolithic Japanese copier companies that "diverse" management ranks are better.

Yggdrasil-

The New Work Force: A New Push to Break the `Glass Ceiling'

---

But Senior Jobs For Minorities Remain Scarce

----

By Leon E. Wynter and Jolie Solomon

Staff Reporters of The Wall Street Journal

11/15/89 WALL STREET JOURNAL (J)

{Part of a Series}

For years, blacks, other minorities and women have complained about the "glass ceiling" -- invisible but real -- that acts as a subtle barrier to promotions into high-level executive jobs.

\* \* \*

Some of Xerox's tactics were considered radical just a few years ago. Among them: encouraging minority caucus groups and national "networks" providing support and advice to black -- and, later, female, Asian and Hispanic -- employees. "Xerox gave them the freedom to help advance themselves," says Glegg Watson, a black Xerox executive and co-author of a book on blacks in corporate America.

Today, many other companies are trying to learn from Xerox. Johnson & Johnson and Polaroid Corp. have contacted Xerox recently to find out about its policies.

Amoco Corp., seeking the best way to establish some form of minority employee groups, looked to Xerox for guidance. "Their reputation is that they do a good job," says Wayne Anderson, vice president for human resources.

Xerox officials say they didn't set out to promote minorities with the changing labor market in mind, yet they see definite advantages in being out front in promoting minorities. "We believe we will have an edge on people who are trying to catch up to the work force of the '90s," says Mr. Rand, the Xerox marketing chief. "The manager of the future is one who can relate to all parts of the population, with the ability to manage minorities, females, etc. and be managed by them."

\* \* \*

Xerox's push started in the 1970s, when managers of the company's affirmative action program examined the careers of 10 top executives to find "the key job without which they would not have made it to where they were," says Theodore Payne, the company's affirmative action manager. Xerox found that the common "pivotal" job was that of first-level sales manager. But an internal survey showed that all of the company's 500 first-level sales managers were white. The affirmative-action managers had their work cut out.

"We would go to a regional vice president and ask, 'How many {blacks} can you get to be a sales manager?'" Mr. Payne recalls. The carrot was that Xerox based 20% of a manager's performance review on success with human-resources management, including affirmative

action. The stick was unequivocal messages from two consecutive chairmen, C. Peter McColough and David T. Kearns, that this program was going to succeed -- or else.

The program met with some resistance from white managers. "There were some . . . who just could not adjust," Mr. Payne recalls. "Some left, others just got crunched up." No one got fired, he says "but some had to be put out of harm's way. If the manager had trouble with blacks," he says, they usually had other problems dealing with people.

In changing its culture, Xerox never tried to dismantle its informal white, male old-boy network. Instead, the company allowed a black network to flourish. Groups sprang up in every major regional headquarters city.

At first, Xerox did nothing to sanction the groups. But when the first confrontations with management arose, Xerox's Mr. Kearns, then head of U.S. marketing, supported the caucus-group concept. Says Mr. Rand, now in the top marketing post: "We knew we had to establish our own support network, our own communications channels, because we were not part of the old-boy network. We called it `revolution by telephone.'"

The caucus groups met on their own time to develop advancement strategies. Mr. Rand says his group met after work in one another's homes and videotaped their sales presentations for group critiques. "If a sales rep wasn't performing well, another black sales rep might go into that person's territory and find them prospects," Mr. Rand says of the early days. One change the caucus sought and won was getting Xerox to post stepping-stone job openings, a system many large companies still resist.

But Howard Holley, a black district manager in San Diego, worries that the groups' effectiveness may be waning because newer employees, finding a system in place, are complacent. "The people coming into the organization now don't feel as threatened," Mr. Holley says.

As the groups succeeded, some whites in the company grew concerned. "There were numbers of white male employees who were worried when they saw how aggressively we were moving," says Richard Healy, who ran Xerox's Eastern U.S. region for most of this decade. "If I chose to place a ready black candidate or female, sometimes the white employees would come up and say, `What about me?'" recalls Mr. Healy, who is white.

Mr. Healy, now a top marketing strategist for Xerox, says a company policy of candor about its affirmative-action goals was a major deterrent to backlash from suspicious white males. "It was a matter of convincing people that they too would have their chance. It was a matter of speaking about it very openly."

To be sure, Xerox's success hasn't been universal or complete. Mr. Watson, who studied hundreds of black executives for his book on blacks in corporations, says minorities haven't had as much success breaking barriers in Xerox's financial-services business or in the important international arena. "When blacks become as successful {in those areas}, then Xerox as a whole will be by far the ultimate corporate model," Mr. Watson says.

Even within sales, "I still think we have too high a rate of turnover of minorities," Mr. Holley says. He adds that Xerox can only sustain its goals by staying vigilant in training new workers.

Mr. Rand believes Xerox will be one of the first companies prepared to test the value of American cultural diversity against Japanese homogeneity in the global marketplace. If Xerox, whose dominance in copying machines has been targeted by Japanese rivals, can prevail, "we'd like to be able to stand up and say that we've done that as a multicultural company," Mr. Rand says. "I think that will serve as a beacon for the rest of American industry."

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Race Bias #14 - "The Weber Case Revisited"**

Below are excerpts from a 1978 Wall Street Journal Article on the famous "Weber" Case. These excerpts are from an article explaining the importance of the case for survival of private programs that discriminate in hiring and promotion against European-Americans.

The Supreme Court agreed to review a Fifth Circuit court decision holding that promotion quotas set aside exclusively for blacks violate the Civil Rights Act. On review, the Supremes held in 1979 that private business was free to discriminate against European-Americans in any way it wished, thereby overruling the Fifth Circuit.

Translation! - Despite its neutral language, the prohibition against discrimination on account of race under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not apply to whites!

In 1995, the Supreme Court made news by holding that race preferences for minorities in federal contracting were illegal. However, the decision did nothing to overturn Weber.

Welcome to the hierarchy of race preferences and political resistance!

Contract set-asides are politically dangerous because the low bidders (unlike the Brian Webbers of this country) have resources and can effectively complain to their congressmen and sponsor opposing candidates if they do not get their way. Their resources could also be used to create institutions that might marshal opposition to affirmative action and, more broadly, integrationism in all its aspects.

To cripple opposition, it is most important for the liberals to get rid of quotas in government contracting.

Far less powerful are the rank and file employees like Brian Weber. The integrationsists have less to fear from them.

Less powerful still are students seeking college admissions. (Curiously, the "policy prescription" set forth by Herrnstein and Murray in the "Bell Curve" was for universities to keep admissions quotas, but to reduce the gap between white and black average IQs on campus to a half a standard deviation from the current range of from 1 to 2 full standard deviations, so that the differences would not be so obvious to European-Americans on campus.)

Last in power are the taxpayers victimized by direct subsidies and tax breaks for minority business. These are the preference schemes most often supported by the economically conservative integrationists like Jack Kemp and William Bennett with their "enterprise zones" and other direct financial handouts.

These schemes allow the Kemps and Bennetts of this country to advocate outright race preferences and buy minority votes while appearing to respect "rights of the individual".

They would impose the burden of minority preferences exclusively on the taxpayer. The virtue of such schemes is that they tend not to arouse the intense opposition of individual victims such as Brian Weber. (Liberals, on the other hand, prefer schemes that involve direct "in-your-face" degradation of European-American males.)

In any event, you should not be surprised to learn that much of the effort you read about in the press to "roll back" racial preferences is not motivated by principled opposition to them, but rather a concern to "fine tune" them so that the consequences will be less visible to the great mass of European-American sheep who commute the freeways and pay their taxes.

Also, you should not be surprised to learn that the Supreme Court will select cases based on cynical political motives as opposed to constitutional principle.

After all, this is America!

So if we are to see a rollback in affirmative action, expect to see it in contract set-asides and, perhaps, job quotas. But look more for measures that refine it and make it less visible - which is to say to load more of its costs onto the taxpayer generally and onto businesses, with less on to the backs of individual victims.

That said, here is an important background piece on the land-mark case that made employment discrimination against European-Americans perfectly "legal".

Yggdrasil-

Sep. 21, 1978 Wall Street Journal P1 C1

In Bakke's Wake Kaiser Aluminum Case May Help in Clarifying Reverse-Job-Bias Issue

Supreme Court May Consider Attack by White Worker On Preferential Program

Weakness of a Clean Record

By MARILYN CHASE

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Brian Weber, a 31-year-old lab analyst with 10 years' service at the Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. plant in Gramercy, La., says he longs for a crack at a skilled crafts job in which he could double his pay, get greater job security and escape the grind of night work.

However, when he applied for a crafts-retraining program back in April 1974, he was rejected. Mr. Weber is white, and the program called for at least 50% black and female trainees. Initial disbelief turned to anger, says Mr. Weber, who often wears a hard hat decorated with patriotic decals. "I'm not a person to sit down and let this happen--let it happen to me, anyway," he asserts. So eight months and several fruitless complaint procedures later, he sued.

So far, Mr. Weber's claim of reverse discrimination has been upheld in federal district court in New Orleans and in the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals; both courts ruled the Kaiser program illegal. The Supreme Court, which begins its new term Oct. 2, could consider whether to accept Kaiser's appeal shortly after that. If it accepts the case, oral arguments aren't likely to be scheduled until early next year. If the court declines to review it, the Fifth Circuit's decision against the Kaiser plan at the Louisiana plant would remain in force without setting any nationwide standard for the moment.

#### Kaiser's View

Kaiser's attorney, Robert J. Allen Jr., warns that a Supreme Court ruling against the company "would destroy affirmative action as we have practiced it--on a voluntary basis." Although Kaiser's chances of winning its case in the Supreme Court are far from clear, one top federal official says a decision in Kaiser's favor would be "momentous" because it would lend legitimacy to just about any industrial affirmative-action program currently in existence. Moreover, Eleanor Holmes Norton, chief of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, supports Kaiser's program as both "reasonable" and "responsible," and she considers such voluntary programs, "absolutely essential to law enforcement."

Mrs. Norton adds that *Weber v. Kaiser* -exemplifies the contradictory pressures squeezing American companies. "Kaiser," she says, "is a classic example of an employer caught between a rock and a hard place, trying to comply with the law but sued by a white employee." Then she adds: "When law enforcement makes it hard for people to comply voluntarily, then there's something wrong with law enforcement."

The central dilemma: A company that shuns affirmative action runs the risk of a discrimination suit by minority employees, and a company that hasn't a proven history of past bias but



embraces affirmative action --such as Kaiser--runs the risk of a reverse discrimination suit by white employees.

\* \* \*

Kaiser had set up its affirmative-action program to comply with an executive order issued by President Johnson. The order required that companies doing business with the federal government not only refrain from discriminating but take "affirmative action" to correct racial imbalance. Many other companies have begun similar programs to avoid losing federal contracts or to ward off Title VII suits by minorities contending that they have been victims of job bias.

The affirmative-action plan at Kaiser was negotiated between the company and the United Steelworkers of America. It was designed to channel minorities and women at Kaiser into higher-paying skilled-crafts jobs, where they were underrepresented. To achieve this, a training program was devised in which at least one black or female employee had to be admitted for every white male. In effect, the lines of seniority split into minority and white, and as a result some minority trainees were placed ahead of whites with more seniority- including Brian Weber.

"The quota eliminated me (and) a lot of people more senior than me," Mr. Weber charges, adding that white co-workers rallied to his side. "People got behind me," he says. "They put their marbles on the suit." And when black co-workers reply that they have suffered historical discrimination, he responds with what may be the rallying cry for the present wave of reverse-discrimination cases: "Yeah, but that's no reason to do it to me now."

Mr. Weber's attorney, Michael Fontham, charges, "We have what is an out-and-out quota."

Moreover, as in the Bakke case, the Weber case turns on the lack of any proven record of bias at the Gramercy plant on which to justify a quota. Kaiser had determined that blacks and women were outnumbered in the crafts because such jobs formerly had been awarded solely on the basis of seniority and prior experience, where white males traditionally had the edge. Voluntarily-albeit spurred on by federal contract compliance reviews, as are all companies-Kaiser and the union set out to redress that imbalance that sprang from years of social inequality in the South.

"I have no problem with any program designed to return an individual to his rightful place in the company, if the company and the union did anything to prevent him from advancing," Mr. Fontham argues. "But for the company to do it to correct general societal conditions is contrary to our values. People like Brian Weber are having their dreams for the future quashed."

However, many federal contractors prefer to set up an affirmative-action program before their employee rolls are found to be racially imbalanced. "It really puts the contractor at risk to have to wait for the government to come in and find something that's wrong," Assistant Secretary of Labor Donald Elisburg says. A predictable storm of bad publicity and possible loss of a lucrative federal contract make companies anxious to avoid such findings of discrimination, whether by a court or federal agency.

Federal officials believe companies undertaking affirmative action under court order, by consent decree or through conciliation with EEOC, are generally safe from reverse-discrimination complaints. But the Supreme Court has yet to issue any definitive rule guiding employers through the gauntlet of opposing claims by black and white workers. Such a rule could emerge from the Weber case.

\* \* \*

Kaiser's case may indeed be weakened ironically enough--by its clean record, government sources say. Thus, some fear Weber v. Kaiser is a bad test case on which to pin the future of voluntary affirmative-action programs. If the lower courts had found that Kaiser or the union had discriminated against black workers prior to initiating the program, "obviously we would feel a lot stronger about the case," says James D. Henry, associate solicitor of the Labor Department.

Big corporations--some with millions of dollars tied up in their affirmative-action programs--are watching the Weber case warily.

\* \* \*

## Enforcement Impact

Those concerned with enforcing fair employment say their job would be vastly more difficult if the Supreme Court bans voluntary affirmative-action programs in the absence of prior findings of discrimination. "It would be distressing, and it would be very difficult," Assistant Labor Secretary Elisburg says.

The key difficulty is explained by the EEOC's Mrs. Norton. "Employers cannot be expected to admit prior discrimination because that would open them up to liability," she says. Corporate officials agree.

Thomas Hilbert, labor counsel for General Electric Co., criticizes the Fifth Circuit decision as "unrealistic" and "marginal" for requiring proof of past bias. To admit to violations is "a hell of a thing for any company to do," he says, noting that GE's recent \$32 million conciliation

agreement with the EEOC didn't require any such admission.

Distaste for government interference is another reason business hopes voluntary affirmative action survives the Weber case. As Robert Stenberg, Ford Motor Co.'s equal employment planning manager, says, "We function better in the business community when we sort of make our own way."

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Race Bias #15 - "Why 'The Bell Curve' is so Dangerous"

Liberal integrationists never mention the real reason they are frightened to death of "The Bell Curve." Dozens of critical reviews and propagandistic critiques have appeared in the popular press. A massive smear campaign is on. As it happens, there is an excellent reason for this smear campaign.

Buried deep in the book is data so explosive that it cannot be mentioned publicly.

The liberals are hoping that if you read the book, you will concentrate on the passages dealing with differences in the distribution of intelligence between races.

Educated people have known about the heritability of intelligence ever since Jensen published his "Genetics and Education" in 1972.

Ditto for differences in average distribution of intelligence by race - old news.

The integrationists are making all kinds of noise about peripheral issues.

Over the past few weeks Yggdrasil has posted excerpts from a series of news reports of specific race preference schemes carried out by businesses voluntarily in the private sector. Each has a specific example of discrimination against European-Americans.

While these articles are illuminating, all that they really prove is that discrimination against European-Americans occurred in the specific instances discussed in each article.

This is what we call "anecdotal evidence". It proves nothing about the extent of discrimination against European-Americans as a whole, nationwide. The articles only prove that it has occurred.

But Herrnstein and Murray have given us something much more powerful than anecdotal evidence of discrimination. They have given us statistical evidence of the extent of job discrimination against European-Americans, and the extent of that discrimination is going to shock you.

When you measure the occupational attainments of samples of whites, blacks and hispanics with equal numbers of people with the same mental abilities, blacks have twice the number of

people in high status occupations as whites, and latinos 1.5 times more than whites of the same ability.

The affirmative action programs and race preferences for people of color have resulted in blacks obtaining twice the number of desirable jobs at any given ability level as whites.

The discussion appears on page 321.

"But after controlling for IQ, the picture reverses. The chance of entering a high-IQ occupation for a black with an IQ of 117 (which was the average IQ of all the people in these occupations in the NLSY sample) was twice the proportion of whites with the same IQ. Latinos with an IQ of 117 had more than a 50% higher chance of entering a high-IQ occupation than whites with the same IQ. This phenomenon applies across a wide range of occupations, as discussed in more detail in Chapter 20."

In other words, you cannot measure discrimination by simply measuring the absolute number or percentage of European-Americans in high IQ jobs. To test for discrimination you must correct for the fact that there are many more European-Americans with high IQs as a percent of the population.

To test for discrimination, you have to test equal numbers of persons of the same ability, and when you do that, you find that blacks get twice the number of good jobs. For Latinos, it is 1.5 times the number of good jobs.

That is statistical evidence of massive discrimination against European-Americans.

As an aside, it was an article by this same Charles Murray, quoted in Yggdrasil's Lesson 4, that aroused Yggdrasil from his long period of inactivity.

In that article, Professor Murray pointed out that the illegitimacy rate among European-Americans had reached 24%, a tipping point at which additional illegitimacy and societal decay accelerate dramatically.

As you read this, an army of 5 million illegitimate young European-American male babies is being born. They will be young adults in 20 years.

The Ygg may be too old to participate when things get really hot 20 years from now, but heat up they will!

It is going to be a very exciting 20 years. -- Stay tuned!

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Race Bias #16 - "Minority Business Bootstrapped"**

In much of the racial dialogue in the U.S., integrationists dispute the simple fact of anti-white bias in the system. Of course, the media generally propagate our national myths; myths intended to hide the ball from the majority. But there is one major daily newspaper that consistently reports facts that are inconsistent with our national myths.

Now here is one example of the many hundreds of discriminatory private investment programs that favor non-whites establishing businesses.

If you expect to compete against this sort of favoritism, you had better plan your business very carefully. Again, this behavior is not compelled by law.

By the way, TIAA-CREF is the provider of retirement annuities for most of the nation's university professors. It is one of the largest asset managers in the U.S.

Are you surprised?

Yggdrasil-

BUSINESS & RACE

----

By Leon E. Wynter

09/21/93 WALL STREET JOURNAL (J), PAGE B1

Arranged Marriage Meets Commitment

MANY socially conscious companies pledge to increase business with minority suppliers. But if no minority firm is large enough for the job, a big company sometimes creates one.

That is what the giant New York annuity company Teachers Insurance & Annuity Association College Retirement Equities Fund did recently. It shepherded a joint venture between PM Realty Group, Houston, a large white-owned manager of commercial properties, and RMC

Group, New York, owned by veteran black real estate consultant Richmond McCoy. The McCoy/PM Realty Group, launched in June, is 52% owned by RMC and is the nation's largest minority-owned full-service property manager. To seal the deal, TIAA-CREF and PM's parent, Jupiter Industries, Chicago, each committed 1.25 million square feet of property for McCoy/PM to manage.

Patrick Jolivet, TIAA-CREF associate manager for real estate, says he wanted to avoid creating a minority "front" firm -- one only nominally controlled by minorities. He says the joint venture creates "a truly minority-owned firm that can compete with all other management-leasing companies on their own terms."

Mr. McCoy says RMC Group, begun in 1991, stumbled at first by focusing on corporate and government "set-aside" work and serving other minority firms. "You go down that route, you're destined for failure," he says, because that strategy doesn't generate enough work.

McCoy/PM has 3,500 employees -- mostly contributed by PM -- in 22 states. Minorities are almost invisible as managers in the management-leasing industry; Mr. McCoy plans to hire minorities "whenever possible" to change that. \* \* \*

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Race Bias #17 - "The Minority Franchise"**

A preferred way to favor minorities in business is for a restaurant chain to grant franchises to minority owners on a preferential basis.

Typically, the parent corporation provides 100% financing.

The snippet below is included to show that being a minority is the only way to get a franchise from Pizza Hut, a Pepsi unit.

Yggdrasil-

BUSINESS & RACE

----

By Leon E. Wynter

03/24/92 WALL STREET JOURNAL (J), PAGE B1

\* \* \*

Former Pizza Hut Official Takes Big Franchise Slice

PIZZA HUT christened the nation's largest black-owned fast-food franchise company last month.

Larry Lundy, until recently the chain's vice president of restaurant development, purchased 31 stores in the New Orleans area for a price that industry specialists estimate at \$15.5 million.

Pizza Hut, a PepsiCo subsidiary, says it is making developing minority franchises a priority. Last fall the chain put another former executive, Mexican-American Eugene Camarena, into 12 Amarillo, Texas, stores. In both cases, Pizza Hut, which owns more than half of the chain's 7,500 U.S. stores, sold pieces of its own territory. Being a minority "is now the only way to get into a Pizza Hut franchise at this time," says Vincent Berkeley, vice president, minority affairs.

But the company's system historically has been hard for minorities to crack. Unlike other chains, Pizza Hut franchises large, exclusive geographic areas, making it tough for newcomers to start businesses from one or two stores.

Pizza Hut won't disclose figures, but sources familiar with the chain say it has about 300 minority-owned stores. That figure probably will shrink soon. The company is expected to buy about 240 stores from Cuban-American franchisee Arturo Torres to resolve a legal dispute. \* \* \*

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Race Bias #18 - "A Boost for Black Media"**

It is no surprise that Time Warner backs black owned entertainment firms. But in the excerpt below, N.J. Nicholas, Time Warner's President, says that "national tastes are made in the black community."

Wishful thinking? - or just code words for how the entertainment industry wants whites to adopt black culture? Blacks have greater brand loyalty, have a negative marginal propensity to save as income rises, and are more given to impulse and status motivated purchases. If you are pushing ad time for beer, automobiles and perfumes you want an audience responsive to advertising! Small wonder Time Warner wants whites to adopt black culture.

Hey folks. No ideology here! Just good old fashioned self interest! You see, if you are in the right business, white hating is good business!

Yggdrasil-

BUSINESS & RACE

----

By Leon E. Wynter

12/12/90 WALL STREET JOURNAL (J), PAGE B1

Time Warner Funds Black Media Firms

WHAT DO producer Quincy Jones, publishers Charles Harris and Donald Anderson, broadcaster Pierre Sutton and cable-channel operator Robert Johnson have in common?

They're emerging black media powers with the same titanic silent partner: Time Warner. The alliances, most made since 1988, are strategic, says Time Warner president N.J. Nicholas Jr., because many national tastes are made in the black community.

Time Warner stands behind Quincy Jones Entertainment Co. in movies, television and records. "Fresh Prince of Bel Air" is already a TV hit. Time Warner also has a stake in Black

Entertainment Television, the only black-oriented cable service.

Time Warner's minority stake in Emerge, a new magazine which aims to lead black opinion, raised some African-American eyebrows at first. But Mr. Anderson the publisher says such liaisons will sharply expand the power of black media ventures. "From a black perspective," he says, "I hope like hell that somebody tries to copy this soon."

Analysts were unaware of any imitators, but Raymond Katz of Shearson Lehman Brothers says the Time Warner style has always been to find talent in new markets, "plant the seed and leave them alone."

Mr. Nicholas says more deals will be forthcoming, perhaps another magazine. \* \* \*

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Race Bias #19 - "Dole's 32 Page List"**

In the early days following the Republican takeover of both houses of Congress, Bob Dole ordered the Congressional Research Service to compile a list of federal race preferences.

Below are selections from that list printed by the Wall Street Journal. Since the list was published, Dole's handlers have told him that an attack on race preferences would be very dangerous politically, because of the treatment that can be expected from the media and because of the inevitable confusion it would create among women.

You will find a noteworthy definition of "minority" in the "Housing" paragraph.

Yggdrasil-

Feb. 27, 1995 Wall Street Journal p A12

### Affirmative Action in Action

This week, Sen. Bob Dole released a 32 page list, compiled by the Congressional Research Service, of federal programs designed to achieve affirmative action goals. Here are some excerpts:

**Agriculture:** The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized "to set aside a portion of funds" appropriated for certain research on the production and marketing of alcohols and industrial hydrocarbons for grants to colleges and universities to achieve "the objective of full participation of minority groups."

**Aviation:** All grantees, sponsors, or planning agencies with 50 or more aviation employees who participate in projects which receive federal airport aid funds are required to maintain "affirmative action" plans containing "goals and timetables" derived from "[a] comparison . . . of the percent of minorities and women in the employer's present aviation workforce . . . with the percent of minorities and women . . . in the total workforce" in the SMSA or surrounding area.

**Banking:** "No grant shall be made . . . for any project" under the Local Public Works Capital Development and Investment Program "unless at least 10 percent of the amount of such grant will be expended for contracts with and/or supplies from minority business enterprises."

Communications: Existing FCC licensees in jeopardy of having their licenses revoked or whose policies have been designated for a renewal hearing are given the option of selling the license to a minority-owned or controlled firm for up to 75% of fair market value.

Defense: Establishes a goal of awarding 5% of the total value of Department of Defense procurement, research and development, military construction, and operation and maintenance contracts to "socially and economically disadvantaged individuals," historically black colleges and universities, and minority institutions in each of the fiscal years from 1987 to 2000.

Education: Reservation of 25% of the excess of certain educational appropriations for allocation "among eligible institutions at which at least 60 percent of the students are African Americans, Hispanic Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, or Pacific Islanders, or any combination thereof."

Government employees: Performance appraisals for the Senior Executive Service take account of individuals' "meeting affirmative action goals, achievement of equal employment opportunity requirements, and compliance with merit principles."

Housing: The policy of the Department of Housing and Urban Development is "to foster and promote Minority Business Enterprise participation in its procurement program, to the extent permitted by law and consistent with its primary mission. For this purpose, "minority" is defined as "Black Americans, Hispanic Americans, Native Americans, Asian Pacific Islanders and Asian Indian Americans, and Hasidic Jewish Americans."

Justice: Recipients of Criminal Justice Improvement Act funds shall be selected for post-award compliance reviews in part on the basis of "[t]he relative disparity between the percentage of minorities, or women, in the relevant labor market, and the percentage of minorities, or women, employed by the recipient."

NASA: The administrator is required to annually establish a goal of at least 8% of the total value of prime and subcontracts awarded in support of authorized programs to be made to small disadvantaged businesses and minority educational institutions.

Railroads: First right to hire of certain previously separated or furloughed railroad employees subject to exceptions for vacancies covered by "(1) an affirmative action plan, or a hiring plan designed to eliminate discrimination, that is required by Federal or State statute, regulation, or Executive order, or by the order of a Federal court or agency, or (2) a permissible voluntary affirmative action plan."

Transportation: Department of Transportation regulations establish a rebuttable presumption that women, African-Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, Asian-Pacific Americans, Asian-Americans and those economically certified under section 8(a) of the Small Business Act are

socially and economically disadvantaged. Recipients of surface transportation funds must establish overall goals for disadvantaged business participation on funded projects and, absent a waiver from the DOT Secretary, must insure that at least 10% of monies expended on federally assisted projects go to such enterprises.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Race Bias #20 - "Contract Set-Asides"

Reprinted below are excerpts from four articles describing the extent of race preferences in governmental contracting, known as "set-asides."

Many European-Americans are aware of the racial preferences in college admissions and in employment that disadvantage them.

However, few European-Americans are aware of the extent and scope of the governmental preferences extended to minority owned private business. It is a massive effort to direct the tax dollar toward creating a prosperous minority elite.

You see, most people with jobs (even very high paying jobs in the "information elite") are really wage slaves. They have no time for political organizing and no real independence.

To really participate in the political process and to shape public opinion, one must have economic assets and liesure time.

And that is the real purpose of governmental contract set- asides, - to create a prosperous minority class with the liesure and resources to support the integrationist politicians at your expense.

Political programs are established with political ends in mind, and not for abstract reasons like "racial equity".

That is why if you follow the money flows, you will arrive at the truth, and as the following exerpts show, there is a great deal of money flowing through the various governmental agencies, all of which now have preferences for minority recipients.

Yggdrasil-

-----  
Feb. 1, 1978 Wall Street Journal P5 C2

Broadcasting Equity For Minority Groups Is Sought by Carter



## Steps to Alter Policy of SBA, FCC Aren't Anticipated To Have Startling Results

By a WALL STREET JOURNAL staff Reporter

WASHINGTON--The Carter administration announced new steps aimed at encouraging minority ownership of radio and television stations and cable-TV systems. \* \* \* So the White House announced revisions in Small Business Administration loan policies to provide up to \$350,000 in direct loans or \$500,000 in federally backed loans for broadcast uses per applicant. \* \* \*

As profitable broadcast properties usually carry multimillion-dollar price tags, any minority purchases probably will be limited to less profitable radio stations in the South and Southwest, where minority audiences are larger, said Henry Geller, a Commerce Department communications consultant. at a press briefing here. The stations Mr. Geller has in mind sell for \$350,000.

The White House, through its Office of Telecommunications Policy, also gave its backing to proposals pending before the Federal Communications Commission that would encourage minority ownership of broadcast properties.

One proposal would let the FCC use its power to defer certain federal taxes in situations where owners sell broadcast properties to minority-controlled buyers.

A second proposal would permit a broadcaster threatened with loss of his license-- usually as the result of an FCC rule infraction--to sell to a minority buyer and thus avoid having to defend himself in FCC license-renewal proceedings. If owners were anxious to avoid FCC hearings their asking prices could be significantly below the going market rates, supporters of this proposal contend. \* \* \*

-----  
1978 (Undated) Wall Street Journal

Helping Hand

Minority-Group Firms Get More Subcontracts Under Federal Projects

Agencies Set Flexible Goals For Giving U.S. Orders; Some Concerns Are Saved

But One 'Nightmare' Is Cited By DAVID GUMPURT

\* \* \*

Mr. Rodriguez's break stemmed from an unlikely source--his Cuban ancestry. The Department of Transportation, in dispensing \$1.75 billion of rail-revitalization funds, has set a goal that 15% or more of the money be directed to companies owned by blacks, Hispanics and other racial minorities. Thus the Rodriguez subcontract was awarded by a contractor-a joint venture between San-Vel Soncrete Corp., Littleton, Mass., and a division of Santa Fe International Corp., Orange, Calif.-that had pledged to find minority subcontractors as a condition of its own contract.

### Significant Upturn

Such goals and pledges are fast increasing the federal money going to minority businesses. Although the idea of expanding minority jobs and strengthening minority communities has been around since the late 1960s, only in the past couple of years have significant federal orders been awarded.

As a result, "market opportunities for minority firms have increased," says John Gloster, president of Opportunity Funding Corp., a Washington, D.C., venture-capital firm that aids minority businesses. In a few cases he adds, the money has poured in so rapidly that minority firms have run into difficulties from expanding too fast.

The exact amount of federal money involved isn't known, but it appears to be well over \$1 billion a year and growing fast. In the fiscal year ended last Sept. 30, about \$1.2 billion of a total of approximately \$75 billion of federal procurements went to minority businesses. That share is up from \$807 million two years earlier, according to the Office of Minority Business Enterprise, a Commerce Department agency that encourages increased spending with minority businesses. (The proportion of additional billions of dollars of federal grants, public-works projects and other federal spending going to minority businesses isn't known, although an official of the Office of Minority Business Enterprise terms the amount "very small." )

### Bakke Case Discounted

Moreover, government officials and representatives of minority business groups don't expect the Supreme Court's recent Bakke decision to change the trend. In the Bakke case, the high court expressed disapproval of arbitrary quotas favoring minorities but backed affirmative-action programs in general in ruling that a white applicant to the University of California Medical School at Davis was unjustly denied admission because of a minority- recruitment program. Government and minority-group representatives contend that the federal spending

programs aiding minority businesses aren't arbitrary because the programs are based on provable past discrimination. They also argue that the programs aren't rigid but rather allow flexibility based on the availability of minority companies in different geographical areas and among different industries.

Government spending with minority firms has been increased in several ways. A Commerce Department public-works program that dispensed \$4 billion this fiscal year included a requirement that at least 10%, or \$400 million, of contracts go to minority firms. Apparently the minority share actually was closer to \$600 million, according to a Commerce Department official. At least one heavy-spending federal agency, the Department of Transportation, has attempted on its own to increase spending with minority businesses. It adopted the 15% minority-spending goal for the recently started Northeast corridor project. In addition, since last year the agency's Urban Mass Transportation Administration has been requiring municipalities to offer evidence that federal mass-transit grants will partly benefit minority firms. And an order issued last March by Transportation Secretary Brock Adams requires the department's other agencies to set up minority spending programs even if "this may result in some increased cost."

#### More Efforts Slated

Such efforts are due to proliferate. President Carter has called for a tripling by the end of fiscal 1979 of the \$1.2 billion of federal procurements from minority firms last year. Consequently, several agencies are said to be reexamining their procurement practices. The Department of the Interior, for instance, is contemplating a goal that 20% of its spending be with minority firms.

In addition, a proposal currently before Congress would strengthen the government's ability to encourage minority- business subcontracting by requiring winners of contracts exceeding \$1 million for construction and \$500,000 for other purposes to work out a plan for such subcontracts before the contracts are awarded. Under current law, federal contractors must simply show, after contracts are completed, that the contractors did their best to find minority subcontractors.

\* \* \*

-----

Enterprise: Lawmakers Seek More RTC Business for Minorities

---

Strict Provision on Distribution of Contracts Is Inserted in House Funding Bill

----

By Albert R. Karr

Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal

06/24/93 WALL STREET JOURNAL (J), PAGE B2

WASHINGTON --

\* \* \*

Pressured by the Clinton administration, the RTC has recently become more vigorous about extending contracts to minority and women-owned companies. But critics in Congress contend that companies owned by white women receive an inordinate share of the agency's contracts aimed at minorities and women.

Companies owned by white women received 27% of the RTC's contracts during the first five months of 1993, even though only slightly more companies owned by white women than minority concerns have registered as potential contract seekers. Minority-owned companies got 13% of those contracts. Black and Hispanic-owned businesses did garner a slightly higher proportion of the fees, however. The contracts primarily cover financial and asset analysis and management of failed thrifts.

Black and Hispanic House members have successfully pushed for additional language in the RTC funding bill that would require women and minority contracts to be spread more evenly between those groups. "The RTC has proven itself unable to keep up with what they tell Congress they will do" about giving contracts to minority-owned businesses, says Rep. Maxine Waters, a black Democratic lawmaker from California. "It has been very tough to rely on them simply to do the right thing," she adds.

The House measure would force the RTC to write guidelines for achieving "reasonably even distribution of contracts" between various subgroups, such as women, blacks and Hispanics. A roughly equal allotment of contracts would have to be made to any subgroup that accounts for at least 5% of all companies registered with the agency. The bill also would impose sanctions on prime contractors that violate joint-venture and subcontracting requirements involving the use of minority companies. The Senate version of the RTC funding bill doesn't carry such language.

\* \* \*

Some RTC officials also appear to favor giving more contracts to minority-owned businesses. Last year, the agency set a goal of awarding 30% of its contracts to businesses owned by women or minorities. The RTC reports that goal has been exceeded lately. But Johnnie Booker, a black woman recently promoted to RTC vice president for minority women's programs, has said that she may recommend a goal of 20% for minorities alone.

The Clinton administration and the Democratic House leadership need black and Hispanic votes to pass the RTC measure. They worry that the minority-contracting provisions could help to defeat the legislation on the House floor, however.

Opponents argue that this approach would snarl the RTC in de facto "quotas within quotas." Rep. Stephen Neal (D., N.C.), chairman of the House Banking Committee's financial institutions subcommittee, recently said he favored the goals of the provisions, but didn't want to "inspire opposition from a number of people who would be automatically opposed to anything that had quotas."

Overall, the RTC is giving a rising share of contracts to minority and womenowned companies. In the first five months of this year, 41% of its awards and 36% of its fees went to such companies, up from 34% and 29%, respectively, in all of 1992. A recent report from the congressional General Accounting Office noted "significant" gains in RTC efforts to award contracts to companies owned by minorities and women. The report praised the agency for creating a specific office to push this program and for setting specific goals.

But "key areas still need improvement," the GAO said.

Separately, minorities and women-owned underwriters have collected \$13 million in fees since the RTC's mortgage-loan securitization program began two years ago. That represents 5% of the amounts paid to large, non-minority companies, the agency says.

\* \* \*

-----  
Politics & Policy: Supreme Court's Study of Affirmative Action Turns to Federal Plans Aiding Minority Firms

----  
By Stephen Wermiel and Mary Lu Carnevale Staff Reporters of The Wall Street Journal

WASHINGTON -- The Supreme Court, which last year forced state and local governments to scrap or revamp hundreds of affirmative-action plans, is zeroing in on federal programs to aid minority businesses.

In arguments this week, the high court will examine the constitutionality of Federal Communications Commission policies that encourage minorities and women to own radio and television stations.

But the two cases -- the biggest civil-rights cases of the court term -- could have effects far beyond the broadcasting industry, calling into question a range of other federal affirmative-action programs that give businesses owned by minorities or women an advantage in competing for government contracts.

"Potentially, the stakes could be that the court will set forth legal standards that apply to all federal programs," says John Payton, a Washington lawyer who filed a brief in the court for the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law.

\* \* \*

The Justice Department says the Constitution allows Congress to adopt programs that give preference to minorities and women. In several federal courts the department is defending a public-works program passed by Congress for the Transportation Department. That program requires contractors for highway and airport construction to give businesses run by minorities, women and other "disadvantaged" groups at least 10% of their subcontracts.

\* \* \*

Legally, the Supreme Court must reconcile two previous decisions. In 1980, the justices upheld a public-works program passed by Congress requiring that 10% of construction contracts go to minority businesses. But last year, in a case involving Richmond, Va.'s, effort to channel contracts to minorities, the court said state and local governments have very limited authority to institute such minority-preference programs. The two cases deeply divided the court, producing a total of 11 separate opinions. \* \* \*

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Race Bias #21 - "Private Quotas - Law"

Reprinted below is an excerpt from a Wall Street Journal article on programs maintained by large businesses in the United States that grant explicit race-conscious preferences in hiring suppliers.

The reason for including this article is the splendid example of affirmative action newspeak. First, the spokesman for the black American Bar Association (an organization that would be illegal if working for the interests of whites) states that retaining minorities has become "an intrinsic part of strategy for lowering outside counsel expenditures."

But then GM's general counsel for its Saturn Division states that GM has "increased billings with minority law firms and partners to well over \$7 million last year, without substantially raising the costs of hiring outside counsel."

Next, the black spokesman states that the cost cutting urge shouldn't lead companies "into assuming that minority attorneys should be asking for less compensation in return for cracking the barriers."

Fascinating view of how markets work! With few exceptions, every white business lawyer starting his own firm must undercut the price of the older, more established firms to get business.

Embedded in the quota mentality is this concept of special privilege. Minorities starting out do not have to offer the customer lower prices, as do their white counterparts starting new firms. They get to hunt on a restricted economic reservation, insulated from competition.

The excerpt below is an object lesson in the necessity for careful reading. The slogan and the reality are two different things.

The program is not mandated by government. Note especially the demand of General Motors for race based billings information. Remember this the next time you buy a car.

Yggdrasil-

Nov. 23, 1994 Wall Street Journal p B1 Good Counsel For Minority Lawyers

THE COLOR OF LAW is changing, according to Roger N. Gordon, publisher of the Minority Counsel Report. Some 18% of the current first-year law school class is black, Hispanic or Asian. The Washington, D.C., newsletter advises aspiring lawyers of color on getting the most out of corporate initiatives to engage more minority lawyers as outside counsel.

Some 200 major corporations and 300 to 400 minority partners and minority-owned law firms participate in programs begun by the black American Bar Association. Other companies are using more minority lawyers, Mr. Gordon says, as the movement has gone "from a 'good thing to do' to being an intrinsic part of strategy for lowering outside counsel expenditures."

Since 1987, General Motors has increased billings with minority law firms and partners to well over \$7 million last year, without substantially raising the costs of hiring outside counsel, says David A. Collins, general counsel for GM's Saturn division. Like all small firms, minority firms "are lean and hungry with low overhead and less complacency," Mr. Collins says, but that shouldn't lead companies "into assuming that minority attorneys should be asking for less compensation in return for cracking the barriers."

Mr. Gordon notes that publicly regulated firms and those that regularly appear before urban juries also are using more minority lawyers. He advises minority attorneys to look for a mandate from top management and to examine how it affects dealings with nonminority firms. GM, for example, requires law firms to break out billings by race and gender, and notifies firms of its "comfort" with being assigned minority partners, Mr. Collins says. \* \* \*

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

## YGGDRASIL

### **Race Bias #22- "Pressure Your Suppliers"**

We learned in Race Bias #21 that large corporations set aside a certain fraction of their purchases for minority suppliers.

But it goes further - much further than that!

Here is an example of a program run by Chrysler pressuring its suppliers do the same thing, - set aside a portion of their purchases for minority suppliers. Chrysler is behaving like a government, indulging in social and political engineering.

And all of this is based on race, not economic status.

Poor Whites who have started a small business need not apply.

Yggdrasil-

-----

DETROIT (AP) -- A 17-month-old Chrysler Corp. program that encourages the automaker's big suppliers to buy from minority-owned businesses has nearly doubled the total spent on such contracts, the company says.

The program asks Chrysler's direct suppliers to buy at least 5 percent of their supplies from minority-owned businesses.

Chrysler's direct suppliers bought \$221 million worth of products from minority companies in 1993, Chrysler said. In the first half of this year, the total was \$202 million.

About 80 percent of the Chrysler's direct suppliers have made efforts to reach the 5 percent target, the company said.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Race Bias #23 - "Finding Minority Suppliers"

A vast effort is underway in corporate America to prefer minority owned business in contracting. This practice is compelled by minority "set asides" in state and federal contracts. However, the practice is pursued as well by many businesses not under government compulsion.

The practice is so entrenched that a supporting industry has grown up around supplying large American corporations with information and contacts to minority business. The article quoted below is but one example.

These aren't preferences for \$7 an hour jobs. We are talking about real money here!

Yggdrasil-

## BUSINESS & RACE

----

By Leon E. Wynter

09/21/93 WALL STREET JOURNAL (J), PAGE B1

\* \* \*

### Supplying a Minority Or Female Supplier

NEED a minority or female supplier fast? Thomas Publishing, a 95-year-old New York company that puts out reference books used by manufacturers, recently started a service to connect manufacturers with such suppliers.

Many government and corporate programs require manufacturers to use minority and women-owned suppliers. Users of Thomas's service can search by telephone keypad through 3,500 product categories and receive information on suppliers within an hour, by fax.

Thomas lists 10,000 suppliers so far and has started signing up subscribers, at \$390 a year.

Suppliers are listed free of charge, with self-reported information as to their certifications as non-white-male-owned firms by government and private agencies. About two-thirds of the suppliers in the database have no proof of certification, however, because many companies ignore getting such approvals.

This worries Harriet Michel, executive director of the National Minority Supplier Development Council, the largest private certification group, because bogus "minority" suppliers may mislead subscribers, at certified firms' expense. \* \* \*

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Race Bias #24 - "Billions in Set-Asides"**

The excerpts from an article quoted below indicate that billions of dollars each year are "set aside" for minority contractors on the basis of their race:

"Keep in mind, bidding preferences are only a variant of longer-standing disadvantaged business breaks. The main program, called 8(a), has resulted in 95,000 contracts valued at \$48 billion since its inception. These are typically "solesourced"-meaning no bids. The list of 8(a) eligible firms totals 5,400, and includes 32 of the top 100 black businesses in the U.S. A single company has piled up \$440 million in 8(a) business."

Under the 8a program, a total of \$48 billion of contracts have been let to minority business with no competitive bidding at all.

The excerpts that follow are included to demonstrate what may be expected from Clinton's "review" of affirmative action. He and his favored minority constituencies are looking for methods to conceal the racial preferences or to otherwise make them look as if they could benefit poor European-Americans as well.

While the "disadvantaged business" bidding preference scheme purports to grant a preference to Appalachians or rural whites, the article notes that less than 1% of "disadvantaged businesses" certified by the Small Business Administration are non-minority, even though these groups comprise more than 50% of the economically disadvantaged.

The excerpts also make clear that one need not be poor to qualify.

Once again, the real purpose is to create a wealthy class of minorities with the resources and the leisure time to participate in the political process. Liberal politicians expect concrete practical benefits from these programs.

Thus, there is a sharp contrast between the highly paid wage slaves of the information elite at the consulting firms and investment banks who must work 60 hour weeks and have no time whatever for political organizing, and the caste of middle class blacks with contracting businesses and plenty of time for such organizing.

That is the intended result of these programs.

In any event, look for the cruder forms of preference in the "sole source" contracts to be repackaged into something more neutral sounding, like the "disadvantaged business" preferences described below.

But the truth is that these programs have more to do with the distribution of political power in our country than with economic fairness. That is why the liberals can say with a straight face that they do not intend to damage European-Americans by operating them. Their intent is merely to provide political resources to their minority allies to maintain the political machine that enforces the relatively benign form of "fractional slavery" enforced against the great herds of freeway commuting, middle class European-Americans.

After all, that is where the real money is!

Yggdrasil-

-----

Mar. 14, 1995 Wall Street Journal A19

Race (etc.) Preferences on the Line

Business World

By Tim W. Ferguson

You'd think from some press accounts that the affirmative- action fight was over before it began. The California Civil Rights Initiative hasn't even gotten its first signature, yet quotas and preferences seem to be halfway out the window.

Afraid not. Formal favoritism is well bunkered. In Washington, President Clinton may be trying one of his straddles, but an executive-branch "review" that leads only to policy pablum about helping the needy of all colors won't root out programs that are deeply insinuated in admissions, hiring and contracting processes. Federal efforts in this area--discreetly numbering 160, according to Sen. Robert Dole--mostly have origins in the Nixon administration and have gone unchallenged by major politicians (including Mr. Clinton) until lately.

To get an inkling of how intractable these preferences have become, and how they aid some companies at the expense of others, consider a controversy involving "disadvantaged businesses." Electra Telecommunications, of Bethesda, Md., is five years old with annual revenues of just over \$4 million. Electra is one of many outfits reselling long distance capacity tailored to meet specific federal needs such as giving two military bases a direct phone tie.

There's room for the Electras, even after their markup, when a major carrier doesn't want to bother with such a small contract. But the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations punish Electra if an opposing small bidder is ostensibly owned by "someone with a social and economic disadvantage." In that case, Electra suffers a 10% penalty. If it bids \$1,000, it loses to the other firm's \$1,099.

Who has a social disadvantage? The Small Business Administration defines it for other U.S. agencies. Right off, partiality goes to all nonwhite citizens, including those of East and South Asian heritage. Then come other openings: "long-term residence in an environment isolated from the mainstream of American society," "social patterns or pressures which have discouraged the individual from pursuing a professional or business education," "acquisition of credit or capital under unfavorable circumstances" and so on.

This is interesting territory, because it suggests what might survive a ban on race-restrictiveness. Even a white person can be a victim, although the burden of proof is higher and less than 1% of disadvantaged businesses certified by SBA are nonminority. Not surprisingly, however, moves are afoot to expand preferences for women, the disabled and presumably other categories to be named. One thing you don't have to be is poor. In most situations, an owner can have a net worth of \$750,000, not including equity in a home and the business itself.

\* \* \*

Electra's particular market niche is tiny. Contracts are less than \$100,000, sometimes way smaller. But overall, big money is involved here--federal agencies are supposed to award 5% of their contracts to disadvantaged businesses.

\* \* \*

Brokering also could take place in other types of defense purchases: electricity, gas, even basic computers. Overall, DoD applied the 10% break in \$515 million worth of contracting in fiscal 1993. Its model for preference-bidding was extended to the rest of the federal government by legislation passed last year, though the Supreme Court is deciding a case that could put the brakes on.

Keep in mind, bidding preferences are only a variant of longer-standing disadvantaged business breaks. The main program, called 8(a), has resulted in 95,000 contracts valued at \$48 billion since its inception. These are typically "solesourced"-meaning no bids. The list of 8(a) eligible firms totals 5,400, and includes 32 of the top 100 black businesses in the U.S. A single company has piled up \$440 million in 8(a) business.

\* \* \*

Other factors are at work as well, but the laws are slow to respond to the new wind. The frustrations of Electra and similar companies are likely to continue. Indeed, government manuals at every level are so inlaid with mind-numbing preference procedures that it is hard to see how anybody but ferocious litigators, acting under a broad court ruling or statute such as the California initiative, will ever rid the books of them.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Race Bias #25 - "Quota Enforcement Police"**

The federal government's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs is charged with enforcing the "affirmative action plans" that every employer must agree to adopt in order to land a federal contract.

The excerpts quoted below are intended to give you a sense of what the federal enforcement effort looks and feels like to the typical contractor doing business with the federal government.

July 1, 1996 Wall Street Journal p A12

### **Bureaucratic Carpet Bombing**

**BY JAMES BOVARD**

The Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, a little known but extremely powerful branch of the Department of Labor, is America's premier racial racketeering agency.

\* \* \*

The OFCCP enforces affirmative action obligations on federal contractors. For many products, the federal government is a monopoly buyer; private companies that produce those products have a choice of meeting the government's demands or perishing. More than 200,000 companies and institutions with more than 25 million employees are subject to the OFCCP's racial and gender dictates. The OFCCP's more than 500 compliance officers conduct over 4,000 compliance reviews a year.

"The OFCCP as it now operates is a racial spoils system," says Peter Kirsanow, a Cleveland labor lawyer. "For a long time we just called them the Office of Racial, Sexual and Ethnic Engineering." According to former OFCCP Director Ellen Shong Bergman, the agency's officers are sometimes guilty of "attempted extortion" in their threats against businesses that fail to hire and promote sufficient minorities and women.

The OFCCP's routine methods amount to bureaucratic carpet bombing. Jennifer Taylor, personnel director of City Utilities of Springfield, Mo., testified to the House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities on Feb. 29 about the nightmare OFCCP audit her company experienced last year. An OFCCP compliance officer descended upon the company

and spent almost an entire year going through its files. The official demanded "documentation and reasons why virtually every minority and female considered for promotion and new hire was not selected for nearly every opening," Ms. Taylor testified. Though the company had roughly the same proportion of minorities on its payroll as in the local labor market, the OFCCP demanded that the company in the future recruit from the Kansas City area-170 miles away.

OFCCP's policies can result in dumbing down the work force. Former Director Bergman noted that one OFCCP district director penalizes contractors for "failure to select a woman, black or Hispanic who is as qualified as the least qualified incumbent, irrespective of superior qualifications of other non-minority applicants." With this standard, the OFCCP seeks to drag down the company's hiring to the lowest level of any current staffer.

Many OFCCP compliance officers abuse their power at the work site. According to one industry attorney, an OFCCP district director in California shows up at site visits and warns the contractor: "If you get a lawyer, I will make it more difficult for you." The director has proclaimed to harrowed employees during audits: "You won't have a job around here much longer unless you cooperate with us because you are in deep trouble." Contractor employees have been left in tears by the OFCCP district director's bullying.

Since 1991, the OFCCP has been on a jihad against the so-called glass ceiling-invisible "attitudinal" barriers to the advancement of women and minorities into the top ranks of corporate power. Earlier this year, the OFCCP sent a notice of violation to the University of Cincinnati instructing it to inform 157 faculty members that "they are part of a group of female and minority professors whose salary should be adjusted." Even in cases where one professor had a doctorate degree from an Ivy League school and another had a master's degree from Ball State, or one had 20 years' experience and another was a new hire, the OFCCP made no adjustment in comparing salaries.

One of Washington's most experienced private sector labor lawyers observed of the method used in this audit: "They do that all the time. They see this as a quick and dirty way to collect a lot of back pay from institutions that are very dependent on government contracts." The OFCCP's glass ceiling methods are routinely characterized as "blackmail" by labor lawyers.

\* \* \*

Government contractors rarely challenge OFCCP power grabs. "Everybody knows what is going on," says Wayne State University Law Prof. Kingsley Browne. "The problem is that the business community has been completely spineless on this issue."

Then-Sen. Bob Dole and Rep. Charles Canady (R., Fla.) proposed the Equal Opportunity Act of 1996, a bill prohibiting the use of racial and gender preferences in federal government programs. The bill would gut the OFCCP'S power to impose racial hiring goals. If the

Republicans ever decide to wake up and champion the principle of freedom, the Dole bill would be a fine place to begin.

Mr. Bovard is a visiting media fellow at the Hoover Institution. This article is adapted from the July issue of The American Spectator.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

## YGGDRASIL

### **Race Bias #26 - "The Racial Spoils System"**

For some reason, the academic establishment is not terribly interested in studying the costs of affirmative action race quotas. But then, that is no surprise, because these programs must remain hidden from the majority in order to survive politically.

We are indebted to Governor Wilson, of California, for ordering his departments to calculate direct costs of governmental race preferences in his state. Most governments refuse to calculate these kinds of numbers.

I have reprinted below excerpts from an article in National Review Magazine by Tom McClintock, director of regulatory affairs for the Claremont Institute, citing those cost figures prepared by the State of California.

McClintock's conclusion is that direct costs to the taxpayers of California are \$156 million. Throw in price increases extracted by minority contractors, and the costs increase to \$363 million. The federal budget is more than 15 times the California Budget. Since the federal government has similar affirmative action race preferences, it is reasonable to assume that federal costs are 10 to 15 times larger than those of California, or in the range of \$3 to \$5 billion per year.

Add in the programs from the other 49 states and about 3000 counties and cities which are required to have them, and the costs probably double again.

Many posters on this newsgroup object to the \$5 billion in annual aid we pay each year to the State of Israel. In fact, the governmental aid we give each year to the Black American Elite is probably twice the size of the Israel aid package.

The lesson in all of this is that racially aware, politically organized minorities can extract a great deal from the public treasury. In both cases, the costs are modest enough so as to avoid economic disruption, but large enough to motivate the respective minorities to remain intensively involved in politics and to continue to block vote their racial interests with 80% plus majorities.

Like most conservatives, McClintock misses the point! He attacks racial quotas by focusing purely on their costs and the economic inefficiency they create, while ignoring their obvious political purpose.

The ultimate prize is the right to tax the great White middle class. For the tax and spend game to continue, the liberals need two things: 1) motivated minority activists to deliver 80% plus majorities in favor of looting the White middle class, and 2) a large minority of uninformed white voters (see Race Bias #1 - "Blissful Ignorance")

There is simply no way for Republicans in Congress to restore limited government and ensure that American taxpayers receive real value for their tax dollars as long as the racial spoils system continues to operate.

If Republicans ever become sincere about restoring liberty to the middle class (as opposed to maintaining their own social respectability and just slowing things down a bit), you will know by their swift and sustained attack on the racial spoils system.

Yggdrasil-

National Review Magazine

July 15, 1996

NR West p 1

The Cost of Quotas

TOM MCCLINTOCK

\* \* \*

In California as in many other states-not to mention the nation as a whole-racial and gender quotas now permeate virtually every aspect of government, including the awarding of state contracts, the hiring and promotion of state employees, the admission of students to state universities, and the appropriation of funds for school children. In the area of acquisition of goods and services alone, California has at least 45 specific laws requiring race- or gender-based preferences. These are included in the Education, Government, Public Contract, Public Utilities, Streets and Highways, Unemployment Insurance, and Vehicle codes. Since 1977 all state agencies have been required to employ affirmative action to "overcome any under-utilization of minorities and women in their respective organizations." And in 1988, the Legislature adopted (and Governor Deukmejian signed) legislation declaring, in essence, that competition for 23 per cent of the dollar amount of all state-funded contracts should be limited to three arbitrary classes: 15 per cent to "minority business enterprises" (MBEs), five per cent to "women business enterprises" (WBEs), and three per cent to "disabled veteran business

enterprises" (DVBEs). Although these standards were described as "goals" rather than quotas, the law specifically disqualified from bidding any business which does not go to extraordinary lengths to attain the requisite race and gender participation percentages.

DIRECT costs of state affirmative-action programs exceed \$156 million per year. For instance, in response to a recent inquiry from Governor Wilson, state agencies estimated their administrative costs for MBE/WBE programs at \$12.8 million for 1993-94 (the most recent year for which complete numbers are available). This survey, however, included only those departments under the direct supervision of the governor's office, and did not include the entire education system, which alone accounts for more than half of the state's budget.

As for education, the "Faculty and Staff Diversity Fund" of the state community-college system spent \$2.9 million in 1993-94 for preferential faculty and staff recruitment. Meanwhile race-based programs in the University of California and California State University systems cost \$47.2 million. California public schools spent \$82 million on "voluntary desegregation" programs, while public schools and community colleges together spend an additional \$10 million annually on categorical programs specifically based on race, sex, ethnicity, or national origin.

\* \* \*

This shouldn't surprise us. As a 1979 report for the National Construction Industry Council noted: "Any law that assigns a portion of a market to a particular group, in essence, legalizes monopoly.... It is a well-established law of economics that monopoly power leads to higher prices."

\* \* \*

A GENERAL Accounting Office report in 1979 found that minority-firm prices averaged about nine per cent higher than other prices. Applying this factor to California contracts under the MBE/WBE requirements would suggest a total cost of \$41.7 million per year in higher prices. This figure is consistent with the experience of the Department of General Services, whose Procurement Division responsible for about 20 per cent of all state business-reported its MBE/WBE related higher prices to be \$9.7 million in 1994. Extrapolated, this would come to \$48.6 million per year statewide. Likewise, a cost study prepared by the Construction Industry Research Board in 1986-based on a survey of 472 prime contractors, majority subcontractors, and MBE/WBE firms, representing 45 per cent of the public-works construction in California during the previous year-estimated \$43 million per year in inflated costs due to preference requirements.

\* \* \*

Estimates of added-private-industry costs range from \$130 million (extrapolated from CIRH estimates of added costs in construction contracts) to \$240 million a year (by California's Little Hoover Commission). It goes without saying that in the end, customers pay these costs through higher prices, taxpayers through higher government costs, employees through lower wages, and investors through lower earnings.

\* \* \*

OFFICIALLY mandated discrimination in California easily costs \$343 million per year in administrative costs to government, compliance costs to business, and inflated prices due to the constriction of competition for the provision of governmental goods and services. This is a conservative number; other estimates range over \$677 million. Nor does it tell the whole story: there are many bureaucracies and businesses for which cost information is not readily available; some costs, as mentioned above, are incalculable; and finally, these estimates do not include the costs of racial- and gender-based quotas incurred by cities, counties, and special districts, which would easily double the numbers.

Official discrimination undermines the founding principles of the nation; it poisons the social tolerance which is a necessary condition of a free people; it undermines respect for the law and for governmental institutions. These are social costs, and they are astronomical.

But it also costs money. A lot of it.

Mr. McClintock is director of regulatory affairs for the Claremont Institute.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Race Bias #27 - "Legalized Graft"

In the previous post entitled "The Racial Spoils System" we documented the costs of maintaining race preference schemes in the state of California.

In this note we continue with an excerpt from the same National Review article of July 15, 1996 entitled "The Cost of Quotas" by Tom McClintock:

"Indirect costs of mandated preferences are even higher than direct ones. For one thing, as the bidding pool for state contracts is reduced, prices rise. Consider the following example cited by the Department of General Services: "A solicitation for rolling-ball pens was issued by the State without the MBE/WBE participation requirements. In response to a request by a local supplier, the State amended the solicitation to include MBE/WBE requirements. As in the past, numerous bids were received. However, the eight lowest bids were all rejected. Although all bidders had met the technical specifications (in fact, all bidders offered the same pen), the eight lowest bidders had not met preference requirements. Award was made to the ninth bidder, and cost the taxpayers about \$50,000 more on a \$200,000 contract."

"In the same vein, California Assemblyman Jan Goldsmith has noted "the creation of so-called pass-through companies, i.e., minority- or woman-owned firms that advertise as suppliers for various items but don't actually stock the items." One of Goldsmith's constituents, an engineering firm executive, explained how these operate: "We purchase steel from PDM Steel, but must offer the opportunity to bid to any MBE/WBE supplier. In doing so, these firms will get a price from PDM Steel, add a percentage to the price, then give us the quote. If we accept the [lower] price from PDM Steel, then we are not giving enough work to [MBEs/WBEs]."

After reading the above descriptions of how these contracting preference schemes work in actual practice, it is hard to conclude that they are anything other than legalized graft.

Tax money is being passed over to political activists under the pretext of running a "business."

None of the "contracting activity" described above is remotely likely to induce the participating businesses to become efficient or competitive in the marketplace. Such businesses will be forever dependent on the special economic reservation created by preferences.

Curiously, the actual operation of the contracting process shows another critical characteristic of all of these schemes, namely, their tendency to be induce competitive failure, and, through



those failures, to continually reinforce the need for the program by producing fresh evidence of "racism" in the system when those failures occur.

Affirmative action quotas in university admissions and employment have the same self-reinforcing effect of producing failure by placing virtually all Blacks in institutions or jobs mismatched to their abilities. While this aspect of affirmative action quotas may seem irrational from the perspective of an individual black's self-interest, it is part of the powerfully rational political calculus of liberalism, dependent upon black and brown anger to maintain its feeding rights in and among the White middle classes.

In the words of McClintock:

"But according to the CIRB study, MBE/WBE subcontractors failed to perform in 11.5 per cent of the contracts reported (often due to bankruptcy), compared to 1.8 per cent (or 6.4 times fewer) of the contracts with non-MBE/WBE subcontractors."

Affirmative action quotas are a creature of politics, not economics.

Yggdrasil-

(P.S. I should mention that National Review is beginning to come around [Peter Brimelow's pieces on immigration are spectacular]. Not my favorite by any means, but they come up with excellent facts that are a valuable addition to any WN library. For those interested in subscribing, the price is \$57 per year - Circulation Dept., National Review, P.O. Box 668, Mount Morris, Ill, 61054-0668)

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Race Bias #28 - "The 'Birmingham' Model"**

The excerpt below contains an illustration of the kind of affirmative action program that will mollify the Associated General Contractors of America, a largely European-American contractors lobby, by substituting a taxpayer financed program of education and racial subsidies for the hated contract "set- asides".

The excerpt illustrates a common problem with American business and with our political system.

The Contractors Association is apparently incapable of learning the larger lesson from its own affirmative action woes and will not resist these programs on principle. Rather, they will support shifting the costs of preferences from themselves onto taxpayers generally.

They uphold the "education and subsidy" program of the City of Birmingham as a model.

The problem with our political system is that we have no group that can assert and protect the interests of European-Americans generally. Thus, there is no fairness in the political process.

Most amusing is the confession in the excerpts below, that the set-asides often fail to produce the result desired by liberal politicians, namely the formation of a class of wealthy minority capable of participating in and financing the liberal political enterprise.

Apparently, the recipients of these set-aside contracts often fail to make profits and go bankrupt because of a basic lack of business skills.

Thus, it is taxpayer financed education and subsidy to the rescue. No sense incurring the political cost (white male anger) without getting the political benefit (a wealthy, politically active class of racial minorities).

Yggdrasil-

Feb. 27, 1995 Wall Street Journal A14 Birmingham's Plan to Help Black-Owned Firms May Be Alternative to Racial Set-Aside Programs

BY PAUL M. BARRETT

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

BIRMINGHAM, Ala. - At a time when affirmative action is widely under attack, this gritty Deep South city once known for civil- rights strife is taking a new approach to the hot-button issue.

Birmingham is trying to help black-owned construction businesses grow without the sort of racial set-asides that have fueled fraud and white resentment across the country. The focus of the city's program isn't on giving blacks an immediate percentage of public works, but instead on building stable black businesses that can compete in private markets as well as public. "Of everything I've seen . . . this offers the best long-term hope for affirmative action in the construction industry," says Prof. John Mouton of Auburn University's building science department, who helped design the educational component of the plan. The vehemently anti-set-aside Associated General Contractors of America backs the city's program and has made it a major topic at its national conference next month in San Diego. Meanwhile, Chattanooga, Tenn., has started a program modeled on Birmingham's, and several other cities have expressed interest.

### Debate Is Heating Up

Debate on the broad issue of racial preferences is heating up far beyond Birmingham. Encouraged by the GOP takeover of Congress, conservatives have launched the first broad assault on affirmative action since such programs became firmly established more than 20 years ago. The first wave is likely to be efforts to kill funding for federal offices and programs that set aside contracts or jobs based on race. The three leading Republican presidential contenders - Senate Majority Leader Robert Dole, Sen. Phil Gramm and Lamar Alexander--are already jousting over who is more serious about rolling back affirmative action. Meanwhile, popular support is building in California for a ballot initiative that would ban the state from using any form of racial or sex-related favoritism.

\* \* \*

The Birmingham approach to contracting could become an alternative model for either Democrats or Republicans. While some black contractors are highly dubious of the effort here, there have been some early successes. The program combines education, nuts-and-bolts guidance on individual projects, and contacts with white businesses that have volunteered to provide blacks with subcontracting work.

\* \* \*

Black mechanical contractor Ravon Charmichael participates avidly in business-management

classes, but nevertheless believes the city's effort must be a sham because white contractors support it. "It wasn't designed to work," he declares angrily.

Distrust was probably inevitable because the Birmingham program was the core of the predominantly black city's 1989 settlement of a series of lawsuits filed against it by the local chapter of the Associated General Contractors. The heavily white AGC claimed former city policies that set aside fixed percentages of public business for minorities amounted to "reverse discrimination." The truce followed a 1989 U.S. Supreme Court ruling that made it much tougher to defend municipal set-asides against such attacks. The AGC and the city agreed to jointly fund a construction authority to nurture black businesses and encourage "mentor-protégé" relationships between white and black companies. After an uncertain start, the authority now seems to be gaining stability under its first African-American head, James McCormick Jr., whom the city and the AGC recruited away from H.J. Russell & Co. of Atlanta, one of the country's leading black-owned contractors.

### Designated Punching Bag

With a staff of five and a \$300,000 annual budget, Mr. McCormick, 43, combines the roles of technical adviser, diplomat and designated punching bag. Physically large, he absorbs verbal blows from both sides of the color line. "It's the nature of this business," he sighs. "We're not doing something easy here, and we're not claiming we're the panacea."

Mr. McCormick strongly believes that Birmingham's white construction industry hasn't done enough to make up for its historic discrimination against blacks. Indeed, he concedes that he viewed the Birmingham settlement as a sell-out when he was still with H.J. Russell. But he rethought his position, he says, partly because of his analysis of the fortunes of some of the city's black contractors during and after a municipal construction boomlet in 1990-92. A number of small black-owned firms expanded rapidly but failed to turn increased volume into profits; in fact, several landed in bankruptcy.

That's the trouble with the "numbers games and set-asides," Mr. McCormick says. "The percentages [of public work] don't tell you whether those contractors are going to make it long-term." (While he won't discuss numbers, his agency's records show that in 1993, the most recent year measured, minorities got 13% of a broad sampling of public and private work up from roughly 8% four years earlier.)

### Trouble Managing Employees

Roy Smith's roofing and paving business more than tripled in size and revenues topped the \$1 million mark in the early 1990s. But at his peak, he failed to complete some jobs and had trouble managing his 14 employees. "We were losing money left and right," he concedes.

Mr. Smith has retrenched but hasn't given up. The construction authority paired him with the white-owned Brice Building Co., which counseled him to focus on his more profitable paving work and helped him straighten out his accounting books. Brice also pulled some strings to get him a better workers' compensation insurance rate, saving him \$10,000 a year.

\* \* \*

Mr. Smith agrees that the city's program has given his business more access. But "it's a struggle," he says. "That's not changing."

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Race Bias #29 - "Tax Breaks for Minorities"**

The problem with quotas and racial preferences in the United States is that they are so widespread, you will have trouble finding them all.

Particularly odious are the numerous tax breaks that promote and advantage minority business. Unlike minority set-asides in contracting, there are no competing businesses to get angry when they lose the contract to a higher bidder. Thus, there is no one to complain.

People seldom know about these. But then the Journal is doing its usual thorough job of reporting.

Yggdrasil-

Jan. 12, 1995 Wall Street Journal p B1

A Cable Empire That Was Built On a Tax Break

By MARK ROBICHAUX

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

On Frank Washington's first trip to buy a cable system eight years ago, lightning struck the wing of the plane he took from California to Tyler, Texas. Thunderstorms rocked the tiny craft, shaking up Mr. Washington and his new partner, Leo Hindery, sweating beside him.

The duo arrived safely and pitched the seller with a new tax break if he sold the cable system to a minority buyer. Mr. Washington, an African-American, was turned down, and the system was sold to another minority buyer.

Undeterred, Mr. Washington went on to build a cable empire using the federal policy, known as the minority tax certificate. Now he and partners that include Mr. Hindery will try to swallow their biggest acquisition yet - the pending \$2.2 billion purchase of cable systems owned by Viacom Inc. The deal would be the largest ever involving a minority tax certificate, and would put Mr. Washington in control of one of the country's 10 largest cable systems.

The deal is expected to be announced soon, perhaps as early as this Week. It would be part of a sweeping agreement that also settles an antitrust lawsuit filed by Viacom against Tele-Communications Inc. TCI, which is backing Mr. Washington's partnership, is also expected to agree to carry Viacom's MTV and Showtime in long-term commitments as part of the deal. Mr. Washington knows minority tax policy inside and out - he helped write its foundation while a consultant to former President Carter's White House staff in 1977. He later went to the Federal Communications Commission, where he helped implement the policy, which was created to increase minority ownership of radio, broadcast TV and cable properties.

"At the time, it was a catalyst," says Mr. Washington. "It focused minorities with aspirations to get into the business, and it focused the funding sources, the white establishment." Advocates say the policy is a practical solution to the dearth of minorities in telecommunications. But critics say it has been little more than a tax loophole for media giants like Viacom, which will be allowed to defer about \$280 million in capital gains taxes, as long as it reinvests the money in replacement media properties within two years or meets other FCC criteria. They say it has helped only a handful of people, and Mr. Washington, who controls more cable systems than any minority in the industry, has been its primary beneficiary.

\* \* \*

Mr. Washington worked his way into Yale Law School, where he met FCC Chairman Reed Hunt and became lifelong friends with Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas. The men were two of only 10 blacks in their class of about 170 students.

After graduation, Mr. Washington went first to a Washington, D.C., law firm and then into the political arena as a consultant to the White House office of telecommunications policy. It was here that he devised the minority tax certificate.

After five years at the FCC, he jumped into the cable business- -first at Times Mirror and later at McClatchy newspapers. He left McClatchy after three years to build his own cable company - using the minority tax certificate. But he bristles at the suggestion that the tax break is solely responsible for his success. "It took an enormous amount of risk and hard work to get where I am today," says Mr. Washington.

\* \* \*

Critics of the tax certificate policy are hoping the program will be dismantled by the new Republican-dominated Congress. "It's utterly odious--the thought that every group has the right to a quota of representation, and any time it goes under par, we go out and fix it," says Bruce Fein, an assistant attorney general under former President Reagan and a lawyer who specializes in constitutional law.

The FCC maintains that successes under the tax certificate program far outnumber the abuses. Mr. Washington defends it as a meaningful way to increase minority ownership. "We're not talking about quotas here--this is a voluntary system," says Mr. Washington. "It really comes down to individual effort."

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Race Bias #30 - "Colin Powell and O.J. Simpson"**

Colin Powell and O.J. Simpson have a great deal in common. They both profit from the numerous tax breaks granted to investments made by minorities.

There is one set of tax laws that applies to European- Americans, and another that applies to preferred minorities.

That fact should not be a surprise, since the entire purpose of the minority preferences is to produce an affluent class of political activists who will organize their people to elect politicians who's primary aim is to ride herd over the White middle class while avoiding any accountability to it.

In the excerpts reprinted below, you get a chance to see some of the "disadvantaged" minorities who are slopping at the federal trough - poor folk like basketball stars Patrick Ewing and Julius Erving, actor Mr. T, and several members of Michael Jackson's family.

And it is at the federal trough that you will find that porcine pair, General Colin Powell and O.J. Simpson, participating in the same deal to reap advantage from the same race based tax preference.

Nov. 8, 1995 Wall Street Journal p A18

Tax Breaks for Being Black

BY GREG FORSTER

Other than name recognition, O.J. Simpson and Colin Powell don't appear, at first glance, to have much in common. But in the eyes of the federal government, both of them are "economically disadvantaged" and in need of special government help, which is exactly what they got.

According to CNN, in 1985 a group of black investors that included Mr. Simpson and Mr. Powell bought a television station in Buffalo, N.Y., and benefitted from a federal minority preference program that gave them a tax break to buy the station. They sold it in April of this year at a healthy profit. A man who can afford to hire a small army of the nation's elite defense attorneys and a national war hero millions of Americans would like to elect president were the

federal government's idea of "economically disadvantaged." The investors also included basketball stars Patrick Ewing and Julius Erving, actor Mr. T, and several members of Michael Jackson's family. All of them got a tax break for being black.

It shouldn't come as a surprise. Many of the federal government's racial preference programs assume that all minority owned businesses are underfinanced and disadvantaged, although that's clearly not the case. The track record of the Federal Communications Commission on racial preference programs is a virtual textbook on how such programs primarily benefit people and companies that don't need the help. In one case, then-mayor of Charlotte, N.C., Harvey Gantt, who is black, and his partners bought a television license from the FCC under a minority-Preference bidding system. They then sold the license to whites four months later, and Mr. Gantt pocketed a \$3 million profit. More largesse for the "economically disadvantaged."

\* \* \*

Preference programs Currently provide special treatment and give away truckloads of tax dollars to countless "disadvantaged" celebrities, millionaires and businesses that are perfectly capable of competing with other companies--and most of these minority millionaire bonanza programs aren't being re-evaluated. Since the Clinton administration is determined to protect the status quo, it may well take a lawsuit for each and every program to force any real change.

\* \* \*

It's time to shut off the federal pipeline for "economically disadvantaged" millionaires. The government should continue to protect minorities from unlawful discrimination, but it shouldn't give money and special treatment to celebrities and businesses that don't need it. Where's the financial sense, not to mention justice, in that?

Mr. Forster is a policy analyst at the Center for Equal Opportunity in Washington.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Race Bias #31 - "Jim Crow Returns"

Just browsing through the California Corporations Code the other night after work and ran across the little gem reprinted for you below.

It is another one of the many thousands of American "Nuremburg Laws" tucked away in our statute books. The statute creates a registry of "distinguished" women and minorities to serve on corporate boards of directors. I took particular pleasure in the definition of "ethnic person of color." In California, that definition encompasses very nearly a numerical majority of the population. Further, two of the groups specified are among the most economically advantaged in America.

Charming also is the subsidy inherent in the government compiling commercially useful data for minority search firms and then making that data available to them on a preferential basis. Lovely, simply lovely!

Politicians value seats on corporate boards-of-directors because the job involves a few meetings, generous fees and lots of liesure time. Thus, the registry below is a perfect means for finding support for minority political activists and hacks who need money and liesure time for their activism, and extorting that support under the table from big businesses seeking legislative favors.

No registry for engineers who want to put in 12 hour days. Those positions are for the great herds of helpless freeway commuting taxpayers. Not at all attractive to the liberal politicians trying to strengthen the "political class."

Care to hazzard a guess what the Supreme Court might do to a statute like this if "ethnic person of color" were to be defined instead as an "American of European descent" or "white?"

Yggdrasil-

CORPORATIONS CODE

TITLE 1. CORPORATIONS

DIVISION 1. GENERAL CORPORATION LAW

## CHAPTER 3. Directors and Management

Cal Corp Code @ 318 (1995) @ 318. Registry of distinguished women and minorities available to serve on corporate boards of directors.

(a) The Secretary of State shall develop and maintain a registry of distinguished women and minorities who are available to serve on corporate boards of directors. As used in this section, "minority" means an ethnic person of color including American Indians, Asians (including, but not limited to, Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Pacific Islanders, Samoans, and Southeast Asians), Blacks, Filipinos, and Hispanics.

(b) For each woman or minority who participates in the registry, the Secretary of State shall maintain information on his or her educational, professional, community service, and corporate governance background. That information may include, but is not limited to:

(1) Paid or volunteer employment.

(2) Service in elected public office or on public boards or commissions.

(3) Directorships, officerships, and trusteeships of business and nonprofit entities, including committee experience.

(4) Professional, academic, or community awards or honors.

(5) Publications.

(6) Government relations experience.

(7) Experience with corporate constituents.

(8) Any other areas of special expertise.

(c) In addition to the information subdivision (b) requires, each woman or minority who participates in the registry may disclose any number of personal attributes that may contribute to board diversity. Those attributes may include, but are not limited to, gender, physical disability, race, or ethnic origin.

(d) In addition to the information subdivision (b) requires, each woman or minority who participates in the registry may indicate characteristics of corporations for which he or she would consider, or is especially interested in, serving as a director. These characteristics may include, but are not limited to, company size, industry, geographic location, board meeting

frequency, director time commitments, director compensation, director insurance or indemnification, or social policy concerns.

(e) Any woman or minority may nominate himself or herself to the registry by filing with the Secretary of State the information required by subdivision (b) on a form the secretary prescribes. Any registrant may attach a copy of his or her resume and up to two letters of recommendation to his or her registration form. Each registrant's registration form, together with any attached resume or letters of recommendation, shall constitute his or her registry transcript.

(f) The Secretary of State shall make appropriate rules requiring registrants to renew or update their filings with the registry, as necessary to ensure continued accuracy of registry information.

(g) The Secretary of State shall assign each registrant a file number, then enter the information described in subdivisions (b), (c), and (d) into a data base, using the registrant's file number to identify him or her. The registry data base shall not disclose any registrant's name or street address, but may list the city, county, or ZIP Code of his or her business or residence address. The secretary shall make data base information available to those persons described in subdivisions (i) and (j). The secretary may provide that access either by permitting direct data base searches or by performing data base searches on written request.

(h) The Secretary of State may also make information contained in the registry data base available to any person or entity qualified to transact business in California that regularly engages in the business of providing data base access or search services; provided, that data base access will not be construed to entitle the user to access to any registrant's transcript.

(i) The Secretary of State shall make information contained in a reasonable number of registrants' transcripts available to any corporation or its representative. A "representative" may be an attorney, an accountant, or a retained executive recruiter. A "retained executive recruiter" is an individual or business entity engaged in the executive search business that is regularly retained to locate qualified candidates for appointment or election as corporate directors or executive officers.

(j) The Secretary of State may also grant access to a reasonable number of registrants' transcripts to any other person who demonstrates to the secretary's satisfaction that the person does both of the following:

(1) Seeks access to the registry in connection with an actual search for a corporate director.

(2) Intends to use any information obtained from the registry only for the purpose of finding qualified candidates for an open position on a corporate board of directors.

(k) The Secretary of State may employ reasonable means to verify that any party seeking access to registry transcript information is one of those specified in subdivision (i) or (j). To that end, the secretary may require a representative to identify its principal, but may not disclose that principal's identity to any other person.

(l) Upon written request specifying the registrant's file number, the Secretary of State shall provide any party entitled to access to registry transcripts with a copy of any registrant's transcript. The secretary may by rule or regulation specify other reasonable means by which persons entitled thereto may order copies of registrants' transcripts.

(m) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be entitled to access to information the registry contains, except as this section specifically provides.

(n) The Secretary of State shall charge fees for registering with the registry, obtaining access to the registry data base, and obtaining copies of registrants' transcripts. The Secretary of State, in consultation with the Senate Commission on Corporate Governance, Shareholder Rights, and Securities Transactions, shall fix those fees by regulation. Fees shall be fixed so that the aggregate amount of all fees collected shall be sufficient to cover the total cost of administering the registry program. Registration fees shall be fixed so as to encourage qualified women and minorities to participate. Fees shall be deposited into the Secretary of State's Business Fee Fund.

(o) The Secretary of State may make any rule, regulation, guideline, or agreement the secretary deems necessary to carry out the purposes and provisions of this section.

(p) The Secretary of State may cooperate with the California Commission on the Status of Women, the California Council to Promote Business Ownership by Women, the Senate Commission on Corporate Governance, Shareholder Rights, and Securities Transactions, women's organizations, minority organizations, business and professional organizations, and any other individual or entity the secretary deems appropriate, for any of the following purposes:

(1) Promoting corporate use of the registry.

(2) Locating qualified women and minorities and encouraging them to participate in the registry.

(3) Educating interested parties on the purpose and most effective use of the registry.

The secretary may also prepare and distribute publications designed to promote informed use of the registry.

(q) The Secretary of State may seek registrants' consent to be listed in a published directory of women and minorities eligible to serve as corporate directors, which will contain a summary of each listed registrant's qualifications. The secretary may periodically publish, or cause to be published, such a directory. Only those registrants who so consent in writing may be included in the directory. The printed directory shall be provided to any person upon payment of a fee, which the Secretary of State will determine by regulation, in consultation with the Senate Commission on Corporate Governance, Shareholder Rights, and Securities Transactions.

(r) The Secretary of State shall implement this section no later than January 1, 1995.

(s) At least once in each three-year period during which the registry is available for corporate use, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Senate Commission on Corporate Governance, Shareholder Rights, and Securities Transactions, shall report to the Legislature on the extent to which the registry has helped women and minorities progress toward achieving parity in corporate board appointments or elections.

HISTORY: Added Stats 1993 ch 508 @ 3 (SB 545). NOTES: Stats 1993 ch 508 provides:  
SECTION 1. This act shall be known and may be cited as the Corporate Governance Parity Act of 1993.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Race Bias #32 - "Caste Effects of Preferences"**

Below are excerpts from an article in the Wall Street Journal by Clint Bolick dealing with the effects of affirmative action race preferences.

The question is - Do these preferences increase employment among the average minority group member?

The answer, apparently is - no!

However, the integrationist researchers cited in Mr. Bolick's article did find that a small minority elite benefits from these policies.

So racial preferences fail to attain their publicly stated purpose but do succeed in fulfilling their real political purpose!

My - What a surprise!

Yggdrasil-

Oct. 11, 1995 Wall Street Journal p A15

A Glimpse at Private-Sector Preference Policies

Rule of Law

Clint Bolick

That corporations engage in widespread race and gender preferences is one of the worst-kept secrets in America. Government regulations and lawsuits induce companies to adopt preferences, even though such policies themselves may violate the law, thereby prompting employers to keep quiet about their actual practices.

A recent study by two Temple University researchers affords a rare and revealing glimpse into the usually well-guarded realm of private-sector preference policies. The results, though cast by the authors as pro-affirmative action, are in fact the latest example of the real world throwing a



dose of cold reality upon race-based social engineering.

Published in the June issue of the Academy of Management Journal, the study examines the motivations and the effects of "identity-conscious" (formal consideration of race and gender) and "identity-blind" (merit-based) personnel policies. By promising confidentiality, Alison M. Konrad and Frank Linnehan gained access to the personnel practices of 138 companies based in the Philadelphia area, running the gamut from large and small manufacturing firms to banks, hotels, colleges and retailers. Extensive surveys were completed by the firms' top personnel officials.

The study found that although companies adopted formal identity-blind policies without government pressure, identity-conscious policies were adopted as a result of federal contracting regulations, compliance reviews or litigation. Indeed, say the authors, these coercive inducements are so influential that in their absence "organizations might not develop any identity-conscious structures beyond those already in place." This, Ms. Konrad and Mr. Linnehan conclude, underscores "the importance of regulation for the imposition and inducement of unpopular organizational change . "

The bombshell comes when the authors explore the results of identity-conscious policies. Though government "intervention consistently resulted in the development of identity-conscious structures," the authors found, "such intervention did not consistently result in improvement in the employment status of protected groups."

It turns out that corporate preferences, like other race-based policies, concentrate their benefits on people at the top while doing little to expand the pool of qualified applicants. Companies with identity-conscious personnel policies, the authors found, had at least one woman at a higher rank and more minority managers than companies with identity-blind policies. But the study found no significant differences on four other measures: the rank of the highest-ranking minority officials, the percentage of women in management, and most notably, the overall percentage of minorities and women employed by the companies. Indeed, the study suggests that identity-blind practices are as (or more) likely to yield minority and women employees as identity-conscious policies. That minorities and women do just as well in a system that is blind to their group identity as in one that seeks to confer group preferences may be surprising to paternalistic policymakers. Yet race-neutral decision making was the goal of the original civil rights laws.

\* \* \*

Mr. Bolick is litigation director at the Institute for Justice in Washington and author of "The Affirmative Action Fraud: Can the American Civil Rights Vision Be Restored?" soon out from the Cato Institute.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Race Bias #33 - "Affirmative Action and the Supreme Court"**

Well, in 1996 the Supreme Court has held in the "Adarand" case that race preferences in federal contracting are unconstitutional except to remedy provable, specific instances of discrimination. The decision prevents federal contracting preferences based explicitly on race. And indeed, it is hard to fault a decision in which the Supremes finally learn to read the plain text of the 14th Amendment.

But then, we must ask, what will be the practical impact?

- The decision spares Congress the necessity of acting on the issue of Affirmative Action. It spares Clinton the necessity of having to take a position in public. Thus, it spares the country a divisive public debate that would have heightened awareness of anti-white racial preferences. It denies European-Americans the opportunity of eliminating these preferences through the democratic process.

- Denying the European-American majority the opportunity to decide the issue with their votes preserves the present liberal, integrationist political elite and keeps that elite in office. It prevents European-Americans from getting in the habit of using their votes to protect their racial interests.

- The black upper class will still demand protection from market forces. With deviation back toward a population mean 15 IQ points below the average, downward mobility among this group will be great. The pressure on government to intervene with preferences to prevent this downward mobility will continue.

- The liberal elites still need their non-white racial allies in their political coalition. They will immediately seek ways to grant the racial preferences under neutral sounding criteria, such as "economic disadvantage" or "urban background" etc.

- Explicit racial criteria can be replaced with geographic preferences for black and hispanic neighborhoods, thereby accelerating the balkanization of the United States.

- The Federal and State agencies that administer these programs are still in place and still staffed with tens of thousands of white-haters who will work to continue the preferences under different masks.

- All this raises the question why preferences for blacks and hispanics could not be run quietly, from behind the scenes in the first place (like aid to Israel). The answer is that racial preferences had to be visible and brazen in order to convince very unsophisticated black and hispanic electorates that the system was "fair" from their perspective.
- While neutral sounding criteria such as "economic disadvantage" or geographic preferences can be manipulated in such a manner as to protect the black and hispanic upper classes, such criteria will not satisfy the black and hispanic masses. Violence and discontent are likely to escalate.
- The Supreme Court decision leaves untouched all of the private race preference schemes operated by large corporations and protected against attack by the "Weber" decision.
- The Supreme Court decision leaves untouched all of the public race preference schemes involving tax breaks and direct subsidies, such as enterprise zones and tax credits for new job creation in areas of high unemployment. The decision leaves open the possibility of shifting the cost onto the taxpayers.
- The adaptations of the liberal elite to the new Supreme Court decision will make it much more difficult for European- Americans to prove that preferences are being handed out based on racial criteria. The preferences will no longer be advertised openly, as they have in the past. Thus, Whites will need institutions with professional staff to discover and publicize these newly disguised racial preferences. At the present time, no such institution exists.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Race Bias #34 - "Business Opposes Quota Repeal"

Well here you have it, folks. We elect a huge crop of new Republican Freshmen who want to represent us by repealing race preferences and what happens?

Big Business lobbies to keep the preferences in place! Their Republican lackeys in the Senate agree.

Some possible explanations:

- Fear that racial unrest and riots could dampen consumer demand.
- Fear by firms employing minorities that upstart competitors might not be faced with the same affirmative action hurdles and costs.
- A feeling that employment serves a social welfare purpose, that quotas are better than welfare, and that all employers should be forced to employ minorities as a concealed wealth transfer from shareholders and the remaining workers who must increase productivity.
- Euro-Americans are such compliant sheep that there is no reason to roll back the quotas and anger minorities (who are not sheep)!

Yggdrasil-

February 10, 1995 Wall Street Journal p A1

PEELING BACK affirmative-action programs picks up momentum in the House.

Critics look to Oklahoma Rep. Istook on the Appropriations Committee to zero in on agencies that enforce minority preferences. One suggested target: the Office of Federal Contract Compliance. Illinois Rep. Fawell plans hearings on Justice Department policies. Florida Rep. Canady, head of a Judiciary panel, says, "The time has come to look at [preferences] in a comprehensive way."

But business is wary. "That is not one of our key issues here at the moment," says the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's Stephen Bokat. The National Association of Manufacturers frets about

a backlash from minorities. Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Hatch doesn't "see in the near future any real set of hearings or bill" on affirmative action.

Following California's lead, Delaware state Rep. Wayne Smith is drafting a state constitutional amendment that would ban government racial preferences there.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

## YGGDRASIL

### **Race Bias #35 - "Consulting and the Information Elite"**

The excerpt reprinted below is important in understanding how large U.S. employers can indulge in racial preference schemes without damaging their business.

In Race Bias #13 we read about large U.S. corporations creating and encouraging minority networks organized for the purpose of getting minorities promoted. Previous posts in the series have illustrated the many private preference schemes maintained for minorities by U.S. corporations.

Discrimination against the talented ordinarily entails economic costs. Thus only governmental employers and regulated utilities insulated against the economic effects of the practice can indulge it on a large scale.

Many of you may have wondered how large corporations can afford these costs.

The answer has three parts:

First, the programs are limited in scope.

Second, affirmative action is mandated by government against all employers with the result that no large competitor can gain an advantage (at least within the U.S. economy) by administering tests that restrict the workforce to the most talented.

Third, consulting firms and investment banks increasingly do all the "heavy lifting".

As the quoted excerpts from the following article show, consulting firms and investment banks more or less uniformly hire the brightest and most talented business school graduates. Private industry seldom hires any. Most management functions are reduced to rote, repetitive decisions with only minor factual variations from problems solved earlier.

American corporations have found that they can operate with less expensive talent, as long as the managers they do hire are trained to turn to the high paid consultants before tackling the tough problems.

In this environment of "outsourcing" the difficult tasks, management has little difficulty creating "easy" management jobs for minorities to fill.

As you might expect, the information elite is now employed by consulting firms and investment banks. There are tens of thousands employed in the computer consulting arms of major accounting firms, and more tens of thousands in general business consulting. Additional tens of thousands are employed in the niche areas of investment banking and smaller fields such as employee benefits and labor relations.

The only way these consulting firms can survive is to hire smarter people than those employed at the corporations. And they do. As you might expect, these consulting firms tend to be ruthless meritocracies with promotion, ownership and income levels strictly tied to merit.

As a general observation, there is no "affirmative action" in these enclaves of the information elite. They have their own oases of employment largely untouched by the political and social costs imposed on large manufacturing corporations.

These firms pay much more at the entry level than corporations, and create many more high paying senior positions than are created in the relatively narrow pay pyramids of the typical industrial corporation.

Thus the top students no longer work for the corporations.

The struggle for supremacy within corporations is waged among those of less talent and more political skill.

Thus jobs within the corporation are, to some degree, insulated from the economic consequence of racial preferences.

The article below discusses the general trend, but also discloses the efforts of a few corporations to hire top business talent and to create special tracks for them. The careers of the information elites will not be slowed by affirmative action efforts designed to benefit minorities.

Yggdrasil-

Dec. 30, 1994 Wall Street Journal p B1

Manufacturers Put on the Ritz to Woo M.B.A.s

By JOANN S. LUBLIN

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL



\* \* \*

Ten leading business schools queried by The Wall Street Journal said the proportion of new M.B.A. degree holders choosing consulting rose between 1989 and 1994. Seven of the 10 said the share selecting investment banking and other financial services also increased. Manufacturers snared a smaller portion of graduates this year from all but two of the 10 schools.

Money is a big problem. This year's graduates of Dartmouth College's Tuck School of Business were offered median salaries of \$60,000 from manufacturers and \$80,000 from consulting firms. And while they've long offered more lucrative salary packages, consulting firms are sweetening those deals even more.

Now many industrial concerns are trying to get back in the game. They are promising M.B.A.s juicier pay packages, including signing bonuses. More employers send senior officers to recruit on campus- To combat the glamour and intellectual challenge promised by a consulting job, other manufacturers have devised faster career tracks, expanding leadership-development programs or moving rising stars into important jobs quickly.

"The competition for the top students is so ferocious that industrial companies think they have to ratchet up the level of recruiting," observes Dick Kwartler, editor and publisher of the M.B.A. Newsletter in Floral Park, N.Y.

ITT'S aggressive pursuit of bright business-school graduates typifies the industrial sector's intensified talent hunt. Rand V. Araskog, chairman and chief executive officer of the New York conglomerate, created the Chairman's MBA Career Development Program in 1992. At that time few young ITT managers held positions responsible enough to propel them "into top management by the time they were 40," he recalls. Yet an early start can be crucial. The 63-year-old Mr. Araskog took over a Honeywell Inc. division at age 30.

Every school year, three ITT executive vice presidents and a senior vice president visit seven schools to interview candidates for the program. They target M.B.A. students with at least three years of business experience.

Chairman's MBAs enter ITT at the executive rank, at base salaries of \$80,000 to \$100,000 and often with a signing bonus. Each soon receives options for between 500 and 1,000 ITT shares a year. Another unusual perk is that these hotshots attend a luncheon with the board. High-level officials closely track the new managers. "I think a CEO could easily come from this group," Mr. Araskog says. Several recruits have already progressed to key posts.

\* \* \*

But the arrival of a well-paid but relatively inexperienced Young Turk can rankle older

managers. Even Frydenberg, a Chairman's MBA and 1993 Stanford University graduate, leapfrogged over more experienced workers when he joined ITT at age 29. He immediately became executive assistant manager of the Sheraton Copenhagen, overseeing about 230 workers.

"Most people in my position are no younger than 35" and worked their way up within a hotel, Mr. Frydenberg says. "I felt [resentment] from people with a little more seniority than me. When colleagues grow jealous, he observes, "you don't get the cooperation, you don't get the support that you need."

And despite its program's visibility, ITT is scoring fewer successes on campus. Just 10 of 17 M.B.A.s accepted ITT's offer this year- in 1993, 12 of 15 signed on. "There is tremendous competition," Mr. Araskog says. "It's a whole new ballgame." Indeed. Consultants A.T. Kearney Inc. wants to hire about 270 M.B.A.s in 1995, up from about 50 in 1993. The Chicago concern says that each new M.B.A. will receive between \$90,000 and \$95,000 in salary and signing bonus. The salary packages could soar to \$200,000 by 1999, one Kearney executive predicts.

Michael Spence, a second-year M.B.A. student at the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School, is weighing widely disparate offers from Mercer Management Consulting Inc. and Ford Motor Co. The 29-year-old was a Mercer consultant for three years before enrolling in business school. Mr. Spence says Mercer will pay him \$85,000 in salary, a \$45,000 signing bonus and a year-end performance bonus. Ford's offer was \$72,000 straight salary, he adds.

A Ford spokesman says that it doesn't offer signing bonuses and declines to discuss performance bonuses.

Mr. Spence, who worked for Ford this summer, wants to become a hands-on manager in industry. But money talks. He will owe about \$48,000 in student loans after graduation. "There isn't an understanding in industry" of how much money indebted M.B.A.s need, he contends.

Unable - or unwilling - to match consultants' lucrative packages, more major manufacturers are beefing up leadership development efforts that rotate a new M.B.A. through numerous business areas. United Technologies Corp. this year revived its program, moribund since 1991. Whirlpool Corp. plans to hire nearly 20 business-school graduates next spring for its development program, up from 11 in 1994. Some participants land an overseas assignment almost immediately.

Still, manufacturers have a long way to go. Industrial companies "need to reassess the job content of the positions they're putting M.B.A.s into," contends Maury Hanigan, a New York recruiting consultant. Too many businesses "are still putting them into fairly low-level jobs that aren't keeping them intellectually challenged."

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Race Bias 36 - "Employment Quotas and Real Estate"

Reprinted below is a scan of a package of information sent by the State of California to every employer who wishes to bid on a state contract.

It sets forth the requirements for establishing an affirmative action plan for the preferential hiring of minorities as a condition of obtaining the contract.

The general concept is that each employer must employ, at each occupational level, a percentage of minorities equal to the availability of minorities within the METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA ("MSA"). In other words, your obligation to employ minorities is a function of which MSA your office or plant happens to be located in.

As the Office of Compliance Programs notice puts it: "Contractors must make every effort to ensure that the underrepresentation of persons in protected groups at all levels of their workforce is not statistically significant when compared to their workforce availability in the same metropolitan statistical area per the 1980 U.S. Census data."

Now suddenly this is getting interesting, and a little lightbulb is going off.

In Yggdrasil's Lesson 7, "Exploitation", we explained the connection between urban decay, white flight and the economic interests of the housing and automobile industries.

Think about it! European Americans are not reproducing themselves. Their population is falling. Thus, there would be no demand for new suburban housing developments from whites without white flight.

Whatever produces white flight (crime, assaultive minorities, welfare dependency, illegal immigration) benefits the housing industry directly, and the automotive industry indirectly.

But let me add an additional fact. Developers build and sell off suburban houses. They earn a one-time profit on these sales. They don't hold these in their investment portfolios.

The real gems are the suburban office towers and shopping malls that the developers build, after they build the housing, to keep for their own investment portfolios.

But as you can see, the developers have a problem. There are singular advantages to locating

business in a central core. Having a central downtown allows for efficient mass transit to carry workers there. Communication and sales calls are made much easier by the close proximity of many offices in one place.

While the forces of urban decay drive European-Americans from the central cities with a force and ferocity unparalleled in history, those forces of high crime and urban decay have a much weaker effect on driving businesses from the downtown business districts.

But developers must drive these businesses from the downtown business districts or their suburban office towers would remain empty and worthless.

How to counterbalance the attraction of a downtown office core?

Simple. In the name of civil rights and "integrationism", force the businesses to hire employees from the surrounding slums. They will leave for those suburban office towers in droves.

Enter "affirmative action". You will notice that an employer's obligation to hire minorities is defined by the MSA statistics. The reality is that the Census Bureau defines each city and county as a separate MSA (Metropolitan Statistical Area). All a business has to do to avoid hiring employees representative of Detroit, for example, is move into one of those new office towers in the next county. Since the adjoining MSA is mostly white, the business can keep its mostly white work force.

Thus, it is no surprise that businesses are fleeing to new suburban offices and industrial parks. Affirmative action is to commercial development what urban decay is to suburban housing.

Yggdrasil's lesson 7 chronicles the history of the housing industry in the 50's and early 60s as the natural post-war demand for suburbs dried up in most parts of the country. The civil rights movement and urban decay arrived just in the nick of time to keep the housing industry growing.

One of the most virulent white haters ever to inhabit the U.S. Senate benefitted mightily from this decay.

In the early 60's, parking garages in choice downtown locations typically charged \$2 or \$2.50 per day. Howard Metzenbaum bought up all the choice parking garages in Cleveland and raised the fees to \$10 to \$12 per day. He made tens of millions in profit by realizing that the Euro-American middle class was frightened to death of inner city violence and would pay virtually any price to obtain close-in parking.

Metzenbaum knew that as welfare programs drove urban decay, the shape of the demand curve

for close-in parking would change dramatically. Demand would become far less elastic. Few whites (aside from Yggdrasil, of course) would be willing to walk to remote parking lots on the wrong side of the tracks. This demand would become particularly acute among the secretarial staffs.

Having made millions from hapless white workers in downtown office towers, Metzenbaum spent a few of those millions getting elected to the Senate where he would relentlessly push legislation to produce more urban decay. Anything to threaten and harass those hated whites!

Metzenbaum is gone from the Senate, and his son-in-law was defeated in the Republican sweep of 1994. But gentler practitioners of the same art remain. Senator Feinstein's husband, Blum, is in the same commercial real estate business, with the same powerful economic motive for marrying an up-and-coming politician.

White flight is unnatural. Without an intense political maintenance effort, the whole scheme would collapse. That is why real estate money supports the liberal integrationist politicians. From those political positions, they adopt welfare programs that subsidize minority family decay and crime, and they mandate employment quotas that will force businesses to follow fleeing whites to nearby MSA's where capable employees can be found. All the time, the Metzenbaums, Feinsteins and Blums of the world are busy developing.

The profits are personalized, while the costs are socialized onto the backs of that great herd of Euro-American sheep.

White hating has indeed been a very profitable business in the United States. It is the foundation upon which many large family fortunes have been built in the latter half of the Twentieth Century.

And so that your archives may be complete, you will find below a copy of the 1987 "DESCRIPTION OF A NONDISCRIMINATION PROGRAM" from the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing.

You will never see this sort of thing in a classroom, either in high school or in college. But as you already know, to find the truth, you must log onto the net and read the postings of

Yggdrasil-

Department of Fair Employment and Housing

Office of Compliance Programs

## DESCRIPTION OF A NONDISCRIMINATION PROGRAM

The information contained in this description has been developed for your convenience by the Department of Fair Employment and Housing, Office of Compliance Programs. Its purpose is to assist State contractors in the development, implementation, and/or improvement of their nondiscrimination programs for compliance with California law.

### I. POLICY

It is the policy of the State of California to promote equal employment opportunity by prohibiting discrimination in employment and requiring nondiscrimination in the performance of contracts funded by the State. This policy has been reinforced and expanded by contract compliance regulations, California Administrative Code, Title 2, Division 4, Chapter 5 (@8101 et seq.). The regulations provide that contractors performing public work or providing goods or services under a State contract shall not discriminate against any protected group employee or applicant for employment on the basis of race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical handicap, medical condition\* (cancer related), marital status, sex or age (over 40). The nondiscrimination and compliance provisions of the Fair Employment and Housing Act (Section 12990, Government Code) and the Commission's regulations are enforced by the Department of Fair Employment and Housing, Office of Compliance Programs.

### II. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

Government Code Section 12990 prohibits employment discrimination by contractors holding a State contract. Such discrimination is often evidenced by the underrepresentation of minorities and women in the contractor's workforce. Contractors must make every effort to ensure that the underrepresentation of persons in protected groups at all levels of their workforce is not statistically significant when compared to their workforce availability in the same metropolitan statistical area per the 1980 U.S. Census data.

\*As defined in Section 12926(F), Government Code 12990.

### III. MAJOR REQUIREMENTS

The major requirements imposed by the regulations include but are not limited to the following:

A. Development or reaffirmation of the contractor's equal employment policy in all personnel actions. [Section 8104(a)(1)] The policy statement is usually a one to two page document designed for posting on employee bulletin boards, in the employment office, and for distribution to all recruitment sources, vendors, and others doing business with the contractor. The statement describes the contractor's commitment to equal employment opportunity for all

persons, regardless of race, color, ancestry, national origin,- religious creed, sex, physical handicap, medical condition\* (cancer related), age (over 40 years), and marital status. It should indicate that all employment practices, including recruitment, hiring, promotions, training, terminations, etc., will be without regard to the protected group bases mentioned above. The statement should establish responsibility for overall accountability with a major company executive as well as identify the individual, at least by job title, who is responsible for the day-to-day operation of the program. The statement should be signed and dated by the company executive mentioned above and updated annually. It is suggested that other company managers/supervisors share in the responsibility for the success of the program and that they be evaluated in the same way as their performance on the achievement of other company goals. It is also suggested the policy statement be included in any employee handbook or other employee orientation program.

#### B. Formal internal and external dissemination of the contractor's policy [Section 8104(a)(2)]

When the contractor signed the contract with the State there was a Nondiscrimination Clause that read in part, "Contractor and its subcontractors shall give written notice of their obligations under this clause to labor organizations with which they have a collective bargaining or other agreement." This section also applies to agreements with employment referral agencies.

It is suggested that internal and external dissemination of the policy be included and/or described in the company's internal operating directives, i.e., personnel manual. \*As defined in Section 12926(F), Government Code 12990. C. Establishment of responsibilities for implementation of the contractor's program (Section 8104(a)(3))

Depending upon the size and structure of the contractor's company, the responsibility for implementation may be an additional or the sole responsibility of the nondiscrimination program manager.

The program manager should have at least the following responsibilities: Develop policy statements; internal and external communications procedures; assist management in collecting and analyzing employment data; and, identify problem areas and develop programs to alleviate problems. In addition, to implement and monitor internal audit and reporting systems to measure program effectiveness and ensure corrective actions are taken.

Perform liaison activities between organizations advocating the economic and social advancement of protected group members, and keep abreast of EEO developments.

Be involved in and monitor all personnel transactions from recruitment to termination to ensure that all actions are nondiscriminatory. D. Annual identification of any existing practices which have resulted in disproportionately inhibiting the employment, promotion or retention of those protected by the Act. [Section 8104(a)(4)]



### 1. Analysis of employment selection procedures [Section 8104(a)(4)(A)]

This is primarily an analysis of each step in the process including but not limited to applications for employment, hiring, promotions, transfers, lay-offs, recall, and terminations. The annual analysis of the selection process is to identify those areas or steps in the selection of applicants/employees that disproportionately inhibit the contractor from reaching parity of employee workforce percentages with the local community workforce availability percentages. Once any problem areas in the selection process have been identified, the contractor must design and implement action oriented programs to eliminate the problem areas. See paragraph E, Page 5. In general, the contractor must have a selection process that does not have an adverse effect on any protected group. It must be designed to ensure that all personnel procedures are being applied consistently and uniformly to everyone.

### 2. Workforce analysis [Section 8104(a)(4)(B)]

Contractors with 50 or more employees in their entire workforce must include a workforce analysis. A workforce analysis is a chart of a contractor's employment pattern. It shows the number of incumbents in each job title, ethnicity and sex of the incumbents and the salary ranges for each job title. The workforce analysis will identify the concentration and/or underutilization of minorities and women, and should be a resource from which such things as upward mobility, and the creation of career ladders and lattices can be developed. The requirements of the regulations pertaining to the workforce analysis are quite explicit. They include:

- o A list of job titles as they appear in payroll records or the applicable union contract.
- o A separate listing of job titles must be ranked in wage order by each department or similar organizational unit, from lowest to highest paid thus indicating by job titles upward mobility progression.
- o Department or unit managers/supervisors must be included on the listing.
- o For each job title, the contractor must show:

- Total number of incumbents, total male incumbents and total female incumbents.
- Total male and female incumbents in each of the following minority groups: Blacks (not of Hispanic origin), Hispanics, Asian/Pacific Islanders, American Indian/Native Alaskans.
- The wage rate or salary range for each job title.

### 3. Utilization analysis [Section 8104(a)(4)(C)]

Contractors with 250 or more employees in their entire workforce must also include a utilization analysis. The contractor should determine underutilization as having fewer minorities or women in a particular job group than would reasonably be expected given their availability in the labor force as indicated by the 1980 U. S. Census data information. The contractor must

compare the availability estimate with current utilization in the job groups. Whenever the percentage of minorities or women in a job group is lower than their percentage of availability within the applicable labor area, the contractor's nondiscrimination program must specifically state that underutilization exists in that job group. If minorities and women are underutilized in any job group, the nondiscrimination program must contain a description of programs planned or already being implemented to remedy the underutilization. An acceptable utilization analysis contains the following:

- o Job titles grouped into EE0-1 job categories or job families.
- o A separate comparative analysis for all women and each minority group employee to their availability in the community workforce.
- o Identification of underutilization in each of the job groups. E. Development and execution of action oriented programs designed to correct problems and attain equal employment opportunities for all applicants and employees [Section 8104(a)(5)]

If minorities and women are underutilized in any job group, the nondiscrimination program must contain a description of programs designed and implemented by the contractor to correct the problem areas, as well as report the anticipated results of such programs. The establishment of specific goals and timetables might be a valuable tool to assist in bringing the contractors workforce into parity with the local community workforce availability. F. Design and implementation of internal audit and reporting system to measure the effectiveness of the program [Section 8104(a)(6)] This audit and reporting system should include written procedures for establishing minimum qualifications for jobs, preparing job specifications descriptions, posting vacancies, recruitment, application forms, interviews, etc., compensation, benefits, etc., promotions and demotions through to final terminations. It should be designed to measure progress toward reaching parity in the employers workforce to the local community labor force availability. The audit systems should provide periodic feedback on program progress, identification of problem areas requiring special attention, and the development of action programs to resolve the identified problems.

It is suggested the audit and reporting system be evaluated and updated annually to ensure its accuracy and effectiveness.

## S A M P L E

### ABC COMPANY'S EEO POLICY STATEMENT (OR REAFFIRMATION)

The ABC Company is an equal opportunity employer and is committed to an active Nondiscrimination Program. It is the stated policy of the ABC Company that all employees, and

applicants, shall receive equal consideration and treatment. All recruitment, hiring, placements, transfers, and promotions will be on the basis of qualifications of the individual for the positions being filled regardless of race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, age (over 40 years), sex, marital status, medical condition\* (cured or rehabilitated cancer), or physical handicap. All other personnel actions such as compensation, benefits, layoffs, returns from layoffs, terminations, training, and social and recreational programs are also administered regardless of race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, age (over 40 years), sex, marital status, or physical handicap.

The objective of ABC Company's nondiscrimination Program is, wherever possible, to actively recruit and include for consideration for employment members of minority groups, females, and the physically handicapped. All decisions on employment and promotions must be made solely on the individual's qualifications (merit) and bona fide occupational qualifications for the job in question, and the feasibility of any necessary job accommodations. Jane Doe has been designated Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinator. Inquiries concerning the application of federal and state laws and regulations, should be referred to her. The coordinator is responsible for administering program progress and initiating corrective action when appropriate. All personnel actions are monitored and analyzed to ensure the adherence of this policy. Regular annual reports are submitted to the Chief Executive Officer for review and evaluation of progress.

To achieve the goals of our Nondiscrimination Program, it is necessary that each member of this company understand the importance of the Program and his or her individual responsibility to contribute toward its maximum fulfillment. Specifically, managers' and supervisor's efforts towards the success of this program will be evaluated as is their performance on other company goals. The ABC Company will update and reaffirm this EEO Policy Statement annually.

Signature

Chief Executive Officer

Title

January 1, 1987

Date --

\*Cured or rehabilitated as defined in Section 12926(F), Government Code 12990.

S A M P L E

**DISSEMINATION Of ABC COMPANY'S EEO POLICY STATEMENT** To ensure that all employees, applicants for employment, and the public are aware of ABC Company's official policy on Equal Employment Opportunity and its commitment to nondiscrimination, the following steps have been taken.

#### **A. INTERNAL DISSEMINATION**

1. ABC Company's Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinator will meet periodically with department heads and disseminate information on the company's overall nondiscrimination Program.

2. ABC Company's policy on Equal Employment Opportunity and the Federal and State notice of Equal Employment Opportunity have been posted on department bulletin boards at locations where applicants are received for employment.

3. The policy statement is available to ABC Company employees. In addition, this policy is included in Personnel Memorandum No. 74 and in the Employee Handbook.

4. ABC Company department heads and supervisors who have a responsibility for interviewing, hiring, promoting, transferring, disciplining, and terminating employees, will continue to receive instructions in and review of the company's Equal Employment Opportunity Policy, and our legal and contractual obligations and the resources available to assist them in meeting their own goals set forth in the company's Nondiscrimination Program.

5. A discussion of Equal Employment Opportunity and the Nondiscrimination Program is included in the orientation of all new employees.

6. The Company's Equal Employment Policy and the Nondiscrimination Program will continue to be a discussion item in all staff meetings for company employees, supervisors and managers.

7. The phrase, "ABC COMPANY IS AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply", will be included in all job announcements. Such announcements will be posted on department bulletin boards. The phrase will be incorporated in all bargaining agreements.

8. A copy of ABC Company's Nondiscrimination Program is available for review through supervisors or the Personnel Department.

#### **B. EXTERNAL DISSEMINATION**

1. All recruiting sources such as those listed in the Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual

and other organizations which serve minorities, females, handicapped, and community leaders, secondary schools and colleges will continue to be informed orally and in writing of ABC Company's Nondiscrimination Program. We will also request their support in furthering our commitment to Equal Employment Opportunity.

These organizations will also be requested to actively recruit and refer qualified minorities, females, and the handicapped, for all available positions.

2. The phrase, "ABC COMPANY IS AN EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply." will be used in all recruitment publications; and if pictures are utilized, minorities, females, and the handicapped, will be represented where appropriate.

3. All purchase orders, leases, and contracts covered by, or subject to Executive Order No. 11246 (as amended) or its implementing rules and regulations will contain an appropriate equal employment opportunity clause therein (either by reference or in its entirety).

## S A M P L E

### DESCRIPTION OF ABC COMPANY'S EMPLOYMENT SELECTION PROCEDURES

#### A. RECRUITMENT - GENERAL

A positive recruitment program for ABC Company will be administered to locate and attract the best qualified personnel available. To encourage advancement, every effort will be made to fill vacancies by promoting eligible and qualified employees already on the staff. However, to assure the company of the best skills necessary to the operation of a complex organization, outside recruitment as well as in-house applications will be solicited for all department directors and other top level position vacancies.

#### B. APPLICATION FOR EMPLOYMENT AND REFERENCE CHECKING

1. Applications for employment with ABC Company will be accepted at any time and the applicants will be considered for all positions for which they are qualified.

2. Where the nature and duties of the job warrant it, applicants may be subject to examination which fairly tests capacity and fitness of the candidate to efficiently discharge the duties of the position for which the examination is held.

3. All candidates will be evaluated against requirements set forth in the job description for the position to be filled.

## C. VACANCY ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. All job opportunities with ABC Company will be announced by publication of the vacancy announcements, which will include:

a. Job title

b. Salary range

c. Description of duties

d. Job site location

e. Minimum education and experience requirements, and any special licenses, certificates or credentials required

f. Other information providing for a better understanding of the nature and conditions of the job

g. How, where and when to make application

h. Statement that ABC Company is an equal employment opportunity employer

## D. PROMOTION FROM WITHIN

1. When a position opening exists, the vacancy announcement is circulated widely and publicly throughout the company, or as a memorandum to all employees, for at least five (5) working days. The announcement may, if deemed essential, coincide with outside recruitment efforts as established in E below.

2. On an informal basis, and without making a commitment for employment, managers should encourage employees who are eligible, qualified, and interested to apply.

3. If there are any eligible and highly qualified candidates by the closing date, screening may proceed. If there are no such candidates from within, outside recruitment becomes mandatory.

a. One qualified in-house candidate who responds to the mandatory vacancy announcement is enough to proceed with the screening.

b. There must always be an announcement of an opening. If a temporary employee is the only responding candidate to the notice of vacancy, and if she/he is qualified, the screening may

proceed.

c. Students or other trainees that are considered temporary may be transferred with a waiver of policies.

## E. OUTSIDE RECRUITMENT

1. Whenever a new position is created, or a present position becomes vacant and is not filled by in-house promotion, it shall be the ABC Company policy to advertise the position as widely as possible for at least five (5) working days.

2. All possible steps shall be taken to notify the community, and use every recruitment source, using the following:

a. Distribute vacancy announcements.

b. Post vacancy announcements in "neighborhood centers" and in all company employment offices.

c. Requests to State employment offices.

d. Requests to municipal, county or State civil service registers.

e. Through "positions available" in news media, including trade journals, for certain professional positions.

f. Requests to community, ethnic and women's organizations such as YMCA, YWCA, NOW, IMAGE, OWL, etc.

9. Requesting free public service announcements on radio and television.

## F. SCREENING AND SELECTION GUIDELINES

1. General hiring policies and procedures are intended to foster the selection of competent and effective personnel while maintaining an age, sex, and ethnic balance in relation to the population of areas served.

2. Formal educational qualifications, unless required by State or local law, shall not be made a requirement for employment or advancement to any position if an individual has demonstrated an ability to competently perform the duties of the position.

## G. SCREENING

1. The purpose of the initial screening of applicants' applications is to evaluate each person's knowledge, skills and abilities to perform the duties of the position for which she/he is applying, based on criteria established by the company. Such screening involves a review of each applicant's file of application, resume, relevant experience, education, training, supervisor's evaluation, pertinent awards, and any other relevant information contained in the applicant's file or provided for review.

2. The person(s) doing the initial screening will determine which applicants are adequately qualified to be interviewed for the position for which they are applying by the following guidelines:

a. Qualified - An applicant shall be declared qualified if she/he meets, has potential to meet, or exceeds the minimum qualifications for the position as stated in the job description.

b. Unqualified - An applicant shall be declared unqualified for lack of any of the required qualifications established for the job.

c. Disqualified - An applicant shall be declared disqualified for the following reasons: (1) Falsification of application or attempted deception in connection with the application; (2) Material evidence of conduct that would be detrimental to the purposes and working relationships of ABC Company.

No applicant will be rejected as "unqualified" or "disqualified" without sufficient justification and the department supervisor's approval of the rejection.

## H. ORAL INTERVIEW

1. The interview panel's responsibilities include interviewing qualified applicants and recommending to the selecting official the best qualified candidate(s).

(3) The Personnel Officer will review the Job Description, Application For Employment, Action Notice, Rating Forms, and Certification of Best Qualified Candidates to determine the appropriateness of hire. She/he will then forward these documents to the appointing official, for his/her approval.

## I. NOTIFICATION OF SUCCESSFUL CANDIDATE

1. After confirmation of appointment, the successful candidate will be notified of his/her selection by receipt of Form ABC-10, "Notice of Appointment."



2. At the same time, Form ABC-17, "Employee Action Notice," will be processed.

3. The candidate who is appointed to the position will have a copy of the certification placed in her/his personnel file.

## J. RETENTION OF RECORDS

1. Records of applicants and interview work sheets will be retained by the selecting official for not less than two years.

2. The selecting official may, if necessary, exercise the option of calling candidates within the six months date of the original interview, to re-interview them to hire without re-advertising.

## S A M P L E

### ABC COMPANY'S ACTION-ORIENTED PROGRAMS

#### PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION

It was determined that the underutilization of Blacks and Hispanics in the Administrative Services Department was due to an artificial barrier requiring two-year college education for some clerical positions.

#### ACTION-ORIENTED PROGRAMS

Preliminary investigation was initiated on February 1, 1987 to compare the minimum qualifications established by local companies for comparable job classifications. In addition, the Personnel Officer is to complete a task analysis of these job classes and report to the President on or before March 15, 1987 with a recommendation to either reduce the minimum qualifications to completion of high school, or equivalency, or to retain present minimum qualifications.

#### PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION

Analysis revealed that the duties and responsibilities of draftspersons and estimators were in error in position descriptions and job announcements.

#### ACTION-ORIENTED PROGRAMS

The Personnel Officer, with the assistance of the XYZ Consulting Firm will perform a task

analysis of these positions and make appropriate recommendations to the President no later than March 15, 1987.

#### PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION

Investigation showed that in the Accounting Department, job announcements were not being disseminated to regular and special recruitment sources which may be inhibiting our reaching labor force parity.

#### ACTION-ORIENTED PROGRAMS

This matter will be addressed at the next manager's meeting on February 13, 1987 and re-enforced by procedures outlined in the Supervisors Handbook by no later than April 1, 1987.

#### PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION

Investigation indicated that the low retention rate of Hispanics in the Marketing Department might be caused by the Department Manager.

#### ACTION-ORIENTED PROGRAMS

This matter has been brought to the attention of the Marketing Manager. He has been counseled concerning our Nondiscrimination Program and has been informed he will be monitored. The manager's hiring, disciplinary, and lay-off decisions must be approved by the Personnel Officer until the Department has reached parity with the local labor force as relates to Hispanics.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Race Bias #37 - "Bias in Rules of Procedure"**

Once again, racial preferences can pop up in places where you would least expect them. Many of the articles in this series have dealt with the "big three" in the hierarchy of racial preferences, namely contract set-asides, employment and admissions preferences, and direct taxpayer financed subsidies.

But as the following article demonstrates, there are off-beat types of racial preference that are more difficult to characterize.

The excerpts below deal with special privileges that have been created for favored races and their lawyers through anti- discrimination law.

Ordinarily, those who initiate a lawsuit ("plaintiffs") in our system must be able to prove facts that enable them to recover. However, if you are of a non-European racial group and you are suing for discrimination, the fact of your race and the fact that you were not hired or were terminated shifts the burden of proof to the European-American defendant. The defendant must prove that he didn't discriminate.

Members of non-European racial groups and their lawyers can file a suit with no evidence at all of discrimination and then take advantage of "civil discovery" to rummage around in the employer's records.

Even if no direct evidence of discrimination against the particular plaintiff is found, evidence of any sort of statistical disparity in hiring will be sufficient to force the suit to go through an expensive trial. Almost any claim of discrimination, no matter how baseless, has economic value. Employers almost always will pay something to settle the case.

These different procedural rules applicable to civil rights cases amount to a kind of hidden "diversity tax" levied on employers, and passed on the consumers in the form of higher prices.

But the greatest advantage of this type of racial preference is the ease with which it can be hidden from public view.

Once again, it is the great herd of European-American, freeway commuting taxpayers that get hit with the cost. Because, once again, to use Willie Sutton's phrase, that is where the money is!

In the excerpt below, you will see that Senator Orrin Hatch has placed some provisions in the legal reform bill to reverse these preferences. Naturally, the non-European racial lobbies went ballistic.

The right to collect money from others under special lenient rules has considerable value.

Yggdrasil-

April 21, 1995 Wall Street Journal B5

Civil Rights Groups Fear Fast Senate Step

By MARGARET A. JACOBS

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.

Civil-rights groups fear that, when the Senate takes up legislation to overhaul product-liability lawsuits next week, Republicans will try to attach proposals that will undermine most antidiscrimination suits.

The groups, including the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights and other public-interest organizations, are particularly alarmed by a bill introduced earlier this month by Sen. Orrin Hatch (R., Utah), chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. They say they believe Sen. Hatch's proposal - which would affect all civil cases brought in federal courts, and many in state courts-would effectively make the cost and risk of bringing lawsuits for race, sex or age discrimination prohibitive to all but the wealthy. In addition, the proposal would also significantly curb employee actions under federal whistleblower, pension and other laws, they say.

The groups fear that they haven't had time to coordinate and counter lobbying by business groups in its favor. "This is very, very troublesome," says Edward Haile, counsel for the NAACP, which is just beginning to mobilize grassroots opposition. "To the extent that the [Hatch] bill will broadly limit access to the courts for the poor and racial minorities, it makes our battle over affirmative action seem really minimal," he adds.

\* \* \*

"While it has become something of a cliché to state that one proposal or another would set this country back 30 years or more," in the case of Sen. Hatch's bill "it is literally true," says Barry D. Roseman of the National Employment Lawyers Association, a group that primarily represents employees in discrimination actions.

\* \* \*

Specifically, the Hatch bill would preclude punitive damages in all but the rarest circumstances, in part because it would require a plaintiff to prove that an employer or other defendant actually intended the discrimination or other misconduct to continue, or acted recklessly in not taking action to prevent it. In certain circumstances, it may also cap punitive damages at \$250,000.

In addition, before even being allowed to ask for punitive damages in a complaint, the plaintiff would have to prove at a costly, separate hearing that he is likely to receive them at trial. There would be extra hurdles if another employee- in an earlier suit not necessarily even related to the current one - failed to win punitive damages. The hurdles would include extensive fact-finding about the earlier case.

The Hatch bill also includes a "loser pays" provision that would effectively reverse two Supreme Court decisions that require plaintiffs in discrimination cases to pay the defendant's attorneys fees only if the claim was found to be "frivolous or - groundless." The provision would require any winning plaintiff to pay the attorneys' fees of the defendant if the judgment at trial was even \$1 less than a rejected settlement.

Further, the proposal would prevent an injured person from collecting full damages from those only partly responsible. While eliminating what is known as "joint and several liability" apparently would apply only to personal-injury cases, lawyers who represent employees fear this would encourage employers to try to avoid large damage awards by building their defense against a harassment charge by placing most of the blame on an individual manager or worker - who might not be able to afford to pay any award.

Public-interest groups also fear that claims would be chilled by a provision calling for mandatory sanctions on lawyers who bring suits considered "frivolous, groundless and vexatious." Many discrimination suits could fall into that category, because the complaints tend to be general until plaintiffs are given access to employer records in pretrial fact-finding, the lawyers say. \* \* \*

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Race Bias #38 - "Democratic Delegate Selection"**

This series of posts on Race Bias against Euro-Americans, has consistently highlighted the connection between racial preference schemes and the political process.

Racial preferences have nothing to do with fairness and everything to do with maintaining political power.

The excerpt below makes that connection explicit. The excerpt describes the racial quotas that the Democratic Party enforces in its delegate selection process.

The article is written in the form of one of those modern "confessional" pieces by a lawyer for Clinton's 1992 presidential campaign. It underscores the degree to which the Democratic party has become the party of non-whites. The problem facing the Democratic party is a simple one.

To benefit politically from racial preferences to minorities, these preferences must be highly visible to the minority beneficiaries but must remain nearly invisible to the majority.

But the Democrats racial preferences are far from invisible to the majority. Exacerbating their problem is the general low education levels and lack of sophistication of the mass of dark skinned voters. Unless these dark skinned voters can actually see large numbers of dark skinned people as political convention delegates, they get suspicious that their interests are not being represented. They cannot accept the benefits of back room deals that would allow the party to appear to be representing the majority.

Absent large numbers of non-white faces, non-white interest in the election wanes and voter turnout falls, hurting the Democrats chances.

But the complexion of floor delegates merely reinforces the image among Euro-Americans of the Democratic party as the anti-white party. In the past, the Democratic party has been able to reward racial aggression of non-whites and exploit it for political purposes without tipping off the majority. Now, that is no longer possible.

The grim reality is that the Democratic party simply cannot get elected unless they energize their dark skinned racial constituencies in ways that are visible to all. They have no choice but to maintain racial preferences in a visible "in-your- face" manner.

They have no choice but to accelerate the balkanization of the United States.

Yggdrasil- Apr. 19, 1995 Wall Street Journal A16

## The Democrat's Quota System

BY PHILIP S. FRIEDMAN

In dealing with affirmative action, President Clinton has apparently seized on the slogan "reflect, don't retreat" while he awaits the findings of a bipartisan commission. But before he embarks on yet another timid assertion of presidential leadership, President Clinton would be wise to reflect on the presidential nominating rules of his own party. There, the full extent of the Democratic Party's institutional commitment to race and gender preferences underscores the likely failure of any affirmative action commission that the president might appoint.

Delegate selection rules for the 1996 Democratic National Convention provide that the national and state Democratic parties must "adopt and implement affirmative action programs with specific goals and timetables" for five minority groups: African-Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, Asian/Pacific Americans and women. While the rules profess to prohibit quotas, each state delegation, and the convention as a whole, must be divided equally between male and female participants. Moreover, at-large seats are "reserved" for members of the above named minority groups to meet the representation "goals" typically established by a demographic study of the Democratic electorate in each state.

While these rules started as a commendable effort to ensure minority participation, in practice they are enforced with the rigidity of quotas. Indeed, during the 1992 Clinton campaign, I found myself in the uncomfortable position of assisting Mr. Clinton's delegate selection team, like all of its Democratic counterparts, in counting the number of women, African-Americans, Asians, Hispanics and other party-sanctioned minority groups.

\* \* \*

Consequently, in a district with 10 delegates, if the voters elect eight male and two female delegates, the party rules dictate that three male delegates be replaced with three female delegates.

The state party must then tally the ethnic, gender and racial characteristics of all the district delegates. If the tally shows that the makeup does not match the state's representation "goals," then the state's "at-large" delegates are "cherry-picked" from among those individuals possessing the group attributes necessary to bring the entire delegation into compliance with affirmative action criteria.

Ostensibly, the purpose of these rules is to encourage those groups who have historically been underrepresented in the party. But rather than provide for equal opportunities, the Democratic Party's rules-as my own experience revealed-dictate equal outcomes based on race and sex. In short, convention delegates are increasingly selected on the basis of their status as members of defined groups, rather than as individuals with unique ideological principles, commitments and beliefs.

\* \* \*

These quotas can't simply be dismissed as the work of a voluntary organization. The Democratic Party, like the Republican, receives millions of dollars in taxpayer funds. Were there any delegates with the courage--and standing--to challenge the system, the federal courts might well find the Democratic Party's use of federal dollars to promote racial and gender set-asides to be in violation of both Title VI and Title VII of the civil rights laws.

Even more important, however, the Democratic Party's nominating rules embody the ideological commitment of the party and presumably its leader, Bill Clinton, to race and gender set- asides. Until President Clinton revamps these rules, not much credence can be given to his promise for an honest review of this country's affirmative action policies.

Mr. Friedman was the deputy general counsel to the 1992 Clinton campaign. He is an attorney in Washington.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

# YGGDRASIL

## Race Bias #39 - "Whites as 'Filler'"

In this installment of the Race Bias series we shift to racial dispossession of European-Americans in the democratic process.

The Voting Rights Act of 1968 has been used to create majority black districts for the purpose of ensuring that 10% of U.S. Congressmen are black. These districts are formed when the U.S. Justice Department files suit to gain the power of apportionment and redistricting.

But of course, redistricting is an art, one that is practiced for purposes of obtaining advantage. Through a process called "packing" you can ensure the election of more minorities and more liberals than their numbers in the population or in the actual voter turnout would justify.

The idea is simple. You just draw district boundaries in such a way that all of the Euro-American voters who will vote to defend themselves and their interests are packed densely into the fewest number of districts. That is why many Republican districts in California have 80% Republican registration, while the Democratic Districts have only 60% Democratic registration. Why waste votes?

Sort of gives you a whole new perspective on the value of a "diverse" society, doesn't it!

As Abigail Thernstrom states on page A15 of the April 12, 1995 edition of the Wall Street Journal:

"The Congressional Black Caucus in its amicus brief in the Louisiana case calls deliberately fashioned majority-black constituencies "among the least segregated districts in the Nation." Indeed, such districts are not "segregated," if by that we mean districts whose populations are exclusively of one race. "They all contain substantial numbers of whites. But integrated they are not. White voters are merely "filler" in such districts, as two proponents of racial gerrymandering have put it. They are included so as not to waste black ballots by excessive "packing." Those black ballots are the only ones meant to count. These are districts reserved for black candidates - no white candidates need apply."

Thus, there are reasons why democracy always seems to fail. But if you think that the story ends here, you have forgotten Yggdrasil's first rule of politics, and that is "follow the money flows and you will arrive at the truth."

This is a quiz! Quick - who else might benefit disproportionately from enlargement of the Congressional Black Caucus?

For the answer, we take another one of Yggdrasil's lessons in careful reading to connect seemingly unrelated facts. In a Wall Street Journal article on Sept. 17, 1993, page A12, two new women lawmakers were profiled. About Rep. Carrie Meek, a black woman representing Miami's black neighborhoods, the article had the following to say:

"Last winter, when the Democratic leadership seemed bent on curbing the committee's strength, Ms. Meek preached defiance - and delivered precious votes from the black caucus. "I just got here," she says. "I certainly don't want the strength diluted after I finally made it after 125 years."

"Her performance won the hearts of the committee leadership but set her apart from the broader budget-cutting, reform agenda associated with last year's election. This is one newcomer who takes to the floor to praise the Army Corps of Engineers and tree-planting programs ridiculed by others. Like many minority legislators with poor constituents, she balks at giving up political action committee contributions."

Indeed, I'll bet she does.

Think about it. If you are a lobbyist for a large pharmaceutical company, what could be better than a congressman from a poor district dependent on business lobbies for contributions, and with constituents who do not recognize legislative agendas and can only recognize the color of their congressman's skin? From a lobbyist's perspective, it's perfect.

The typical large corporation has grown quite comfortable with big government, and would prefer to deal with representatives who cannot afford to say "no" to special interest legislation and who need not fear reaction in their districts, because the districts can only react to race.

Thus, there are clear political reasons why big business has quietly come to favor racial gerrymandering in the political process and the more generalized transformation of the United States into a third-world country through immigration. It makes the political process much easier to deal with.

And, indeed, the Congressional Black Caucus now stages rather crass fundraisers to keep the shell game going. The excerpt that follows is a classic illustrating the total dependence of the Black Caucus on business contributions, giving business the means of enacting special-interest legislation inimical to the interests of the majority.

Yggdrasil-

## BUSINESS & RACE

----

By Leon E. Wynter

09/21/93 WALL STREET JOURNAL (J), PAGE B1

### Black Caucus's Clout With Business Grows

THE CONGRESSIONAL Black Caucus jumped to 40 members this year from 26, and corporations are taking notice. Many companies sharply raised their support for the caucus's huge annual legislative conference in Washington, which ended Sunday.

McDonnell Douglas, for example, rented the cavernous National Air and Space Museum for a reception honoring 14 black freshman legislators. It was a "several fold" increase in spending over the company's 1992 support, says Thomas M. Culligan, a McDonnell vice president. He says the largess was prompted by heightened awareness of minority issues and the fact that some 7,000 McDonnell employees live in the district of caucus member Rep. William Clay (D., Mo.).

"We want to work with the caucus," Mr. Culligan says. "It's a growing voice, and its agenda grows with it."

The caucus, whose members now make up almost 10% of the House, attracted some first-time sponsors, like Federal Express and Tyson Foods, according to caucus officials, who declined to discuss the fund-raising campaign in detail. The caucus's long-time sponsors include Chrysler, Philip Morris, Sony and PepsiCo.

There was some grumbling among corporations about pressure to increase donations to the caucus's nonprofit research and education fund, according to several company representatives. But that didn't put a serious damper on the giving. The 500 tables at the caucus's awards banquet were sold out, mostly to corporations, even though the top price of a table jumped to \$25,000 this year from \$10,000 last year. \* \* \*

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Race Bias #40 - "White-Bread"

At this point in our Race Bias series it is time to turn our attention once again to the attitudes of our liberal elites.

What gives these elites the idea that social cohesion can be maintained under a potent mix of racial quotas with ever growing groups of non-white beneficiaries?

What leads these liberal elites to think that imposing these burdens on their own kind will not lead to rebellion?

Fascination questions!

The problem is that you cannot just go out and administer a poll to our elites and expect honest answers. After all, they invented the polling game. He who polls others acquires power, while he who responds to the poll gets manipulated! There is no way that our cosmopolitan elites are going to submit truthfully to a poll.

But fortunately, you do not need a poll to find out what our elites really think. You see, our elites love to talk and write. You can plumb their racial attitudes by sampling the texts that they produce for their own amusement and consumption.

The best place to start are the "Leisure and Arts" sections of the L.A. Times and the New York Times. You see, our elites can publish and read whatever they want in the major metropolitan newspapers with little fear that the average middle American will ever read or react to the stuff.

Our elites define and celebrate themselves and their attitudes in these "Arts" sections of the major metropolitan dailies. And they do so with surprising candor.

What you find when you sample these "Arts" pages of the major metropolitan dailies, is that our liberal elites use racial stereotypes and epithets to describe their fellow whites and to describe white culture.

Throughout history, elites have displayed a need to differentiate themselves from the "commoners" and to express a sense of superiority. However, the fragile political coalition that keeps the majority elite in power in the United States depends upon universalisms of social equality. Therefore, it is not possible for this elite to express anti-egalitarian sentiments towards

members of racial minorities or, more broadly, based on economic criteria.

Thus, in the U.S., expressions of contempt for "inferiors" must be limited to members of your own race. Paradoxically, the greatest source of social hostility and friction in our multi-racial empire ends up being based on explicit racial criteria. Logically and inevitably, the reaction against the liberal elite by Euro-America must be based on the same explicit racial criteria.

The most vulgar and anti-egalitarian stereotype is already familiar to anyone who reads alt.politics.nationalism.white. It is the stereotype of "trailer parks." The most graphic Hollywood representation of this stereotype is the 20 year-old film classic "Deliverance" starring Jon Voigt and Burt Reynolds.

Only a crude and alienated minority of the liberal elite feels a need to differentiate themselves from the poorest of their fellow whites with images of "white trash," trailer parks, incest and low IQ.

(Indeed, one of the primary benefits of creating alt.politics.nationalism.white was to provide a forum in which young wannabe liberals could provide us with free samples of this vicious stereotype for later use in "motivating" European- Americans to rebel. The curious thing is that these liberal screamers are so profoundly secure in serving up these insults that even after you \_tell\_ them that you are saving their posts for later "motivational" use, they continue posting!)

In any event, our purpose is not to dissect the stereotypes used by a small but aggressive minority of young, liberal wannabes, but rather to investigate the widespread use of anti-white racial epithets in mainstream liberal culture.

And more specifically, we want to examine what these epithets tell us about the elite's attitudes toward their fellow European- Americans. Do they really believe average European-Americans are so passive that they will tolerate any burden or any insult?

The racial epithet "white-bread" has far broader significance than the liberal stereotype of the Euro-American working man living in a trailer park. "White-bread" is an epithet that applies broadly to suburbia and to middle class Euro-American culture. It is an epithet that our liberal elites use to differentiate themselves from their nearest "middle class" Euro-American competitors. And for that reason, it is much more important than the crude stereotype of the trailer park.

So in this post, we will analyze the ways in which liberal "Culture and Arts" writers for major daily newspapers use the word "white bread" to express contempt for Euro-America.

When the Ole Ygg first logged on to the Nexis "Major Newspaper" library and typed in WHITE

BREAD, the computer quickly came up with over 1500 "hits" and stopped the search. The Ole Ygg then narrowed the search to 1994 and later, and quickly discovered that the "hits" were about equally divided between the literal usage in the "Foods" sections of our major dailies, and the derogatory usage in the "Leisure and Arts" sections. In an attempt to eliminate most of the "foods" articles, the Ygg added the word "image" to the search, with the following result:

YOUR SEARCH REQUEST IS:

WHITE BREAD AND IMAGE NUMBER OF STORIES FOUND WITH YOUR REQUEST THROUGH:

LEVEL 1... 468

The raw numbers are staggering. This is one of the most important and oft used anti-white epithets. It is central to understanding the perceptions of our liberal elites. Use of the epithet is so wide-spread that it is even used in the diminutive "Leisure and Arts" section of the Wall Street Journal, an institution that roundly condemns the attitudes behind the epithet on its editorial pages.

It is an epithet from which America cannot escape.

But despite its widespread use, it is an epithet that is unknown to the great mass of freeway commuting "middle Americans." (As a parenthetical, I should mention that Ygg Jr., a politically aware college student, had never heard or seen the term "white bread" used in a cultural context, and was shocked when he read the raw downloads from the Nexis search before this post was written.)

So let us see how our elites actually use the term "white bread."

First, we have an example of an "orthodox" use of the anti- white epithet "white-bread" to mean boring, uninteresting, or "not worth living."

It comes from the March 19, 1995 edition of the Atlanta Constitution, Section A, page 3 in an article headlined "Around the South REGION IN BRIEF:"

SOUTHERN ACCENT "It's not that [Charlotte] has a bad image; it's that it doesn't have an image at all. . . . This is a white-bread town, a city that never wakes. . . . White shirts and dark suits are uniforms de rigueur. Most restaurants view dishes with more than two ingredients as daring culinary experiments. And Marie Osmond is always a guaranteed sellout." - David Goldfield, a University of North Carolina at Charlotte professor in the premiere issue of Reckon: The Magazine of Southern Culture, published by the Center

for the Study of Southern Culture at the University of Mississippi.

There are literally thousands of articles that use the term in this way. Above all else, our liberal elites want to escape from suburban America. Instead they want to be seen as "vibrant," exciting and at the cutting edge. The life and culture of the average middle class Euro-America is not good enough.

Next, we have an example in which the term "white bread" is used to mean dull and uninteresting, but in a sexual sense. An example of this usage can be found in a theater review for Newsday dated Nov. 18, 1994 entitled "The Diva Drives 'Sunset Boulevard'," by Linda Winer.

SUNSET BOULEVARD. Music by Andrew Lloyd Webber, book and lyrics by Don Black and Christopher Hampton, based on the Billy Wilder film. With Glenn Close, Alan Campbell, George Hearn, Alice Ripley. Sets by John Napier, with costumes by Anthony Powell, lights by Andrew Bridge, choreography by Bob Avian, musical direction by Paul Bogaev. Minskoff Theater, 45th Street west of Broadway. Seen at Tuesday's preview.

\* \* \*

Close is the major reason to see Trevor Nunn's production of Andrew Lloyd Webber's latest, an extravaganza that turns Billy Wilder's acidic movie classic about the Hollywood dream-machine into a sort of theme-park operetta noir. Depending on one's gooey-music threshold and Broadway's desperation for a new show, she and the sets may be enough.

\* \* \*

The problem is not the cast. There's still no mistaking Alan Campbell for William Holden, but his Joe has become less white-bread, and more attractively dissolute, over the months since L.A. Alice Ripley is not overly innocent as Betty, the symbol of industry goodness. And George Hearn, as Norma's loyal protector and butler Max, replicates Erich von Stroheim's cartoon-stoic dignity while adding his distinct sound and emotional richness.

The above example is interesting because it demonstrates that while "white-bread" is sexually uninteresting, Euro-American actors can "grow" and become less "white-bread" and "more attractively dissolute."

Next, we have an example from the January 29, 1995, edition of the Toronto Star, "Spotlight"

section, page E-12, by Tanya Barrientos and entitled "Conservative America's sweetheart sings at big game - Kathie Lee Gifford: 'Mom-and-apple-pie with a slice of cheesecake on the side':

\* \* \*

Yes, the Princess of Perk, Kathie Lee Gifford, will be on the tube today singing the national anthem at the Super Bowl.

\* \* \*

She seems to be everywhere, all the time. In the morning, in the evening, she's pertness personified.

\* \* \*

In the last four months, she has been on the cover of TV Guide and McCall's and Ladies Home Journal. She's the co-host for a prime-time institution chock-full of Kathie Lee wannabes - the Miss America Pageant.

\* \* \*

Some Kathie Lee watchers say she has tapped into the hearts and minds of Middle America and it adores her image as conservative America's sweetheart. She's a Christian poster girl with a touch of the devil in her. She's mom-and-apple-pie with a slice of cheesecake on the side. She's sophisticated enough to wear designer clothes and a five-carat diamond ring, but down-home enough to talk about her kids' runny noses and dish out bathroom humor on live television.

\* \* \*

At least 10 million viewers of Live! With Regis And Kathie Lee love to love her because she's openly religious, vocally conservative and downright adamant about her devotion to her family.

\* \* \*

So has Kathie Lee found the key to long-term success? Mullen of Entertainment Weekly thinks so. "Yes, she's white bread, and yes, she's mayonnaise, but go to your supermarket and you'll see there's an entire aisle of white bread and mayonnaise," he said. "It sells." GRAPHIC: Photo: WHITE BREAD: Kathie Lee Gifford's middle-American, God-fearing image made to order for a Super Bowl anthem crooner.



The title under the picture says it all. Above all else, "white- bread" symbolizes "middle-American, God-fearing image." Very unsexy and very boring.

As if to emphasize the point, our next example says the same thing but with a much nastier bite, - no surprise when you consider that the source is the Feb. 17, 1995 edition of the San Francisco Chronicle "Daily Datebook" section, page C3, entitled "It's the Story of Those Oh-So-Groovy Bradys," by Edward Guthmann:

THE BRADY BUNCH MOVIE: Spoof. Starring Shelley Long, Gary Cole, Michael McKean and Jean Smart. Directed by Betty Thomas. (PG-13. 90 minutes. At the UA Galaxy, Empire, the Plaza in Daly City.) Imagine the Brady Bunch, that insipid, polyester family from sitcom-land, entering this world. Like Coneheads on a day pass from Remulak, they're the ultimate in displaced aliens: bland, clueless slices of white bread who still wear bell bottoms, still say "groovy," and seem to thrive in a pastel bubble of their own.

As you can see, the term "white bread" can contain a fair measure of anger and nastiness, even in the cultural realm. Note that the qualities of "alien, bland and clueless" have, for our liberal elites, come to be identified as a white racial characteristic.

From the usage of "white bread" to disparage "middle America, God-fearing," we move on to the term's use in explicitly ethnic and racial contexts. Our first excerpt is a borderline or transition example from a story by Jerry Carroll in the Dec. 11, 1994 edition of The San Francisco Chronicle, page S1, entitled "Mr. Jenkins Has His Eye on You. But just who is that man with the martini in his hand?"

\* \* \*

Mr. Jenkins is slowly stealing his way into the national consciousness. Think of it as subliminal accretion, sort of like the way pearls are made. You become dimly aware of him here and there and don't pay much attention until finally the image load gets so heavy that the cross-over to the conscious level occurs. Then he stands revealed, sardonic and superior, the embodiment of the once-dominant country club WASP paradigm (in, say, the time of Eisenhower), back to demonstrate what roguish savoir-faire is all about.

\* \* \*

In Mr. Jenkins' case the product is Tanqueray, the English- made gin. It has always been a solid seller, but its American distributor, Schieffelin & Somerset Co., brooded that a younger generation of tipplers in the United States identified it with Modern Maturity

readers.

\* \* \*

So Tanqueray sent its advertising into the shop for retooling.

The upshot is a \$ 27 million campaign, the biggest in liquor advertising history, designed by a Madison Avenue team led by Deutsch Inc. creative director Greg DiNoto, Dallas Itzen and Kathy Delaney. Their task was to reach out to younger people without losing Tanqueray loyalists who could be counted on to feel horror at being thought hip. "There are associations people made with the core audience that became associations made with the product: older, more conservative, probably kind of white bread and stuffy," said DiNoto. "We decided, let's take older and turn it into sophisticated. Let's take stuffiness and turn it into urbanity and wit. Let's take conservative and turn it into restraint and a highly evolved sense of humor."

To sell a product identified in the Public Mind with tired old WASP's, you find a tired old WASP and then give him an image that will sell to a younger, ethnically and racially diverse market. In this case, it is the creative director of the ad agency who uses the term "white bread" to describe an existing customer that the target customer presumably would associate negatively with the product. Again, individual characteristics have come to be associated with the race.

We move next to an example which combines a high level of liberal elitist anger with an explicit racial use of the term "white bread." It is an article by a feminist writer gushing over Hillary Clinton. The example is from an editorial by Leslie Baldacci on page 37 of the Feb. 17, 1995 edition of the Chicago Sun-Times entitled "Hillary Clinton's Homecoming; Memo to the First Lady: You Rule -- Don't Change":

There was no line of panting admirers, so after Hillary Rodham Clinton's speech to the Civic Federation Wednesday night I was able to walk right up to her and shake her hand. "Nice speech," I told her. "And I have a message for you from my daughters. 'You rule.' " Tell some people "You rule" and you can tell they don't have a clue what you're talking about. Not Clinton. Her eyes brightened with understanding and a touch of amusement and she said, "Thank you very much."

\* \* \*

Hillary indeed "rules." I admire her and I encourage my daughters to appreciate precisely what many Americans seem to despise about her -- that she's a strong woman, smart and articulate, and a feminist of my generation who doesn't tone down her act to accommodate other people's comfort levels.

\* \* \*

In some circles, that is a definition for "bitch." Part of our society -- men and women both -- still feels threatened by a woman like Hillary Clinton. That is the only way to explain the consistently bad rap she gets. "Bitch on!" I say. "Go, girl!"

\* \* \*

I heard her excitement about the diversity of the student body at her old high school. When she went to Maine East, she said, it had a homogenous, white student body. Now it has students of every hue who speak 63 different languages. All of our children are growing up amid diversity; I certainly didn't encounter it in my white-bread '60s upbringing. I agree with Clinton: America's growing diversity is something worth celebrating. These high school kids are luckier than we were.

\* \* \*

Fascinating! Note how this white liberal sees fit to express her anger and frustration using black street talk!

Yggdrasil went to a diverse center-city high school with 40% black and 30% jewish populations, and he couldn't agree more. A "diverse" educational experience is something to celebrate! A large fraction of our European-American children are undergoing a similar experience in school now!

However, liberals are going to be surprised at the consequence. There is absolutely no evidence anywhere to suggest that mixing races in this manner increases tolerance and understanding. In fact, the regions and neighborhoods with the greatest amount of inter-racial contact always yield the greatest racial strife.

The absence of a "white-bread '60s upbringing" means that today's Euro-Americans will leave these diverse institutions knowing first hand that the American dream of integration and racial harmony is a lie. The heavy doses of propaganda administered in these schools guarantee that the real education will slip in under the radar of the liberals' polling techniques.

Next we move on to a more gripping personal tale of sexual frustration from page 4 of the January 20, 1995 edition of the Jerusalem Post. In an article by Netty C. Gross entitled "Leavin' Manhattan with the Bombay Heartthrob Blues," a Jewish woman who cannot find a Jewish mate refers to her sexual competitors as "white bread and mayonnaise."

A friend who lives in her own condo on the Upper West Side of Manhattan calls me.

She's 39, single, a partner in a Big Eight accounting firm and inexplicitly identified as a traditional Jew. She's called to say good-bye.

It is the old story. She is quitting New York, tired of looking for a husband, tired of being rejected by persnickety Jewish men. Maybe it has something to do with their mothers or with their fathers or with their cousins from France, my friend speculates, laughing. Who cares. I'm outta here, she says. It's 1995. She has to do something radical. She is moving to India.

\* \* \*

The idea of moving to a Third World country - to a place she says where men are still men and where a white woman who can buy her own elephant for transportation is prized - is not new. Another SJF from Manhattan who moved to India several years ago became folklore. In a small Jewish congregation in Bombay, she met her British-Jewish Hugh Grant. Today they are married and living in London. After 15 years of chasing Jewish men, my friend says her tired flesh wants a little adulation, a little lust, a little naches from having been born female. And she wants clamorous attention from thousands of men. A Jewish Benazir Bhutto, that's what she wants. So when her company decided to transfer the current managing partner in Bombay, she, to her parents' dismay, volunteered for the position.

\* \* \*

Jewish men want what's intensely familiar to them - Eastern European food, intelligent female conversation - and what's intensely alien: extreme height, a degree of imagined carnality. (SJFs in Tel Aviv report men there favor Dutch converts for wives.)

\* \* \*

The divorced men, according to my friend, are slightly different. They act like they've just made a jailbreak. They want a whole different model, preferably waitresses from Minnesota, science teachers from Duluth, basically any female whose never heard of Loehmann's, decorators or lawyers. They want women who, when they hear they have to sign a pre-nuptial agreement, say, "Great!"

\* \* \*

As the sun sets over the 20th century, one of the biggest jokes, according to my friend, is that Jewish men aren't anxious to marry her: a pert, admittedly aggressive, self-made Jewish woman. She blames traditional feminists whom, she believes, devalued female

sexuality without concerning themselves with cultural trespass. Traditional Jewish women, she says, who really believed they could "have it all" are paying the price. Jewish men can't handle so much firepower. They are seeking their white bread and mayonnaise elsewhere. According to my friend, it's not that Jewish men reject strong women, they just don't like the artifice unmasked. They are still earnest, programmed to work hard for home and hearth but not for peers. Only for pale, lanky types who say "great" every half-hour.

\* \* \*

Don't ask the Ole Ygg what "mayonnaise" adds to the "white bread" image in this context. The Ole Ygg is "clueless."

Finally, we move on to uses of the term "white bread" in the context of the black experience. The first example comes from the Arts section of the Jan. 15, 1995 edition of the Hartford Courant entitled "A Jazz Pianist 'Beyond Category.'"

\* \* \*

Despite schizophrenia, drug abuse, alcoholism, galling encounters with racism and economic exploitation at the hands of club owners, Powell, in a triumph of spirit, mind and heart, somehow created one of the greatest legacies of piano music of the 20th century before dying at 41 in 1966 in a Brooklyn hospital.

\* \* \*

"Bud was classically trained as a kid and knew the repertoire. His family wanted him to be a classical concert pianist, but he was black, and at that time that wasn't possible," Bishop says. Arthur Taylor, who performed as a young drummer on many classic trio sets in both the Blue Note and Verve boxes, agrees that Powell, like such other black virtuosos as Fats Waller and Tatum, was excluded by cultural apartheid from the white-bread world of classical music."

For anyone familiar with the classical music scene, the idea that a black musician would be excluded because of race is laughable. Voluntary affirmative action has been the rule in the classical music world for about a century and everyone knows it. The author knows this too, and he uses the term "white bread" in order to inject a note of ambiguity into the issue of causation. In other words, it might have been "impossible" for a black to make it in the "white bread world of classical music" for reasons of acute cultural discomfort rather than for reasons of discrimination.

In this context, the derisive term "white bread" indicates that the black musician would be turned off by this world and, indeed, that he should be turned off.

Finally, we deal with one of the most common uses of the term "white bread" in the context of an article that uses other, more potent anti-white racial epithets as well. This final example comes (appropriately enough) from the March 24, 1995 edition of the New York Times, Section C; Page 8; Column 5 in an article by Caryn James and entitled "Film Festival Review; Drive, They Said, And Drive They Did."

There is a scene at the center of "New Jersey Drive" that captures everything this fast, thoughtful street drama tries to do: a group of black teen-agers in Newark steal a police car from the cop's own driveway and go on a joy ride. Suddenly, the audience is rooting for a bunch of car thieves, young men clearly driving off to destruction. Yet the moment is gleeful. This white cop is corrupt and physically brutal; he deserved it. And the scene takes a comic turn, as the thieves pull over a carload of geeky white guys and discover what it's like to have power. Midget, the tough leader of the thieves, gets on the speaker and in a dead-on white-bread accent scares the preppy types to death. They put their hands up, Midget warns that they have the right to remain stupid, and races on.

Notice that in the above example the epithet "white-bread" is used to describe the black hero's imitation of whites in general. It is a universalized epithet. In contrast, when the author/critic describes the actual Euro-Americans depicted in the movie, he uses the more powerful racial epithet, "geeky white guys."

The above excerpt is particularly fascinating because of its inconsistent mixing of racial images of whites. When one thinks of "geeky white guys" one thinks of "stage crew" types in high school with pocket protectors in their short sleeve shirts.

But in the next sentence, the reviewer notes that the black hero "scares the \_preppy\_ types to death." Perhaps it is the pressure of deadlines, but the popular stereotype of "preppy" is not at all the same as the stereotype of "geeky white guys." Preppies are "tight white protestants" in training to become the suited businessmen typically portrayed in our movies as criminals.

In any event, the use of the term "white bread" in the excerpt above is intended to demonstrate the greater "authenticity, excitement and masculinity" of the blacks described in the movie. Indeed, when you review the varying uses of the term "white bread" above, you cannot escape the impression that our liberal white elites are profoundly unhappy with the white culture from which they came. To them, it is boring and meaningless, sexless and unattractive.

This widespread and nearly unanimous cultural attitude on the part of our liberal elites emphatically raises some very interesting points.

First, is it any surprise that we have admissions and hiring quotas? Any surprise that we have contracting set-asides? After all, our liberal elites enacting such preferences have never actually met anyone willing to admit to being "white." Everyone they know is profoundly ashamed of "whiteness" and flees from it both literally and metaphorically.

Any chance that those making such free use of this epithet "white bread" could even imagine people taking offense at racial quotas? Where on earth would such people be found? In trailer parks?

Second, anti-white hostility is not confined to liberals from any particular group based on European ethnic origin. Hostility to Euro-American culture seems to be a rite of passage into the elite; one embraced by all, and a minimum qualification, it would appear, for peddling soaps and gin through the mass media. Thus, while one may appropriately abhor the politics of 80% of this country's Jews, it is clear that anti-white animus is often strongest among those in the elite who had a "white-bread '60s upbringing," something that very few Jews would claim.

Third, it seems a near certainty that such strong and pervasive anti-white animus among our elites motivates much of the universalist ideology of "compassion" and "tolerance" and inevitably informs this ideology with intensely destructive policy content. The truth is that after you see enough references to "white bread," you have much less trouble linking destructive policies to evil motives, and ignoring the universalist labels and masks.

Finally, our elites might wish to ponder what the millions and millions of European-Americans with no pretensions and no need to differentiate themselves from their fellow European-Americans will think of all this when they find out (as they inevitably will).

Might these millions suddenly wish to prove the boring and passive stereotype wrong?

And how exactly might they elect to disprove it? After the fashion of Timothy McVeigh?

What options have the liberals left them?

Just a few thoughts from

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Race Bias #41 - "What do They Know?"

In Race Bias #40, "White Bread," we examined the anti-white racial attitudes of a large group of educated Americans who read the "Arts" sections of our major daily newspapers.

This is the strata of our society that implements the policies of racial preference for non-whites that have been the subject of the first 39 posts in this series. Although "white" themselves, they detest middle class European-American culture, seeking always to escape it.

Many university professors, reporters in the print and broadcast media, and government employees share these views of "white bread" with associated stereotypes of the people from whom they wish to distance themselves.

Thus, it should be no surprise that our bureaucracies can find people to staff programs that flatly contradict the plain words of the 14th Amendment without troubled conscience. However, while this portion of the American elite may be well educated, it is not necessarily economically well-off.

And this leads to a natural question. We have a clear picture of the "cultural elites," but what of the economic elites? Are they anti-white too?

Certainly, there is a fair scattering of white-haters among the top corporate leaders and the super rich in America. However, there are important differences in perspective between this elite generally and the cultural elite profiled in Race Bias #40.

A defining characteristic of the super-rich and the CEOs of the fortune 500 is that they are far more conscious of what others think, particularly their customers and fellow market participants. It is an elemental skill for survival in the marketplace. Those obsessed with their own needs and feelings tend to be less able to identify and satisfy market demands (the needs of others).

With this market and customer focus on what others think, our corporate elites are typically going to be far less inclined to indulge any anti-white ethnic or racial animus they might harbor. The term "white-bread" will never sell soap or beer and they all know it. (Although it does sell theater tickets!)

Nevertheless, this class has enormous power in our society, and so the question naturally arises



whether they are "guilty" and whether, in some changed future, they ought to be held accountable. After all, they are the ones who have approved these policies of discrimination against European-Americans based on race!

The prime measure of guilt is intent. So then the question becomes, "what do these corporate chieftains really think?" What do they know? Why would they do this to their own kind? Do they share this contempt for "white bread?"

This post provides you with some tantalizing clues.

First is a short excerpt from an economic forecast called the "Sommers Letter", published by the Conference Board for its members. The Conference Board is a lobbying, issues analysis and "networking" organization for large U.S. Corporations.

Its purpose is to give the fortune 500 a forum for organizing input to Congress on those issues on which most of the members agree. One of the member services the organization performs is publication and distribution of its own economic forecast made by its own staff economists.

To many members, this service is one of the most important. If the Conference Board has an ideology, it is moderate to liberal in the sense that they have learned to live with big, intrusive government. As "realists" they all accept the metastasis of intrusive and irrational government as "inevitable." They organize, in part through the Conference Board and similar organizations, to gain influence over the direction of that malignant growth.

In any event, you would be amazed at what these corporate chieftains discuss in private among themselves. Here is that classic example from the Sommers Letter, published by the Conference Board, Sept. 1, 1987:

"But the prevailing impression, based upon such portentous facts as the 18 percent of U.S. employment represented by disadvantaged minorities, the 32-percent share of minorities among the unemployed, and the high percentage of advanced engineering degrees granted by American institutions to foreigners (with a penchant for returning to their own countries) supports a troubling prima facie case for an educational impairment of efficiency not present in the homogeneous labor forces of our principal competitors."

So there you have it - "homogeneous labor forces of our principal competitors". The Corporate Chieftains of America are abundantly aware of the advantages of a racially homogeneous work force. They are abundantly aware of the weaknesses of multi-racial empires.

And as the somewhat longer excerpt printed below makes clear in the most straightforward language, these liberals are abundantly aware of the damage that mass immigration of the low

skilled inflicts on our living standard.

The above quote from the Conference Board sat unused in Yggdrasil's clippings file until the May 1, 1995 issue of Barron's arrived with an article on page 15 entitled "Really Rich - How very wealthy families view investments, society, the future." The article is a survey on the attitudes of Americans with more than \$100 million dollars. As that survey notes:

"[T]he second great difference of those with wealth. Many of them perceive the nation's social fabric to be unraveling, the delicate threads being pulled by ethnic and racial conflicts, a worldwide population explosion and a growing national debt."

Further:

"At least two-thirds of them believe that in the next decade, the U.S. trade imbalance will get worse, that the national debt will balloon, that more and more tax dollars will be chewed up by entitlement, - and oh, yes, that law enforcement is going to become somewhat, um, problematic."

And:

"lastly, the "internationalists," who metaphorically - and sometimes literally - are getting out of town before the barbarians come crashing through the front gates. \* \* \* Their response: Jump ship. This group believes not only in investing overseas but in seeking out offshore tax shelters, still a relatively radical move for most wealthy families. In extreme cases, these folks will consider renouncing their U.S. citizenship."

The Barron's survey speaks in "code". The belief by two-thirds of the wealthy that "law enforcement is going to become somewhat, um, problematic" is a polite way of saying that urban juries will lead to spotty law enforcement, as will the inevitable darkening of urban police forces.

At the time this survey was taken, the participants were aware of the O.J. Simpson charade, but probably unaware of the percolating rage in rural America, and certainly unaware of its potential for destruction.

The wealthy have no respect for our legal system and have no expectation that the legal system can deliver fair or just results. They are frightened by the civil (tort) system, and afraid of being sued. They have no need to read the "Bonfire of the Vanities." They have already moved part of their wealth, and they are getting ready to move themselves.

But despite these attitudes, untrammelled immigration continues to exacerbate the skills deficit

and the potential for ethnic conflict. While virtually all of corporate America privately recognizes that integrationism is a myth, they do nothing to oppose it. The question is "why?"

The truth may surprise you.

The fact is that despite the power of the corporate chieftains and the wealth of those with over \$100 million, most of these people feel that politics is alien and that they have little real power to change things.

From their immediate personal perspectives, it is better to appear generous and kind in public, to counteract the natural tendency towards economic jealousy. They keep any anti-egalitarian thoughts to themselves.

In a sense, this feeling of helplessness among the corporate elites and the wealthy is merely one more natural and predicable pathology of the multi-racial empire. You see, our corporate elites are not at all sure that Americans are "their people." It is easy to disclaim responsibility for the fate of total strangers.

To the corporate chieftains and the wealthy, image is everything. The corporate chieftains have learned that the art of acquiring and keeping power in a large organization revolves around withholding information. After all, if a subordinate knows what you know, he may be able to make a better presentation to the board. Most chief executives come up from sales. Seldom is the CEO the smartest person in the organization. Deny those around you the essential data, and they can never mount a successful challenge to your power.

And indeed, it is no surprise that the wealthy and the corporate captains opt for this familiar stratagem in public life as well.

After all, it is the only thing they know.

This need to conceal, control and manipulate information creates a profound distrust of our society and our political institutions. But they can never say so in public. They know that integration is not working. They know that multi-culturalism is fragmenting the U.S. However, they have a powerful short term economic interest in patching over the conflicts and keeping the system running until their stock options can be exercised or, in the case of a wealthy founder, the company can be taken public.

In any event, that is why corporate officers never criticize such obviously silly policies as affirmative action. It is best to go along with it. After all, one misstep, and you could lose that power.

Their primary wish is to appease the "political classes" and not arouse their jealousy. What they fear most of all is the political power of the mass of educated "white bread" haters in the media and on the legislative staffs who can stir up political hostility toward business.

From the perspective of a Fortune 500 CEO or corporate founder with over \$100 million, society is ruled by a very dangerous class of information elite skilled at extracting tribute and disrupting real economic activity through the press and the political and legal systems. As individuals, the members of these information elites may be less skilled at acquiring power than CEOs, and less lucky at being in the right place at the right time than the wealthy founders. However, they control the opinions of the voters and consumers.

From the perspective of top managers and the very wealthy, it is a class that is far too dangerous to confront.

In the words of Prof. James Q. Wilson, in a review of a book from the Jan. 11, 1978 Wall Street Journal, P14 Column 4:

\* \* \*

The contrary hypothesis is easily stated. Since the 1930s, and especially since the 1960s, the drift of public policy has been increasingly hostile to business.

The essential difference between Mr. Lindblom's theory and the alternative stated above is that his imputes power to an institution or class on the basis of the resources it possesses, while the other attempts to measure power on the basis of who wins and who loses. The fallacy of the Lindblom view is well-known to every student of politics: One cannot assume that the disproportionate possession of certain resources (money, organization, status) leads to the disproportionate exercise of political power. Everything depends on whether a resource can be converted into power, and at what rate and at what price. That, in turn, can only be learned by finding out who wins and who loses.

For a long time, business could block environmental controls; now they cannot. Why? They have great power, it would appear, in maintaining the favorable tax treatment of capital gains, but not in lowering the corporate tax rate. Why? They lose on most OSHA regulations, but win (usually) on maritime subsidies. Why? Clearly, some distinctions are in order. But even more, some research is in order. This book is destined, I think, to have a great intellectual influence. And it fails in that part where evidence rather than logical analysis is most necessary. It is an armchair view of American politics and stereotyped from the outset: The only actors on the stage are elected politicians and business firms, so Mr. Lindblom sees the latter as being the principal constraint on the former.

But to a participant in politics, and even to most observers, the full list of actors is much larger and the constraints far more complex. The student reading this book will learn nothing of the professions, the bureaucracy, the courts or the public-interest law firms, and next to nothing of the mass media, intellectuals, "experts," universities and foundations that have such a large effect on American public life. It is a pity, because in the past we have learned so much from Prof. Lindblom.

Mr. Wilson is Henry Lee Shattuck professor of government at Harvard University.

It is thus clear that the very wealthy and the corporate CEOs know exactly what is going on. It is clear they understand that the racial burdens they are imposing on less fortunate members of their own kind are destructive and contrary to the plain words of the Constitution and the Civil Rights Act of 1964. (And, indeed, all of these people could be placed on trial without adopting a single word of new legislation!)

But the ultimate question is whether they are guilty of sins of omission or commission. Do they indeed feel constrained by a hostile political environment, or is the adoption of racial quotas a direct and intentional attack motivated by hate?

We will know in the fullness of time!

With the exception of the chiefs of the movie studios and networks, few CEOs are interested in changing the popular culture. They are generally happy with the status quo. Therefore, they are unlikely to support new social movements, particularly ones as unpopular as "white nationalism," until long after the movement demonstrates its broad appeal, acquires political power and the collective self-discipline to reward and punish business.

Thus, among the corporate chieftains, we will find out who is motivated by animus by observing who resists our movement with money and resources in the future. We will find out who is not so motivated, by observing who seeks to come to terms with us. The important thing to do is to keep good notes along the way!

But do not expect business to defend Western Civilization. The truth is that business has no direct interest in preserving our civilization. And of course, defending that civilization has costs. Our institutions subsidize those who hate our "white bread" civilization while the image masters of Beverly Hills do their utmost to convince the great herds of freeway commuting "white bread" that their civilization is in good hands.

It is a lie. But it is a lie that has kept the shopping malls full and the checkbooks open for a very long time.

In the meantime we know that they have actual knowledge - a key ingredient of guilty intent.

So, take very good notes!

Yggdrasil-

-----  
The Sommers Letter

The Conference Board

September 1, 1987

87-21

\* \* \* Finally, there is an ongoing struggle, probably still in an uncomfortably early stage, over the quality of the U.S. household sector viewed as producers rather than consumers. The issues here are educational attainment, worker training, worker incentive. International comparisons in this area are even more uncertain than comparisons of saving and investment rates, which are themselves undependable. But the prevailing impression, based upon such portentous facts as the 18 percent of U.S. employment represented by disadvantaged minorities, the 32-percent share of minorities among the unemployed. and the high percentage of advanced engineering degrees granted by American institutions to foreigners (with a penchant for returning to their own countries) supports a troubling prima facie case for an educational impairment of efficiency not present in the homogeneous labor forces of our principal competitors.

All of these struggles have a powerful bearing on the U.S. living standard, the high consumption share that prevails in the United States, and future prospects for the U.S. living standard. A living standard has to be "earned," in the same sense that a living standard is a "cost" to the system. Earning it is a matter of labor, capital and managerial efficiency; it is not earned by a falling currency, however helpful the decline may be for producers in tradeable-goods industries. Indeed, in its own mysterious way, a falling currency is symptomatic of the fact that the prevailing U.S. living standard, in the present international context, is exposed. If our domestic economic institutions and policies will not constrain it, then it seems likely that the world will impose constraints on us, in the form of higher domestic inflation, and higher interest rates.

-----  
May 1, 1995 Barron's p15

## Really Rich

How very wealthy families view investments, society, the future

By Andy Zipser

The truly rich are different from you and me - and, Hemingway notwithstanding, it's not merely because they have more money.

\* \* \*

Which brings up the second great difference of those with wealth. Many of them perceive the nation's social fabric to be unraveling, the delicate threads being pulled by ethnic and racial conflicts, a worldwide population explosion and a growing national debt. Inside the mansion gates, however, it's no picnic, either, what with the kids and grandkids and great-grandkids all clamoring for their share of the estate as Malthusian dynamics nibble away at the family fortune. What to do? Where to turn? Whom to trust when you can't talk to anyone?

Such sentiments may explain why 150 of the country's richest families-each of whom has at least \$100 million in assets- recently took the time to fill out an exhaustive questionnaire probing these very issues. Prepared and analyzed by Graystone Partners, a Chicago-based matchmaker for wealthy families and investment managers, the survey may be the country's first comprehensive public profile of truly rich people. The data collected obviously benefit Graystone, but as principal David Horn points out, it also fills an information void for the respondents themselves.

"These families are very interested in benchmarking," Horn says-a polite way of saying that rich people, just like the non- rich, are immensely curious about other people's money.

After hours and hours of computer number-crunching, Graystone can tell you this: The rich are not only different from us but from one another, with four distinct personality types emerging from the bits and bytes. And, second, that capital preservation is no longer the overarching consideration it used to be. Instead, Horn explains, the combination of increased global volatility and growing family size means "this generation has to be more aggressive than the last" - a polite way of saying they'll have to gamble more. (Horn is always polite when he talks. Comes with the turf.)

Taken as a group, Graystone's respondents clearly demonstrate that money can't buy peace of mind. At least two-thirds of them believe that in the next decade, the U.S. trade imbalance will get worse, that the national debt will balloon, that more and more tax dollars will be chewed up by entitlement, that tax breaks favoring the rich will be eliminated - and oh, yes, that law

enforcement is going to become somewhat, um, problematic. No wonder, then, that the great majority of respondents also say they'll move more of their wealth out of the U.S., diversify their holdings and increase their use of offshore tax havens (see chart, page 16). Graystone's four categories of rich people include the "trendists," whose world view tends to be determined by the media; the "optimists," who tend to believe the country will somehow manage to muddle through perilous times; the "power brokers," who know things are a mess but believe they can influence events for the better through their own direct intervention, and lastly, the "internationalists," who metaphorically - and sometimes literally - are getting out of town before the barbarians come crashing through the front gates. Viewed from each of those vantage points in turn, this is how the world looks:

**The Trendists** - Don't bother with these folks if you're looking for contributions to the city symphony. Trendists (39% of the total) are least likely to prepare for change. They tend to think of events as moving in a straight line. They are the most likely of all four groups to believe that entitlement will devour a growing share of the federal budget and are least likely to believe that a flat-rate tax will be enacted, or that the affluent will invest heavily in what Graystone calls "the rebuilding of America." They're also least likely to believe the wealthy will increase their support of the nonprofit community.

**The Optimists** - Despite their rosy label, this 19.9% slice of the respondents are the milquetoasts of the bunch. They don't have really strong feelings about much of anything and can be swayed relatively easily. But underneath all the vagueness is a belief that everything will end up for the best. Optimists are most likely to believe the government will restructure itself, that the federal deficit will be significantly reduced through cost-cutting and that aggressive trade policies will create a favorable trade balance. In short-don't worry, be happy.

**The Power Brokers** - This is the Chicken Little crowd, but with attitude: The sky is falling, but if we get our act together we can hold it up. Power brokers (25% of the total) believe the affluent will lose faith in financial institutions and in the federal government - thanks in large part to a national debt that expands beyond control. Power brokers are also more convinced than other respondents that ethnic and racial violence in the U.S. will escalate, disease will ravage the world, and environmental collapse is a real probability. But for these strong-willed types, this only reinforces the need to enlarge their circles of financial advisers and come together in "affinity groups" to affect public policy.

**The Internationalists** - Less apocalyptic than the power brokers, this 16.1% of the total nevertheless is highly skeptical about the future of the U.S. economy-virtually all are certain that income taxes will rise significantly and that value-added taxes are on the way. Their response: Jump ship. This group believes not only in investing overseas but in seeking out offshore tax shelters, still a relatively radical move for most wealthy families. In extreme cases, these folks will consider renouncing their U.S. citizenship. Fairweather friends or citizens of the world? You decide.



Yet whether adopting as their muse either Pollyanna or Cassandra, today's wealthy families recognize that investing has grown much more complex and turbulent. That's only half of the problem, however. The other half, as students of dynastic wealth well know, is the propensity of most families to grow exponentially--a growth rate, alas, at which few fortunes can expand. Moreover, human psychology all but guarantees that family wealth will be dissipated over successive generations: It's a rare family in which the founder's entrepreneurial zeal is matched by his descendants'. Instead, as children and grandchildren become more cautious or detached, the great wealth-creating engine slows and stops and then starts shifting into reverse.

Now, a growing number of wealthy families realize they have to be more daring if they intend to keep their fortunes.

\* \* \*

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Race Bias #42 - "Eroicide"

We conclude this series on Race Bias against European-Americans on a more personal note, and with a second call to action. The actions which are most essential to our survival are only marginally "political."

Indeed, there is a titanic struggle unfolding in America today. It is a struggle of far more consequence than passage of the Contract with America, or the legislative defeat of the racial quotas that have been the primary subject of this series. It is the struggle in which the fate of Western Civilization will be determined.

It is the struggle to reproduce.

As we have discussed in previous posts, the advertisers in our mass media seek to encourage irrational purchases by appealing to status longings and sexual frustration. Prior to the invention of photography shortly before 1850, young boys and girls invariably formed their ideas of sexual attraction based upon people they actually saw in their neighborhoods.

However, with the advent of the photograph and the use of the photograph in advertising, it became possible to select rare and infrequent images of human beauty and present them to the public as the desired norm. Thus, sexual imprinting came to be based upon the result of a selection process that excluded all but a very tiny fraction of the population. The selection was done for commercial reasons. The scarcity of the image in real life increased its advertising value.

Politics in the 19th and 20th centuries has been largely a struggle over equality. However, few areas of life present more stark and visible inequalities than sexual attraction. Given equal amounts of exercise and training, most men can run the 100 meter dash at pretty much the same speed. The differences are minor.

But the aesthetic differences between individuals are absolutely enormous - orders of magnitude greater than the differences between them in strength, manual dexterity or intelligence. In other words, the ability of most people to make a contribution to the economy is far more equal than their ability to attract a mate (if the reasons for mating are exclusively based on aesthetics, and not practical necessity).

The problem, of course, is that every advertisement published by the press spreads images of

women the like of which are seldom seen in real life in most towns and cities in America.

You can search the streets of Manhattan for days and never see a blonde beauty like Claudia Schiffer. In cities such as Cleveland, Pittsburgh and Columbus you can wander for days through shopping malls of European-American neighborhoods and never see a woman who comes anywhere close to looking like Claudia Schiffer or Cindy Crawford.

You do see small numbers of women who look like them throughout the Western United States, but it is still a minority.

The pathology created by these images are fairly predictable.

Males are frustrated. Inevitably, the mate you pick will represent a compromise. Nothing will match the images in the movies or on TV.

The women know they cannot measure up and so the temptation is not to try. They assume that men want what they see in the movies, so they might as well become male-hating liberationists, or stuff their faces and drop out of the sexual competition.

Organized ideological male-hating never existed until the advent of movies and television. Indeed, if you are seeking an explanation for the anti-white animus of our cultural elites (despite their Euro-American racial origins), sexual anger is an excellent starting point. Here is just one example from the April 22, 1994 edition of the Wall Street Journal, page A1, entitled "Mixed Signals":

### Mixed Signals

\* \* \*

Some white students make an effort to cross the racial divide. Lisa Todorovich, a senior from Milwaukee who is the first in her family to attend college, took an African American Studies class last semester on the writings of Toni Morrison. In a class equally split between blacks and whites, Ms. Todorovich, 22, found herself for the first time feeling self-conscious about her skin color.

When the class discussed Ms. Morrison's "The Bluest Eye," a book about how white ideals of beauty affect a black girl, Ms. Todorovich felt she, too, could relate. As a child, she felt unattractive because her looks didn't measure up to Shirley Temple's. "But I didn't open my mouth," she says, because she considered her childhood pain trivial compared with the experiences of black women in the class.

\* \* \*

Given the blatant anti-white attitudes of the cultural elites who produce the icons of our popular culture, the most tempting analogy is chemotherapy. One suspects the poisons produced by the dream meisters, while harmful to all, are intended to destroy only the hated "white bread" of society. And, indeed, we find considerable evidence of this intent in Race Bias #40.

But, paradoxically, that isn't how it works in actual practice. In effect, the frustrated and angry dream meisters often end up eating their own young.

Exhibit One comes from Eldridge Cleaver's "Soul on Ice," page 19.

"This little game got good to me and I got good at it. I attacked all forms of piety, loyalty, and sentiment: marriage, love, God, patriotism, the Constitution, the founding fathers, law, concepts of right-wrong-good-evil, all forms of ritualized and conventional behavior. As I pranced about, club in hand, seeking new idols to smash, I encountered really for the first time in my life, with any seriousness, The Ogre, rising up before me in a mist. I discovered, with alarm, that The Ogre possessed a tremendous and dreadful power over me, and I didn't understand this power or why I was at its mercy. I tried to repudiate The Ogre, root it out of my heart as I had done God, Constitution, principles, morals, and values -- but The Ogre had its claws buried in the core of my being and refused to let go. I fought frantically to be free, but The Ogre only mocked me and sank its claws deeper into my soul. I knew then that I had found an important key, that if I conquered The Ogre and broke its power over me I would be free. But I also knew that it was a race against time and that if I did not win I would certainly be broken and destroyed. I, a black man, confronted The Ogre -- the white woman."

Continuing on page 23:

"From our discussion, which began that evening and has never yet ended, we went on to notice how thoroughly, as a matter of course, a black growing up in America is indoctrinated with the white race's standard of beauty. Not that the whites made a conscious, calculated effort to do this, we thought, but since they constituted the majority the whites brainwashed the blacks by the very processes the whites employed to indoctrinate themselves with their own group standards. It intensified my frustrations to know that I was indoctrinated to see the white woman as more beautiful and desirable than my own black woman. It drove me into books seeking light on the subject. In Richard Wright's Native Son, I found Bigger Thomas and a keen insight into the problem."

And finally, beginning on page 25:

"Somehow I arrived at the conclusion that, as a matter of principle, it was of paramount importance for me to have an antagonistic, ruthless attitude toward white women. The term outlaw appealed to me and at the time my parole date was drawing near, I considered myself to be mentally free - I was an "outlaw." I had stepped outside of the white man's law, which I repudiated with scorn and self-satisfaction. I became a law unto myself--my own legislature, my own supreme court, my own executive. At the moment I walked out of the prison gate, my feelings toward white women in general could be summed up in the following lines:

### TO A WHITE GIRL

I love you Because you're white,  
Not because you're charming  
Or bright.  
Your whiteness Is a silky thread  
Snaking through my thoughts  
In redhot patterns  
Of lust and desire.

I hate you  
Because you're white.  
Your white meat  
Is nightmare food.  
White is  
The skin of Evil.  
You're my Moby Dick,  
White Witch,  
Symbol of the rope and hanging tree,  
Of the burning cross.  
Loving you thus  
And hating you so,  
My heart is torn in two.  
Crucified.

"I became a rapist. To refine my technique and modus operandi, I started out by practicing on black girls in the ghetto--in the black ghetto where dark and vicious deeds appear not as aberrations or deviations from the norm, but as part of the sufficiency of the Evil of a day--and when I considered myself smooth enough, I crossed the tracks and sought out white prey. I did this consciously, deliberately, willfully, methodically--"

Clearly, blacks suffer much more than whites from the images of European beauty that are cast in front of them by the advertisers.

Here is a second example from the perspective of a black female reporter for the New York Times:

Glamour Magazine October, 1995 p. 127

Bridges:

Light skin versus dark: A painful topic many blacks would rather not confront.

By Charisse Jones

I'll never forget the day I was supposed to meet him. We had only spoken on the phone. But we got along so well, we couldn't wait to meet face-to-face. I took the bus from my high school to his for our blind date. While I nervously waited for him outside the school, one of his buddies came along, looked me over and remarked that I was going to be a problem, because his friend didn't like dating anybody darker than himself.

When my mystery man--who was not especially good-looking-- finally saw me, he took one look, uttered a hurried hello, then disappeared with his smirking friends. I had apparently been pronounced ugly on arrival and dismissed.

That happened nearly 15 years ago. I'm 30 now, and the hurt and humiliation have long since faded. But the memory still lingers, reinforced in later years by other situations in which my skin color was judged by other African Americans--for example, at a cocktail party or a nightclub where light-skinned black women got all the attention.

A racist encounter hurts badly. But it does not equal the pain of "colorism" -- being rejected by your own people because your skin is colored cocoa and not cream, ebony and not olive. On our scale of beauty, it is often the high yellows--in the lexicon of black America; those with light skin whose looks reap the most attention. Traditionally, if someone was described that way, there was no need to say that person was good-looking. It was a given that light was lovely. It was those of us with plain brown eyes and darker skin hues who had to prove ourselves.

I was 12, and in my first year of junior high school in San Francisco, when I discovered dark brown was not supposed to be beautiful. At that age, boys suddenly became important, and so did your looks. But by that time--the late 1970s--black kids no longer believed in that sixties mantra, "Black is beautiful." Light skin, green eyes and long, wavy hair were once again synonymous with beauty.

Colorism--and its subtext of self hatred--began during slavery on plantations where white masters often favored the lighter-skinned blacks, many of whom were their own children. But though it began with whites, black people have kept colorism alive. In the past, many black sororities, fraternities and other social organizations have been notorious for accepting only light-skinned members. Yes, some blacks have criticized their lighter-skinned peers. But most often in our history, a light complexion has been a passport to special treatment by both whites and blacks.

It is hard to understand how anyone reading these words could believe that the multi-racial empire was worth its costs.

The problem is that racial affronts and racial animus against whites arise from well springs of human interaction that have little or nothing to do with the actions of whites themselves.

What could any white person do to avoid the hurt of Charisse Jones? The answer is not much, except to partition the country into separate nations.

And absent that partitioning, people who's character and moral judgment have been formed by racial anger and sexual frustration gravitate naturally toward occupations in the media, where their anger makes it much easier for them to participate in the broad attack on middle american culture and its restraints.

Eldridge Cleaver sold over 2 million copies of Soul on Ice over 20 years ago. The cultural elites have been well aware of the misery integrationism inflicts for at least several decades.

But that was 20 years ago when we were only required to imprint upon the unattainable. Today, the giant consumer brands provide us with much more powerful toxins.

May 19, 1995 Wall Street Journal B5

Advertising/by Fara Warner

More Marketers Aiming Ads at Lesbians

The magazine advertisement for Tuaca liqueur seems pretty traditional at first glance: Three trendy young women gabbing over drinks.

Then you realize the women are flirting with one another. Another advertising taboo is being shattered as Hiram Walker & Sons the distributor of Tuaca, joins a small wave of national advertisers targeting the lesbian market.

"In the last two years, there's been a much broader discussion of lesbianism," says Richard Mukamal, vice president and group category director for Hiram Walker's liqueurs. "Lesbianism has made its way into network television. It's part of a young, hip, urban demographic."

The "outing" of the lesbian market is drawing big-name advertisers such as American Express, Stolichnaya vodka, Atlantic Records and Naya bottled water to such magazines as Deneuve, Lesbian News, Girlfriends and On Our Backs which all have national distribution. In addition, Tanqueray vodka and Pierre Cardin have signed on to sponsor the television show "Freestyles," hosted by Amanda Bearse, the openly lesbian actress from the "Married ... With Children" TV series, according to the marketing publication Next News. The paid program will run this summer on cable channel VH-1 with features that appeal to both gay women and gay men.

Most marketers use general ads that simply show their products, but a few marketers are being more direct with ads like Tuaca's and one for Atlantic Records showing two women holding hands at the beach.

For years, the lesbian market was overshadowed by the more vocal and more noticeable gay male audience, which a number of advertisers considered worth pursuing. Lesbians were stereotyped as less affluent than gay men and uninterested in traditional women's products such as cologne and cosmetics.

But now some marketers are taking another look, with brands like Unilever's Calvin Klein fragrances and Vivant skincare products considering advertising to the lesbian market. They are being swayed partly by new statistics breaking out lesbians from the overall gay population. Overlooked Opinions, a Chicago-based research firm that tracks the gay market, estimates that lesbians spend about \$137 billion a year and have average household incomes of \$42,755.

Beyond the numbers, lesbians have greater visibility, with lesbian relationships featured in television shows such as "Friends" and movies such as "Bar Girls" and "The Incredibly True Adventure of 2 Girls in Love." Also, more women are joining celebrities such as k.d. Lang, Melissa Etheridge and Martina Navratilova in openly expressing their lesbianism.

"The market, both gay and lesbian, is one of the most highly educated and fiercely loyal audiences we have," says Vicky Germaise, senior vice president of Atlantic Records, which runs ads in Out and Genre magazines promoting lesbian artists such as Melissa Ferrick.

In addition to media, such advertisers as Seagram and Hiram Walker also are trying to



reach the lesbian market through special events such as the Dinah Shore Weekend, a gathering held every March in Palm Springs, Calif., that draws about 20,000 women. The event occurs at the same time as the Nabisco-Dinah Shore golf tournament, but isn't connected to the Ladies Professional Golf Association tournament.

\* \* \*"

And as the above excerpt makes clear, the driving force behind production of these toxins is money.

And indeed, there are hints in the above quotes from the market research types that the most educated and the highest income groups are the most severely impacted by the toxins.

Reprinted from Race Bias #40, and from page 4 of the January 20, 1995 edition of the Jerusalem Post, is a more normal expression of despair in the war to reproduce. Indeed, it is clear that the dream meisters of Beverly Hills are eating their young:

A friend who lives in her own condo on the Upper West Side of Manhattan calls me. She's 39, single, a partner in a Big Eight accounting firm and inexplicitly identified as a traditional Jew. She's called to say good-bye.

It is the old story. She is quitting New York, tired of looking for a husband, tired of being rejected by persnickety Jewish men. Maybe it has something to do with their mothers or with their fathers or with their cousins from France, my friend speculates, laughing. Who cares. I'm outta here, she says. It's 1995. She has to do something radical. She is moving to India.

The idea of moving to a Third World country - to a place she says where men are still men and where a white woman who can buy her own elephant for transportation is prized - is not new. Another SJF from Manhattan who moved to India several years ago became folklore. In a small Jewish congregation in Bombay, she met her British-Jewish Hugh Grant. Today they are married and living in London. After 15 years of chasing Jewish men, my friend says her tired flesh wants a little adulation, a little lust, a little naches from having been born female. And she wants clamorous attention from thousands of men. A Jewish Benazir Bhutto, that's what she wants. So when her company decided to transfer the current managing partner in Bombay, she, to her parents' dismay, volunteered for the position.

Jewish men want what's intensely familiar to them - Eastern European food, intelligent female conversation - and what's intensely alien: extreme height, a degree of imagined carnality. (SJFs in Tel Aviv report men there favor Dutch converts for wives.)

The divorced men, according to my friend, are slightly different. They act like they've just made a jailbreak. They want a whole different model, preferably waitresses from Minnesota, science teachers from Duluth, basically any female whose never heard of Loehmann's, decorators or lawyers. They want women who, when they hear they have to sign a pre-nuptial agreement, say, "Great!"

As the sun sets over the 20th century, one of the biggest jokes, according to my friend, is that Jewish men aren't anxious to marry her: a pert, admittedly aggressive, self-made Jewish woman. She blames traditional feminists whom, she believes, devalued female sexuality without concerning themselves with cultural trespass. Traditional Jewish women, she says, who really believed they could "have it all" are paying the price. Jewish men can't handle so much firepower. They are seeking their white bread and mayonnaise elsewhere. According to my friend, it's not that Jewish men reject strong women, they just don't like the artifice unmasked. They are still earnest, programmed to work hard for home and hearth but not for peers. Only for pale, lanky types who say "great" every half-hour.

The above excerpt is consistent with the statistics. College educated black women with advanced degrees have the lowest birthrate in the nation. Second lowest is Jewish women. In both cases, they are far below replacement levels.

As Lipsett and Raab state in "Jews and the New American Scene," page 46:

The Jewish birthrate is low and declining. The completed fertility rate for Jewish women age 45-49 is 20 percent below that of Jewish women of the same age 20 years ago, almost 20 percent below that of all American white women, and 10 percent less than the level needed for population replacement.

The irony of the article on lesbian advertising is that Edgar Bronfman, chairman emeritus of Seagrams, marketer to lesbians and purveyor of the message that the lezzie lifestyle is hip, is the head of the American Jewish Committee, and like Lipset and Raab, publicly bemoans the high intermarriage rates and low birthrates of American Jews.

Well, it is Bronfman who produces the toxic waste that, to a large measure, drives young Jewish women to leave the country, and young Jewish men to seek out the genotype of the models in his ads.

And, of course, Edgar Bronfman Jr., was busy chasing every shiksa skirt in New York City 25 years ago. Now Edgar Jr. has caused Seagrams to buy 80% of MCA so that he can get into the movie business and begin producing toxic waste on a much grander scale.

Daddy has much to atone for. Sonny doesn't care.

As if to anticipate the family's new onslaught, the elder Bronfman's antidote to Seagram's cultural effluent is more "Jewish education," by which he means the segregation of young Jews so that they can imprint on one another, and to make explicit the message that the cultural toxic waste flowing from Seagrams and others is not meant for Jews. Jews are supposed to be smart enough to resist the stuff. Inter-marriage is for goyim, dummies!

Reality presents much more compelling arguments for racial separation than slogans. And indeed, in the United States, minorities suffer at the hands of the integrationist state. The reason they suffer is that the integrationist state is attempting to do something that simply cannot be done.

When several races are placed in a single country they compete. That competition does not go away. Our social sciences tend to focus solely on legal relationships (like slavery) or economic relationships (such as relative income levels). But the truth is that the social sciences conceal the most significant form of competition - sexual selection. Legislation cannot stop it or the hurt it engenders. In fact, the well-springs of racial feeling run so deep that they can never be eradicated. It is foolish to try.

In the struggle for sexual survival, educated Blacks and Jews are losing in the United States. But in all honesty, if Euro-Americans are experiencing the "thrill of victory" in this area, I would hate to experience "the agony of defeat." As with so many aspects of life in the Multi-Racial Empire, we are all losing, it is just that European-Americans are losing at a less rapid rate in this one particular arena.

If this seems paradoxical, I would suggest that it is one more illustration of the powerful self-destructive impulse that the Multi-racial empire stirs up in minorities. (See Yggdrasil's Lesson #9.) The need to attack Euro-Americans is so overpowering that the attackers pay scant attention to the casualties from within their own ranks.

From the economic perspective of the purveyors of our popular culture, the ideal would be for all of us to become totally self-absorbed, have no children, spend all of our income on impulse and status related purchases, and then die off in a single generation, to be replaced entirely by new immigrants.

Our advertisers are equal opportunity exterminationists. They could care less who gets destroyed by their wares. They bestow quotas on minorities in the hope that minorities will think the system fair and refrain from direct challenges to the great herds of freeway commuting Euro-Americans. If the Euro-American middle class were to feel racially threatened, they might become distracted from the urgent business of getting and spending. Heaven forbid!

And as luck would have it, the agony of Erocide produces many talented volunteers willing to attack the Euro-American middle class and mold their moral sentiments in such a way that any defensive racial response becomes impossible. After all, we cannot let racial identity keep us from shopping till we drop!

In several earlier posts, I have argued with Milton Kleim that if by "National Socialism" he means government control of the economy, 1930's style National Socialism makes no sense for Euro- America in its present circumstance. Economic freedom has been the primary offensive weapon of Western Civilization. Shackling our economic power with the dead hand of bureaucracy is a prescription for our collective defeat.

If, on the other hand, "National Socialism" means some form of public dampening of the cultural toxins that advertisers spread to encourage the self-absorbed lifestyles that lead to evolutionary failure, then Milton Kleim seems to have a valid point.

Even if the sphere of activity of such a government were confined to public exposure of the toxic waste, as opposed to its outright repression, such a government would need a will and a ferocity to resist the organized special interests and their frustrated, angry minions that could only be described as "heroic." But let me suggest that government power gives us no magic bullet for Euro-American survival. The truth is that Euro-American survival depends upon our behavior as individuals and as part of a group. At this point, it has very little to do with who is elected to the next Congress.

In Yggdrasil's lesson 10, I asked that all of you cut your cable TV subscription.

We must minimize our exposure to advertising and its media. As outlined earlier in this post, advertising has the primary purpose of making us unhappy with our lot and leading us to believe that an irrational purchase might help. One of its primary tools is sexual frustration. It causes us to imprint upon largely unattainable images.

Second, advertising is the vehicle that brings us cultural messages designed to weaken our motivation to make the sacrifices necessary to preserve our own kind. After all, why would one wish to go through all the work of having children when they will just be "white bread" or "wimpy white guys" or "barbie and ken dolls" or one of any number of other epithets served up to us in word and picture by the dream meisters of Beverly Hills.

We are all much better off if our kids learn to interact with real people rather than watching TV all the time.

Further, once several million of us cut off the cable, it creates opportunities for entrepreneurs to create new media and a new cultural message to communicate to us.

But more important, by isolating ourselves from the commercial media, we can begin to overcome the many pathologies that limit us in our everyday lives.

Most relevant for you college students are those cultural pathologies that make finding a mate much more difficult than it should be. Let's list a few examples:

Young men (and women) often select mates for "status" reasons rather than on how well they get along together. Young men and women carry around images and ideals of the perfect mate (crafted in large part by the media) that are often destructive.

First, high status females are hard to find. Women with IQs above 130 constitute only 2% of the female population. If you restrict yourself to that group, you will have very few examples to pick from and you are likely to end up with a compromise that requires more than the normal amount of endurance to live with.

Second, females with IQs above 130 mature much more slowly than the general population. Thus, they tend to have greater hangups about their physical attractiveness. They are much more susceptible to feminist ideology as a universalized and institutionalized excuse for their own self-imposed sexual failures.

Third are the crippling effects of prosperity. Most high status females spend 10 to 12 years perfecting the manipulative behaviors that enable them to avoid doing the dishes and cleaning their rooms. There are limits to how much nagging mom is willing to do; and dad will not resort to violence or severe economic coercion. The bottom line is that the young princesses have become expert in turning mom and dad into maid service.

And of course, having children means doing lots of dishes and other lowly chores. It may seem shocking, but the abysmally low birthrate of college educated women has almost nothing to do with ideology and everything to do with avoiding maid service. After training for 12 years to handle mom and dad, don't be surprised if she has the same thing in mind for you.

This deep and irrational status aversion to doing chores not only has personal consequences (low birthrates) but has enormous secondary economic and political consequences as well. It means that much of the economic value of household tasks is moved from the untaxed self-help economy to the transaction economy where it yields tax revenue that strengthens our oppressive government. To avoid untaxed household work, the career woman gets a job and gives up 40% of her wage in taxes just to spend the remainder to buy fast food every night (rewarding those high advertising budgets) and to hire day care and maid service, which, in turn generates more tax revenue.

From the perspective of a successful male, eating pizza and McDonalds hamburgers every night

(it is surprisingly expensive) hardly seems like much of a reward for a successful business career.

The second career is not the problem. Rather, it is the inevitable irrational spending and the irrationality of the lifestyle that follows.

For you young Lotharios who want to take on the challenge of having a family with the "high status" female college graduate, the Ole Ygg says "go for it!" Just don't allow yourself to be surprised at the agenda you may face the day after the wedding if you fail to work these issues out in advance. If her agenda is the same as the agenda of the society around her, then it ain't likely to have anything to do with personal sacrifice or the survival of the Euro-American race.

If the Ole Ygg has one piece of advice, it is to ignore your own status perceptions and concentrate on finding a mate who delights your aesthetic senses. If she is smart enough to communicate well with you, she is smart enough to have your children.

The truth is that our status yearnings have been thoroughly manipulated by the media in ways that make it more and more difficult for Euro-Americans to get along and reproduce. These status images have become unreliable. Shed them.

For all the media talk about sexual freedom and liberation, our popular culture makes an unmistakable statement. The status of a woman can be measured by how often she says "no." The women with the greatest status are the ones who have sex the least often and with the fewest partners.

The image applies across the board from Janet Reno and Hillary Clinton to the young starlets on the TV series 90210.

I will never forget the stunning episode of 90210 in which Shannon Doherty's character (Brenda) loses her virginity to Luke Perry's character (Dillon) the night of the prom. The day after the big event, Doherty's character breaks off the relationship complaining that she didn't know whether she enjoyed it. I watched this episode in amazement, wondering what sort of extra bonus they had to pay Luke Perry to play along with this insult to his masculinity and to pretend that he wanted the ice princess back. It was impossible to suspend my disbelief.

In truth, the images produced by the mass media are profoundly hostile to heterosexual sex. In Hollywood, frigidity among heterosexual females is the expected norm. Sexual failure is the expected norm. It is no accident that the real heroine of 90210 was the producer's daughter, Tori Spelling, who managed to say "no" to everyone in every episode. She never made anyone happy!

These messages have an effect.

They give broad license to the status ranking among the herds of suburban PTA moms. Being 40 pounds overweight is the irrefutable symbol of arrival at the exhalted position of having to please no one. Pity the poor divorced woman who has to lose 30 pounds to find a new husband, or the slender model types who are so insecure about their place in society that they must maintain their sexual prowess and skills. Low status work indeed!

In truth folks, all human societies seek to control reproduction of their members. Our modern American society is no exception.

What is surprising is that Hollywood had so little difficulty wresting control from the priesthood. But once the priesthood was replaced, it was no surprise that Hollywood satisfied the market demand for sexual expression with fare that avoids any suggestion of a joyous link between sex, rewarding relationships and procreation. And indeed, the images it sells are uniformly of sexual frustration and failure.

The Ole Ygg is always bemused by the protests against pornography orchestrated by the religious right. If you have a teenage boy, you had better watch a few of these films, because your teenage son certainly will. The stuff is all over the place. And when you do watch a few of these movies, it becomes obvious that the sexual message is exactly the same as the sexual message of 90210. It is only the explicit acrobatics that are different. The message of the porn flicks is that even women who habitually say "yes" are at best frigid, but more likely lesbians, and that men are better off withdrawing from it all and masturbating.

Seldom ever do porn movies portray normal heterosexual intercourse that ends in a happy conclusion for both parties.

It is just more of the same toxic waste with the same message.

I see no reason to treat pornography more harshly than Network television. The messages are indistinguishable.

No matter what your station in life, whether it is a teenager trying to build your own sexual identity, a young adult trying to find a mate, or an older adult trying to raise children, you face a formidable challenge.

The first step in coping with that challenge is to stop the flow of poison into your home. Cut the cable TV subscription. Then, seek out sources of culture that assist in our collective survival.

Gents, if you have daughters, you are going to have to do the dishes with them occasionally,

and convey the message that household chores are meaningful activities that you care about doing right. More than mere convenience is at stake here.

The typical middle class father will push his daughter to become "independent" and a "career woman" so that he will not have to support her. Thus, the real, unspoken message to middle class girls is that no young male is likely to want to support her for the value of her companionship. Children listen to deeds, not words, and the real message that the typical middle class male communicates to his daughter is that no young man can be trusted to want her for any considerable period of time.

As counter-intuitive as this might be for a father, you are going to have to make clear to your daughters that you admire and respect the women that have the most sex (and the most offspring) and not those that have the least. This principle applies whether you raise your family in the Christian tradition of glorifying sex by saving it for marriage, or (most likely by default rather than by design) in a more instinctive and pagan tradition in which sex is glorified for its power to unify and continue the tribe.

To your sons, you are going to have to make clear the enlightened self-interest motivating the chivalry of Gismund in Robert Browning's classic poem, "Count Gismund."

These issues are not new.

Gentlemen, rebellion against our tormentors may come in time. But first we must strengthen ourselves and reconstruct our personal and cultural defenses.

We have not arrived at this pass through conquest, but through our own divisions and our own weakness.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.





## EURO-AMERICAN RESISTANCE: WHITE NATIONALISM

This is Yggdrasil's White Nationalism series. Yggdrasil explains why it is necessary to assert racial independence in order to reduce conflict. These are the defining principles of our movement - a must-read for anyone interested in WN.

1. [The White Nationalist Premise](#)
2. [Conservative Hypothetical](#)
3. [Liberals, Lights Unto the World!](#)
4. [Why White Nationalism?](#)
5. [White Nationalism - Key Concepts](#)
6. [What is White Nationalism?](#)
7. [Sweating the Details](#)
8. [Who Stays and Who Goes?](#)
9. ["Milton's Trillion"](#)
10. [Can Jews Switch Sides?](#)
11. [White Nationalism - A 'Jewish Conspiracy'?](#)
12. [Rabbi Schiller's Racial Separation](#)
13. [Margaret Thatcher - White Nationalist?](#)
14. [Yggdrasil Quibbles with Tom Lathrop](#)
15. [The Promise of White Nationalism](#)

---

**BACK**

---

# YGGDRASIL

## **The White Nationalist Premise**

The premise behind White Nationalism is quite simple.

Including more than one race in a single country produces conflict.

The moral thing to do in such cases is to reduce conflict by giving each race its own nation.

Egalitarianism and integrationism are moral contrivances of elites wishing to maintain governmental power and low wage rates.

It is really that simple!

Modern elites have two strategies for holding multi-racial empires together:

- Massive Repression, as in the old Soviet Union and in communist Yugoslavia.
- Racial preference schemes to achieve "social cohesion" by preferring one group over another. (Malaysia, India, China, United States, Canada, South Africa, Kenya, Nigeria, Sri Lanka).

Racial preference schemes reward racial anger.

The race with the most anger is the one that will get the greatest government benefits through racial preferences. Thus, the existence of these preferences sets off a scramble among competing racial groups to display more racial anger than other competing groups.

The group that displays the least anger is the one on whom the greatest burdens will be placed.

The factual argument for White Nationalism has been stated best by Thomas Sowell, a black professor of economics, in his book, "Race and Culture."

The news for liberals is uniformly bad:

- The demand for quotas and preferences comes not from the poor, but from elites within

each group.

- The demand for quotas and preferences is accompanied by improved education and rising living standards.
- Political entrepreneurs will often provoke racial animus where none previously existed.
- Racial preferences are uniformly successful at attaining their political aim of reinforcing the power of political elites.

The notion that such social problems will disappear with rising incomes and rising education is contradicted by the evidence. It is increasing education, increased prosperity and increased inter-group contact that produce conflict.

Yggdrasil-

\* \* \* \* \*

From Race and Culture

by Thomas Sowell p 141

(Basic Books, c.1994) "Group Polarization Patterns

"Political anger and demands for privileges are, of course, not limited to the less privileged. Indeed, even when demands are made in the name of less privileged racial or ethnic groups, often it is the more privileged members of such groups who make the demands and who benefit from policies designed to meet such demands. These demands may erupt suddenly in the wake of the creation (or sharp enlargement) of a newly educated class which sees its path to coveted middle-class professions blocked by competition of other groups--as in India, French Canada, or Lithuania, for example.<sup>38</sup>

\* \* \*

"Economics is often the key to such anomalies--and the implications reach well beyond India or Nigeria. Those cities in India with strident political nativist movements demanding preferential treatment for local groups have generally been cities where (1) most of the lower-middle-class positions were held by outside groups and where (2) there were growing numbers of the educated unemployed locally.<sup>61</sup> Such movements tend to be disproportionately staffed by, and appeal to, those who are part the first generation of their family to be educated.<sup>62</sup> Ironically, it was such people who made Indians their target and prey in East Africa.

A rapid expansion of education is thus a factor in producing intergroup conflict, especially where the education is of a kind which produces diplomas rather than skills that have significant economic value in the marketplace. Education of a sort useful only for being a clerk, bureaucrat, school teacher--jobs whose numbers are relatively fixed in the short run and politically determined in the long run--tend to increase politicized intergroup strife. Yet newly emerging groups, whether in their own countries or abroad, tend to specialize precisely in such undemanding fields. Malay students, for example, have tended to specialize in Malay studies and Islamic studies, which provide them with no skills with which compete with the Chinese in the marketplace, either as businessmen, independent professionals, or technicians. Blacks and Hispanics in the United States follow a very similar pattern of specializing disproportionately in easier fields which offer less in the way of marketable skills. Such groups then have little choice but to turn to the government, not just for jobs but also for group preferences to be imposed in the market place, and for symbolic recognition in various forms.

"Intergroup competition is, in one sense, inevitable in a world without unlimited resources, but the nature and intensity of this competition may be either moderated or accentuated, depending upon the institutions through which it takes place. The marketplace provides incentives for groups to moderate their competing demands upon the resources and output of the economy, because prices serve as an impersonal mechanism to cause self-rationing. Ethnic politics has just the opposite effect. Although politicians do not create economic benefits, they can transfer them, usually below cost and often free to the recipients. Just as prices force self-rationing, freeness permits self-indulgence. Competing demands readily escalate beyond what is available without the constraining effect of price to convey the scarcity and production costs of what is demanded. The inherent constraints of economic life are not removed by political intervention. Rationing among individuals and groups is as much an inherent necessity as ever. The rationing must simply be done by other means such as political struggles, violence, or the threat of violence.

"Politics is not simply a mechanism for resolving existing differences among racial and ethnic groups. Politics can also generate and magnify such conflicts. Groups with little racial or cultural difference, such as the Andhras and the Telanganans in India, [63] may exaggerate what small differences there are, in order to compete for political favors as more or less artificially created social groups. Similarly, more or less "natural" social groups such as the Italians and Greeks in Australia, may make little or no effort to organize politically until after group-based benefits have been proffered by national political parties. [64] There is no such group as "Hispanics" anywhere in the world except in the United States, because only in the U.S. do government programs recognize such a category, thereby leading to political ethnic coalitions to capitalize on government grants and appropriations. In short, political favors are not simply responses to existing groups. The groups themselves may be artifacts created by Political favors--and, even when not created by these favors, their degree of self-consciousness, politicization, or polarization may be functions of the availability of government largesse. "However detrimental polarization may prove to be to particular groups or to the society as a whole, it may

still be beneficial to those in official positions at various levels. In Thailand, for example, the abortive attempt to drive the Chinese out of the rice-exporting business by establishing a government monopoly did not achieve its goal, but did succeed in diverting profits to Thai soldiers, police officials, and politicians, whose cooperation became necessary to allow the Chinese entrepreneur to continue performing a function which only he could perform. [65] Much the same story of corruption and quasi-corruption could be found in Malaysia and Indonesia. [66] It is not at all uncommon for policies to be, simultaneously politically effective and economically counterproductive. In Uganda, the expulsions of the East Indians were so popular that political pressure developed to do the same in neighboring Kenya, even though the economic consequences proved disastrous for Uganda.

"While economic interests are sometimes significant in explaining political decisions, they are by no means universally valid explanations. Educated elites from less advanced groups may have ample economic incentives to promote polarization and preferential treatment policies, but the real question is why the uneducated masses from such groups give them the political support without which they would be impotent. Indeed, it is often the less educated masses who unleash the mob violence from which their elite compatriots ultimately benefit--as in Malaysia, Sri Lanka, or parts of India, Africa, or the United States, where such violence has led to group preference policies in employment, educational institutions, and elsewhere. The common denominator in these highly disparate societies seems to be not only resentment of other groups' success but also fear of an inability to compete with them, combined with a painful embarrassment at being so visibly "under-represented"--or missing entirely--in prestigious occupations and institutions. To remedy this within a politically relevant time horizon requires not simply increased opportunities but earmarked benefits directly given on a racial or ethnic basis. [67]"

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Yggdrasil's "Conservative Hypothetical"

Suppose a frustrated conservative finally realized that he can't possibly roll back the welfare state as part of the loyal conservative opposition.

Suppose he has watched Bill Buckley, the YAFers, and various stripes of libertarians debate theory for years and realizes that debate just doesn't change anything.

Suppose he suddenly realizes that Liberals don't need to worry about rational arguments concerning the welfare state and its destructive power because voters respond to advertising and not distant concepts like economic efficiency.

Suppose he gets tired of seeing liberals manipulate the political process by buying minority votes, and then splitting the majority over how much tribute to pay them.

Suppose he tires of the same old answer all the time - higher taxes and more tribute. Suppose he is sick of the liberals taking their cut of the spoils and commandeering jobs in the bureaucracies they create to pass out this tribute.

Suppose also that this frustrated conservative is truly outraged at the destruction the welfare state wreaks on blacks and other people of color, including family break-up, decreasing opportunity for economic interaction with the majority, and increasing racial hostility within those racial communities - all with the purpose of ensuring block voting for those "high minded" liberals who designed the system.

Now suppose this frustrated conservative starts looking around for a political force strong enough to unite the majority against the liberals and their political manipulation and political profiteering.

Where would such a conservative look?

The answer is obvious!

Every liberal instinctively knows how to defeat a liberal!

What is the one thing that liberals fear? What thoughts are so horribly threatening to them so as to be banished from public discourse?

Could the answer be race?

But of course! Liberals are afraid of race because they know it is the one political force strong enough to overthrow them. (And indeed, while nothing much is likely to come of the 1994 Republican electoral victory, that victory was, according to the Wall Street Journal, attributable to "angry white males".)

Now let us suppose that this frustrated conservative has absolutely no interest in being mean to blacks or jews, and has no interest whatever in kicking them out of the country. (Suppose, in fact, that he prefers them to white liberals.)

But suppose also that this frustrated conservative figures out that the only way to stop white liberals from plundering his wallet and destroying his culture is for him, and other like minded Americans, to declare independence from those few states in which liberals and minorities are concentrated.

If this newly independent nation has no racial minorities, then the liberals are going to have a much tougher time manipulating elections.

Better yet, if most of the liberal agenda is made unconstitutional, then it will take years for liberals to fashion new manipulative myths and propaganda to set themselves apart as morally superior beings, and it will take decades for them to fashion new special claims on the power to meddle in the lives of others.

Now if the liberals remain concentrated in the parts of the country dominated by blacks and browns, their pretensions to power are going to become frightfully conspicuous.

What a delightful prospect! Freedom from liberalism all around!

Freedom from liberalism for whites, plus freedom from the welfare state for races now being destroyed by it! - Double bonus!

Now suppose our frustrated conservative looks at the rest of the world and sees that everywhere else on earth, races and ethnic groups are separating into their own little separate countries.

Suppose that academic economists say that these separate countries are economically viable in the information age as long they follow free trade policies.

Suppose also that there are examples of secession and nation- splitting that are carried out peacefully, without bloodshed.

Now I am going to ask a simple question:

Aside the fact that liberals would lose their jobs manipulating productive citizens, and would be forced to get real jobs producing something that customers value, what is so reprehensible about this vision that tempts our hypothetical, frustrated conservative to reject the integrationist premise?

No reason to start fantasizing about weird racial superiority theories, race wars, pogroms or other stuff that our hypothetical conservative has not advocated! No need to seek opportunities for knee-jerk displays of liberal moral outrage!

Just a simple means to a humane result! - No?

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Liberals, Lights Unto the World!**

Oh! I get it!

So the Azerbaijanis slaughter the Armenians in Azerbaijan.

The Tutsi slaughter the Hutu in Rwanda.

The Hindus riot and kill Moslems, and vice versa in India, Kashmir and Punjab.

The Xhosa necklace the Zulu and vice-versa in South Africa.

The Israelis kill Palestinians, and the Palestinians kill Israelis in Palestine.

The Basques carry out terror attacks against Castilians in Spain.

The Bosnians - everyone knows about Bosnia.

The Malays grant themselves draconian employment preferences to hobble the Chinese living in Malaysia.

The Vietnamese drive the Chinese out of Vietnam.

The Chinese colonize and slowly exterminate the Tibetans and Mongolians in China.

The Kenyans, Ugandans and Zimbabweyans drive whites and East Indians from Africa.

The Sinhalese impose drastic employment quotas on the Tamils, and the Tamils retaliate with killings in Sri Lanka.

The list goes on.

But whites in the United States are not allowed to act like Moldovans, Sinhalese, Chinese or Africans.

It would be significant if whites were expected simply to refrain from the above types of

conduct. That alone would make them different from the rest of humanity!

But whites are not only expected to restrain themselves, they are expected to submit to racial preferences and pay tribute in the form of social welfare to all of these groups that choose to enter the U.S., legal or not! Fact is, this does not happen anywhere else in the world!

Now why would anyone assume that whites are capable of restraining themselves in this fashion?

Do liberals think whites are somehow special? How is it exactly that Whites are not like all the rest of humanity? How could they possibly be expected to live up to such a standard if they were not - dare I say the word - superior?

Echoes of Rudyard Kipling. The white man's burden lives!

But we now read that any white man or woman who simply wishes to act like the rest of humanity is "white trash" and has "low self esteem" as compared to our estimable liberals - lights unto the world - who have shown us all how to shift the costs of the white man's burden onto the backs of the young, the politically weak, and the productive too busy earning a living to organize and defend themselves.

Now it would appear, based on examples set by the rest of humanity, that the humane thing to do is separate races or ethnic groups into separate nations to reduce conflict.

Who knows, it may be that whites are merely human too! But maybe liberals would lose too much self esteem to admit it!

Seems the curtain is parting on the shriveled little wizards at the controls of the liberal multiculturalist empire!

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Why White Nationalism?

There are two answers to the question "Why White Nationalism?".

### 1. The futility of Conservatism!

As we approach the millenium, there is not much Western Civilization left in the United States to conserve. The original ideal that brought our ancestors to the United States was the melting pot, the "color blind society" in which individuals would be judged on merit and not on skin color or ethnic origin. The original ideal has been abandoned by our liberal elites. Individuals are no longer judged by their own merit. The ideal of the color blind society has simply disappeared. As a practical matter, it will never return. As a consequence there is no longer any reason for a European-American (or anyone else, for that matter) to attempt to slow down the rush towards a balkanized United States. What is the logic in slowing down a process that is already 70% completed?

### 2. To assert European-American intererests in this new balkanized society!.

All efforts of liberals at maintaining racial peace in the United States are guided by the false assumption that hostility and anger by non-whites is provoked by "white racism". The truth is that non-whites would be hostile toward us even if every European-American were a saint.

In every non-homogenous country in the world non-whites have powerful racial animosities. (See Yggdrasil's lesson #2). These reactions occur whether Europeans are present or not. However, white liberals imagine that once these people arive on our shores they lose that natural and universal propensity to dislike people of other races.

To the liberal mind, black and brown people arriving here either become "saints", devoid of the natural inclination of men everywhere to dislike people with different skin color, or become "new socialist man," motivated solely by calculations of economic self-interest and utterly devoid of racial awareness. Thus, to a liberal, whenever blacks or browns become angry, they must have been provoked by "white racism."

Now this unfortuate assumption places the average European- American in a rather awkward position. Every time black and brown people raise a stink about their status or treatment, the liberal assumes that there must be hidden white racism somewhere, and that the way to appease the blacks and browns is to adopt new employment quotas, more contract set-asides, new

standards for race-normed testing or admissions procedures, adopt more stringent "hate crime" laws, censor white speech ever more stringently to filter out anything that might be giving such offense, and if all that fails, buy peace with direct cash handouts (paid for by the middle class, of course).

Now black and brown people are not fools, they know they are being rewarded for raising a rukus. So far, they keep getting the same rewards for it. More rukus leads to more benefits, more advantages, more tribute, and more humiliation of the average white by their own elites. What a country!

Now for the average European-American who just commutes to work in the morning, has very little racial anger, and certainly doesn't want to foment or participate in any "revolution", all of these concessions present a dilemma. At some point, these undeserved burdens have to stop. Yet the average European-American has been so tolerant of their imposition, and the white liberal elites in charge have been so utterly naive and misguided in their judgments about race, that there is no visible mechanism or group that could possibly stop what is now beginning to look like a massive racially-based attack.

There are no European-American leaders who are willing to stand up and state the obvious. It is the blacks and browns who are racist. It is the blacks and browns who are exploiting the race issue for advantage. At some point, the white liberal elites are either going to have to say "no" to the black and brown racial aggressors, or those white elites will have to be replaced with someone who can.

Thus there is a practical advantage to be gained by bringing white nationalism out into the open. These white liberal elites are going to have to understand that there are competent rebels within their midst (within the information elites described by Herrnstein and Murray in "The Bell Curve") who feel a moral obligation to dissent and organize average European-Americans to resist their practice of rewarding black and brown racial aggression. It does not matter whether this practice arises out of a sincere (if obviously silly) notion that only white racism could cause black and brown hostility, or whether this practice is a conscious aggression on the part of an alienated white liberal elite motivated by a need to show contempt for their fellow European-Americans. Either way, it is going to stop. The only question is how "messy" the process of stopping these practices is going to get.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## White Nationalism - Key Concepts

CONCEPT 1. - There is nothing sacred about having several races in the same country.

If having several different races in the same country works, then fine. Keep the arrangement. If it doesn't, then scrap it. There are no moral imperatives involved in the deciding whether to have one country or several. The issue should be decided based on practicality. The solution that reduces conflict and provides the greatest degree of happiness to the most people is the one to be pursued.

In the United States, we are taught that racial integration is a moral imperative. This morality is the self-interested creation of planters and industrialists interested in cheap labor. It is a morality created to facilitate what Alvin Toffler describes as the "second wave" industrial economy.

It was very much in the interests of planters and industrialists to import whomever they wish to facilitate rapid growth and keep wages low. Any cultural and non-economic costs of learning to adapt to one another were imposed on the existing inhabitants and were not borne by the planters or industrialists individually.

In other parts of the world, races come to be included in the same nation by way of military conquest and colonization. For colonizers, drawing borders in such a way as to include several races makes it possible to pit one race against another, rendering the colony easier to control. Niccolo Machiavelli described the strategy 400 years ago in his work "The Prince."

CONCEPT 2. - When several races are placed in a single country, conflict arises.

For all the talk about the "brotherhood of man" examples of several races getting along in a single country for an extended period are either few or non-existent. Different races coexist temporarily only under repressive and totalitarian regimes. In the absense of force and repression, conflict escalates.

Racial and ethnic groups always compete.

With the advent of "multiculturalism" the U.S. is rapidly balkanizing. It is only a matter of time before conflict escalates.

CONCEPT 3. - Races will choose different methods of competition depending on their circumstances.

In the United States, we are taught that majorities always oppress minorities.

In truth, both minority and majority races compete for status and power in a multi-racial country. They typically compete using different means and strategies. Obviously, a minority will attempt to conceal its aggressive agenda so as to lull the majority into political complacency.

To be successful, minorities must be content with indirect racial victories masked from majority view by universalisms like "fairness," "tolerance" and "compassion". To be successful, minorities must conceal their explicit racial agenda from the majority.

However, the achilles heel of minority control is their ability to keep the non-elite members of their own group content with the fruits of this indirect aggression against the majority.

Once a significant number of any racial minority becomes dissatisfied and desires the more intense pleasures of direct racial confrontation with the majority, the game is very near an end.

In contrast, with raw numbers on their side, majorities will almost always assert their racial interests in direct ways. Because of this, it is easy to portray a majority as crude and insensitive when it begins to assert its racial interests in the public debate even if only in self-defense.

CONCEPT 4. - A minority will expend great effort in defining the conditions of its interaction with the majority.

The most successful minorities will expend great amounts of energy convincing their racial opponents that they are not competing. Competition and conflict take many forms. Outright violence gets the headlines. However, less visible forms of ethnic conflict always occur. The political struggles for preferences and group advantages that take place in the legislatures always favor organized minorities over complacent majorities.

Successful minorities will attempt to dominate all communications media to the point where they can prevent the dissemination of any message that calls attention to minority racial and ethnic dominance. Only messages of minority victimization are allowed to pass. Serious discussion of these issues in books and periodicals directed at the elites are spoken in "code" so that they cannot alarm the majority.

All a minority need do to dictate the terms of interaction between minority and majority is to define public morality in such a way as to ensure that demands to block negative messages will

be obeyed by the majority elites. It does not require direct ownership or control over all communications media.

CONCEPT 5. - Majority elites typically benefit from the presence of minority races and will ordinarily oppose the racial interests of their own kind.

An elite would never allow the importation of a racial minority unless it benefitted from the minority's presence. So naturally, once the minority has arrived, the majority elite will protect that minority as long as the majority elite continues to benefit.

It makes perfect sense that the elite will invent new secular moral imperatives of tolerance and respect for minorities and demand that the majority learn, believe and follow those new imperatives.

CONCEPT 6. - New immigrants struggle to gain supremacy over the earlier arrivals.

If you examine the history of the migrations to the United States, it is clear that each new wave of arrivals struggles to supplant the earlier arrivals and that most such groups succeed.

The earliest arrivals were the Puritans 1620-1680 (largely, descendants of Danish invaders of England) and Scotch-Irish who settled in Appalachia. Once these early arrivals subdued the Indians, later arrivals of English Episcopalians sought to displace the Puritans economically and politically. The contest was fought with cultural and political tools, and the new Episcopal arrivals won.

When the earlier arriving Celtic "Anglo Saxons" inhabiting the Southern States attempted to secede, this new Episcopal elite fought the bloodiest war in U.S. history to suppress them.

Beginning in 1880, this Episcopal elite allowed a new wave of Jewish and Southern European immigrants into the U.S. They too supplanted the earlier English Episcopalian elite in wealth, education and political power within 50 years of their arrival.

Immigrant groups will invest a great deal of effort creating myths surrounding the hardships encountered on first arrival to deflect attention from their quick acquisition of economic and political power. The myths about hardship and "discrimination" confer upon these new elites "victim status" which insulates them from criticism by the less fortunate and more complacent descendants of earlier arrivals.

CONCEPT 7 - The masses of a majority race are likely to go along with importation of different races as long as the majority elite demands that new immigrants assimilate.

If the majority elite demands that the new arrivals assimilate, this is a recognition that the current inhabitants do not have to give up their culture to accommodate the new arrivals. New arrivals must strive to become as much like the existing inhabitants as possible and must strive to limit the potential sources of friction.

Once the elites of the majority race drop their demands for minority assimilation, the minorities will tend to accentuate their differences with the majority. Conflict, whether cultural, political or physical, will escalate.

CONCEPT 8. - Majority elites will abandon integrationism as soon as it ceases to benefit them.

Until approximately the mid-1980's large corporations and government bureaucracies created hundreds of thousands of middle management positions to be filled by "generalist" college graduates.

New computer technologies are rapidly replacing these "generalist" knowledge workers. Prior to the advent of these technologies, "how you behaved" was more important than your technical knowledge. To be assured a middle class position in one of these bureaucracies, you only needed to learn the liberal propaganda at college. Not much else mattered.

In exchange for belief in liberalism and integrationism, Euro- American elites were rewarded with middle class jobs. In short, they were bought off. There were direct economic rewards for liberalism.

That is no longer so.

Race based hiring preferences have largely eliminated access to these middle management jobs in government and regulated utilities. Technology is eliminating these positions in the private sector.

In the past, you went to college to learn what to say. One slip of the anti-egalitarian tongue and you ended up in the mail room.

Absent 1300 plus combined SAT scores and critical knowledge skills, you will end up in the mail room anyway if you are White.

Increasingly, the behavior and manners of egalitarian belief are becoming less relevant to earning a middle class living.

In the future it is going to become much more difficult for the minority elites to find sufficient numbers of Euro-American front men throughout our institutions to lull the majority back to



sleep. Anti-egalitarian dissenters will proliferate among Euro- Americans within the information elite.

It is going to be much more difficult to sustain the idea in the minds of the average European-American that this is their country.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## What is White Nationalism

1994

1. Q. What is White Nationalism?

A. The idea that Whites may need to create a separate nation as a means of defending themselves.

2. Q. Do White Nationalists feel they are superior to other races?

A. No. The desire of White Nationalists to form their own nation has nothing to do with superiority or inferiority.

3. Q. Do White Nationalists seek to dominate other races?

A. Not at all. In fact, formation of a White Nation removes any possibility of White dominance of other races, as well as the plausibility of the accusation that Whites wish to dominate others.

4. Q. Do White Nationalists seek to insulate themselves from competition from other races?

A. No. A separate White Nation would establish a policy of free trade with its new neighbors. Labor markets are global, and the formation of a White Nation would not protect Whites from economic competition.

5. Q. Well if White Nationalists don't feel superior, don't want to dominate others, and don't seek protection from competition, then why would they want a separate nation?

A. To avoid exploitation.

6. Q. Exploitation? This is rich! So how is it that Whites are exploited?

A. It is a long list. Burdensome racial preference schemes in hiring, race-normed employment tests, racial preference schemes in university admissions, racial preference schemes in government contracting and small business loans. Beyond quotas there is the denial of rights of free speech and of due process to Whites who are critical of these governmental policies. We have special punishments for vandalism and assaults committed by Whites if the *accused White has ever expressed a preference for his own kind*. In addition, Whites pay a proportion of the costs of the welfare state that is disproportionate to what they receive in benefits.

But the most exploitative aspect of the situation is that neither the racial quotas, the business preferences, the loss of freedom of speech, nor the disproportionate contributions to the welfare state have managed to sate the appetites of non-whites living in the United States.

The more Whites sacrifice, the more non-whites demand. Many Whites are beginning to believe that no amount of tribute, other than mass suicide, would satisfy the non-white demands.

If our presence stirs up that much hatred in the hearts of non-whites, then the only sensible course of action is to separate ourselves from them.

7. Q. You claim that non-whites are the aggressors and haters in race relations. Aren't you afraid that most Whites will think this is ridiculous?

A. Not in the slightest. For the past 30 years most Whites have taken part in a mass migration or "white flight" away from neighborhoods inhabited by non-whites. Aggressors don't flee. For example, on a per-capita basis, blacks are 49 times more likely to assault a White than a White is to assault a black. The best measure of racism is the number of non-economically motivated attacks. Whites score low in this regard, non-whites high.

The fact is that non-whites are clamoring to enter this country in droves. Whites are fleeing en masse to less densely inhabited areas to escape these new arrivals.

8. Q. But how can Whites be exploited when it is whites who have enacted these racial

preferences, the taxation, the welfare payments and the immigration laws?

A. Excellent question! It is true that Whites are exploited by their fellow whites. In fact, we do not expect any resistance to the formation of a separate nation from non-whites. We expect white integrationist elites to resist. They are the ones who have a great deal to lose.

9. Q. If life in America is so bad for Whites why don't you just move back to Europe?

A. We are a majority. We do not have to move back. We can resolve to defend ourselves against this onslaught. We have the option of peacefully ceding lands already inhabited by non-whites to separate non-white nations. We would save money, and could restore our civil liberties and free ourselves from constant threats of violence by so doing.

**Besides, most of Europe has decided to follow the lead of the United States and transform itself into a multi-racial hell hole, enforcing the now official state religion of multiculturalism with draconian penalties against dissenting heretics. There is no longer any place left for us to go!**

10. Q. What would your separate state look like?

A. The truth is we don't know yet. Our separate state would follow the geographic outlines of White flight. The model for this state would be the modern gerrymander created by the Voting Rights Act to create majority non-white congressional districts. We would simply cede these to a separate nation. The mechanics of this process will be explained more fully later in a post entitled "sweating the details."

11. Q. Would all Whites be welcome in your separate state?

A. Absolutely. There would be no restriction by country of origin, and no genetic tests, skin color or hair color tests or any nonsense like that. The only restriction would be that those who wish to recreate the present system by importing non-whites and then encouraging their hostility would not be welcome. They would have to remain in or move to the lands ceded to the non-whites.

12. Q. Would Asians be welcome in your separate state?

A. Unresolved. As a general rule, Asian-Americans show very little aggression towards Whites, either personally or politically. Thus, there is no compelling reason to exclude them from our new state.

**Further, it is probable that Asians will become political allies at some point because they are almost certain to be viewed as a threat by the existing Jewish- Black-Hispanic racial extortion coalition and be subject to the same discriminatory burdens as we are.**

**Thus, our relations with Asian Americans are fluid and likely to be shaped by the strategic choices of the racial extortion coalition. We would anticipate that Asian Americans would maintain a strong aesthetic preference for their own kind and might want to maintain their own non-sovereign "nation" within our state, which would generally be fine with us.**

13. Q. Would the same hold true for hispanics.

*A. The "hispanic race is an artificial grouping of peoples (cobbled together by multiculturalists in an attempt to enlarge the racial extortion coalition) that includes many Whites of European origin, including Spaniards, and Portugese, as well as many Cubans and Latin Americans of European origin. Hispanics of European origin, as well as those of mixed ancestry who consider themselves White, blend in and display no hostility of a personal or political kind, would be part of our White Nation. Those Hispanics with a history of participation in the racial extortion coalition, and "Mecha" members who want to see the Southwestern U.S. annexed to Mexico would not be welcome.*

14. Q. You are proposing that inclusion and exclusion be based on ideology and feelings. Won't your act of nation splitting turn into a witch hunt?

A. For white liberals it is definitely going to feel like a witch hunt! When the time comes, those who are guilty of "integrationism" should do the sensible thing and flee. It will spare us all a lot of pain.

15. Q. Is this White Nation something that you intend to pursue right away?

A. No. The White Nation is, by most accounts, about 20 years off. When the rest of the U.S. begins to look like Southern California it will happen more or less automatically, without much of a push from us.

16. Q. Why do you use the term "European-American"?

A. All Whites are descended from European immigrants. The term European-American has political significance for two reasons. First, it recognizes that most people in the U.S. of European extraction have intermarried to such an extent that it is no longer possible to identify american Whites as "Irish" or "German" or "Italian". But more important, use of the term "European-American" is intended to recognize that white elites in the United States have exploited differences based on religion and European national origin to divide European-Americans, with the intention of rendering us unable to defend ourselves against non-white demands.

17. Q. What is White separatism?

A. A White separatist will agree on most points with a White Nationalist, except that he may not see a need to establish a separate sovereign nation within the present territorial boundaries of the U.S.

18. Q. What is a White supremacist?

A. That is a White who wishes to subjugate other races by force, ordinarily by military conquest. White supremacists are very rare in 1994, and there is no visible trend or base of support which would allow them to carry such a political program into effect. White supremacists are generally an embarrassment to White Nationalists.

19. Q. Do White Nationalists think of Adolph Hitler or National Socialism as a model to emulate?

A. White Nationalists do not seek to recreate the German experience of 1936-1945. Hitler's Reich is not a model for White Nationalism, *primarily because White Nationalists do not tolerate hostility and aggression against fellow descendants of European Christendom based*

*on language or national origin.* White Nationalism is defensive. It is not externally aggressive. It would most likely be a government of very limited powers, with a federal structure that assures localities considerable latitude to experiment with moral and social laws, with the idea of fostering traditional communities and traditional religions in places where the overwhelming majority of people want such things - and secularism where the majority wish to have that as well.

However, within the ranks of White Nationalists, there are some significant differences of opinion about the **historical** significance of Hitler, and whether he was a help or a hindrance to the cause of White survival. Also, there are those who argue that Hitler's military exploits were a defensive reaction to the ethnically motivated slaughters by (predominantly Jewish) Marxists in Russia. This debate among White Nationalists can get emotional at times, but has little to do with the practicality of White survival or the probable characteristics of any new White Nation today.

20. Q. Are White Nationalists anti-semitic.

**A. Depends on how you define anti-semitism. A uniform and essential characteristic of White Nationalism is opposition to Jewish power as that power is now expressed in (A) the formation, financing and direction of the racial extortion coalition, (B) the cultural attack (and consequent degradation of our race) emanating from *effective Jewish control of the entertainment media and other organs of public opinion, and (C) control of U.S. foreign policy and law enforcement (the state monopoly on violence) and the use of that monopoly to further Jewish and Israeli interests.***

**At the same time, White Nationalists recognize that there are individual Jews who do not participate in these expressions of Jewish power nor approve of them, and must not be subjected to the same measures as those who do.**

***One central agenda of White Nationalism is White autonomy (self-determination), which will involve opposition to the exercise of Jewish influence and control over the White population. Anyone who considers himself Jewish but does not have a problem with participating in such opposition is, by definition, not part of the cooperating Jewish group and is welcome to join the White community and work toward the achievement of our goals.***

**The problem is that the majority of Jews share an irrational fear of the American Descendants of European Christendom (Steven Issacs, *Jews and American Politics*) which refuses to scale itself in any reasonable way to the nature of the actual threat and to their power to avert that threat.**

**It is one thing for an impoverished and harrassed group to harbor such distrust, but quite another for a fabulously wealthy and dominant elite to do so. In fact, the wealthier and more powerful Jews become, the more intense the discrimination and cultural attacks against us become.**

**Although Jews are racially "white," the predominant Jewish evolutionary psychology is qualitatively and quantitatively different from that of the white gentiles who join them in supporting the multi-culturalist enterprise, and who support the demands of the racial extortion coalition. White gentiles who support these causes do so largely for reasons of perceived individual self interest, the acquisition of social status, and for the enjoyment of feelings of moral superiority - all signs of a class that is complacent and comfortable with the status quo. Thus, the behavior of most Jews will be much more difficult to modify than the behavior their white gentile allies.**

**Allowing Jews wildly disporportionate wealth and political power has not moderated their suspicion nor their preemptive attack upon us. Thus, rational "deals" with them will be almost impossible to broker.**

21. Q. What is the difference between political conservatism and White Nationalism?

**A. White Nationalists generally diagnose the problems of the United States in exactly the same way as do most conservatives.** Indeed Thomas Sowell's treatise on the universality of racial strife worldwide and the tendency of governments worldwide to aggravate racial strife are the factual raw material for the White Nationalist argument.

**However, there are enormously important differences.**

Conservatives generally believe that different races can live peacefully in a single country as long as the government has limited powers and serves as a "loose confederation" guaranteeing individual rights. White Nationalists tend to have emotional sympathy toward this conservative viewpoint.

However, White Nationalists will point out that there is no existing example of such a loose confederation in which racial autonomy and peace has been achieved, nor is there any reason to believe that a government (such as the United States Government) which starts out as a loose confederation with limited powers will remain so for long if subjected to the competing demands of different races.

White Nationalists believe that the urge to use governmental power to gain racial advantage is



so great that the safest and most humane choice is to break up multi-racial empires and place each race under a separate government. In broad outline, the *old Soviet Union headed in the right direction in preventing racial and ethnic conflict by splitting apart and allowing different races and ethnicities their own separate governments.*

Conservatives assume liberals are motivated by good intentions, and that the destructiveness of their policies should be forgiven. White nationalists believe that liberals are motivated by a lust for power and carefully cloaked ethnic and cultural hatreds and that their destructive social policies achieve their real (as opposed to their stated) aims. Because our federal and most state governments are dominated by liberals, those governments are illegitimate and the people have the right of immediate rebellion.

White Nationalists, believe that liberal elites will never tolerate the loss of power that comes from stripping down the U.S. Government to its original conception of a loose confederation, and that liberals would resort to any and all means including electoral fraud, suspension of freedom of speech and of the press, warrantless arrests, suspension of habeas corpus, inciting racial violence, and inciting mass migrations into the United States to avoid any such loss of power.

Most White Nationalists view our liberal elites as extremely dangerous, - as vicious and manipulative in the use of police power as they are cowardly in their personal lives. Most White Nationalists also view the "Waco" incident not as an aberration, but as the preferred response of liberals to dissident religious or anti-egalitarian Whites, and are convinced that the result of this incident represents the preferred outcome from the liberal perspective. It is clear that liberal elites think of dissident religious or anti-egalitarian Whites as, at best, a form of undesirable "property" **that they may dispose of as they wish.**

**Thus, conservatives basically accept the fundamental premises of the secular religion of human equality and the brotherhood of man, accepting the notion that states should act as coercive blenders. Conservatives hope (against hope) that competing races are enough like us that they can be persuaded by reason and rational argument to treat us fairly while we are swirling in that blender.**

*White Nationalists, on the other hand, have been taught by careful observation of humanity to reject the secular religion of human equality and the brotherhood of man, and to recognize that the way to maximize peace and to prevent racial oppression is not with romaniticised visions of a single blended human race, but rather to accord all men the basic human right of belonging to a separate nation defined by the perfectly natural preference for genetic self similarity. When this is done, it is possible to minimize racial conflict through reason at the level on which reason has a chance of working, namely at the level of diplomacy between racial nations.*

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

**(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.**

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Sweating the Details

(A companion piece to Yggdrasil's Lesson #6, "What is a Race?")

[originally posted to alt.revolution.counter]

I read Mr. X's post, below:

"Are there any useful historical precedents to look to? My impression is that when different peoples are jumbled together geographically then a breakup on ethnic lines is usually a bloody mess. I suppose I'm thinking mostly of the partition of India, the establishment of the State of Israel and subsequent events, and the last 100 years in the Balkans."

- and I realize that history does not provide many truly useful examples of how one can engage in ethnic nation-splitting when different ethnic groups are not already geographically segregated. In truth, though, there is already a great deal of racial and ethnic geographic separation in the United States, and no reason to place a premium on brutality or violence.

Secession means accepting less land than you would demand in an ethnic cleansing in the realization that people who you could not abide voting in your elections might make very good trading partners once ensconced in their own separate nation.

While it may be the task of authoritarian rightists to force such a split, the agenda for a humane administration of such a split will be a gift from our libertarian allies.

Guarded borders are obsolete.

When one thinks of a racial-state, the mind immediately conjures images of borders fortified with barbed-wire and machine guns to keep "them" out.

Purge that image!

The embryonic model for the breadkaway state is the modern gerrymander. It is a POLITICAL district that twists and turns through the countryside, taking in a house here, a neighborhood there, based on the particular voting characteristics of the household.

There is absolutely no reason why a breakaway state needs to have straight borders or to be a contiguous land mass. In this age of modern electronic communications, a breakaway state can and should be a checkerboard that extends to neighborhoods sharing cultural traits.

Nations confined within a single contiguous land mass are an anachronism. Back before the telephone and the personal computer, it may have been necessary to define a nation in such a limited geographic fashion. But with modern electronic communications, there is no need to gather your entire tribe in a single spot.

Indeed, Manhattan Island has much more in common with Los Angeles than it does with any part of Utah or Wyoming. As long as Utah and Wyoming understand that it is in their interests not cut the phone lines or interfere with airline traffic, there is no reason why Manhattan and Los Angeles should not remain in a single nation.

Those of us who strenuously object to being governed, propagandized and taxed by Manhattan and Los Angeles should be free to get a divorce. (And to watch in delight as the sophisticates and the slum dwellers learn to cope with one another without the stabilizing influence of middle America.)

There is absolutely no reason why the breakaway state should waste its time or money erecting fences or staffing border checkpoints. People of all colors in reasonable numbers should be free to come and go as they please. They should be free to engage in market based transactions. The only thing non-citizens would be denied is the vote and social welfare.

However, the breakaway state would defend itself from any unarmed or armed invasion.

All that is needed to prevent a new class of liberals from arising in the breakaway state and recreating the same integrationist mess we have now is to limit citizenship to lineal descendants of the original citizens. Reasonable numbers of non-citizens could come and live there, but no one can be granted citizenship other than the original inhabitants and their offspring, spouses, etc.

In an era of international free trade, and free mobility of capital, there is no longer any legitimate economic need for mass immigration into the U.S. To the extent that the breakaway state might wish to accommodate refugees or satisfy affairs of the heart, limited immigration can be allowed, but citizenship would be granted only in very small numbers and to immigrants who can demonstrate a lack of probable animus toward the existing inhabitants.

(Come to think of it, the idea that any nation would allow the immigration of groups hostile to its current residents is rather odd, isn't it. So odd, in fact that normal people would never suspect it could occur until they experience the proof first hand!)

In any event, the purpose of the breakaway state would be to help the existing European-American population adapt successfully to economic change, rather than abandoning them and employing a flood of new immigrants. The real reason we have unlimited immigration to the United States today is that immigrants have immense political value to our liberal elites. New immigrants of color are naturally hostile to European-Americans and favorably disposed toward generous welfare and high taxes. Deny votes to immigrants, and the internal constituency for encouraging their arrival pretty much disappears.

In truth, we already have in the United States the infrastructure for these separate nations largely in place.

Under the Voting Rights Act, approximately 40 Congressional districts have been drawn up that are overwhelmingly black. These districts can be made into a separate nation. Other congressional districts populated by the liberals can also be made a part of that black nation (that they love so much) or be made independent.

Each of these states would have their own military and their own police. The European-American nation would grant the citizens and the military forces of these residual nations unrestricted rights to travel between their non-contiguous lands.

There is already a great deal of de-facto geographic and cultural segregation in the United States. The trend in that direction accelerates even as greater percentages of our population learn the socially acceptable answers to give to pollsters when asked questions about racial tolerance.

In effect, a European-American state would merely recognize, de jure, what already exists, de facto.

As foreign tourists have learned to their chagrin over the past few years, when you come to visit "America" you must be very careful about which "America" it is you intend to visit. In one very large "America" you are safer than you are in Europe. In another America you are very likely to be killed.

Natives know instantly which American they are in, and what precautions to take when they happen to be in the "wrong America." Tourists, on the other hand, are unprepared because our public discourse is based on a lie intended to avoid enraging that "other America". These rules of public discourse prevent candid public warnings to tourists. There is indeed a lot of race hatred in the United States, but it is predominantly anti-European hatred.

Like our foreign tourists, there are some unfortunates (perhaps Mr. "X" is one) who may wish to live in the breakaway state, but happen to live on the "wrong" side of the new borders. Indeed,

those 40 gerrymandered black congressional districts have from 20% to 40% non-black populations. Those unfortunates would have the choice of remaining where they are or moving to (and claiming citizenship in) the breakaway state.

Indeed, treatment of European-Americans living beyond the control of the breakaway state (a state that would exist for the sole purpose of protecting them) might be "messy". But then you cannot create a "secession omelette" without allowing a few eggs to be broken outside your jurisdiction. I would not imagine that every instance of white hating everywhere in the world would become a "causus belli" for this new breakaway state.

The model would be Israel's "Law of Return," but applied to European-Americans and their descendents.

But then I presume too much. It is certainly not for me to dictate the policy or exact dimensions of this new state. My task is merely to show that its creation is possible without a great deal of dislocation. - that is, absent some very ugly violence and hardening of attitudes that could be started by our ruling liberal elites in their effort to prevent the formation of such a state.

While we are sweating details, let me attempt to dispose of one more. I am certain that these discussions must be creating a great deal of anxiety among Asian-Americans.

Allow me to presume for purposes of these discussions that Asians born in the United States are "white". While this presumption is obviously false historically and genetically, it is an attempt to recognize that the motive force behind creation of the new breakaway state is to escape from a manipulative liberal elite and its constituent white-hating voting blocks. It is certainly not an attempt to insulate European-Americans from "competition" from talented and hardworking groups that are already here in the U.S. and that blend in with little friction. The same would apply to hispanics who are already here, accepting the gringo-hating "Mecha" types who wish to annex the Southwest to Mexico.

One would hope they understand that we must defend ourselves from those that hate us (including our own decadent elites) and that they trust us to accurately identify our enemies.

Since Asian-Americans generally adhere to the old fashioned notion of a color-blind state and generally show few symptoms of white hating, there is really no reason to make a distinction between them and European-Americans (unless, of course, it is their collective wish that we do so).

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Who Stays and Who Goes?

On this newsgroup we advocate secession - the creation of a breakaway nation- as the vehicle for escaping liberalism and its assorted multicultural attacks on Americans of European ancestry.

I am willing to bet that some of us within the movement feel that they are not "European-Americans" but just plain "Americans," that this is "our country" and that we should just "take it back."

This is the "ethnic cleansing" option. The idea is that we take political control of the country and just expel the liberal multiculturalists and their racial allies.

Fair enough, let's talk about that idea! Is it a practical option?

Those of us who advocate the "secession option" have discussed the issue of how the breakaway nation defines the class of people eligible for citizenship. Who Stays and Who Goes?

Another way of phrasing the question is - "who is white?"

The only workable answer, it seems to me, is that any current citizen of the U.S. who wants to live in the breakaway nation and displays no hostility toward whites, is welcome.

To all others, including the white liberal elites, we are willing to cede the real estate they now occupy (about 15% of the U.S. land mass) to a new nation where they will be free to live with anyone else who wishes to submit to their compulsion for "social re-engineering."

Admittedly, in the act of setting the borders, we would use modern technology to gerrymander a new nation based on a functional definition of race. That is, the national boundaries ought to be drawn in such a way as to minimize the possibility of racial competition and conflict within the new nation.

But however artfully we may engineer boundaries, there will be individuals on either side of the new borders who will feel aggrieved.

After the new nation is formed, the decision on whether to remain in the breakaway nation



should be voluntary with the individual. I have not heard anyone within the movement discuss the "secession option" and advocate that a democratic majority within the breakaway nation should be given the power to expel individuals based on hair, eye or skin color. The time has come to invite comment on the alternative "ethnic cleansing" model for protecting ourselves from the liberals and their assorted multiculturalist attacks.

Anyone wishing to argue that model should post in its defense. I would suggest that history provides a valuable object lesson in the dangers of placing too much faith in the power of government to shape the racial and cultural character of a nation.

Reprinted below is the text of the famous "Posan speech" delivered by Heinrich Himmler to a group of SS officers on October 4, 1943. Remember, that he is speaking to the most committed "movement" members of his time!

"I also want to talk to you, quite frankly, on a very grave matter. Among ourselves it should be mentioned quite frankly, and yet we will never speak of it publicly... I mean the clearing out of the Jews, the extermination of the Jewish race. It is one of those things it is easy to talk about - "The Jewish race is being exterminated," says one party member, "that's quite clear, it's in our program - elimination of the Jews, and we're doing it, exterminating them." And then they come, 80 million worthy Germans, and each one has his decent Jew. Of course the others are vermin, but this one is an A-1 Jew.

"Not one of all those who talk this way has witnessed it, not one of them has been through it. Most of you know what it means when 100 corpses are lying side by side, or 500 or 1000. To have stuck it out and at the same time - apart from the exceptions caused by human weakness - to have remained decent fellows, that is what has made us hard. This is a page of glory in our history which has never been written and is never to be written, for we know how difficult we should have made it for ourselves if - with the bombing raids, the burdens and deprivations of war - we still had Jews today in every town as secret saboteurs, agitators and trouble-mongers. We would now probably have reached the 1916/17 stage when the Jews were still in the German national body."

Himmler is complaining to his most committed followers about the political limits and realities of implementing the policy of "ethnic cleansing" adopted by the Third Reich.

Himmler notes that while "80 million good Germans" (a number equal to their entire population) may agree with "ethnic cleansing" as an abstract or conceptual proposition, once the SS or police start rounding them up, it seems that all "80 million good Germans" have a personal relationship with at least one Jew and will complain and cry for an exemption for him.

In other words, the implementation is politically unworkable.

Himmler goes on to note that even in wartime, when the SS has to confront 500 or 1000 corpses of their fallen comrades and stand firm in their resolve, the average German sees none of that and would just as soon have a "fifth column" in their midst making the problem worse. That is the matter about which Himmler would "never speak publicly."

If Nazi Germany had that much trouble implementing ethnic cleansing during war, just imagine how difficult it would be to implement such a process in peace time in the U.S.

Ethnic cleansing is not something like "social security" that you can just dump on government and expect the government to take care of.

The fact is that in an integrated society, millions of Euro- Americans have personal relationships with people of other "races."

It may be easy for middle class European-Americans to recognize the destruction the liberal welfare state inflicts on blacks. Most European-Americans may easily agree that they too should be free from the quotas, cultural onslaughts and veiled attacks of liberal multiculturalism.

It will be easy for us to agree that we cannot leave government in the hands of liberals to serve as a tool of oppression.

But if we assign to government the task of "ethnic cleansing", this agreement will rapidly disappear. The truth is that personal relationships with minority friends are stronger than attachments to abstract ideology. The average middle class European-American may concede the concept of the racial state as a logical response to the liberal multi-cultural mess. But the bureaucracy to which you assign the task of "ethnic cleansing" simply will not be able to withstand the endless pleading for special exemptions.

The secessionist gerrymander offers a solution.

First, the very act of drawing the new borders excludes enough liberals and their racial allies that liberals will no longer be guaranteed of winning all elections simply by dividing the white vote on how generous to be to minorities and then having the minorities carry the day by voting for their own interests.

Second, we outlaw the importation of labor (the "immigration invasion").

Next we replace modern welfare that subsidizes social decay, encourages "white flight," and creates opportunities for profit from liberalism with private unemployment insurance and old age insurance that citizens must purchase for themselves. There will be no separate "welfare

culture."

Next, we outlaw bilingualism and any other scheme to encourage aggrieved racial separatism for the tiny remnants within the breakaway state. Assimilation will be the law.

Once this is accomplished, liberal multi-culturalism will be permanently hobbled, and there should be no need to interfere with personal relationships that already exist. People can be free to socialize within and across the new border without hindrance. No one would be expelled.

Over time, we would envision that those who are "uncomfortable" on the wrong side of the border would move voluntarily. The key point is that this realigning immigration would be voluntary. The individual would make these decisions for himself.

No majority would be empowered to expel people.

While the new breakaway state might, at first, look like a "Seattle suburb", it is all relative. For a resident of New Jersey or Southern California, a "Seattle suburb" free of liberal multiculturalist political assaults is a fairly compelling vision.

The moral of this lengthy discourse is that things have changed since 1940. We have a much better understanding now about the limits of governmental competence. I would suggest that government has a very limited role in the salvation of a race or nation. The private actions of individuals and social organizations are far more important. (And in those private actions we are severely lacking. We need to change our folk-ways, and these necessary adaptations will be the topic of an upcoming series of posts entitled "The Culture Wars.")

Having made clear my preference for the "secession option" with its Czech -Slovak possibilities for peaceful divorce, I offer this as a prescription and not necessarily a prediction of the future.

As I have argued in many prior posts, the balkanization of the United States is now being driven by the liberals - not us. I would warn each of you that there isn't a single example anywhere in the world of a country with racial quotas and a political culture of racial grievance that has maintained racial peace.

The truth is that our breakaway nation may be forced upon us prematurely, and its creation may not be anywhere near as tidy or peaceful as we hope.

We are a tiny minority with no power to affect or change the course of events right now. Things will be different in 10 to 20 years.

In the meantime, I expect more "Wacos" and more "Vickie Weavers."

I expect more L.A. riots.

So stay in shape, go to the range regularly, keep your mouth shut, and your eyes open!

And never sell a gun to anyone!

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Milton's Trillion

In a post to the newsgroup alt.revisionism, my friend Milton Kleim expounds on a vision of "ethnic cleansing" for the United States, in part, as follows:

Newsgroups: alt.revisionism  
From: bb748@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Milton Kleim)  
Date: Mon, 20 Mar 1995 04:18:22 GMT  
Lines: 44

[A concerned Holocaust defender asks Milton Kleim:]

'That's a responsive answer? I ask again: What exactly will your authoritarian government of "wise men" do to Jews, Milton? And if you do condescend to answer, how will we know that you are telling the truth?'

[And Milton answers:]

Jews will be encouraged to emigrate, and reasonable assistance will be provided by a National Socialist government for those who cannot afford to leave. Those who wish to subvert the new Aryan state will of course be expelled by the most efficient means (to Mexico, etc.).

The definition of a "Jew" will be open to interpretation, just as it was in the Third Reich, and many "Jews" will undoubtedly be eligible for citizenship.

\* \* \*

To answer Mr. Shein's comments in another post, yes, Blacks will be repatriated to Africa, with massive financial assistance (\$1 trillion will be allocated for this purpose -- funds derived from the expropriation of usury facilities, commonly known as "banks").

We are going to spend a trillion dollars to move blacks back to Africa?

No way!

Look, the whole idea is that our people are tired of paying. They want to stop paying. You are going to have to show our people how they can SAVE money by doing this, not spend more!

You have to make our program attractive, Milton. The average Euro-American is not going to be moved by calls for additional sacrifice.

Frankly, this notion that a trillion can be taken from banks to pay for relocation shows just how completely the alien socialist propaganda has infected our minds.

Milton, a bank is just a large vehicle for collecting money from people like you and me and then lending it to others. On one side of the bank's balance sheet you have its liabilities. These are deposits collected from the "little guy". On the asset side of the balance sheet, you have loans; auto loans, a few mortgages, loans to the government (treasury notes and bonds) and lots of loans to business.

Now in the lower right hand corner of a bank's balance sheet will be a comparatively tiny entry called "equity". This is the bank's capital.

The sad truth is that banks are the most highly leveraged businesses in the U.S. Typically, their capital equals only 2% or 3% of their assets. Even if you were to confiscate all this capital, it would not equal a trillion dollars. (After all, the only use of bank capital is to protect you, the depositor. You don't think they leave any more than necessary for that purpose, do you?) And if you confiscate anything else, you are taking deposits - money that belongs to little guys like you and me!

The political problem with banks is not the interest they charge on their loans, but the fact that by gathering deposits from working folks like us, they have acquired the power to decide who gets to employ that money in our economy and for what purposes. We depositors lose the power to decide how our money is used, while the government forces bank managements to make uneconomic loans that aid our enemies.

If you confiscate all bank capital, you will be left with weak financial institutions that cannot grant new loans, and that are vulnerable to failure, risking the loss of deposits of the little guys.

There is no free trillion out there to be had for the taking.

If Euro-Americans are going to have to spend a trillion dollars to send Africans back to Africa, it is going to have to come out of their own pockets or out of the pockets of the next generation.

The truth is that we would be better off spending the trillion to build up our own culture, rather

than moving another.

I have a better idea. Let's just cede New York City, Detroit, Atlanta, Los Angeles and similar venues along with the 40 Voting Rights Act districts (about 10% to 15% of our land mass) to a new nation with its own separate government and tax system.

That way, we shed the enormous welfare costs. While we lose the tax base on some valuable urban real estate, we would keep most of the tax base associated with suburban offices, factories and warehouses.

The idea is to avoid disrupting our economy. Nor do we wish to disrupt trade between the businesses in New York City and the rest of the country. Rather, we want to disrupt minority control over our new slimmed-down Congress and to disrupt minority control over our own culture and arts.

We want to have the ability to foster arts, entertainment and news broadcasts that compete with Hollywood, as well as cleaning up the social sciences and history curriculum of the schools. We would drastically curtail immigration.

For the life of me, I cannot see the sense of paying a trillion dollars to keep a de-populated New York City. Not only do you lose the trillion, but you end up with a lot of urban real estate with little or no economy and little value, once its inhabitants are expelled.

It's the "vision thing," Milton. I do not like any vision of the founding of our new Euro-American nation in which we deliberately plunge our people into poverty or war.

At times, Milton, you seem to have this vision of government as some wondrous agent for progress and good, deprived of its capacity to elevate us into Valhalla only because it has fallen into hands of Jews and their racial allies.

The truth, Milton, is that government is a bumbling, incredibly inefficient employer of last-resort - fouling up everything it touches with the possible exception of national defense. The basic principle and purpose of government is to benefit the few at a diffuse and hidden cost to the many.

It is this inherent purpose of government that creates its vulnerability to manipulation by special interests and racial minorities in the first place.

Our Euro-American nation will forcibly confine government to those functions it can perform, and give the people instant, direct electronic veto power, so that it will be impossible to impose those indirect and hidden costs without their informed consent.

As I have said often before, poverty and war may find us anyway for reasons not of our making. However, we must make it clear to our people that our program for the founding of the Euro-American nation will improve living standards, and not decrease them. We want to increase real practical freedom for our people, and ensure their survival.

We will free them from the oppressive and incompetent hand of government and not saddle them with more.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

# YGGDRASIL

## Can Jews Switch Sides?

In a post entitled "Yggdrasil Can't answer Bowery's Questions" Frey's Friend (anonymously) poses a fundamental question of concern to all white nationalists:

"Yggdrasil makes an implicit assumption that the interest of European-Americans and those of Northern European ancestry are the same. In previous posts, Yggdrasil has stated that Jews should be welcomed as citizens in a "Euro-American" state. Yggdrasil has never to the best of my knowledge stated clear, intelligible reasons on why this should be the case-he just assumes that it should be.

"[Who] are the folks who have benefitted most from the political and economic shifts in the last 60 years? Why should those ethnicities that have benefitted as an ethnicity be allowed to switch sides at the last minute and still get all the benefits of changes in policy that are likely to occur?"

One of the gravest dangers of scapegoating is that, when the balloon finally goes up, and the battle is joined, your most dangerous enemies are to your rear.

Bowery and friends need a simple history lesson.

If you attempt to construct a list of influential liberals most responsible for the liberal integrationist mess that exists here in the United States today, such a list will be dominated by names such as Earl Warren, Lyndon Johnson, Hugo Black, William O. Douglas and Hubert Humphrey. The list will be full of family names such as Rockefeller, Dodd, and Percy. The academic and foundation elites they hired would include names such as John Gardner, Milton Eisenhower and Derek Bok.

The point is that the modern integrationist empire would have been created with or without Jews. Indeed, as an ethnic group, Jews may have benefitted most, but they did not create the mess.

It was not Jews who decided to plunge the United States into a war resulting in the deaths of 600,000 Anglo-Saxon lives and 30 years of economic depression following 1865.

It was not Jews who crafted the League of Nations, the United Nations and all of the other one-world agencies of the twentieth century.

It was not the Jews who decided to craft new ex-post-facto law and apply it to Germans following their defeat in WW-II. Once the decision was made, Jews enthusiastically helped implement these new ex-post-facto laws. But their role was that of subordinate ministers and not prime movers.

Even though Jews disproportionately manned the Hollywood cultural degeneration machine, it was not the Jews who decided to pour untold billions of advertising dollars into that machine to make it grow.

Now in implementing the egalitarian policies and propounding the myths of the multi-racial empire, Jews had a role disproportionate to their numbers in the population.

So then what is the consequence? In cleaning up the multi-cultural mess, do we apply a quota system? Guilty persons are forgiven as long as they are not disproportionate to their ethnic group's share of the population?

Do we allow guilty Anglo-Saxons to switch sides, but expel Jews, guilty or not?

Set aside any considerations of fairness here and focus on the practical. The Puritans (comprised mostly of descendants of the Danish invaders who settled in Northern England and Southern Scotland circa 800 AD) arrived in North America and defeated the Indians. Shortly thereafter (once it was safe) younger sons of the English gentry (descended mostly from Germanic tribes who settled in Southern England circa 400 AD) began to arrive to take advantage of new economic opportunities.

Immediately, these more recent arrivals (mostly Episcopalians) set out to take political power from the descendants of the original Puritan settlers. They fixed upon the witch trials (curious events that sprang up all over Europe, spread to North America, but lasted only a few months) as evidence that these original settlers were unfit to govern and lead the nation.

Much of what passes for 19th century American literature drives home this message. "The Scarlet Letter" is a classic example of an American novel with a political purpose. A wide audience of Anglo-Saxon liberals bought both the novel and its purpose.

"Bigotry" and "intolerance" were code words invented by newly arriving Anglo-Saxons for the purpose of controlling the descendants of earlier Puritan and Celtic (Scotch-Irish) immigrants (many of whom settled in the South). Controlling these lesser "Anglo-Saxons" was a far more important task than maintaining dominance over blacks or Jews.

In fact, one of the major amusements of these Anglo-Saxon liberals was the degradation of the

lesser whites by forcing them to submit to minorities of color during the period of Reconstruction and in the quota era (known as the "civil rights" era) that began 100 years later.

Anyone who understood the history of conflict between these different "Anglo Saxon" tribes knew that the Rockefellers, Percys and Dodds had absolutely no interest in a "color-blind" society. Only outright quotas and preferences could disadvantage and enrage the descendants of their age-old tribal enemies, the Picts (Puritans) and Celts (Scots and Irish), known colloquially as "white trash."

The truth is that Anglo-Saxon white haters are far more dangerous to the survival of Euro-America than are Jewish white haters.

Until we stand up to these Anglo-Saxon liberals and call them to account for the treason they are committing, the rest of the liberals will know that we are dazed, confused and incapable of success.

Further, we will have left our most dangerous enemies free to oppose us, unseen, from the rear.

The equities also seem compelling.

A critical distinction is that the Jews, who played an important but subordinate role, have the excuse of racial difference. The Anglo-Saxon liberals who played the dominant role in creating this mess had no racial or ethnic excuse whatever. After inhabiting the same island with kindred tribes for nearly 1400 years, they had no individual or personal sense of racial or ethnic difference. But the old tribal differences had evolved into a powerfully destructive set of caste and status perceptions which caused them to gleefully sacrifice the interests of their own kind as a means of reaffirming their "superior" status.

The Jews never pretended to be anything other than a distinct and separate group. While they have attempted to conceal their animus behind the cloak of "tolerance," it is only natural that they should be aggressive towards the majority. Their feelings of aggression are understandable.

Viewed objectively, there is no evidence that the Jews arriving in the late 19th century did anything other than ape the social attitudes of the liberal wasp elites already here. Jews are quick studies. They saw the opportunity to become valuable allies to this firmly entrenched elite and they (naturally) took that opportunity.

Viewed from the perspective of new Jewish immigrants arriving in 1880, it would have been foolish to oppose the ideology of this elite. After all, this elite had just provoked a war more brutal than any in history and slaughtered their own kind with singular ferocity just to protect access to Southern markets and to protect tariffs collected disproportionately from European

imports to the South.

These champions of "compassion" and opponents of "bigotry" were very dangerous people indeed.

But over the last 30 years, European-Americans have intermarried to such a degree that most European-Americans younger than age 25 either will not know their European ethnic heritage, or will recite an admixture of some sort. The conflict between different types of Anglo-Saxons that dominated Republican politics as recently as the Taft-Eisenhower struggle in 1952 has disappeared. The "ethnic" Republicans have won. Among these "ethnic" Republicans are the descendants of the original Puritans and Celts, who are so heavily represented within the hated "religious right".

Now whites of Polish, Italian, Irish, German, British and east European descent mix easily and unconsciously. The quotas, crime, illegitimacy, racial aggression and white flight produced by the integrationist welfare state affect them all more or less equally.

To Bowery and to Frey's Friend, I can only state the obvious. Any attempt to create a "northern european" ethnic consciousness within the European-American community is doomed to failure for the simplest of reasons. Very few European-Americans are going to know which side they should take!

Your appeals will be met with blank stares. Such an effort no longer makes sense from the perspective of ethnic reality nor from the perspective of political self-interest.

There is not a single aspect in which the interests of a European -American of Italian ancestry deviates from that of a European- American of German ancestry. A happy consequence is that for the first time, it is very difficult for the liberal manipulators to confuse significant numbers of European-Americans into thinking that they too are "minorities" or "new immigrants" and that they should side with people of color and vote against their own interests.

For the first time in history we have the opportunity to be free from the bondage created by European tribal differences. For the first time in U.S. history the white race is, with the exception of its elites, largely united.

Indeed, as Steven Schrag (a Jew) points out in his book, "The Decline of the WASP," it is hard to identify the old East Coast Anglo-Saxon elite any more. They have disappeared. But all of the mechanisms this elite put in place to disadvantage the descendants of the original Puritan and Scottish settlers now impact more or less uniformly all European-Americans, whether they are Poles, Italians, Englishmen or Cubans.

Our liberal elite will have to be replaced. My guess is that this elite will be replaced with ferocity and violence.

Ferocity in such matters is a sign of sincerity. And nothing will cripple a revolution more quickly than a general perception of softness.

However, like all strategists great and small, when the battle is finally joined, I would prefer to confront the smallest number of enemies possible.

Thus, all sincere conversions before that event are most welcome and will be respected.

To Bowery and to Frey's Friend, I owe thanks for provoking a discussion which is difficult to commence.

But to them, I would urge an end to this curious mix of nostalgia for some bright Northern European past and yearning for a technological rescue into new and more demanding frontiers of the future.

There isn't a frontier anywhere to which manipulators will not repair once it has been made safe and profitable.

We must master the techniques of political self defence here and now, on the battlefield we have before us.

There is no escape. Nor need there be. For it is clear that we can win.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## White Nationalism a "Jewish Conspiracy?"

From: jabowery@netcom.com (Jim Bowery)

Subject: Question for Yggdrasil

What controls the genetic direction of a population more:

-Different fertility rates among men or different fertility rates among women?

Which genetic group suffered the greatest damage in male fertility as a result of feminism?

-Those of Northern European ancestry or those of Jewish ancestry?

Which genetic group was most over-represented among the leadership of the feminist movement during the baby boom's years of fertility?

-Those of Northern European ancestry or those of Jewish ancestry?

Which group enjoyed the greatest relative gain in economic status over the same period?

-Those of Northern European ancestry or those of Jewish ancestry?

Which is offering those of Northern European ancestry the best deal? The Nation of Islam with its prohibition against sexual exploitation of and intermarriage with whites? Those of Jewish ancestry who are promoting the new "white" nationalism via east-coast establishment institutions and media?

Of your close associates who are of Jewish ancestry, how do they feel about the concept of strict liability in the law -- where intent is no defense against the claim of liability for damages?

Mr. Bowery, I find your question "Which is offering those of Northern European ancestry the best deal?" defeatist.

I say nonsense! We don't have to take anyone's deal! In 20 years, it is we European-Americans

who will be offering the "deals" on our terms to whom ever we please.

Each time the third world has directly challenged European power, the result has been the same. European-Americans are under attack in the United States by third world elements. Our upper-middle class (with a few notable exceptions) burys its head in the sand and wishes it were not so, because confronting that challenge means the destruction of the myths on which their status is based, and an inevitable shift in existing power relationships within our society.

But once the average European-American understands the extent of that challenge, the result will be swift and predictable.

We aren't going to need "deals" from anyone.

Now this notion that the new 'white nationalism' is a jewish conspiracy is laughable.

You must come to understand a simple universal proposition. It would be imprudent for any minority to live in diaspora without investing a great deal of time and effort in controlling the terms of its interaction with the majority.

It is an involuntary reflex and not a conspiracy. In my student days, I observed many Jews who lacked the energy, intelligence or self-discipline required of conspirators nevertheless gravitate en-masse toward the cause of integrationism without specific direction.

The whole point of existence as a minority is economic advantage. No group is going to leave the land of its own tribe and attempt to live among some other potentially hostile tribe unless they believe that they will benefit economically. There has to be compensation for such risk before the movement will take place.

Minority status offers the group the chance to have some other group be their garbage collectors and burger flippers. In the U.S. civil rights struggle, we are witnessing the struggle of American Blacks (up until now, history's exception), striving to occupy that upper-middle ground that minorities the world over uniformly achieve. They are, of course, being coached by the experts.

Indeed, Robert Fogel won a nobel prize last year for pointing out nearly twenty years ago in his seminal economic analysis "Time on the Cross" that slaves in the U.S. occupied a middle status between the plantation owners and the "white trash" who lived "up the river" and to whom slaves would be sold (up the river) if they misbehaved.

In many respects, the civil rights struggle can be viewed as an effort to recapture status lost following emancipation.

Driving minorities in this universal behavior is a reasonable assumption about human nature, namely, that once a majority figures out that a minority possesses a disproportionate share of the nation's wealth or desirable occupations, the majority will rise up, displace their own corrupted native rulers and install new ones who will expel the minority.

Minorities are instinctively aware of this risk. They do not need a conspiracy to remind them of it or to motivate involvement in an ongoing effort to dominate the discussion about the terms of their interactions with the majority.

Existence as a minority requires constant maintenance.

That is why minorities need victim status, to deflect attention from their privileges. A great deal of effort will be expended mythologizing the short transition phase of economic hardship upon first arrival. We are endlessly reminded of sweatshops and garment workers. A great deal of effort will be invested in nurturing stories of minority victimization (much at odds with what majority individuals actually see in their everyday lives).

That is why minorities advocate Marxism and socialism, to focus attention on inequality between majority elites and the majority masses, and divert attention of the masses away from the far more statistically significant inequalities between the racial minorities and the majority.

That is why minorities will invest disproportionate effort in culture and the arts - to produce native elites which (while resembling the majority physically) become more comfortable in the company of minorities whom they come to resemble culturally.

A great deal of effort will also be invested in replacing native majority moral codes with new moral codes based on racial and ethnic tolerance.

If you are a minority, no other morality really matters.

A great deal of effort will be expended on "educating" the majority about "hidden" and "unconscious" racism. Minorities know it exists because this is the only type of racism that their circumstance allows them to practice. And they practice it a great deal.

The point, Mr. Bowery, is that this phenomenon is universal. The paradigm was formed in the West by the Greeks in ancient Rome. Captured and enslaved, they became subordinate ministers and tutors to the children of the elite. The Israelites in Egypt are an earlier non-Western example.

As a latin teacher once said in an earlier era of rigorous education to 30 impressionable minds, "Slaves were taken by captains, not privates!"



Thus, you are likely to find minorities working as hard to define their relationship to native majorities in Malaysia, Vietnam, India and South Africa, as they do in the United States.

The truth is, Mr. Bowery, that the only Jews who are not alarmed by the new "white nationalism" are Jews who are assimilating psychologically and thus, arguably, (by one or more of their own definitions) are no longer Jews. With Edgar Bronfman claiming on the pages of the Wall Street Journal that the intermarriage rate has reached 70%, it should not require the strategic mind of a Napoleon or a Clausewitz to realize that there is absolutely zero utility in hectoring them on the basis of race or ethnicity.

During epochs of rapid change, there are some trends best left undisturbed. I am a great believer, Mr. Bowery, in a functional definition of race and in the freedom of groups to define their own collective dislikes without my interference. It is up to the Jews to tell us who they are. Let the dust settle for a decade or so, and they will let us know who among them are friend and who are foe.

In the meantime, Mr. Bowery, what is needed is the kind of leadership and the kind of sense of relevance that will allow our fellow European-Americans to recognize the patterns that describe and make sense of the forces at work around them. Ultimately, they will buy your prescriptions for the future only if those prescriptions are grounded in reality.

Yggdrasil

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Rabbi Schiller's Racial Separation**

Below is an article by Rabbi Mayer Schiller advocating racial separatism.

His argues for peaceful disengagement.

He sees no necessary logical link between the impulse toward racial separatism and the impulse to attack other races.

One can take a cynical view that, having seen what is happening in dozens of other multi-racial empires around the World, Rabbi Schiller understands that Euro-American self-determination is inevitable and wants to ensure that the process of "disentanglement" is safe for Jews.

But it is only natural that he should seek the safety of his own group.

We should do the same. After all, about 14 million Germans and a larger number of "Aryan" Russians died in WWII. Not exactly a desirable outcome!

But Rabbi Schiller is conceding something that few of his co-religionists are willing to concede, namely, that White European culture is worth preserving.

Most of his co-religionists share a deep seated bolshevik impulse to transform Western man into consumerist domestic cattle.

While it should be possible to convince the black-brown-talmudist coalition that we mean them no harm, the problem of whether white liberal elites will peacefully give up their valuable "feeding rights" in the White middle class remains. The white liberal elites shrewdly share these feeding rights with their black-brown-talmudist coalition partners, thereby providing the leaders of these groups with plenty of incentive to provoke violence if any serious effort at separation should occur.

But allowing for the complexities of the real world, Rabbi Schiller's viewpoint should be encouraged.

Yggdrasil-

-----  
"Bigotry and Racism - Beyond the Cliches"

by Rabbi Mayer Schiller

Third Way Publications Ltd.  
P.O. Box 1243  
London SW7 3PB  
U.K.

To hate a human being because of his race, religion or nationality is a horrible thing. The history of all mankind is marred by the outbreak of unspeakable violence against people perpetrated, not because of anything they did, but merely because of who they were. Bigotry is a vile thing, its prejudgment of a man in direct violation of Judeo-Christian morality as well as the norms of Western Civilization.

Yet, it is also clear that so much of what makes life worth living is to be found in group identity. We are who we are not only as individuals, but also as members of larger entities, i.e. families, neighborhoods, towns, nations, races, religions and civilizations. No man is born into a total vacuum of identity. We are the products of genetic, familial and cultural forces. In the end meaning is provided solely by these extra forces which provide our perceptions and action with conceptual or at least visceral coherence.

Whether these extra personal loyalties be of a metaphysical nature deriving their essence from an essentially spiritual (God centered universe) or be they merely an inherent part of the rational world is a question beyond the confines of this brief essay. What is relevant for our purpose is that man needs identity, meaning and purpose and becomes confused and demoralized without them.

Accordingly it is one of the moral imperatives of our era to articulate a philosophy and seek to implement a policy which will allow men to realize themselves in a group without falling prey to hating or harming other groups. This is far from an easy task. Indeed, there are those who would maintain that the enmity which often goes hand-in-hand with group identification is inevitable and it is best to pursue policies which will inexorably weaken those loyalties. It is an alluring position and one to which the "respectable" media and politicians of our era are all pledged.

It is, an illusory, immoral and unnatural agenda, however. Illusory, for history's testimony is that widely diverse people cannot and will not live peacefully together. Immoral, because its ultimate results will be the end of the truths and virtues of the world's various faiths, races and

nations. Unnatural, because group identity is a fundamental need of all men.

The way out of our current impasse on matters of race, ethnicity, etc. would seem not to lie in the direction of totalitarian coercive mixing, but towards voluntary disentanglement by men of good intentions.

All any man really desires is a sense of physical security, some orientation towards a life of meaning, a community whose ways are familiar and pleasant to him and a place to call his (and his peoples') own.

Sadly, today all the above is granted certain groupings but not others. Europeans, White people and those attached to traditional faiths and lifestyles of the West are told by the powers-that-be that they alone among mankind's tribes are forbidden to have or even articulate a collective identity.

Perhaps this is due to their having overstepped the proper boundaries in the past, or alternatively to their own current weakness and gullibility. Whatever the reason none can deny the current threat to Western Man. Other peoples define themselves as groups, only European Man is forbidden to do this.

A solution to our crisis will be found to the degree that all of the world's assorted tribes can say to each other: "You have your way of life and your place to live. We wish you well. Now let each of us live among our own. We bear you no ill will."

It is in the spirit of separation founded on mutual respect that I have attempted on a personal level over the past decade to communicate with nationalists (White and Black), to patriots of many nations and to committed members of many faiths. My goal has been to strip group identity of hatred and the responses I have received have been almost uniformly encouraging. I have found that when you face a man and say; "Your people are a people with a unique identity. They have a right (perhaps an obligation) to survive as a people. Yet you must realize there are other peoples in the world who have similar yearnings. How can we work this out?" - that most men are willing to act in a positive fashion.

To sum up, groups should speak to each other as groups (away from media terror and self-seeking politicians). Far more important than speaking, though, is listening. To hear the other as we remain ourselves is our contemporary task.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Margaret Thatcher - White Nationalist?

Look who the Wall Street Journal caught poking at the soft underbelly of the world's multi-racial empires!

Margaret Thatcher, of all people!

The passages come from the "Notable & Quotable" column of July 27, 1995, page A12, quoting from her new book, "The Path to Power" by Margaret Thatcher (HarperCollins, 1995).

First, she emphasizes the positive powers of national identity, claiming, correctly, that having a nation makes it easier for us all to make the sacrifices necessary for group survival:

"For the conservative, of course, the nation (like the family) has also a profound and positive social value; around its traditions and symbolism individuals with conflicting interests can be encouraged to cooperate and make sacrifices for the common good. Nationhood provides us with that most essential psychological anchor against the disorienting storms of change-- an identity which gives us a sense of continuous existence. Consequently the man who shrugs off his nationality, like the man who discards his family background or (as G.K. Chesterton famously observed) who abandons his religious faith, is a potential danger to society for he is apt to become the victim of every half-baked ideology or passion he encounters."

Just so! If Euro-Americans are going to survive as a group in the United States, they are going to need their own nation.

The positive potential of nationalism is fairly well understood, and has been commented upon at length in the past. Nothing really new here.

But then Margaret marches into territory profoundly threatening to the liberal order and to all of its constituent enterprises, - - the multinational consumer brands, the various anti-white civil rights lobbies, and the Isreal and Holocaust lobbies -- to name but a few.

The "Europe of 500 Flags" is a profoundly threatening concept to liberals everywhere, because their power and prosperity come from controlling and exploiting the productive populations in advanced industrialized states.

And what better way to control these productive populations than by placing them in artificial states, creating a welfare class and importing non-whites to vote against them! Niccolò Machiavelli would have been proud. But the question of the day is what counsel dear old Niccolò would give to the liberals to prevent messages like the following from creeping into the consciousness of these productive classes:

"Even the artificial states, which take in different nations with different languages and traditions, pay a kind of involuntary tribute to the power of nationhood by seeking to forge a new national identity. This was tried in the Soviet Union and in Yugoslavia; it is now being attempted in the European Union. Such enterprises cannot work, and generally break down amid acrimony and mutual hatred. But their very artificiality often inspires the ideologues to extremes of doctrinaire chauvinism, alternately ruthless and ridiculous, from Stalin's mass deportation of peoples to the promotion of a European version of Dallas. It is therefore wrong to argue, as diplomats are still prone to do, that striving to keep large multinational, multicultural states together by all possible means makes for stability. It is, of course, quite possible that several distinct peoples will live within the frontiers of a single state for a variety of reasons - security, economic resources, geography, or lack of any alternative. Developing a liberal political and economic system is the best way to persuade them to do this, as Switzerland's extraordinarily decentralized structure illustrates. But in the artificially constructed states--founded on an ideology (like the Soviet Union) or a mixture of diplomatic convenience and fear of greedy neighbors (like Yugoslavia)-it is all too likely that centralized power and the use of force will be relied upon to keep the unit together. And this--again as with the USSR and Yugoslavia--only increases national fervour and the aspiration to national independence on the part of component peoples."

Margaret can be forgiven her habit of using the term "liberal" in its 19th Century meaning. Nevertheless, it appears that mainstream conservatives are beginning to spot connections between survival, race and nation and the potential for those connections to produce real change.

Waco and Ruby Ridge make it clear that the United States Government will resort to force to hold this artificial construct together, much as it did 130 years ago.

Comrades, our task on the Net is to make clear the real reasons why.

If our people begin to understand the economic motives behind the multi-racial empire, they will be much less tolerant of the violence and brutality it takes to hold it together.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

# YGGDRASIL

## Yggdrasil Quibbles with Tom Lathrop

From: tlathrop@netcom.com (Tom Lathrop)  
Subject: Re: Yggdrasil Quibbles with Tom Lathrop  
Date: Sat, 29 Apr 1995 04:00:42 GMT

Yggdrasil asked me some questions last February, and I wrote up the following answers, but never posted them. Because of last week's bombing in Oklahoma city (which has left me quite shaken) I want to post them now. They include some first thoughts on "the problem of extremism" as it affects white nationalism. Until last week I considered the extremists to be a highly embarrassing but basically impotent sideshow, and I had no idea how dangerous or how stupid they could be. I now think they represent the single greatest problem the white nationalist movement faces, and quite frankly I hope the government infiltrates the hell out of them. If you can't do it above ground you shouldn't be doing it!!!

Anyway, let's see if I can provoke some intelligent discussion here. I have a feeling some of you are not going to like what I have to say.

In article <3gljo8\$ma4@agate.berkeley.edu>, Tommy the Tourist (Anon User) <nobody@csua.berkeley.edu> wrote:

"Tom:

'I fear I must quibble with a statement you made in a recent post. While making a worthwhile and important point, namely:

'The word racist can have yet another meaning. It can mean someone who commits violent acts against members of other races, simply because of their race. This is entirely unacceptable.

'You then follow with what I would consider an overstatement:

'Lathrop: "I am not willing to participate in a race war, and if that is what is necessary to preserve the separate identity of my people then I will simply concede defeat."

'If I may be so bold, I believe you meant to say that you are not willing to do anything to \_initiate\_ or \_provoke\_ a race war.'

Pretty much. I am not a pacifist, and if conflict were unavoidable I would most likely end up fighting on the side of the whites. But not necessarily. If white people were marching blacks off to death camps I would fight against that, even against my own people. Some solutions are simply unacceptable, period.

'Indeed I am in solid agreement with the sentiment that our initiatives must all be peaceful. That is the reason for the extensive discussion of secession as a means of avoiding the conflict that accompanies more aggressive options such as forcible expulsion or outright slaughter (which we witness with increasing frequency in other parts of the world.)

'But I must confess I am mildly offended :) that you have not yet absorbed the full meaning of Yggdrasil's Lesson #2, which is that if you live in a multi-racial empire like the United States, then there is a high probability that race war will, sooner or later, find you whether you initiate it or not.'

Perhaps. But I have my doubts about the long term workability of separatism. I am not yet ready to give up the land our ancestors won for us. I am not yet willing to withdraw to one small segment of North America and watch the rest be flooded by the Third World. And I am afraid that, even if such a solution were arranged (and the odds against that right now seem staggering), in the long run a separate white state would not be able to hold out against the pressure of the Third World on it's very doorstep. I think it would be more productive to try to reverse the trends that are working against us. I think our main goals should be to stop Third World immigration, raise the white birth-rate, and instill in young European-Americans a sense of themselves as a distinct people.

'And if that were to happen, Tom, I would hate to think that you would simply concede defeat!

'Under such circumstances "simply conceding defeat" has certain immediate personal consequences that we are all pre-programmed from birth to avoid.

'While it may be a sad commentary on human nature, one cannot isolate one's particularist affinity for "living among your fellow whites" (which I take it you do now without much hindrance) from the recognition of more universal patterns of human behavior which dictate that the most humane and prudent means of pursuing world peace is to design each nation in such a way that its borders are drawn around a people as racially and ethnically homogeneous as reasonably possible.

'We should recognize all European-Americans as brothers and work toward a Czech-Slovak style solution to contain the open anger of our distant African cousins and the

veiled hatreds of our liberal elites.'

'But if a Rwandan solution suddenly heads our way, I would like to believe that you and I can rely on one another for mutual self- defense.

'Yggdrasil-'

Let me see if I can explain what I meant by "conceding defeat". I think that one of the most serious problems faced by white nationalists is the problem of extremism. The thing is, the "liberal elites" have been so successful in demonizing white racial consciousness that, to a large degree, the only people willing to openly support the white nationalist cause are those people who feel more strongly about their racial identity than anything in the world. In other words, extremists, and in some cases actual demons, people who will terrorize and murder to save the white race, people who will defend what the Nazis did, because they hope to do the same thing themselves. These people are extremely useful to the liberals, who use them to justify and validate their demonization of white racialism. This is a vicious circle that we must somehow break.

The thing is, there are a vast number of American whites who are quite uncomfortable with our current situation and direction, who do *\*not\** want to see America become a crowded Third World country, but who simply are not extremists, and who recoil from the idea of racial violence and warfare. I number myself with these. I care a great deal about the future of the white race, but there are certain things I will not do to defend it. If it turns out that the only way to save the white race is through terror and genocide, then the white race will not be saved. I am willing to accept the possibility of defeat, and absorption into the Third World rabble. This would be a great shame, but such things have happened before, and I think it is liberating to look this possibility in the face and accept it. In fact, I think that without openly accepting and dealing with this possibility there is no way we can avoid the iron logic of extremism, which says that the white race must be preserved at *\*any\** cost.

What I am trying to do here is find a way to open the door to a *\*moderate\** white nationalism, a normal sort of nationalism that can be openly supported by your normal, average, respectable white person, who cares about the future of his race, but is not obsessed with it, and who cares about other things just as much. Without these people we will lose, and since these people will *\*never\** march shoulder to shoulder with Nazis we must reject not only Nazism but the kind of thinking and values that lead to Nazism. The Nazis dealt a terrible blow to the West and to the white race, and like it or not we must deal with their legacy. This is what I am trying to do when I assert that some things are more important than racial survival, and that there are some circumstances when I would feel obliged to "concede defeat".

---

---

Tom Lathrop

tlathrop@netcom.com

Politics: A strife of interests masquerading as a contest of principles. -- Ambrose Bierce

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## The Promise of White Nationalism

The fundamental question white nationalists must answer is:

Why will Euro-America be better off with race as an organizing political principle?

In what ways will the American middle class benefit if our politics is reshaped along racial lines instead of the current competing principles of "equality" and "individualism"?

In this newsgroup, I have often argued that we are being forced to accept race as an organizing political principle out of necessity. With the multi-culturalists whipping up anti-white racial feelings among the non-European groups, the "color blind" society advocated by libertarians and other individualists cannot happen.

How could the libertarians enforce a "color blind" society? Outlaw racial block voting by minorities?

Absent disenfranchisement for such behavior, the anti-white racial politics will always win out over the racially blind variety - with escalating costs imposed on the "color blind". After all, clever politicians like Clinton bet their careers on proven winners - not "color blind" losers.

Simple self-defense against the demands of non-whites impels race as the organizing principle for European-Americans.

But there is a much more important structural reason as well. Not only do we have the defensive or "negative" reason outlined above, but a positive one.

Let me illustrate with a case study.

Two days ago I was surfing the radio channels here in Texas looking for a "business channel" with regular market reports. I ran upon a "talk radio" show. It was one of those typical shows staged by an establishment station to defuse white anger. They found two good 'ole boys with strong Texas accents to fool fellow whites into thinking that their interests are being explored, while the conversation is always steered in safe directions.

Apparently, one of the talk radio commentators stirred up a fuss with a local Austin paper over

the issue of tax abatements and other concessions given by the City of Austin to Samsung, the Korean industrial giant, as an inducement to locate a manufacturing plant in the area.

From the paper's perspective, the issue was racial insensitivity to Koreans. From the talk show host's perspective, the issue was why Americans must spend American tax money to get them to come here.

What happens is that American cities will typically give back the city's share of property and income taxes for 20 years to a large employer, and agree to build access roads, sewers and other required infrastructure if the employer will choose it rather than some other competing location.

Now this practice poses all kinds of delicate problems that ought to be at the center of fierce public debate.

Out of one side of their mouths, city staffs will typically argue that the new employer will generate more tax revenue, even as, out of the other, they give it all back to that employer.

Local reporters are too dumb and too low paid to understand.

Cities claim that they need new tax revenue to finance new roads and schools, although the concessions to the new arrival make clear that funds or credit sufficient to build the infrastructure will be extracted from current residents.

Simply stated, tax money is being taken from the existing residents to pay for the new arrivals.

Who benefits?

The local retail merchants who dominate the Chamber of Commerce will benefit slightly, because growth in retail sales at rates exceeding the rate of inflation are possible only with population growth. They will favor the tax rebates and other inducements.

The city government will benefit, because a new employer, and the in-migration of its new employees, will expand the need for city services (schools, police, administration) and expand their empires.

Will the current residents benefit? Probably not.

But in any event, the city staff will not even consider their interests in the planning process. In fact, no methodology exists for even considering those interests.

For example:

- What if the new plant causes several thousands of people (not employed at the plant) to wait an extra two minutes in traffic each day? How should this lost time be valued?
- The mantra of all American politicians is "jobs." But do the kind of jobs and the kinds of workers make a difference to the existing residents?
- Suppose the plant will pay \$10 per hour, not enough to support a family. Do the existing residents benefit from an increase in these types of jobs?
- Suppose 80% of the plant's workers will be immigrants paid the minimum wage. Suppose that to afford housing these minimum wage workers will pack themselves into homes and apartments at a density of 8 to the bedroom (as they do now in Southern California). Will the advent of such a plant and its subculture benefit the existing residents?
- Will the advent of new arrivals force schools to dumb down standards, or will the new arrivals exert pressure to improve the learning process?
- Would existing residents be better off if the money to be spent on new roads and sewers were spent on additional parks or less crowded schools instead?

None of these questions are even asked. And there is no mechanism in place for current residents to express their wishes.

Cities argue that the expense of tax abatements and other goodies to the big corporate employer will be made up over time by sales and income taxes projected to be paid by the newly arriving workers. Present value calculations are typically missing from the analysis. Wishful thinking and rosie scenarios can be found in abundance. The only thing certain is expanding government.

In America, new arrivals always win and existing residents always lose.

It is the same on the local level with tax abatements as it is on the national level with immigration.

The voice of existing residents is never even heard.

The problem, of course, is that America is not a nation.

American governments are never asked to define who they must benefit or protect. If all governmental actions must clearly and demonstrably benefit existing inhabitants, then you get

very different results on all levels.

Not all economic growth is good and not all jobs are equal. Admitting illegal aliens and employing them illegally at half the minimum wage will boost measured GDP. If GDP and "jobs" are the only criteria by which government is measured, then the policy of not enforcing immigration laws is a winner. It creates jobs and boosts GDP.

However, the downward pressure on wages of existing residents, the increased welfare costs and the degradation of the quality of life of most existing residents (essentially everyone except those employing the illegals) is devastating.

Governments and the elites that run them have far greater flexibility to pursue their own institutional interests if they are never forced to define who they must protect.

Without a nation or race of specific people to protect, governments are free to adopt any policy favored by any special interest that is convenient to them at the time. They are free to pit the interests of new arrivals against the interests of existing inhabitants for the purpose of enlarging their power and influence.

Our American governments sit by passively as illegitimacy soars, and our central cities are taken over by violent gangs. Our large corporations stimulate demand for overpriced brand names by encouraging self-absorbed lifestyles that have produced birthrates among Euro-Americans far below replacement levels. Again - no problem! Just replace them with hordes of new arrivals from the third world!

Indeed, our local, state and national governments behave as if they were already under U.N control.

In truth, it has been this way for nearly 400 years in America. From the importation of children kidnapped from the streets of London to the importation of African slaves, existing inhabitants of America were considered to have no input and no interest in the decision. The importers of cheap labor were never asked how disruptive the new arrivals might become to existing inhabitants.

Similarly, the great waves of immigration following the Civil War were undertaken at the behest of industrialists in search of cheap labor. The interests of existing inhabitants were not taken into account at all (not even when my parents were admitted in 1945).

The problem for our American governments has been that to define the purpose of government as protecting the welfare of the existing inhabitants threatens to eliminate many of the policies that politically active special interests support.



In the latter half of the twentieth century, with our ever expanding populations of non-European immigrants, any attempt to force governments to protect and foster the welfare of existing inhabitants would be labeled as "racist" because it would delay the ultimate date of non-white political control.

Even if the purpose of protecting existing inhabitants is phrased in neutral, non-racial terms, and administered in a non-discriminatory fashion, the non-white minorities would make it a racial issue because it would frustrate their goal of ultimate domination. Any policy or objective that delays the day of reckoning will be made a racial issue. It is a measure of their aggression and their hate.

Thus the answer to the question "Why will Euro-America be better off with race as an organizing political principle?" is simple.

For the first time in our history, governments at all levels would have a specific people and culture to protect and foster.

For the first time in our history, the vast resources of local, state and federal government would be applied to improve our lives, rather than to tear us down.

For the first time in our history, the requests of special interests would be turned down unless it could clearly be shown that the lives and wages of existing inhabitants were improved by granting the request. No other criteria would apply.

Sadly, our local, state and federal governments do not recognize such a thing as an "American." There are only "citizens of the world" all with equal claims to entry, social services, and your tax dollars.

America is not a nation, because it cannot identify a single people whose culture and welfare it fosters to the exclusion of other goals.

America is not even a "country," because it has no generally respected borders.

America has been stolen from us.

Reclaim it!

Yggdrasil

---

[Back to Main Page](#)








(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



## THE JEWISH ROLE

The first 15 items are from Yggdrasil's "Holocaust Revisionism" series. The remainder discuss broader themes of Jewish and Israeli involvement in US affairs.

1. Of Soap, Lampshades and Diesel Engines
2. Madness of Crowds
3. Vermont Royster's 1.5 Million
4. Uses of a Holocaust - Arms Sales
5. Uses of a Holocaust - Israel Aid
6. Uses of a Holocaust - Settlement Aid
7. Uses of a Holocaust - Fundraising
8. Tactics of a Leveraged Investment
9. Of "Jewish Soap" and Veiled Hatreds
10. Tender Hearts of The SS 🧐
11. None Could Be So Craven
12. The Sigmund Freud Card 🧐
13. Beyond Freud - The Mapplethorpe Card 🧐
14. Yggdrasil's Holocaust FAQ
15. Nine Views of the Meaning of the Holocaust
16. Deep Cultures I 🧐
17. Deep Cultures II 🧐
18. Christ the Tiger! 🧐
19. Jews, Intermarriage & Change
20. A Jewish Master Plan
21. Censorious Impulses
22. The "Grinch" 🧐

23. Significance of Non-Existent Chambers
  24. Hey Israel, Show us Your Guns
  25. Hey Israel, Show us Your Guns Again!
  26. Occupied America Part I: Sayanim 
  27. Occupied America Part II: The Misgerot 
  28. The Devil Makes Them Do It! 
  29. Occupied America Part III: Politics and Money 
  30. Occupied America Part IV: An Ugly Trend 
  31. What It Would Take to Cleanse Serbia 
  32. Princeton Tries to Explain a Drop in Jewish Enrollment; or "What is Communism?" 
- 

**BACK**

(c) 1996-1998 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## \* OF SOAP, LAMPSHADES AND DIESEL ENGINES \*

Man, this alt.revisionism group surprised the hell out of me!

My father, a WW-2 vet, taught me that the Germans made soap and lampshades out of the jews.

Man, those SS guys were REALLY TWISTED!

I find out there was no soap and no lampshades!

Could the SS be only half-twisted?

I find out that many of the camps were "labor camps", some, such as Aushwitz, were mixed "labor" and "death" camps, while four pure "death" camps were located in remote areas.

OK, but now my weak brain is starting to fail. We have camps reflecting multiple purposes, some inconsistent with extermination. In the "mixed use" camps, these purposes exist side-by-side.

We have an evil Hitler who orders a "final solution", but an SS that somehow leaves a million survivors hollering like stuck pigs for the next 50 years!

Is the SS incompetent? Did they miss the movies of Joe Stalin herding capitalists dressed up like peasants off trains and shooting them on the spot?

And now the lesser mind truly fails me. I learn that the SS used diesel engines to gas inmates at the four "death camps".

Diesel engines???

These guys invented binary nerve agents. Hitler had a warehouse of the stuff and refused to use it in battle! Did he refuse to use it in death camps as well? Such incredible chivalry!

Did the SS forget about potassium cyanide? How about mustard gas?

This whole thing begins to sound like a rogue operation cooked up by some sergeant

somewhere!!

But wait!

Maybe it was the German people, pulling up to camps in their trucks, gassing a few jews, and then driving home! Sort of like the way hippies drove to Woodstock! After all, Hitler took their guns, so how else could they do it?

That's it! The gassings were a spontaneous expression of reflexive hatred by average Germans. The German people were so evil that the camps could carry out their purposes with jaded motorists bored by the new autobahns and seeking new thrills.

Talk about guilt!! I'll try it out on Dad, and see if he likes it better than soap and lampshades!

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## \*\* MADNESS OF CROWDS \*\*

Ok. I confess. I did a naughty thing.

I ordered a copy of Rassinier's "Holocaust Story" from that naughty place in California that nice people are not supposed to know about. I read the thing.

Once past the story of his own internment at Buchenwald and Dora, I could have sworn that I was reading a chapter from Mackay's "Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds".

The charm of understatement.

Here we have victorious allies who must reestablish government in Germany. They have to impose a constitution upon Germany and have it accepted as legitimate. No small task!

The allies have to kill or imprison Himmler and the rest, or they would run for election in the new government, win, and start the thing all over again.

Solution? Stage a bunch of trials and convict them as war criminals. A bit inconvenient for Anglo-saxon victors who cherish trial by jury for themselves (No ordinary German folk on any juries here!) and prohibit application of ex-post-facto laws to themselves (Vide the views of the late Justice Black).

So the "crimes" have to be pretty outrageous to allow them to apply not their own law to the Germans, but a version especially created "pro haec vice".

Enter the crowd.

First, we have the survivors. Many were prison trustees, who stole food rations, set the labor pools, operated the crematoria, and (if any existed) ran the gas chambers as well.

They must inflate the German atrocities to deflect attention from themselves.

You have the lesser inmates who, naturally, resent their treatment, exaggerate, and repeat camp rumors.

You have the German POWs, hoping for lenient treatment, anxious to please the allied authorities with "good stories" about the camps.

You have virulent German haters among the Anglo-saxon and Gallic victors who will say and do anything to persecute the vanquished. (Rassinier says little about them. But I bumped into them often in Sunday School in the 50s and even as late as 1971, in Berlin, when I had to stop a fight between two aging U.S. Master Sergeants and some Berlin border guards in an NCO club. The invective was unbelievable, a minor jolt to international relations!)

You have U.S politicians who need to give the American people a moral reason for entry into the war. The balance of power in Europe is a tad abstract.

Finally, you have a New German government that will view any dispute about the truth of the war crimes verdicts at Nuremberg as a threat to its own legitimacy.

All the ingredients are present for the happy marriage of myth creators and myth preservers.

Jews really didn't have much of a role in concocting this mess!

But they went along for the ride, and now that the creators have basically lost interest, they are stuck defending it.

Fess up, boys! If you had been in charge, there would not have been so many loose ends, now, would there! (Soap, lampshades, and reports of gas chambers where there clearly weren't any!)

A particular passion on this newsgroup is "documentation".

Among you holocaust defenders, if something is documented, it is assumed to be true. Let me suggest that in the goy world that is largely responsible for the shape and content of the holocaust story, documentation means only that the proponent of an idea has resources and time. It does not necessarily mean that the documented proposition is true.

I would refer you to the text of the search warrant written by BATF agents and signed by a judge in 1993 (modern times!), preparatory to the invasion of the Branch Davidian compound in Waco Texas. (talk.politics.guns)

Carefully "documented" in that warrant is the possession of anti-tank rockets and a belt-fed 50 calibre machine gun on the premises. Also carefully "documented" is a bunch of hearsay and salacious gossip of disgruntled neighbors and liberal social workers alarmed at Koresh's polygamy.



The problem is, that after the fire, no trace of a 50 cal. machine gun or any anti-tank rockets could be found. That which was documented was false!

Illegally altered small arms were found, but nothing with the military significance of an anti-tank rocket or a "50". The really big stuff in the story was a crock!

Even today, prosecutors and police routinely pad their claims. It is their job to gather and carefully "document" every possible rumor and statement, no matter how low its probative value. They introduce all they can get into evidence and hope the jury buys it. Of course, at the Nuremburg trials, the verdicts were pre-ordained by political necessity.

Don't make the mistake of assuming that affidavits, statements, confessions etc. extracted by police and prosecutors at the end of WW-2 were true. They were not intending to write books of the Talmud.

Don't defend the indefensible. Anyone who has read Machiavelli's Prince is going to understand the powerful motives for exaggeration behind the holocaust story. 1.5 million dead ain't a bad story. Accept it and go in peace.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Vermont Royster's 1.5 Million

The late Vermont Royster was a conservative columnist who built a large and loyal following of readers over his 30 year career with the Wall Street Journal.

Vermont Royster wrote the article that you will find reprinted below, in response to a TV dramatization of the Holocaust shown in April of 1978.

When this article came out, I wondered why Royster, a very careful and very well read journalist, would use the figure "a million and a half Jews".

The only figure I had ever heard was 6 million. The oddity of the number caused me to save the article.

His editorial point - that the Holocaust should not be used to badger the innocent - had little meaning to me back then.

Yggdrasil-

Apr. 26, 1978 Wall Street Journal P18 C3 By Vermont Royster--

### The Holocaust

\* \* \* But to be reminded of that holocaust in vivid pictures ought to make us think again about the word "racism" and the phrase "human rights." The racism of the Nazis slaughtered at the very least a million and a half Jews as a deliberate government policy. No one knows how many gentile Germans joined them, but those who spoke the slightest word of difference with the regime had no human rights at all, whether they were keepers of shops, generals or bishops, scientists or philosophers. Nor was that the only holocaust. The Japanese in their march through Southeast Asia slaughtered untold millions of other races who resisted their hegemony. The great Russian purge exterminated eight million people. The record may be held by the China of Mao Tse Tung which, according to the Senate Judiciary Committee, exterminated 32 million.

Such figures simply overwhelm the mind, yet in the world around us the evil is not yet ended. In Russia the Gulag Archipelago remains full of the condemned. In many parts of Africa, Latin America and Asia the slaughter of the innocents continues. The power of drama is to pluck out one part of it and put it in human terms the mind can grasp. I would hope that those watching

remembered that at no time in this country, ever, has there been anything comparable. To equate our frailties with the cancers of such holocausts is to deny the American experience and to insult the American spirit. And it leaves us no words to distinguish barbarism from civilization. If someone can call Gerald Ford a "racist" or if others think ours is a society trampling upon human rights, what words are there left to describe those who send millions to some Buchenwald or Auschwitz?

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## **The Uses of a Holocaust - Arms Sales**

The following article appeared in the Wall Street Journal on the date indicated. It appears that the Holocaust story may have effects beyond the purely internal issue of how Jews see themselves.

In truth, Hollywood's Holocaust productions are often timed for optimum practical effect.

Yggdrasil-

---

Apr. 21, 1978 Wall Street Journal P1 C5

TV'S "HOLOCAUST" sends vibrations through Washington. Some Congressmen figure the vivid reminders of the Nazi horrors inflicted on the Jews will defeat Carter's plan to sell arms to the Arabs, or at least sway more votes against it. Mondale worries about the effect. White House strategists debate whether to delay sending the plan to Capitol Hill.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Uses of a Holocaust - Israel Aid

Well here we have it!

The annual aid tab for Israel runs from \$3 billion to \$5 billion per year, depending on the number you believe.

From 1949 through 1991 the U.S. provided Israel with \$53 billion.

"From 1974 to 1989, Israel received a total of \$16.4 billion in "loans" that the U.S. converted to "grants," according to congressional researchers."

Call it a leveraged investment!

Does anyone really believe that these massive amounts of aid could be granted without the "Holocaust" as political justification?

Curiously, Americans are paying and we had nothing to do with the Holocaust!

Now what do you suppose would happen to this massive aid program if the Holocaust were suddenly disbelieved?

[Sept. 19, 1991 Wall Street Journal p A16]

A Close Look at U.S. Aid to Israel Reveals Deals That Push Cost Above Publicly Quoted Figures.

BY EDWARD T. POUND

Staff Reporter of The WALL STREET JOURNAL WASHINGTON-Supporters of the \$10 billion in loan guarantees for Israel say the program isn't likely to require a penny of taxpayer funds. If any problems arise, they say, Israel is credit-worthy and will, as always, take care of its obligations. But a review of U.S. aid to Israel over the years reveals a more complicated picture involving special deals that wind up costing taxpayers more than advertised in the beginning.

Consider the \$1.2 billion in economic aid that the U.S. transfers to Israel each year. Unlike most

foreign subsidies, which are paid in quarterly installments, this one is remitted in a lump sum at the beginning of the U.S. fiscal year. That means the U.S. has to borrow the funds against future revenues, and therefore pays interest on the borrowings-at U.S. taxpayer expense. And what does Israel do with its expedited subsidy? It lends the money back to the U.S., purchasing Treasury bills that in one recent year earned Israel \$76.7 million in interest payments from Uncle Sam.

A similar gimmick last year accomplished the politically sensitive purpose of increasing Israel's military subsidy. Congress directed that the U.S. disburse the military aid right away. That money, too, was invested in U.S. government securities, where it has been drawn down as needed. The net result is that Israel will earn more than \$34 million this year in interest on the grant, according to a senior Israeli official.

As one congressional aide puts it, there's a "truth-in-labeling" problem: "The nature of the aid effort is sometimes more than we realize."

### Finding the Cost

But as the Bush administration squares off against Israel's plea for \$10 billion in immediate loan guarantees, some officials are trying to find out precisely how much money Israel's special carve-outs cost. Rep. Lee Hamilton (D., Ind.), though a supporter of Israeli aid programs, says that in recent years, his House Foreign Affairs subcommittee has identified Israel as one of three whose aid "substantially exceeds the popularly quoted figures."

In Israel's case, he says, the publicly quoted figure is \$3 billion. But the State Department has provided him with figures indicating that Israel's aid in 1991 actually exceeds \$4.3 billion-not including \$400 million in housing loan guarantees provided earlier this year. Egypt and Turkey also receive funds in excess of the widely cited figures, he says. "It is important we understand . . . the total amount of U.S. assistance, rather than cloak it as we have done by putting it under so many spigots," Rep. Hamilton says.

\* \* \*

Congress gave Israel a sure-fire way of repaying its debt in the mid-1980s, when Israel was in deep economic trouble. Lawmakers directed that the U.S. provide Israel with economic assistance equaling or exceeding its annual debt repayment to the U.S.

The bottom line: Israel is using most of its \$1.2 billion economic grant this year to repay debt that grew from U.S. military loans, according to figures Israel supplied to the U.S. this month. In fact, military loans have a way of becoming grants. From 1974 to 1989, Israel received a total of \$16.4 billion in "loans" that the U.S. converted to "grants," according to congressional

researchers. The money went out in the first place with the understanding that it wouldn't be repaid; it was categorized as loans because loans don't require oversight by U-S officials while grants do the researchers say.

The financial-aid pot is sweetened in other ways. A few years ago, the U.S. allowed Israel and some other countries to refinance portions of their military debt with banks that provided lower interest rates. This arrangement saves Israel about \$150 million a year in interest payments, money that would have otherwise gone to the U.S., according to State Department figures. The U.S. agreed to guarantee repayment on 90% of the bank loans.

Israel's request for the \$10 billion loan guarantees has heightened concern in some quarters about its economic stability. Rep. David Obey (D., Wis.), for one, supports the request, but wants a delay so Congress can answer a few key questions. "Does Israel have the financial capacity to pay these loans back without-and I underline without-additional U.S. assistance?" he asks. Israel says it does, but Rep. Obey says his appropriations subcommittee will hold a hearing in two weeks.

"Anytime you are asked to put your name on a \$10 billion loan guarantee, you have an obligation to know doggone well that it is wired together well enough so you don't wind up holding any liabilities," Rep. Obey says.

But Israel's strongest supporters don't want a delay. They argue that the program would also provide jobs and exports for Americans, and that Israel always pays its debts. Israel "has never even been late with loan payments [and ] it has good credit ratings among international commercial lenders," Sen. Harris Wofford (D., Pa.) said last week. "Our guarantee will enable Israel to borrow money from American banks at more favorable rates."

Either way, there's little doubt that Israel relies heavily upon foreign aid and borrowing to maintain its economy, according to congressional researchers. Since 1976, they say, Israel has been the largest annual recipient of U.S. foreign assistance- between 1949 and the present, the U.S. has provided Israel with \$53 billion in grants and loans. With the massive immigration of Soviet Jews and others, Israeli officials say that more U.S. help is critical. Between 1990 and 1996, they expect one million people to have immigrated to Israel. Right now, they say, Israel's "absorption efforts"-the cost of resettling refugees- represent 16.1%, or \$5.3 billion, of its \$33 billion " budget. By 1992, they say, the resettlements will take nearly 19% of Israel's budget.

These Officials make no excuses for wringing every dollar or special favor from Congress. Israel forever is finding creative ways to stretch its U.S. aid, find new dollars, or pump up its ailing economy.

The U.S. even helps bankroll Israel's own foreign-aid program, providing a \$7.5 million grant that Israel, in turn, uses to finance development projects in Third World countries and for the

training of foreigners.

## Hard Currency

\* \* \*

Israel's basic source of U.S. aid amounts to \$3 billion--the \$1.8 billion military grant plus the \$1.2 billion economic grant. But U.S. figures demonstrate that with the various programs benefiting Israel, the aid level easily exceeds \$3 billion. Some officials, such as Rep. Obey, think that when the value of all cash, equipment and programs is added together, the amount is closer to \$5 billion. Israel says that isn't so, but acknowledges that its assistance this year was nearly \$4 billion.

\* \* \*

Despite the size of the aid program, there is little oversight by the U.S. In the case of the \$1.2 billion economic-support program, the grant agreement allows the U.S. to review Israel's documentation on how it spends the money. But U.S. officials don't exercise that option, relying instead on quarterly disbursement reports from Israel. The latest report consisted of a one page letter.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

# YGGDRASIL

## Uses of a Holocaust - Settlement Aid

In 1992 when the article below was written, Israel was in the process of resettling large numbers of Russian Immigrants to Israel in occupied Arab lands, thus angering the Arab world and frustrating U.S foreign policy while making Arab-Israeli peace more difficult.

The article below is important because it demonstrates how exceptional it is for Israel to have trouble getting its generous aid package from the U.S.

Sympathy for Israel must be maintained with U.S. voters:

"Never before has a U.S. president successfully attached conditions to economic aid for the Jewish state. But given widespread public disapproval of Israel's settlements policy and opposition to the guarantees -- a recent Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll shows that U.S. voters oppose them by a 4-1 margin -- Mr. Bush is expected to prevail."

Just imagine voter reaction if it became widely understood that the extent of the "Holocaust" was exaggerated?

"James Reichley, a political scientist at the Brookings Institution, says \* \* \* In a presidential election year, "it usually becomes a bidding war among Democratic candidates to see who can go highest in expressing support for Israel,".

The stakes in the Shoah game are high. That is why we have Holocaust museums and the like. There is a continuing need to inculcate in the minds of the young an image of a people wronged, of a people entitled to sympathy, if not outright reparations.

Yggdrasil-

-----

[01/28/92 WALL STREET JOURNAL (J), PAGE A16]

Politics & Policy:

U.S. Jewish Groups, Fearful of a Backlash, Adopt Low-Key Approach on Israeli Loan

## Guarantees

---- By Robert S. Greenberger Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal

WASHINGTON -- As the Bush administration again takes up the issue of whether to give Israel \$10 billion in loan guarantees, the only sound coming from the powerful pro-Israel lobby is a deafening silence.

In the struggle over what remains Israel's largest single economic objective -- guarantees to help resettle Jewish immigrants from the former Soviet Union -- U.S. pro-Israel groups are for the most part sitting quietly on the sidelines. They are convinced that the politics of the situation are against them and that another full-court press for the guarantees would only further backfire.

So instead of trying to press Congress to steamroll administration opposition, the groups are adopting a low-key approach, publicly backing negotiations between the administration and Israel while privately advising the Israelis that they will have to agree to significant concessions.

\* \* \*

But this low-key approach stands in marked contrast to the situation last September when the loan guarantees first came up. Despite President Bush's contention that approving the guarantees at that point would harm the chances for Mideast peace, Israel's supporters brought thousands of loyalists to Washington to push for the guarantees immediately, and with no conditions concerning Israeli settlement policies attached. In Congress, lawmakers competed to make speeches supporting the humanitarian aid.

Mr. Bush, though, won a 120-day delay in the consideration of the guarantees -- and since then, the public mood has shifted markedly in his favor. Last week, when Sen. Patrick Leahy said the guarantees wouldn't pass without strings attached, none of Israel's friends in the Senate stood up to rebut him.

The issue returned to the front burner last week when Israel's ambassador to the U.S., Zalman Shoval, met with Secretary of State James Baker to discuss the guarantees. The U.S. wants Israel to greatly curtail its settlement-building activity in the occupied territories won in the 1967 war -- the West Bank, Gaza Strip and Golan Heights -- in exchange for the guarantees, which would allow Israel to borrow money from private banks at preferential rates.

Over the weekend, Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir said he wouldn't agree to a settlements freeze, although he expressed optimism that terms could be worked out with the Bush administration.

The situation marks a stunning setback for Israel: Never before has a U.S. president successfully attached conditions to economic aid for the Jewish state. But given widespread public disapproval of Israel's settlements policy and opposition to the guarantees -- a recent Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll shows that U.S. voters oppose them by a 4-1 margin -- Mr. Bush is expected to prevail.

"The president has the support of the American people on this issue, and he's playing the leverage he has for all it's worth," says Republican pollster Linda DiVall.

\* \* \*

Complicating the issue are recent developments in Israeli politics: Prime Minister Shamir has lost his parliamentary majority and has become even more hard-line on the settlements issue. Last week, Mr. Shamir, defying President Bush, vowed that settlements expansion "will continue, and no power in the world will prevent this construction."

That attitude is driving a wedge not only between Israel and the administration but also between Israel and some pro-Israel groups in the U.S. "There is disagreement with the notion that settlements are so important that you have to endanger loan guarantees in order to get settlements," says Mr. Lifton of the American Jewish Congress.

James Reichley, a political scientist at the Brookings Institution, says the political dynamics of aid to Israel are unlike those of earlier years. In a presidential election year, "it usually becomes a bidding war among Democratic candidates to see who can go highest in expressing support for Israel," he says. While some of the traditional factors still exist, he says, "the liabilities are stronger now than they have been in most recent campaigns."

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## **The Uses of a Holocaust - Fundraising**

The Holocaust is major glue that binds Jews to each other and to the political and charitable fundraising that gives them power disproportionate to their numbers in the U.S.

The article reprinted below is a classic from 1983. It gives you a detailed description of how this process works.

For the 10 years after the 1967 war, fundraising for Israel was relatively easy, because of a continuing military threat. However, since the early 1980's, as enthusiasm for Israeli policies has waned within the Jewish community, the "Holocaust" has become more important in Jewish fundraising.

You will note the particular importance of Yad v' Shem, a monument/museum to the Holocaust in Israel, in the decision of one major donor.

You will note that "Hate Crime" laws, and aggressive prosecution and press reporting of these events (however rare statistically) are equally important.

Indeed, the publicly accepted characterization of the activities occurring in this newsgroup also plays a role.

As mentioned in the article, all of these things create a siege mentality - one in which suggestions of "persecution and attack" resonate:

"Applying principles of sales psychology to fund raising, Mr Neshar teaches solicitors first to educate prospects about the "product," the financial needs of the Jewish community and Israel. Such a pitch frequently deals with such emotion- packed topics as Holocaust survival, terrorist attacks and antisemitism- The solicitor, in effect, tries to make the prospect identify with these topics as a member of the Jewish community. And how, the solicitor then asks, can this community be strengthened against persecution and attack? The answer: by giving money to Jewish institutions. "I call this educational process Jewish spiritual circumcision," Mr. Neshar says."

Power and money flow from the memory of the "Holocaust".

Somehow, mass deportations, and even mass shootings don't resonate in quite the same way as

"homicidal gas chambers."

Follow the money flows and you will arrive at the truth!

Yggdrasil-

-----

[Apr. 1, 1983 Wall Street Journal p1 c1]

Anguished Appeal Jewish Charities Raise Huge Sums in the U.S., But Resistance Grows

Some Big Givers Quit Giving Because of Israel Policies; How the Solicitors Work

Pressure at a Country Club

By DORON P. LEVIN Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.

\* \* \*

Rising Doubts

Since the war in Lebanon last summer, Mr. Fisher and some other American Jews have increasingly questioned the wisdom and practicality of some Israeli actions. The trend has hampered fund-raisers, whose activities have traditionally been a central part of Jewish life. And although the United Jewish Appeal, an umbrella organization for a number of Jewish charitable projects domestically and abroad, continues to be envied by other charities for its effectiveness, the group can no longer expect simply to ask for money and get it.

Beginning after the Six Day War in 1967 and for nearly a decade afterwards, the danger Israel faced in battle provided much of the emotional impetus for a wave of lavish philanthropy among U.S. Jews. But beginning in the mid-1970s, relations between the U.S. and Israel cooled perceptibly, and U.S. Jews were put in the sometimes uncomfortable spot of being at odds with Israeli or U.S. policy while being asked to shoulder the increasing financial burden of the tiny Jewish state.

Still, the totals raised keep going up, even as the anguish grows.

Last year, the UJA received pledges for near-record contributions of about \$567 million, up from \$542 million in 1981. More than half the money collected goes to Israel, providing a major portion of that country's social-welfare budget. A much smaller amount is channeled to

Jewish communities in other foreign countries. Slightly less than half goes to Jewish educational, social-welfare and community groups in the U.S. Contributions Heavy

The UJA's annual budget is about a third the size of the nationwide United Way's even though the Jewish population in this country amounts to less than 3% of the total population. The UJA raises more each year than the American Cancer Society, American Heart Association, Muscular Dystrophy Association, March of Dimes and National Easter Seal Society combined.

But for Jews, the needs of their less fortunate people are only one reason for giving. Underlying a traditional altruism rooted in religion, community leaders and fund-raising professionals agree, are deep-seated emotions: Jewish pride for Israel; fear that American Jews could become a target for anti-Semites; and the horror and guilt associated with the Holocaust, when most Jews here stood by helplessly.

"Jews today have an opportunity to control their destiny (through fund raising)," says Robert Slavitt, a Washington, D.C., investment banker active in that city's Jewish Federation and annual UJA fund-raising drive. "Jews now live in a free country. All of us haven't had that."

Once Inactive

Of course, not all U.S. Jews view themselves precisely from that historical perspective. At one time, even the well-to-do Mr. Slavitt would give \$1,000 each year to the UJA but never volunteered to work and had little idea how the money was used. Three years ago, a high-school chum asked Mr. Slavitt to join a week-long "discovery mission" to Israel; on an impulse, Mr. Slavitt agreed to go. With 16 other prosperous Jewish men from the Washington area, Mr. Slavitt toured biblical sites, attended briefings by army generals and cabinet ministers and visited orphanages and community centers aided by UJA money.

For Mr. Slavitt, the highlight of the trip was Yad v' Shem, a windswept monument in the hills of Jerusalem dedicated to the Jews who perished in Hitler's death camps. There he noticed a small, wooden menorah, a ritual candle holder that had been made by a doomed inmate.

Since that trip, lighting the Sabbath candles has become a Friday night ritual at the Slavitt home. In the past three years, moreover, Mr. Slavitt has journeyed six more times to Israel, has steadily increased his family's UJA contribution to \$21,000 annually and has raised a great deal of money for the group each year by soliciting about 25 donations ranging from \$500 to \$25,000.

Instead of relying on mass appeals for small donations from many people-as does the United Way, whose average annual contribution is about \$10-the UJA concentrates on the relative few who give more than \$10,000 and sometimes up to \$1 million or more annually. A UJA survey

showed that only about 1.5% of those who give do so in amounts exceeding \$10,000 but that their donations constitute 50% to 60% of the annual total.

As a result, however, the loss of even a few major contributors could derail a fundraising drive.

So, UJA fund-raisers acted quickly after last summer's invasion of Lebanon-with more vigorous solicitations, guided tours of captured Lebanese territory for UJA leaders and contributors and more speeches to UJA gatherings in the U.S. by Israeli notables.

\* \* \*

"Avoid controversial topics," advised a training film shown to volunteers before they began their calls. "And remember, our contributions aren't going to the Israeli government. This is a campaign of people helping people." More than 1,500 volunteers turned out that day to call about 50,000 of the city's 180,000 Jews.

\* \* \*

### Shift in Techniques

In recent years, UJA fund raisers have begun using such telethons, direct mailings, walk-a-thons and the like to reach a greater number of less affluent Jews. But these methods still collect relatively little cash compared with the sums raised by direct, face-to-face requests put to well-to-do prospects. In Washington, for example, the telethon's \$1.7 million accounts for only about 10% of the 1983 goal of \$16.6 million for the city. Some 80% of the total will come from about 8% of the capital's Jewish population, UJA leaders say.

As fund-raising techniques go, direct solicitation probably is the most difficult as well as the most productive. "When I first got active, the only thing I said I wouldn't do is solicit," Mr. Slavitt says. "I now realize how important it is." For years, Mr. Fisher solicited peers in the Boston academic community until his recent decision to suspend UJA work, but he confesses that he never liked doing it.

"People are afraid of face-to-face because it is something in which they can be confronted directly with failure," says Aryeh Neshet, the UJA's head of training.

### How It's Done

Applying principles of sales psychology to fund raising, Mr Neshet teaches solicitors first to educate Prospects about the "product," the financial needs of the Jewish community and Israel. Such a Pitch frequently deals with such emotion-packed topics as Holocaust survival, terrorist

attacks and antisemitism- The solicitor, in effect, tries to make the prospect identify with these topics as a member of the Jewish community. And how, the solicitor then asks, can this community be strengthened against persecution and attack? The answer: by giving money to Jewish institutions. "I call this educational process Jewish spiritual circumcision," Mr. Nesher says.

In local Jewish federations around the country, volunteer UJA fund-raisers study Dun & Bradstreet credit reports, deed transfers and corporate proxies to figure out the net worth of wealthy Jews in their community. In the course of their research, volunteers are encouraged to discuss what they know about the finances of neighbors friends and colleagues. A physician who gives might be expected to help assess the finances of other physicians.

"There are three kinds of doctors," Mr. Nesher says. "Those who make less than \$250,000, those who make \$100,000 and those who make less than \$50,000, and they all know which is which."

### Psychic Rewards

Big donors are often lionized with awards at UJA dinners, named committee chairmen and written up in local Jewish newspapers. "People also want the ego gratification that goes with this activity," a UJA employee says.

Those declining to give, on the other hand, could face problems, particularly if they are prosperous. At Pittsburgh's heavily Jewish Westmoreland Country Club, philanthropy is expected. "If a nongiver wants to join, someone will mention, in a nice way of course, that behaving responsibly means remembering Jewish philanthropies," a member says. An influential lawyer active in several charities favors tougher methods, including ostracism, if friendly persuasion doesn't work. "I wouldn't walk across the street to shake the hand of someone who won't give," he says.

\* \* \*

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

# YGGDRASIL

## **The Tactics of a Leveraged Investment**

In a previous post entitled "The Uses of a Holocaust-Arms Sales" we noted that the release of Hollywood Holocaust productions are timed to achieve specific political purposes. In this particular case, to defeat arms sales to Arab countries.

In the next post entitled "The Uses of a Holocaust-Israel Aid" we examined the resources that the United States Government has provided to the state of Israel over the past 45 years.

In that post, we asked what would happen to this ongoing aid stream if the Holocaust story were suddenly disbelieved.

In the next post entitled "The Uses of a Holocaust-Resettlement Aid" we examined the lobbying tactics undertaken when an Israel aid package ran into political trouble because its purpose, the resettlement of jews in the occupied Arab lands, was unpopular in the United States.

In the next post entitled "The Uses of a Holocaust-Fundraising" we examined the role the Holocaust plays in motivating jews to contribute to charitable and political causes.

In these prior posts, we described the Holocaust as a leveraged investment. It is used to raise money, which then is applied in the political system to win a hundred times the amount spent on political contributions in U.S. aid to Israel.

Hence the word "leverage".

In this post, we will look at some specific tactics and organizations that dispense the political money that keeps this leveraged investment going.

Follow the money flows and you will arrive at the truth!

Yggdrasil-

-----

[June 24, 1987 Wall Street Journal p1 c6]

Linked Donations?

Political Contributions From Pro-Israel PACs Suggest Coordination

Groups' Leadership Overlaps With That of AIPAC, A Lobbying Organization

It Denies a Linkup in Giving

By JOHN J. FIALKA staff reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.

WASHINGTON -- When Idaho Senate candidate John V. Evans decided he needed to raise big out-of-state money for his race last year, he went to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, or AIPAC, one of Washington's most powerful lobbying organizations. Despite the initials in its name, "AIPAC emphasized constantly that they were not a PAC (political action committee)," which gives money to candidates, says Mr. Evans, a Democrat and former governor. "But they noted that there were Jewish organizations all over the country that had their own PACs and that if we would contact them, they would be able to help us."

Indeed, AIPAC did much better than an ordinary PAC could do for Mr. Evans. By federal law, a PAC is limited to a maximum contribution of \$5,000 per race, and groups that coordinate their spending are counted as one PAC under this limit. But AIPAC steered Mr. Evans to a series of supposedly independent organizations-- many of them run by people with ties to AIPAC- that gave him \$204,950 for his losing race against Republican Sen. Steve Symms.

According to a computer-aided analysis of 1986 Federal Election Commission reports, despite AIPAC's claims of non-involvement in political spending, no fewer than 51 pro-Israel PACs-- most of which draw money from Jewish donors and operate under obscure- sounding names--are operated by AIPAC officials or people who hold seats on AIPAC's two major policymaking bodies. The study shows that 80 pro-Israel PACs spent more than \$6.9 million during the 1986 campaigns, making them the nation's biggest-giving, narrow issue interest group.

The analysis shows that three of seven "regional chairpersons" a AIPAC direct PACs and 26 more PAC chairmen or treasurers sit on AIPAC's 131-member executive committee, which meets four times a year and sets overall lobbying strategy. Twenty-two more PAC leaders hold seats on a second, advisory body, the 200-member national council.

Similar Spending Patterns

While the pro-Israel PACs represent diverse and supposedly bipartisan Jewish communities in almost every major city and region in the country, their spending patterns are remarkably similar. For example, of \$3.9 million given directly to candidates, the pro-Israel PACs focused

their power on three Senate races, spending \$642,000 on Democrats in South Dakota, Idaho and California. In these races, only one \$5,000 donation went to a Republican.

AIPAC leaders, including its executive director, Thomas A. Dine, refused repeated requests for interviews on the group's relationship with the pro-Israel PACs. Reading from a prepared statement, an AIPAC spokeswoman says the group "denies most forcefully that any such (spending) coordination occurs," and insists that the interlock with pro-Israel PAC leaders "is a function of the nature of political activism and in no way connotes affiliation or connection."

But the overlaps between the organization and the pro-Israel PACs begin at the top. For instance, the Los Angeles-based Citizens Organized Political Action Committee was founded by the wife of AIPAC's chairman, Lawrence J. Weinberg. And Citizens Concerned for the National Interest, located in Chicago, was started by Robert H. Asher, AIPAC's president. Neither could be reached for comment.

\* \* \*

The race that experienced the biggest influx of pro-Israel PAC money was the Senate race in South Dakota, where Democratic Rep. Thomas Daschle's successful campaign received \$229,480. The PACs and people associated with them spent another \$91,000 to help the state's Democratic Party finance an unprecedentedly lavish get-out-the-vote drive, including computerized voter lists, statewide phone banks and paid operatives who scoured remote Indian reservations for Democrats needing a ride to the polls.

The effort on behalf of Mr. Daschle infuriated Stanford M. Adelstein, a Rapid City developer, a former AIPAC executive committee member-and a Republican. "I'm angry. I really, in a sense, gave up on AIPAC," says Mr. Adelstein, who estimates that half of the state's 150 Jewish families are Republican.

Mr. Adelstein says he went to great lengths to get Jewish contributors to listen to incumbent GOP Sen. James Abdnor, and he helped arrange the senator's mid-campaign trip to Israel, where Mr. Abdnor promised to soften his long-held stand against all foreign aid. But Mr. Abdnor was unsuccessful in stemming the flow of funds to his opponent.

Mr. Abdnor wasn't the only target of pro-Israel money to visit Israel last year. Mr. Zschau and Sen. Symms also made trips there and had warm praise for Israeli leaders and their prospects for future U.S. aid. The pro-Israel PAC money, however, went almost unanimously against them.

\* \* \*

-----  
[June 24, 1987 Wall Street Journal p1 c6]

## Anti-Zionist's Candidacy Was Helped By Jewish Contributors in California

By JOHN J. FIALKA

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

LOS ANGELES-Edward B. Vallens, a 67-year-old retired contractor, is an avowed anti-Zionist. Just how he wound up with \$120,000--much of it from Jewish contributors--to stage a television blitz in the final hours of the 1986 California Senate race still bothers him.

The \$120,000 might seem like a small amount in a race that consumed \$24 million and is believed to be the most expensive Senate race in history. But it is part of a larger story that might have affected the outcome of the close, bitter race between Democratic Sen. Alan Cranston and his unsuccessful GOP challenger, then-Rep. Edwin Zschau.

A key figure in the story appears to be Michael Goland, a Los Angeles developer who is one of the largest donors to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee and who has been active in opposing candidates he views as being unfriendly to Israel. He recently agreed to pay a \$5,000 fine for his role in running television commercials attacking former GOP Sen. Charles Percy of Illinois in Mr. Percy's losing 1984 race; the commercials were illegal because the source of the financing wasn't disclosed.

Mr. Goland, who couldn't be reached for comment, surfaced in the California race at a May 1986 reception for Mr. Zschau held by Jewish supporters in Los Angeles's San Fernando Valley. According to the accounts of both Mr. Zschau and campaign manager Ron Smith, he confronted the candidate and, in Mr. Smith's words, "said, 'I'm going to get you just like I got Percy.' "

A few weeks later, Mark Barnes, the operator of a Los Angeles political consulting firm, was approached to produce and buy time for a television ad for Mr. Vallens, the Senate candidate of the American Independent Party. Mr. Barnes says he can't divulge who his clients were. About that time, Libertarian Party candidate Rreck McKinley says he received a call from Mr. Barnes, who said he represented some potential contributors. Mr. McKinley says that when he pressed for more information, Mr. Barnes said he was working on behalf of Mr. Goland. Mr. Barnes confirms that he called Mr. McKinley but denies mentioning Mr. Goland's name. Mr. McKinley says he rejected the offer.

Mr. Vallens says that in mid-October, as his campaign struggled along with a few thousand dollars, he received a call from Mr. Barnes promising \$120,000 from "very conservative Republicans who don't want Zschau in there." Mr. Vallens was told to go to a Los Angeles television studio, where he made commercials asserting that he, and not Mr. Zschau, was the only real conservative in the race.

The commercials ran at least 60 times on Los Angeles and San Diego stations in the final hours before the election. Mr. Vallens, hitherto a political unknown, got 109,856 votes. Mr. Smith claims the ads siphoned off Zschau votes and depressed voter turnout in heavily Republican Orange County. Mr. Zschau lost the election by 116,000 votes.

The Los Angeles Times found two of the donors worked for companies controlled by Mr. Goland and another who lived in a house that is owned by Mr. Goland. One \$4,000 check came from Mr. and Mrs. Michael Altman. Mr. Altman says he is a close friend of Mr. Goland's and that he is treasurer of Young Americans Political Action Committee, a pro-Israel PAC of which Mr. Goland is assistant treasurer.

\* \* \*

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Of "Jewish Soap" and Veiled Hatreds

It is a sad fact that our social sciences, most particularly sociology and political science, devote much effort to the study of average people, with a view toward controlling their thoughts, votes and attitudes.

Far more interesting and important is the study of the motivations of our elites. Such studies are seldom, if ever, done outside the field of economics.

In this post we are going to ask a simple question: - When confronted by an elite too smart to simply admit in opinion polls their real motives, what are the indicators that their ideas and actions are motivated by malice?

At what point may we conclude that contradictory statements and utterly irrational arguments voiced by visibly talented people are motivated by passion and prejudice?

What extremes of internal contradiction would allow us to take alarm that the motivating passion might be hatred?

Let's look at "Jewish Soap" and the Holocaust.

Jewish historian Walter Laqueur acknowledged in his 1980 book, *The Terrible Secret*, that the human soap story has no basis in reality.

Deborah Lipstadt, professor of modern Jewish history, in 1981:

"The fact is that the Nazis never used the bodies of Jews, or for that matter anyone else, for the production of soap."

Jewish historian Gitta Sereny noted in her book, *Into That Darkness*:

"The universally accepted story that the corpses were used to make soap and fertilizer is finally refuted by the generally very reliable Ludwigsburg Central Authority for Investigation into Nazi Crimes."

In April 1990, professor Yehuda Bauer of Israel's Hebrew University, regarded as a leading

Holocaust historian, as well as Shmuel Krakowski, archives director of Israel's Yad v Shem Holocaust center, confirmed that the human soap story is not true.

Notice the dates.

After 1980, it simply was not possible for any proponent of the Holocaust to repeat the "Jewish Soap" story in good faith. Nevertheless, we have the following:

Author Konnilyn Feig, in her 1981 work, *Hitler's Death Camps*, repeated the soap story in lurid detail, accepting the story because:

"Most East European camp scholars...validate the soap stories, and other kinds of bars made from humans are displayed in Eastern Europe -- I have seen many over the years."

In Washington in April 1983, Rabbi Arthur Schneier repeated the tale at the opening ceremony of the largest Holocaust meeting in history. In his invocation to the "American Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors," the Rabbi solemnly declared:

"We remember the bars of soap with the initials RJF -- 'Rein judisches Fett', Pure Jewish Fat -- made from the bodies of our loved ones."

We are being asked to believe a collection of specific factual assertions about the Holocaust.

The problem is that the proponents of this collection of assertions cannot agree. They cannot get their story straight. If they disagree about the facts of the story, then why should we believe?

But the credibility of the collection of Holocaust assertions that comprise the "Jewish Soap" story suffer not just from the disagreements of the proponents.

The factual premise of that story about Jewish soap contradicts the proponents' frequent and plausible assertions that victims of gassings were starved and overworked. How would one be able to get sufficient body fat to make soap from emaciated gassing victims?

The problem with Holocaust belief is the facility with which the images of camp life and conditions conjured by the proponents change, depending upon the point to be proven.

For example, when one poster on alt.revisionism questions the practical details of how all the corpses could be removed quickly from delousing chambers at Aushwitz turned into makeshift gas chambers, a proponent of the "Holocaust" notes:

From: golux@mcs.com (The only Golux in the World, and not a mere Device) Date:

Sat, 01 Oct 1994 20:56:16 -0600:

"The 'average adults' killed in Auschwitz gas chambers probably did not weigh more than 100 pounds at the time of their death, since the SS probably wasn't feeding them too well."

Indeed, hunger in the camps was so pervasive that, according to one proponent, food motivated camp inmates themselves to operate the gas chambers for the SS.

From: bzs@world.std.com (Barry Shein) Date: Fri, 30 Sep 1994 07:09:59 GMT:

"As to fresh meat, they were herding their fellow inmates, by the dozens if not hundreds, into chambers for execution. And you the guards should have been concerned about running out of help?"

"If you get to do the loading then \*maybe\* you get to live another day, maybe you even eat a little better under starvation conditions."

And indeed, the image of hunger, disease and misery in the camps is universal throughout all of the assertions about the Holocaust, except the "Jewish Soap" assertions. But if the plausible image of hunger is so widely held by proponents, then why do so many proponents have difficulty rejecting the "Jewish Soap" assertions?

To make soap, we need large numbers of camp inmates with ample body fat.

Could ethnic anger and aggression be so strong within the Holocaust proponents that many of them (perhaps most) will believe fundamentally contradictory stories?

The Holocaust is intended to shame Western Europeans into honoring the ideals of "compassion", "tolerance" and "diversity."

Yet how can these Holocaust proponents, who so strenuously advocate the values of "compassion", "tolerance" and "diversity" for others have such a powerful need to believe the worst about their real and imagined enemies, even when the stories are utterly implausible?

Could it be that this value system of "compassion", "tolerance" and "diversity" is meant to be followed by others, but not by the Holocaust proponents themselves? Could it be that for Holocaust proponents values and ideas are artifacts of convenience and advantage depending upon who benefits at the time?

Could it be that when you are a minority in "diaspora" you build "Tolera-centers" to showcase



the Holocaust in Los Angeles, because "tolerance" and "diversity" benefit you, but that when you are a majority in Israel "tolerance" and "diversity" have no place?

The Jerusalem Report of April 7, 1994 , p.24, says of Rafael Eitan, one of Israel's most influential leaders:

On one occasion, at a meeting of top army brass in Gaza in 1980, he [Eitan] said, according to notes taken at the time: "We have to do everything to make them (the Arabs) miserable so they'll leave. All the Arabs are the same. They should all be finished off."

The Jewish Press for October 28 to November 3, 1994, on page 107, quotes Yitzak Rabin as follows:

"We cannot keep having this mixture of Jews and Arabs. We have to stop the blurring. There has to be a separation, not just a technical closure. We have to decide on separation as a philosophy."

Is "Jewish Soap" just one more example?

Could the words "compassion", "tolerance" and "diversity" have a double meaning when spoken by such people? Could these words require passivity of the audience but leave plenty of room for unbridled aggression and veiled hatred for the speakers of such words?

Caution is in order.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Tender Hearts of The SS

In an earlier post entitled "Of 'Jewish Soap' and Veiled Hatreds" we posed three questions:

- When confronted by an elite too smart to simply admit in opinion polls their real motives, what are the indicators that their ideas and actions are motivated by malice?
- At what point may we conclude that contradictory statements and utterly irrational arguments voiced by visibly talented people are motivated by passion and prejudice?
- What extremes of internal contradiction would allow us to take alarm that the motivating passion may be hatred?

In that earlier post, we noted that the problem with Holocaust belief is the facility with which the images of camp life and conditions conjured by the proponents change, depending upon the point to be proven.

Today we will tackle one more of those profound contradictions. But first, a little background.

Those of us who have gathered our impressions of the Holocaust "homicidal gas chambers" as "instruments of mass murder" from the popular press and from Hollywood have grown up with an image of high tech killing machines.

To the popular mind, the chambers were large structures dispensing hydrogen cyanide gas through automated dispensers camouflaged to resemble stainless shower heads. The hundreds of corpses produced by each gassing were then fed by automated conveyor belts to huge, blast furnace style crematoria.

In this popular or Hollywood view, the killing machine was mechanical and "capital intensive". No need for battalions of laborers dragging around dead corpses. The Hollywood view has the virtue of logical consistency. After all, if you are going to slaughter millions and dispose of the remains, automation makes sense. And indeed, the only reason to do this job with gas chambers is the opportunity it affords for economies of scale and mass efficiency. The Hollywood view of the gas chambers is at least logical.

The problem with this Hollywood view of the "instruments of mass murder" is that there are no remains, either physical or documentary, of any such high-tech structures. In a word, the

Hollywood version is false.

Rather, we have ample physical remains and documentary records of the construction of delousing chambers for the disinfection of garments, as well as crematory ovens identical to those used in civilian mortuaries at that time. These records include construction blueprints and purchase orders from vendors as well as photographs.

The proponents of mass murder describe for us, and ask us to believe a new, decidedly low-tech, labor-intensive version of gas chamber killings.

From: dzk@cs.brown.edu (Danny Keren) Date: 20 Sep 1994 22:12:38 GMT:

"Wayne McGuire <wmcguire@world.std.com> wrote:

<I was brought up with an image of the Holocaust as a sort of gigantic factory of death, in which six million Jews were exterminated in gas chambers with industrial precision.>

"Not very accurate."

"But consider a gas chamber like the large ones in Auschwitz, 7 X 30 meters in area. One can easily gas a 1,000 people per day in such a chamber. Actually, the main problem the SS had was not the gassing, but disposing of the bodies."

What happened, apparently is that some of the delousing chambers were converted into gas chambers. In the words of one proponent of the gas chamber story:

From: dzk@cs.brown.edu (Danny Keren) Date: 27 Sep 1994 21:06:09 GMT

"The delousing chambers at Auschwitz used cyanide gas, and the SS had no problems with them. Obviously, it's no big deal to use Zyklon-B (which releases the HCN gas) for delousing. Using it for killing people is almost exactly the same. Only differences are: the Zyklon has to be inserted from the outside, and the door has to be reinforced so the people being gassed won't break out."

"I'm sure you'll agree with me that it was no big problem to reinforce the doors, and to insert the Zyklon from the outside."

Ok, so we now have makeshift conversions of delousing chambers at Auschwitz. Fair enough. But as one proponent of the gas chambers points out, these structures are underground, thus making disposal of hundreds of thousands of bodies even more difficult.

From: k044477@hobbes.kzoo.edu (Jamie McCarthy) Date: Fri, 30 Sep 1994 03:35:13 -0400

"The underground gas chambers, both homicidal and delousing, were located in a swamp and frequently stand for many months with a few feet of water."

And indeed, the low-tech nature of these "homicidal instruments of mass murder" helps explain the lack of any documentation similar to that which we have for the civilian style crematoria or any eyewitness testimony of construction workers who built them. Apparently, they were built on the sly, so that nobody, including the construction crews, knew what was being built:

From: mstein@access3.digex.net (Michael P. Stein) Date: 2 Oct 1994 03:56:51 -0400

"The gas chamber was often referred to as a morgue. It may indeed have been planned that way, before the order for the "Final Solution" was issued. In part this camouflage was because the construction workers were to be kept in the dark as to what they were building - "

But now we have the low-tech specter of hundreds of workers having to go down into underground buildings, coming into contact with poison gas, and having to carry hundreds of corpses to slow, civilian style crematory ovens. We are asked to envision such a means of killing millions of people.

This low-tech image may have some plausibility for Auschwitz, which had batteries of crematory ovens. (The camp had a population of up to 100,000, and, in this era before antibiotics, had death rates from diseases such as typhus of up to 20% per year, necessitating the disposal of up to 20,000 bodies per year.)

But the low-tech image is even more troublesome for camps such as Treblinka, where there were no crematory ovens, and where the gas chambers are alleged to have been wooden rooms in which prisoners were suffocated with diesel exhaust. The battalion size work crews which apparently emptied the rooms of corpses carried them away to open pits where they were buried.

All of which prompts skeptics over and over to ask why simpler and easier low tech means were not employed. Namely, why did the SS not simply shoot them?

For which the proponents of the "homicidal gas chambers" have a ready answer:

From: bzs@world.std.com (Barry Shein) Date: Wed, 28 Sep 1994 07:43:28 GMT

"Actually, the reason for not using bullets was because it took a lot of soldiers to shoot that many people every day and yes indeed the SS tried this and had "morale problems" which are also documented in their memos etc. Ordinary soldiers had a problem with mowing down men, women and children all day for very long."

So the reason the SS had to resort to crude, low-tech gas chambers to kill jews is that they could not find anyone in the SS willing to shoot them!.

Now if that is the case, then why would the Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal brand the SS as a "criminal organization"?

What happened to "Ivan the Terrible?" Was he not willing?

The tender hearted SS could not bring themselves to shoot the hated jews! C'est fantastique!

Now it happens that literally millions of American males over the age of 40 have actually fired the M-60 NATO 7.62 mm belt-fed machine gun. Millions more have seen it fired. It has a cyclical rate of fire of about 560 rounds per minute. The Germans invented machine guns with similar rates of fire before World War I. The venerable U.S M-2 .50 cal. machine gun (larger and heavier than the M-60) with an RPM of about 470 was designed by Browning during WW I and is still in use.

The SS had several different models of these guns in WW II and had them available at all times.

Proponents of the "homicidal gas chamber" argue that the capacity of the crematory ovens at Auschwitz was from 1200 to 1400 per day if run day and night.

One belt-fed machine gun can kill all 1400 in 5 minutes. All it takes is one man to fire the gun, one to clip belts, one on a bulldozer to move the bodies, and a rifle company to stand guard..

Soldiers in wartime do what they are trained to do, and that is to use their rifles and machine guns.

What the proponents of these low-tech "homicidal gas chambers" are asking us to believe is that the SS could not find one anti- semite willing to stand back 200 meters from a 100 meter rank of souls 14 deep and shoot them for 5 minutes. Each bullet would pass through several bodies. That is all it would take. One anti-semite SS soldier in each of the four "death camps" five minutes per day.

And such persons could not be found?

As with the previous post, "Of 'Jewish Soap' and Veiled Hatreds," this notion of a tender SS bears not only on the credibility of the "homicidal gas chambers" story but on the motives and character of the proponents as well.

It is yet another example in which proponents of the Holocaust take positions that are fundamentally and profoundly contradictory.

How is it that the SS is a "criminal organization" filled with anti-semitic murderers such as "Ivan the Terrible" one moment, but in the next, when the ease of shootings has to be dismissed, no SS troops could be found who were willing to kill?

How is it that John Demjanjuk's SS identity card alone is conclusive evidence of murder, when, at the same time, to save the low-tech version of the "homicidal gas chambers", holocaust proponents brazenly state that no such murderers could be found within SS ranks?

The problem with Holocaust belief is how quickly and easily reality transforms itself into fantasy depending upon the point to be proven.

Now I ask you to consider what passion could drive otherwise visibly talented people to such depths of contradiction?

Is it the same passion that drives these people to such forceful advocacy of "understanding" "tolerance" and "respect for diversity"?

What if the passion that drives these people to advocate belief in the Holocaust as part of their campaign to enforce the values of "understanding" "tolerance" and "respect for diversity" is in fact concealed hatred?

Do words have double meanings for these people? - One set of meanings for me and another for thee?

If so, then what exactly do they, as our leaders and elites, have in mind for us?

Caution is in order.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## None Could Be So Craven

In an earlier post entitled "Tender Hearts of the SS" we dealt with a profound and unanswerable contradiction created by the Holocaust proponents as they argue their low-tech vision of the "homicidal gas chambers."

As we noted in that post, we have gone from the high-tech, automated vision of death popularized by Hollywood and the press to a decidedly low-tech version of reworked delousing chambers at Auschwitz and wooden rooms filled with the exhaust of diesel engines at Treblinka.

These methods are, of course, labor intensive, requiring battalions of workers to drag corpses out of these makeshift facilities to civilian style cremation ovens in the case of Auschwitz, and to open burial pits in the case of Treblinka.

All of which prompts many skeptics to ask why the SS did not avail itself of much simpler low-tech means. Why didn't the SS simply shoot them? In the case of Treblinka, right into the open burial pits!

To which we get one of those truly incredible answers; namely, that they could not find SS troops willing to do this sort of work:

From: bzs@world.std.com (Barry Shein) Date: Wed, 28 Sep 1994 07:43:28 GMT

"Actually, the reason for not using bullets was because it took a lot of soldiers to shoot that many people every day and yes indeed the SS tried this and had "morale problems" which are also documented in their memos etc. Ordinary soldiers had a problem with mowing down men, women and children all day for very long."

As we have noted in the previous two posts in this series, the problem with Holocaust belief is the facility with which the images of camp life and conditions conjured by the proponents change, depending upon the point to be proven.

First, we have Holocaust protagonists believing that "Jewish Soap" can be extracted from emaciated gas chamber victims.

Next, we have Holocaust protagonists asserting that the SS resorted to primitive, labor-intensive



gas chambers because all the "Ivan the Terribles" in that murderous "criminal organization" were conveniently missing when it came time for a few volunteers in each camp to wield a machine gun, or to fire it from the anonymity of the inside of a tank. All of which prompted one skeptic to note that, whatever SS troops might or might not be willing to do, they certainly would not be willing to enter gas chambers to fetch dead bodies shortly after a gassing. Such duty is dangerous and the SS troops would protest.

For which, without so much as a blink, our Holocaust protagonists had one of the most profoundly disturbing rationalizations conceived by man.

According to our first Holocaust proponent, work crews comprised of hundreds of Jews apparently pulled jewish corpses from the gas chambers to make room for the next batch of jews being herded to their deaths.

From: k044477@hobbes.kzoo.edu (Jamie McCarthy) Date: Tue, 27 Sep 1994 18:47:10 -0400:

"First of all, do you suppose the Nazis cared? The people moving the corpses were the Sonderkommando: Jews who weren't ever going to leave the camp alive. (At least, that was the plan.) They recycled the Sonderkommando units every few months, the recycling process being an extermination of the old workers and their burial by the new. When your workers are under a death sentence anyway, you don't worry about OSHA regulations that might put them in danger."

According to our second Holocaust proponent, not only did large work gangs of "condemned" jews pull jewish corpses from the chambers, but these jewish work gangs also herded their fellow jews into the gas chambers and dumped the cyanide pellets through the hole into the acid:

From: bzs@world.std.com (Barry Shein) Date: Fri, 30 Sep 1994 06:57:13 GMT:

"Since what you are actually discussing is a murder device operated primarily by people who themselves are to be murdered (prisoners) then setting such a standard is unnecessary. This isn't a factory concerned with workers' health, this is a murder device and the more it kills the merrier. The guards only stand close enough to make sure the prisoners herd the others in and dump the cyanide pellets thru the hole into the acid."

Our second Holocaust proponent also casually informs us that these jewish camp inmates participated in the slaughter of their own kind for extra food, and a few weeks reprieve from the inevitable and well understood death sentence:

From: bzs@world.std.com (Barry Shein) Date: Fri, 30 Sep 1994 07:09:59 GMT:

"They were herding their fellow inmates, by the dozens if not hundreds, into chambers for execution. And you think the guards should have been concerned about a morale problem? "As to fresh meat, they were herding their fellow inmates, by the dozens if not hundreds, into chambers for execution. And you think the guards should have been concerned about running out of help?"

"If you get to do the loading then \*maybe\* you get to live another day, maybe you even eat a little better under starvation conditions."

And a third Holocaust proponent confirms the fringe benefits of participating in the murder of your own kind:

From: annya666@aol.com (AnnyA666) Date: 2 Oct 1994 11:29:01 -0400:

"The Sonderkommandos were provided with gasmasks. They were well-fed for the short period they were employed, which is the main reason most of them took the job. (Cit: Phillip Mueller "Eyewitness Auschwitz")"

According to these Holocaust proponents, while no volunteers could be found within the SS to wield a machine gun to kill jews, plenty of jews could be coerced into killing their own kind in low-tech gas chambers!

Incredible!

To save the "homicidal gas chamber" story, the proponents are willing to make tens of thousands of ordinary jews in the camps the craven killers of their own kind. And all for some food and a short reprieve from their well understood death sentence!

All of this begs again the question,- why?

Why would the advocates of the Holocaust story stoop to such incredibly contradictory stories? What exactly are the passions that lead to these contradictions? Few passions, aside from raw hatred, are that strong!

Does the Holocaust story have so much importance as a tool for forcing the rest of us to obey the values of "tolerance" "compassion" and "diversity" that the proponents of this story are willing ultimately to sacrifice their own in this manner?

Talk about slandering the memory of the dead!

It is no wonder that the Zionists in Israel could not, at first, accept the Holocaust story. In the words of Tom Segev, from his work, "The Seventh Million" p 183-184:

"A few days after he came home from his mission to Hungary, paratrooper Yoel Palgi went to a veterans' club in Tel Aviv. It was June 1945. Everyone received him warmly and with admiration, he later wrote. They all wanted to hear what had happened over there. But no one was interested in accounts of Jewish suffering. They wanted a different story, about the few who had fought like lions. "Everywhere I turned," Palgi wrote, "the question was fired at me: why did the Jews not rebel? Why did they go like lambs to the slaughter? Suddenly I realized that we were ashamed of those who were tortured, shot, burned. There is a kind of general agreement that the Holocaust dead were worthless people. Unconsciously, we have accepted the Nazi view that Jews were subhuman.... History is playing a bitter joke on us: have we not ourselves put the six million on trial?"

"The term "sabon" (soap) expresses the contempt that native-born Israelis felt towards Holocaust survivors. (Segev The Seventh Million 1993 p183-4)."

Any hint of redemption for these "Sonderkommando" camp survivors must come at the expense of the "homicidal gas chambers."

Are there such hints?

Indeed there are!

As one advocate of the "homicidal gas chambers" notes, there was a rebellion at Treblinka in which the SS lost control of the camp to prisoners. The cause of the rebellion, apparently, was lack of food:

From: bzs@world.std.com (Barry Shein) Date: Wed, 28 Sep 1994 07:43:28 GMT:

"In order to starve to death thousands of people you need good lock-up facilities because it takes a while and they get pretty desperate. The Nazis did lose Treblinka to prisoner riots, for example."

It is hard to imagine prisoners rioting over food and not over the slaughter of their own kind. If they were under a death sentence anyway, why not fight?

But then, such are the demands of "Shoah Business."

Yggdrasil has no way of knowing whether this improbable story of "homicidal gas chambers" is

true or not.

However, if forced to chose between the improbability of craven jewish camp inmates assisting in the slaughter of their own kind, or the improbability that these low-tech homicidal gas chambers existed in the first place, the choice is an easy one.

Yggdrasil would cast his vote in favor of the bravery and humanity of the camp survivors and against the advocates of these strange and twisted stories of "homicidal gas chambers."

The fever swamps of the Holocaust story are a modern creation, provoked and sustained by modern passions.

Handle with caution.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## The Sigmund Freud Card

We leave now the detail of the Holocaust story - that world of stark contradiction driven by passion and aggression. We move on to a different and more recognizable world of tradition.

Ethnic tradition, that is.

Name-calling is so frequent on alt.revisionism, that one gets used to it. Indeed, outrage is a tool of discourse, intended to drive off those who question the orthodox version of the Holocaust.

After all, it is a story believed by 91% of the population, unknown to another 8%, and disbelieved by a mere 1 of 100, according to a recent poll.

Thus, the best tactic is to shout-down the opposition. It doesn't take the mind of a Clausewitz to understand that silence is the best friend of the status quo. Make life so unpleasant that these dissenters stop posting.

So it was with particular delight that we recognized among the spew that appears on alt.revisionism some material inspired by Sigmund Freud. When name-calling fails, try some traditional techniques for embarrassing the doubter.

The Freudian attack is elegantly simple. "Your frustration makes you hostile (antisemitic). You are frustrated because what you really want is to f\_\_\_ your mother." Or, "you keep hammering away at an argument only because you are a sexually frustrated".

It is impossible to answer the Freudian accusation. He who is rude enough to assert it always wins.

In this crude incarnation, Freudian analysis gives the attacker enormous power. In the world of ethnic politics, it confers the power to control the dialogue, - to control the terms of discourse between minority and a majority.

John Murray Cuddihy wrote a brilliant, but little known work published in 1974 by Basic Books entitled "The Ordeal of Civility." It is an exploration of the thesis that the intellectual aggressions of Freud, Marx and Claude Levi-Strauss (the famous anthropologist) all arise from the shock of emancipation from the East European shtetl.

(p. 17)

"Sigmund Freud's lifework, and especially his masterpiece, *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900), concluded one phase in the great nineteenth century debate on "Jewish Emancipation": as the unruly wish can fulfil itself only in the form of a disguised dream, so the "Ostjude" is not admissible into the civil society of the Gentile unless he submits to social censorship, disguising his unruly importunity in socially acceptable ways."

(p. 20)

"I argue that a classical genre of Jewish joke, the inner structure of Freud's theory of dreams, and the public discussion in nineteenth-century Europe of the eligibility of the Eastern European shtetl Jew for admission to civil society- the so called Jewish Emancipation problematic - all have the same structure: there is (a) the latent "dark" id or "Yid" pressing for admission to consciousness or to civil society: (b) there is the social-moral censor (extended or internalized) - insisting that to "pass" properly into awareness or Western society the coarse id - "Yid" should first refine itself (sublimate) or disguise itself (assimilate) - in a word, civilize itself, at whatever price in discontent; and finally, (c) there is the id - "Yid" in the very act of "passing," its public behavior in Western public places carefully impression-managed by an ego vigilant against the danger of "slips," in which the unseemly pariah will show through the parvenu.

Cuddihy then cuts to the chase(p. 38):

"What Howard Morley Sacher refers to as " the unconscious desire of Jews, as social pariahs, to unmask the respectability of the European society which closed them out" was, in Freud's case at least, the conscious desire of a conscious pariah. "There was no more effective way of doing this," Sacher continues, "than by dredging up for the human psyche the sordid and infantile sexual aberrations that were frequently the sources of human behavior, or misbehavior. Even Jews who were not psychiatrists must have taken pleasure in the fact of social equalization performed by Freud's new thinking. The B'nai B'rith Lodge of Vienna, for example, delighted in listening to Freud air his theories."

And so it is with no real surprise that even in a totally anonymous medium such as Usenet, we find the Holocaust defenders returning to their "roots."

It starts gently with Barry Shein subtly questioning Doyal's masculinity:

From: bzs@world.std.com (Barry Shein) Date: Sat, 19 Nov 1994 22:12:45 GMT:

<You really nailed him good Michael. Now we can look upon his other posts in the same

light. With contempt.

Doyal@eskimo.com>

I realize the truth is your enemy, Mr Doyal. And in this war you make a fine cheerleader. I wonder how you look in short shorts and a pom-pom...

Then it gets more serious and bends to the more classic Freudian innuendo - "Perhaps your 'hate' results from child abuse you suffered or, perhaps from sexual dysfunction."

From: martev <martev@gate.net> Date: Wed, 23 Nov 1994 14:50:30 -0500 (EST)

Maquire, as a sideliner to all these posts of yours and your fellow marchers, it amazes me the amount of hate in you..

I wonder what it can be attributed to?

Could it have been child abuse YOU suffered?...

Sexual dysfunction, or what?

Why so much hate in you?

Next, we get a reference to "perverse psychosexual need for infinite amounts of stimulation," giving meaning to the term "psycho-babble."

From: bzs@world.std.com (Barry Shein) Date: Thu, 24 Nov 1994 00:32:56 GMT

Are you nuts or what? Is this just some sort of personal psychosexual need for infinite amounts of stimulation on the subject? The Cold War wasn't enough?

Then, we return to the B'nai B'rith Lodge of Vienna where two Freudians have a self-congratulatory laugh at having shamed a goy. Here we get a reference to "perverse psychosexual need for for this masturbatory fascination," giving additional meaning to the term "psycho-babble."

From: bzs@world.std.com (Barry Shein) Date: Thu, 24 Nov 1994 00:39:38 GMT

<Could it have been child abuse YOU suffered?... Sexual dysfunction, or what? Why so much hate in you?>

"You know, it's funny, just previous to running into your post I was speculating out loud here on about the same thing, a few messages back."

"I wondered if McGuire had some perverse psychosexual need for this masturbatory fascination, it struck me this way also."

"Coincidence that we should both independently express this observation in such similar ways?"

"You be the judge..."

Then a final rejoinder in which the hapless goy is portrayed as "suffering from one very long, orgasm, which just doesn't go away.." An interesting phrase presenting either an ontological question of whether extended ecstasy must inevitably turn to agony, or perhaps just more psycho-babble.

From: martev <martev@gate.net> Date: Fri, 25 Nov 1994 14:00:18 -0500 (EST):

<I wondered if McGuire had some perverse psychosexual need for this masturbatory fascination, it struck me this way also.>

"Frankly, I don't know, except that he and his ilk are just suffering from one very long, orgasm, which just doesn't go away.."

"Their sighs and moans do sound like it, don't they....."

<Coincidence that we should both independently express this observation in such similar ways?> "Coincidence?, doubtful, been obvious to many for many years.."

<You be the judge...>

"I have been for a long time.."

"Marty"

So now we have some concrete examples of Freudian theory used as a weapon. Save them and place them in your collections.

Yggdrasil-

---



[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Beyond Freud - the Mapplethorpe Card

Modern times produce new pioneers. Indeed, in the 1990's Sigmund Freud seems a bit like old hat. For special enemies Freud's tactic is too "civil".

As we mentioned before in a series of earlier posts:

"It is a sad fact that our social sciences, most particularly sociology and political science, devote much effort to the study of average people, with a view toward controlling their thoughts, votes and attitudes."

"Far more interesting and important is the study of the motivations of our elites. Such studies are seldom, if ever, done outside the field of economics."

And indeed the latter half of the Twentieth Century has produced new images which hold a much more powerful sway over our elites than do the theories of Sigmund Freud.

The most powerful of these images are the photographs of Robert Mapplethorpe.

These, dear reader, are photographs and other artistic representations of male genitalia. These works attract large numbers of our cosmopolitan sophisticates to exhibitions in galleries from New York and Chicago to LA. and San Francisco.

Most of the pictures are of what our press, lapsing as it must into "code", calls "homoerotic art."

They run the gamut from a relatively mundane phallus protruding from the center of a flower, to men copulating, and on to a man with a bullwhip protruding from his rear end.

So powerfully do these images resonate with our predominantly heterosexual elites, that Yggdrasil has seen prints decorating the walls of the world headquarters of a client. (And indeed it is at such times that one appreciates the ego on patrol against the dark "id" preventing any inadvertent "slips" into aggression against the hand that pays the bills.)

Now I mentioned that our press must talk about these exhibits in code. It is not so much that the pictures themselves cannot be discussed; it is the gravitational pull these images exert on our elites that is troublesome.

It is not so much that the "art" might be described when a middle American city like Cincinnati bans the exhibit from its museum; but that in describing the court case brought by the ACLU to reverse the ban, the newspapers might have to explain its "redeeming social value" in the eyes of our elites. Now that must be described in code!

The middle class American probably has no trouble understanding that homosexuals might hold a fascination toward these works.

But what about our heterosexual elites? What is in these photographs that excites them?

Let us no longer speak in code!

The centerpiece of Mapplethorpe's exhibit is a photograph of a black man urinating into the mouth of a white man on his knees.

Perhaps to a homosexual, this photograph could represent some sort of erotic play.

But to our elites it has an entirely different meaning. It is the ultimate triumph of their multiculturalist vision. It is a graphic image of the endpoint of their struggle for "tolerance" for "diversity" and to "right wrongs" and to procure "equal justice for all."

That endpoint is the ultimate humiliation of the White Male.

The centerpiece photograph and the entire Mapplethorpe collection become a symbol to our elites of their hope to accomplish with sly manipulation of cultural toxins that which could never be accomplished through direct confrontation.

The liberal frustration with half-way measures like employment quotas finds its release here in a photo of a white male on his knees in a position of degradation and subservience to one of the liberals' dark allies. It is an excitement that is heightened by the danger of its discovery by the masses. No Freudian "slips" allowed!

And so it is not terribly surprising that in the fever swamps of alt.revisionism we should see the Mapplethorpe card appear, in defense of the Holocaust story and all else that is "just and true":

Barry Shein writes:

You are such a moral cripple Hermann, it's a good thing for you the T4 euthanasia program is no longer operating. Even in Nazi Germany you'd be considered something of a political liability.

As I've said before, the only justice you should expect would be two cellmates placing bets on how much of their urine you can swallow as the evening's entertainment after lights-out.

Anything more would be undeserved generosity.

Caution is advised-

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## YGGDRASIL'S HOLOCAUST FAQ

### 1. Do you deny that the Holocaust happened?

No. It happened. There is no question that many hundreds of thousands of people held in German prison camps (both Jews and non-Jews) suffered and died in WW-2.

### 2. So what is it you want to revise?

Under the circumstances, we have a hard time believing that 6.5 million Jews died in the camps. The number may have been more like 1.5 million.

Further, there are questions of whether the purpose of the camps was the systematic extermination of Jews, as popularly believed, or whether the camps were labor camps, or whether they were for the purpose of detaining an ethnic group sympathetic to wartime enemy Russia.

### 3. What would lead you to believe that the Holocaust story is exaggerated?

Many people are skeptical of holocaust claims.

They were brought up believing that Germans made soap and lampshades out of the skin of Jewish gas chamber victims.

Jewish Holocaust experts now admit that the widely believed stories about soap and lampshades were false.

All we are asking is that the proponents of the holocaust story get their story straight.

Take Treblinka, for example. How were the Jews killed? You are going to have to cast your votes!

Method A. -- Steam cooking.

On August 8, 1943, the New York Times reported that two million Jews had already been killed at Treblinka by steaming them to death.

An "eyewitness" account received in November 1942 in London from the Warsaw ghetto underground organization, reported that Jews were exterminated in "death rooms" at Treblinka with "steam coming out of the numerous holes in the pipes."

"Lest We Forget", published in New York in 1943 by the World Jewish Congress, describes in detail how Jews were steamed to death, and provides a diagram showing the location of the purported "boiler room" that produced the "live steam."

According to a 1944 "eyewitness" account compiled by the OSS, the principal US intelligence agency, Jews at Treblinka "were in general killed by steam and not by gas as had been at first suspected." {OSS document, April 13, 1944. National Archives (Washington, DC), Military Branch, Record Group 226 (OSS records), No. 67231.}

Although no reputable historian now supports the "steam" story, and little has been heard of it during the last several decades, it was revived in a widely-circulated booklet published in 1979 and 1985 by the influential Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. {The Record: The Holocaust in History.}

#### Method B. -- Steam suffocation

A Polish government report dated December 5, 1945, was submitted as prosecution exhibit USA-293. It charged that Jews were killed at the camp "by suffocating them in steam-filled chambers."

#### Method C. -- The vacuum chamber

Former Treblinka prisoner Samuel Rajzman testified that during the time he was in Treblinka, Jews were "suffocated to death" there with a machine that pumped air out of death chambers. {Rajzman text in: Yuri Suhl, ed., They Fought Back (New York: 1967), p. 130.}

Shortly after the war, the World Jewish Congress published The Black Book, a 559-page volume. At Treblinka alone, the book alleges, three million persons were killed. Three diabolical techniques, including poison gas and steam, were supposedly used there to kill some 10,000 Jews daily. But "the most widespread" method "consisted of pumping all the air out from the chambers with large special pumps." {Jewish Black Book Comm., The Black Book (1946), pp. 407-408.}

A former inmate testified shortly after the war that Treblinka's victims were "poisoned by the different gasses or asphyxiated when the chamber was turned into a vacuum and all the air sucked out." {Isaiah Trunk, Jewish Responses (New York: 1982), p. 263.}

## Method D. -- Poison gas.

At the main Nuremberg trial of 1945-1946, two conflicting stories were given: steaming and gassing. Former Treblinka prisoner Samuel Rajzman testified that Jews were killed there in gas chambers. {International Military Tribunal, Trial of the Major War Criminals Before the International Military Tribunal, Nuremberg: 1947-1949, ("blue series"), Vol. 8, p. 325. (Feb. 27, 1946)}

Adolf Eichmann, the wartime head of the SS Jewish affairs section, said in 1961 during pre-trial interrogation in Israel that during the war he "was told" that Jews were gassed at Treblinka "with potassium cyanide." {Jochen von Lang, ed., Eichmann Interrogated (New York: 1983), p. 84.}

## Method E. -- Electrocution

In the Nuremberg trial of Oswald Pohl, U.S. Judge Michael A. Musmanno declared that "death was inflicted here [at Treblinka] by gas and steam, as well as by electric current."

## Method F. -- Delayed Action Gas

One of the strangest Treblinka extermination stories, which appeared in September 1942 in a Polish underground periodical, claimed that Jews were killed there with a "delayed action" gas:

They enter it [the gas chamber] in groups of 300-500 people. Each group is immediately closed hermetically inside, and gassed. The gas does not affect them immediately, because the Jews still have to continue on to the pits that are a few dozen meters away, and whose depth is 30 meters. There they fall unconscious, and a digger covers them with a thin layer of earth. {"Information Bulletin," Sept. 8, 1942, published by the command of the Polish underground "Armia Krajowa." Quoted in: Yitzhak Arad, Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka (Bloomington: 1987), pp. 353 f.}

## Method G. -- Rifle and Machine Gun Fire

According to the testimony of yet another "eyewitness," a Jew named Oskar Berger who escaped from the camp, many Jews were systematically put to death at Treblinka by shooting them with rifle and machine-gun fire. {E. Kogon, Theory and Practice of Hell (New York: Berkley, pb., 1981), pp. 183-185.}

## Method H. -- Diesel Exhaust

In recent years, the most widely-circulated story has been that Jews were gassed at Treblinka with carbon monoxide from the exhaust of a diesel engine. {Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (New York: 1985), p. 878.; "Treblinka," *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (1971), vol. 15, p. 1368.}

The official Holocaust record appears to be a chaotic jumble of inconsistent and unbelievable accusations.

#### 4. Who would have a motive to muddle the original historical record?

The victorious allies.

They must reestablish government in Germany. They have to impose a constitution upon Germany and have it accepted as legitimate. No small task!

The allies have to kill or imprison Himmler and the rest, or they might run for election in the new government, win, and start the thing all over again.

Solution? Stage trials and convict them as war criminals.

A bit inconvenient for Anglo-saxon victors who cherish trial by jury for themselves (No ordinary German folk on any juries here!) and prohibit application of ex-post-facto laws to themselves (Vide the views of the late Justice Black).

So the "crimes" have to be pretty outrageous to allow them to apply not their own law to the Germans, but a version especially created "pro haec vice".

Many of the camp survivors (both Jews and non-Jews) were prison trustees. They had to do this to survive.

But to survive, they stole food rations, set the labor pools, operated the crematoria, and (if any existed) ran the gas chambers as well.

Their morally ambiguous posture invites inflating the German atrocities to justify their own actions in the camps.

The German POWs hope for lenient treatment.

They are anxious to please the allied authorities with "good stories" about the camps.



Virulent German haters among the Anglo-saxon and Gallic victors who serve as Nuremberg prosecutors.

They are less than careful with the facts, particularly when the outcome is pre-ordained by political necessity.

U.S politicians need to give the American people a moral reason for entry into the war.

Gripping stories of genocide have more power than abstract concepts like the balance of power in Europe.

Finally, you have a New German government.

It will view any dispute about the truth of the war crimes verdicts at Nuremberg as a threat to its own legitimacy.

5. Why would anyone want to exaggerate the extent of the holocaust 50 years after the war?

Victim status.

Jews are by far the most prosperous and successful ethnic group in America. They are more prosperous than Japanese or Chinese, who rank second and third, and much more successful than European Protestants, or WASPs, who rank below Americans of Italian, Polish and Irish ancestry, and are only modestly ahead of African Americans.

Despite their status as a cultural and economic elite by any objective measure, Jews seem have a need to think of themselves as victims and to convince others that they are victims, in need of special protection.

6. Is the need for victim status on the part of an elite group rational?

In fact, many younger officers in the Israeli Army would prefer that Jews downplay the Holocaust in public, as it is dangerous to dangle in front of Arabs an image of Jews herded like sheep to slaughter.

The need for victim status is rational only if Jews feel that the rest of us cannot be trusted to live in peace with them without constant reminders of the Holocaust story to make us feel guilty.

In effect, the emphasis given to the holocaust story makes a statement about us, the non-Jews living in America.

By aggressive and constant reminders about this atrocity, the Jews are making very clear their feelings that we are brutal savages who cannot be trusted.

Thus, in order to determine whether this need for victim status is rational, one must determine whether it is also rational for Jews to make their feelings of deep mistrust known in this very public way.

## 7. Why shouldn't we just let Jews believe and say what they want about the Holocaust?

A price we pay for life in a pluralistic society, is that we must often refrain from speaking our minds and contradicting belief systems of certain groups, when speaking out would inflame the passions of the group. We refrain from speaking what we believe is the truth in order to maintain civil peace.

We exercise near total restraint when it comes to a group's beliefs in the spiritual or supernatural realm, no matter what their socio-economic status. That is why it is rude to argue with another group's religion.

However, we show less restraint when a group holds a secular belief system that has political implications.

If an economically disadvantaged group needs to cling to a version of the past that is distorted or false in order to maintain its dignity or self respect, then we may often remain silent to avoid inflaming passions.

Examples are our silence about the historical accuracy of the film "Roots", and our public silence about Dr. Martin Luther King's plagiarism of his PhD thesis and his womanizing while married. Some national myths are tolerated in the interest of civil peace.

The question is whether we should also remain silent for an economic and cultural elite with disproportionate political influence. Must we accept a distortion of history propounded by an elite?

Ultimately, the question boils down to whether the Jews are primarily motivated by a generalized sense of fear and insecurity, in which case the exaggeration of the holocaust story may be viewed in a sympathetic light, or whether their need to exaggerate the story is motivated by their mistrust of and dislike for the rest of us, in which case the exaggeration may be viewed as a public insult.

You must make your own decision.

Yggdrasill

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

Nine Views of the Meaning of the Holocaust!

\*\*\* Here they are!

Nine differing views of the meaning of the Holocaust:

Cast your vote:

1. A "Neoconservative Jewish" view.

It was a war. A war announced clearly, years in advance. A war we chose not to fight. A war we lost.

We believed that government was the agent of progress. Government could do not wrong. Our faith in government was so extreme, we believed it could produce paradise here on earth. Had we been Scots, Sicilians, Basques, Malaysian-Chinese, or Kashmiris, we would have known better.

The Holocaust is a monument to governmental barbarism.

2. An "Establishment Jewish" view.

The state of Israel is economically weak and needs aid! Western Europeans only provide aid to "victims." The Holocaust story makes us "victims." The Holocaust story is useful and must be maintained.

3. An "Early Zionist" view.

If you are going to be killed anyway why not fight! Hope my fellow Jews have learned their lesson. I have mixed emotions about defending the Holocaust story. Defending it is Ok, but let someone else pay.

4. A "Meir Kahane" view.

I hate white goyim! I especially hate German goyim. In the public mind, the Holocaust excuses my hate. (Of course, I would hate them even without the Holocaust!) Thus the

Holocaust story is useful and should be defended.

5. A "White separatist" view.

There is no necessary or logical link between expression of racial self-interest and brutality toward other races.

In the public mind, the Holocaust is used to associate any expression of white racial self-interest with murderous brutality.

Therefore, the Holocaust must be "demythologized."

6. A "White Conservative" view.

The Holocaust is just another excuse for a raid on the Treasury.

Sure wish I could oppose it without looking like a Nazi!

7. A "White Liberal" view.

I am desperately afraid of being mistaken for a working class white. (God! And I look just like them! - It's so horrible!)

By deploring the Holocaust, I set myself apart from my fellow whites.

Therefore, I need the Holocaust, much as I need "white racism."

8. A "White Supremacist" view.

What do you mean we didn't kill 6 million jews? Are you trying to make us look like incompetent wimps? Oh, - you mean it ticks-off the Heebz we missed? Well, OK, - as long as someone else does the work!

9. An "Objective Historian" view.

There are no objective historians! See above!

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Deep Cultures - Part I

In the past Jim Bowery and "Frey's Friend" (writing anonymously) refer to Jews as having a "deeper culture" than Whites. They suggest that Jews are far more powerful politically than other European groups.

Bowery and Frey's Friend have a point.

Below are some quotations from the book "Jews and American Politics" by Stephen D. Issacs, published by Doubleday in 1974.

Issacs suggests that Jews are politically active and support integrationism out of fear for their survival. He cites important research suggesting that Jews are far more suspicious, and far less trusting of others than are members of other European- American groups.

This distrust is the key to their power and influence. They constantly think past words of others to their interests and hidden agendas. If you ignore the words and concentrate on the interests and hidden agendas, you understand reality.

In contrast, our Christian institutions have taught us to be trusting of others - to assume only the best of motives - and to prepare ourselves for the Second Coming, when there will be no need for suspicion and all men will be brothers in Christ.

Two points:

- First, Christ's words and deeds do not support this vision as a prescription for survival here on earth.
- Second, there is a level at which trust equates with stupidity.

Indeed, this institutional ignorance that Christian Churches implant in their flocks has more to do with preventing questions about what happens to funds in the collection plate than it does with theology or survival. Christian institutions, just like top managements of corporations, abhor accountability.

The Jews have a very different vision and method of organizing themselves.

Theirs is centered on group survival. They teach their members to be suspicious. The rabbis

would rather be accountable to suspicious fellow Jews than to keep them stupid and risk weakening the group.

They assume that other groups are always hostile, and they are intensely suspicious of their motives.

It is an aggressive posture - one that Euro-Americans must emulate if they wish to understand how the browns, blacks and talmudists exert such disproportionate influence on our politics.

It is a point about liberals that conservatives typically have a hard time understanding.

The policies urged upon the welfare state by these liberals are slyly destroying black America far more surely than the Ku Klux Klan could ever dream possible. Abortion kills more than one black baby for each live black birth. The rate for whites is .25 to 1.

Aid to dependent children has been destroying the black family. The illegitimacy rate has risen from about 6% in 1950 to 60% nationally today. These policies have produced a class of young black male who is essentially unemployable.

The visible destruction wreaked by these policies has continued for over 40 years.

Hollywood-based cultural attacks are now beginning to have a substantial effect among Whites as well.

Now you might reasonably ask - If these high minded liberals are so concerned about blacks and the "downtrodden," then why are they destroying them?

The answer is that they are not "high minded liberals." These people have a vision of a society in which they are "safe." It is a vision, not surprisingly, calling for social welfare policies that cripple and destroy other cultures.

The crippling and destruction have been ignored for the past 40 years because either (i) it is the desired outcome, or (ii) it is irrelevant in that the policies were never intended to benefit the downtrodden, but were intended to transform society in ways that make a much less visible and much more prosperous group feel more secure.

That is why conservatives obsess about "educating the liberals," not understanding that the destructiveness of their policies is beside the point. What conservatives and gentiles need to understand is that policies espoused by groups full of fear and paranoia will always serve second agendas that are never publicly announced and are much more important to the psychic security of the proponents than the objective results of that policy for the broader society



generally.

Ideas are weapons in struggles for dominance and supremacy.

Bowery is right.

We are losing. Often, most of our Euro-American brothers do not even recognize the ongoing struggle for group survival nor understand its agendas and likely outcomes.

Yggdrasil-

\* \* \* \* \*

## Jews and American Politics

Stephen D. Isaacs

Doubleday 1974

p 140

### IX The myth of "liberalism"

#### The Jewish Voter

When analyzing the "Jewish vote," academicians tend to agree that Jews' "liberal" voting often is inimical to their own best interests and almost inevitably conclude that this voting behavior must emanate from the strong ethical tradition of Judaism. Their overwhelming attachment to progressive causes over the last four decades in America often is cited as proof per se that Jews are the most selfless voters in the American polity; that a Jew, when he steps inside a voting booth, is cloaked in a history and tradition of social justice, humanism, and charity that virtually preordain his voting posture. Jews do have a sturdy tradition of charity, love for fellow man - [141] particularly if fellow man is downtrodden, oppressed and disadvantaged. But other religious and ethnic groups have such traditions too; the humanitarian ethic is neither the invention nor the exclusive property of Jews.

Jews' distinctive voting history suggests something else: that the Jew in America may be motivated not so much by Isaiah's ancient call to "seek justice and relieve the oppressed" beating a tattoo inside his subconscious as he is the fear of a tattoo on his forearm. While sociologists have striven to trace patterns, the politicians--actually the most perceptive students of behavior in America--have known all along the core fact: the Jew is an insecure, frightened

voter. Thus those politicians who have captured the "Jewish vote" have played to Jews with hardly any effort at subtlety. As long ago as the 1870'S, Rutherford B. Hayes was protesting Russia's treatment of its Jewish citizens and making sure that Americans knew of his protests. Theodore Roosevelt did the same later. So did William Howard Taft. Perhaps the most blatantly hypocritical of such acts in those days was that committed by Secretary of State John Hay, who, at the direction of President William McKinley during the off-year congressional campaign of 1902, complained loudly to Rumania over its persecution of Jews. Hay's protest was bruited widely throughout the American Jewish community while he noted privately, "The Hebrews-- poor dears! All over he country they think we are bully boys."

For decades, many Jews have insisted that no such thing a "Jewish vote" exists. Jews, they have maintained, are like all Americans and, as such, vote on all the issues, not just "Jewish" ones. To admit otherwise would, of course, lend credence to the anti-Semites' claim that Jews in America are subversively un- American, are Jews before they are [142] Americans, before they are editors, before they are stockbrokers. So, while some Jewish agencies have persistently denied the existence of a "Jewish vote," just as persistently the politicians have pandered specifically to "Jewish" interests and issues. The pandering has been especially observable since 1948, when the state of Israel was created. Many appeals have been in the form of accusations against opposing candidates' alleged lack of zeal for Israel's defense. The tactic is employed whether or not the opposing candidate is Jewish. Unsubtle appeals to the "Jewish vote" have been most obvious in New York State, where more than two of every five Jews in America live. In 1956, for example, in Jacob Javits' first race for the United States Senate, his opponent, Robert F. Wagner-- then mayor of New York City and a Catholic--bought advertisements in Jewish newspapers that showed Wagner with the chief rabbi of Israel. Another pictured Wagner with fellow Democrat Herbert Lehman's hand on his shoulder. The Jewish Lehman had been a popular governor and senator from New York.

New York Jewish voters were bombarded by similar propaganda in 1970. In the gubernatorial race between Arthur J. Goldberg, the former Supreme Court justice, and the incumbent, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Rockefeller had a particularly delicate problem: not only was Goldberg a Jew, he had been a lifelong, ardent Zionist. Advertisements claimed that Rockefeller was "one of the staunchest supporters of the state of Israel" and always were signed by leading Jewish businessmen and community figures. One pro-Rockefeller letter, over the signature of E. J. Korvettes' Charles Bassine, was mailed to one hundred thousand Jews in "swing" voting districts.

\* \* \*

[144] The notable feature of an such appeals is that none are pitched to altruism and progressivism. They are aimed at Jews' insecurity, an insecurity that can, on occasion, make this highly educated group appear incredibly and almost pathetically gullible. Politicians know (because they are told so by the Jewish strategists they hire) that many Jews perceive Israel as

their ultimate refuge, as being synonymous with survival.

\* \* \*

[148] Just how distrustful Jews are has been calculated in a survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Center for Dr. Melvin Kohn of the National Institute of Mental Health. In this survey, Jews almost leaped off the chart in terms of their intrinsic distrust of others. That survey, reported by the center's Andrew Greeley in his book *That Most Distrustful Nation*, attempted to assess various white ethnic groups' comparable levels of distrust. The scale went from Plus 4--most trusting--to Minus 4--least trusting:

#### GROUP ORDER AND SCORE

Irish Catholic	2.506
Scandinavian Protestant	1.583
Slavic Catholic	1.481
German Protestant	0.767
German Catholic	0.757
Italian Catholic	0.502
White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant	0.242
Jewish	- 3.106

These figures might also suggest that the disparity in general outlook between Jews and non-Jews carries over into political behavior, since voting statistics of Jews compared with non-Jews show the same variant. It has been proven, too, that as other members of society advance up the educational, economic, and professional ladders, their votes become increasingly "conservative," for preserving the status quo. But as Jews move up the same ladders - and they have hurried up them faster than other groups - [149] their votes become increasingly progressive, more amenable to change.

\* \* \*

The upper class Jews are progressives because they reject what they see as a narrow, parochial route to survival--the one chosen by the more ethnic, more sequestered Jews. The "elite," which moves more in non-Jewish society than the more ethnic Jews, tends to see survival in terms of an America that is open, unauthoritarian, socially concerned. They are for civil rights, for "liberal," progressive government. In that kind of America, they reason, all Jews as members of

the society will thrive. They want a world in which all can live harmoniously, so they view an attack on blacks as an attack on their - Harmonious World, an attack on free speech as an attack on their Harmonious World. But this "liberal" stance does not mean the upper class "elite" is any less defensive any less protective of Jewish interests than the pious Hasidim with their side curls who want government aid - - their Jewish day schools. Their version of defense only sounds more polite than that of the Hasidim. That is why the pattern of Jews' voting in presidential elections is so consistently "liberal." It is in fact not so much liberal as it is anti what they fear, as is clear from the record of Jewish voting for the last half century:

#### PERCENTAGE OF JEWISH VOTE

1916	Republican (Hughes)	45
	Democrat (Wilson)	55
1920	Socialist (Debs)	38
	Republican (Harding)	43
	Democrat (Cox)	19
1924	Progressive (La Follette)	22
	Republican (Coolidge)	27
	Democrat (Davis)	51
1928	Republican (Hoover)	28
	Democrat (Smith)	72
1932	Republican (Hoover)	18
	Democrat (Roosevelt)	81
1936	Republican (Landon)	15
	Democrat (Roosevelt)	85
1940	Republican (Willkie)	10
	Democrat (Roosevelt)	90
1944	Republican (Dewey)	10
	Democrat (Roosevelt)	90
1948	Progressive (Wallace)	15
	Republican (Dewey)	10
	Democrat (Truman)	75
1952	Republican (Eisenhower)	36

	Democrat (Stevenson)	64
1956	Republican (Eisenhower)	40
	Democrat (Stevenson)	60
1960	Republican (Nixon)	18
	Democrat (Kennedy)	82
1964	Republican (Goldwater)	10
	Democrat (Johnson)	90
1968	American Independent (Wallace)	2
	Republican (Nixon)	17
	Democrat (Humphrey)	81
1972	Republican (Nixon)	35
	Democrat (McGovern)	65

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Deep Cultures - Part II

In a previous post, Deep Cultures - Part I, I reproduced some quotations from a book by Stephen Issacs arguing that "Jewish Liberalism" is a myth, and that Jews are merely voting for a vision of society in which they feel safe.

I argued that this is the reason that powerfully destructive policies are tolerated by their advocates. The effects of those policies on the direct recipients are not nearly so important as the psychic effect on the Jewish proponents of these policies.

What matters is the "statement" that such policies make about the kind of society that we are. A little destruction of non-Jews just isn't that important.

In this Part, I reprint some quotations from a very important book written by Irving Howe in 1976. It is called "World of Our Fathers," and is a comprehensive history of the arrival of Russian Jews in America from 1880 to 1920.

The purpose of the book is to teach young Jews what it means to be Jewish.

Now the parentage of this volume is unquestioned. It is modern, it is not a "forgery" and can still be found on sale at any B. Dalton's, and at WaldenBooks across the nation.

What you find, when you read this perennial seller, is that young Jews are taught to be profoundly antagonistic towards Christianity.

We find on page 182:

"Suspicion of the physical, fear of hurt, anxiety over the sheer pointlessness of play: all this went deep into the recesses of the Jewish psyche. It was a price, hardly the largest, that Jews had paid for the conviction of specialness. They could no more suppress their true feelings about the frivolities of street or gymnasium than they could deny the shudder that passed through them on walking past a church."

Now suppose that a WASP wrote a book to other WASPs suggesting that a "shudder that passed through them on walking past a [synagogue]" was a normal and desirable feeling. In fact, WASPs do not shudder when they see a synagogue.

The truth is that "pluralism" and "tolerance" are not possible in a society when one group reserves the right to teach its children to revile other religions and distrust other peoples. It is a kind of bald hypocrisy that should be publicly opposed because it has consequences.

But there is more.

Irving Howe explains the political and social significance of Lenny Bruce to young Jews on page 572:

"... Bruce did retain the power to shock, in part because he was not, like, say, Norman Mailer, good-natured beneath it all or still infatuated with high art and reputation. Bruce's Goldwater skit was a relatively mild but funny variation on Jewish delusions and gentile nightmares:

"Not many Jews feel hostility toward Goldwater because he is Jewish and changed his religion. See, all Jews did that. I'm Leonard Alfred Schneider, not Lenny Bruce. I'm Lenny Bruce legally, but it was a pain in the ass, man. A lot of dues. So dig. Goldwater lives in Arizona. He did a switch, man. He says, "Frig it. I'll keep my name and I'll change my religion." That was his bit.

"That's weird, you know? Finally we have a man in--that's going to be Goldwater's last step: gets in, gets before the T.V. cameras for the acceptance speech, and he rips off the mask and you see the big nose and the semitic look and the spittle coming out and [Goldwater screaming vindictively] "YAHAAHAAHAAAAA! WE'LL BURN ALL THE CHURCHES!"

The fact that Jews understand this joke is rather frightening. No Christian would ever guess that Jews would even fantasize about burning all the Churches. But the suggestion by Bruce that this is a normal action of the unrestrained Jewish "id" is scary because it exposes the motive force behind the drive for "tolerance," civil rights activism, and all of the other unworkable policies advocated by 80 to 90% of Jews.

But then it removes much of the mystery as to why and how such destructive political policies can remain in place year after year without change. Powerful irrational motives support them.

Continuing on page 572:

More ominous, genuinely frightening, was his skit about Christ and the Jews:

". . . you and I know what a Jew is--One Who Killed Our Lord. I don't know if we got much press on that in Illinois--we did this about two thousand years ago--two thousand years of Polack kids whacking the shit out of us coming home from

school. Dear, dear. And although there should be a statute of limitations for that crime, it seems that those who neither have the actions nor the gait of Christians, pagans or not, will bust us out, unrelenting dues, for another deuce. "And I really searched it out, why we pay the dues. Why do you keep breaking our balls for this crime?"

"Why Jew - because you skirt the issue. You blame it on the Roman Soldiers."

"Alright, I'll clear the air once and for all, and confess. Yes, we did it. I did it, my family. I found a note in my basement. It said:

'We killed him. signed, Morty.' And a lot of people say to me, "Why did you kill Christ?"

"I dunno . . . it was one of those parties, got out of hand, you know." We killed him because he didn't want to become a doctor, that's why we killed him."

For Jews, hostility and fear are tied more to Christianity than to race. That is why so much of our cultural fare from the mass media is so profoundly anti-Christian. A gentile script-writer or producer cannot produce an explicitly pro-Christian show without offending the Jews who work around him. Thus, no such entertainment is produced.

Continuing on page 633:

"There were younger Jews, brought up in a moment of relative tolerance, who grew impatient with the rooted fears of their parents and critical of those Jewish organizations which kept sounding the alarm against even the most trivial anti-Semitic incidents. Trying hard to be evenhanded, such younger Jews would say that they remembered from their youth outbursts of antigentile feeling by their parents, contempt for churches and goyim -- and why were these any better in principle than hatred of Jews by gentiles?"

There you have it! "[A]ntigentile feeling by their parents, contempt for churches and goyim." And in response to the question why such anti-gentile feelings are different when indulged by Jews, we get the classic response:

"In principle, of course, they were not. But the evenhandedness of such younger Jews almost always missed the point, as did their ridicule of Jewish "overreaction" to the threat of anti-Semitism. For behind the words they remembered having heard in their childhood - - fear and disdain of the goyim -- lay an all but endless collective experience. And those who retained a historical sense, something fairly uncommon among the American young, could understand and even sympathize with the "overreaction" of the masses of Jews."



Ethnically based Jewish hostility is justified by "all but endless collective experience." On the other hand, the racial and religious feelings of other groups are bad because they might threaten Jews.

Elegantly simple, isn't it!

Continuing on page 633, Howe suggests that the possibility of aggression by others justifies preemptive aggression by Jews:

"Not many Jews could or dared bring it to speech, but many Jews seemed persuaded that as long as Christianity survived, so must anti-Semitism. The "tradition of the curse" which Christianity had traditionally placed upon those Jews who refused to follow Jesus had become integral to the mythology of our culture, handed down from generation to generation. Joel Carmichael has vividly detailed this process:

"What makes anti-Semitism unique, and uniquely linked to Christianity as such, is the dramatic element of mystical satanism that is the only way specifically Christian thought can explain the historic existence of the Jewish people since the Crucifixion. For if the drama of Christianity is to retain its magnetism, if personal salvation via the redemptive Crucifixion, with or without the intervention of a Church, is to remain a potent symbol for the Christian masses, the Jews constitute an alien, repugnant, and profoundly indigestible element in the world.

\* \* \*

"Not many Jews could have said all this as well as Carmichael, but many of them, one hazards, shared a similar sense of things. They were held by a well-earned sense of historical realism ..."

The ideas and feelings quoted above are classic symptoms of life in the multi-racial and multi-ethnic empire. Veiled ethnic and religious hatreds from those preaching "tolerance". In the multi-racial empire, "tolerance" is always selective.

But having lived for thousands of years scattered in the "diaspora" of other cultures, Jews have naturally used those thousands of years to perfect the techniques of the veiled attack.

It is a technique that any group must master to survive amongst alien peoples.

But if the group to which you belong must be honest and straight with others, then your group had best separate itself into a separate nation, or it will not survive.

To separate from those others in peace (provided they are so inclined!) would be a blessing.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Deep Cultures - Part III - Christ the Tiger!

"In the juvenescence of the year came Christ the Tiger."

Gerontion  
T. S. Eliot

As I demonstrated in earlier posts entitled "Deep Cultures - Part I" and "Deep Cultures - Part II," the Jews have a rather powerful fear of Christianity.

Many young White Nationalists have developed a contempt for Christianity. They view it as passive, weak and ineffective. They argue that it is a "semitic religion" designed to weaken us.

They turn instead to Christian identity or paganism.

Ironically, while the Jews are frightened of Christianity, White Nationalists view it as too wimpy and passive. Who is right?

In the spirit of Easter, it is time to ask whether T.S. Eliot's poetic image is accurate. Do we really have "Christ the Tiger?"

In part, we have become the victims of our own declining literacy. Few Christians understand that all modern Jews are "Pharisees," believers in the "oral law" passed down in the Talmud.

Christ the Tiger had a few words about the Talmud and Talmudic (Halachic) reasoning.

Let's review them:

"Then Jesus said to the crowds and to his disciples,

"The teachers of the law and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat. So you must obey them and do everything they tell you. But do not do what they do, for they do not practice what they preach."

Could Christ the Tiger give a more clear warning about double dealing and saying one thing while doing another? Must Christians ignore his words?

"Woe to you teachers of the law and Pharisees, you hypocrites! You shut the kingdom of heaven in mens faces. You yourselves do not enter nor will you let those enter who are trying to."

Doesn't Christ the Tiger clearly say that the Pharisees do not enter heaven themselves and prevent the faithful from entering as well?

"Woe to you teachers of the law and Pharisees, you hypocrites! You travel over land and sea to make a single convert and when he becomes one, you make him twice as much a son of hell as you are."

Talmudic Rabbis sons of hell? - Strong words Christ!

"Woe unto you blind guides!

"You say, if anyone swears by the temple, it means nothing; but if anyone swears by the gold of the temple, he is bound by his oath! You blind fools: which is greater, the gold, or the temple that makes the gold sacred? You also say, 'if anyone swears by the altar, it means nothing; but if anyone swears by the gift on it, he is bound by his oath. You blind fools! Which is greater, the gift, or the altar that makes the gift sacred? Therefore he who swears by the altar, swears by it, and by everything on it. And he who swears by the temple, swears by it and the one who dwells in it."

Apparently Christ the Tiger doesn't like halachic logic. Probably would not like the Marxist incarnation of it either. He is telling you that Talmudic reasoning is just complexity that enhances rabbinical power and twists the commandments of God into their opposites.

"Woe to you teachers of the law and Pharisees, you hypocrites! You clean the outside of the cup and of the dish, but inside they are full of greed and self- indulgence. Blind Pharisee, first clean the inside of the cup and dish, and then the outside also will be clean.

"Woe to you teachers of the law and Pharisees, you hypocrites! You are like whitewashed tombs, which look beautiful on the outside but on the inside are full of dead men's bones and everything unclean. In the same way, on the outside you appear to people as righteous but on the inside you are full of hypocrisy and wickedness."

Again it is hard to conceive of words that more clearly command us to be on the alert for hidden agendas and double meanings. Any hint here that Christ the Tiger wants his followers to be gullible and stupid?

Would Christ the Tiger feel comfortable at a dinner meeting of the Conference of Christians and Jews?

"Woe to you teachers of the law and Pharisees, you hypocrites! You build tombs for the prophets, and decorate the graves of the righteous, And you say, 'If we had been in the days of our forefathers, we would not have taken part with them in shedding the blood of the prophets.' So you testify against yourselves that you are the descendants of those who murdered the prophets. Fill up, then, the measure of the sin of your forefathers!

"You snakes! You brood of vipers! How will you escape being condemned to hell? Therefore I am sending you prophets and wise men and teachers. Some of them you will kill and crucify; others you will flog in your synagogues and pursue from town to town. And so upon you will come all the righteous blood that has been shed on earth, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zechariah son of Berekiah, whom you murdered between the temple and the altar. I tell you the truth, all this will come upon this generation.

"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, you who kill the prophets, and stone those sent to you. How often I have longed to gather your children together, as a hen gathers her chicks under her wings, but you were not willing. Look, your house is left to you desolate. For I tell you, you will not see me again until you say 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.'"

Indeed it is hard to imagine language that more clearly un-chooses the Talmudic Jews. "You snakes! You brood of vipers! How will you escape being condemned to hell?"

It is a major rant!

Indeed Christ the Tiger spends many more words warning us away from the dangers and deceptions of Talmudic Judaism than he does of, for example, pre-marital sex.

In those bibles that print Christ the Tiger's words in red, you will see that it fills an entire page.

Most modern clergy are so busy attending banquets of the Conference of Christians and Jews that they have little taste for attending the words of Christ the Tiger. Indeed, Matthew 23 is an embarrassment to them.

I am afraid that many of you hot-heads who are turning away from Christianity are reacting to cowardly modern clergymen.

But if you look closely, you may see a Tiger lurking.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Jews, Intermarriage and Change

[originally posted to alt.revolution.counter]

In fact some Jews are every bit as aggressive and hostile toward whites as blacks. Although they do not engage in criminal violence, they do display block voting characteristics. 80% for Clinton, for example. As you mention, their cultural aggression against Christianity and non-Jewish whites has also been rather extreme.

I might also add, for the record, that I do not buy the argument that communist slaughters in the first half of the 20th century were non-racial. I firmly believe that they were racially motivated. - But of course, if you are a small minority you will not want to slaughter your entire host, and you will be scrupulously careful to conceal your racial motives behind universalisms like "equality".

But having said all that, I feel that we must look in the windshield at what is ahead, rather than looking in the rear view mirror at what is past.

We should not attack Jews as a group because of their past aggressions. The reason is simple.

As a group they are changing very rapidly. We should let that happen. We should not slow down that process by forcing them to circle the wagons in defense against us. We have nothing to gain by doing that.

Edgar Bronfman (Seagrams - Chairman of the AJC) wrote in the Wall Street Journal last week that the Jewish rate of intermarriage has now reached 70%.

No, that is not a typo - 70%.

Neoconservative Jews are defenders of Western Civilization and would be welcome in a European-American nation.

Howard Stern, the redneck Jew, is emblematic of an even more significant movement of Jews out of the psychological ghetto of fear, and into mainstream European-American popular culture. When Howard Stern berates blacks, he is not overcome by fear that turning his goyish audience against blacks might lead to discrimination against Jews as well. Forty years ago that would have been an automatic reaction among all Jews. Today, that fear seems as implausible to

most Jews as would a fear that stirring up anti-black sentiment would lead inexorably to discrimination against the Irish.

Jews in the Howard Stern/Andrew Dice Clay mold do not consider themselves threatened by other whites. Psychologically they feel that they are whites, and I see no reason to try to change their minds.

Put baldly, before you attack the Jews, you must answer the question - "Which Jews?"

And, of course, if you answer that question honestly, you will have to admit that the Jews that upset you are a moving and rapidly shrinking target. Let us wait and see what becomes of them! Pointing out the destructiveness of jewish politics and jewish hostility to Christianity is one thing, but ethnic based attacks based on the assumption that jewish hostility toward Whites is an immutable racial characteristic seems silly.

First, as Bronfman argues, the race is disappearing. Second, if we fall into the trap of assuming that obnoxious jewish political views and hostility toward Christianity are immutable racial characteristics then it is certain that our adversaries will argue that White Nationalists might spot similar flaws in other Euro-American ethnic groups, thereby disqualifying them from inclusion in the White Nation.

Stay off that slippery slope, comrades!

With modern databases and information sources, we can easily identify and deal with the offending individuals when the time comes.

The trend is your friend!

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

# YGGDRASIL

## The Jewish Plan

One would think that a minority with above average intelligence would have enough sense to adopt a "live and let live" approach to the majority group.

But no, that is not what we get at all in our multi-racial empire. Instead we get a struggle to remake and remold the majority.

It is part of the wider campaign by each new arriving group for dominance over the earlier arrivals.

Yggdrasil

-----

ISRAEL COHEN (1912)

"We must realize that our party's most powerful weapon is racial tensions. By propounding into the consciousness of the dark races that for centuries they have been oppressed by whites, we can mold them to the program of the Communist Party. In America we will aim for subtle victory. While inflaming the Negro minority against the whites, we will endeavor to instill in the whites a guilt complex for their exploitation of the Negroes. We will aid the Negroes to rise in prominence in every walk of life, in the professions and in the world of sports and entertainment. With this prestige, the Negro will be able to intermarry with the whites and begin a process which will deliver America to our cause."

Israel Cohen, A Racial Program for the Twentieth Century, 1912. Also in the Congressional Record, Vol. 103, p. 8559, June 7, 1957

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## The Censorious Impulse

After innumerable battles with the net censors who complain and block access to anonymous remailers, I decided to open an account in Yggdrasil's name and post directly from it.

What the hell! Life is short, right!

But along the way, I had an interesting experience with - of all things - another net censor!

I signed up for a PPP account with IDT (International Discount Telecommunications). Their adds loudly ask: "Why go with the major online services when they control what you see and what you read? With IDT, you get access to the entire internet."

Well, not exactly!

They block access to alt.skinheads, alt.revisionism, alt.politics.nationalism.white, and alt.politics.white.power.

That is not exactly the entire internet.

Even more curious, their web browser software served up a pre-selected list of suggested newsgroups for beginners. It was loaded with porn-picture groups. The first ones up were kiddie and teen specials.

To you and I, "free speech" means that any one may say or print anything he pleases. But to our East Coast liberals it means something entirely different.

How can I put this delicately?

Lets just say that for our East Coast elites, the real definition of "free speech" reads something like this:

"Free speech means that you can say anything that conflicts with Christian values, is designed to weaken Western Civilization, and is inimical to the interests of European-Americans as a race. Since overt public professions of fundamental Christian faith are inherently anti-semitic, and since defense of the West, or arguments favoring European-

American racial interests, are ultimately intended to confer power on those who wish to censor and repress the liberal and enlightened elements of our society, all such messages must themselves be preemptorily censored and repressed."

Halachic logic admittedly, but an accurate reflection of the reality under which we all live.

Ironically, most Federal Judges now on the bench attended law school at a time when SDS (children of the East Coast elite who believed that communism was sexy) and the Berkeley "free speech" riots were in full flower. Back then, militias, the internet and white nationalism did not exist. There was nothing on the right to censor. So the halachic double meaning was left out, and the dumb goy lawyers were allowed (unwisely, as it turns out) to learn that "free speech" should be construed in accordance with its "plain meaning."

But not to worry. Law students nowadays are busy crafting speech and "harassment" codes for their universities and suppressing speech with a vengeance. No need to teach them the new halachic construction of "free speech." Much safer to just set them to work authoring the harassment codes. Then their ambitions will cause them to internalize and act on the meaning without ever having to verbalize it on the conscious level.

Regardless of ethnic origin, in 20 years our federal judges will understand perfectly that any public profession of faith that offends Jewish sensibilities, and any motivational defense of Western Civilization or public identification of the collective interests of European-Americans that offends blacks and browns is "harassment" and must be suppressed.

Laws are tools of convenience and control in the hands of our liberal elites.

With that in mind, I thought it might be a good idea to catalogue all of the net censorship that readers of this group might have encountered. Is this practice widespread? At the universities? Among commercial access providers?

If your university blocks access to newsgroups or web-sites, post a reply. If you know of a commercial provider who blocks access post as well. Let's stir up some of that many-to-many communication that allows us to monitor the establishment!

Yggdrasil

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Culture Wars - The "Grinch"

Since it is the Christmas season, it is time to explore a cultural icon and examine its significance - its "real message."

I am talking now about a modern tale that is broadcast over and over to our children and has come to define the meaning of Christmas for most of America.

It is the famous story entitled "How the Grinch Stole Christmas" by Dr. Seuss (Theodor Geisel). But more important than the storybook is the animated movie produced by Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc. in 1966. It is narrated by Boris Karloff.

A full generation of Americans has grown up on it.

So the question is; what is the real message of this short animated feature.

The movie opens on the small village of "Whoville" and shows in fulsome detail the lavish material trappings of their christmas celebration.

While one must stretch to believe that a small peasant village could indulge such opulent gift giving, feasting and celebration, the oddity of such impulsive economic behavior is overshadowed by the villainous Grinch.

After our introduction to the material goodies of the village, the "pantookas" and "roast beast," the narrator explains that the Grinch wants to stop christmas from coming and so steals all the gifts, ornaments and food.

With all of the material trappings stolen and moved up the mountain, The Grinch learns a lesson that all of us should ponder. He learns that despite the crass materialism of the village, they are happy even without the goodies. So - no point in taking them away. These folks have tons of spirituality! So much spirituality that hardship holds no lessons for them. Might as well just give all of the material goodies back!

And the Grinch does just that!

The real message of the movie is that anyone who might try to enhance the spirituality of the holiday by taking away the lavish spending and gift giving doesn't understand its true spiritual

meaning!

Take that, you fundamentalist preachers!

How dare you try to convince your flocks to boycott Halloween and stay away from the stores at Christmas! Anyone who does that is just a mean spirited Grinch who doesn't understand the true spiritual meaning of these holidays!

The animated video is a classic of 20th Century U.S. propaganda, and speaks to the very core of the economic interests of our liberal elites.

It is a classic of Leninist, east European logic, where words come to mean their opposite. Those who argue against the materialism of the holidays are mean spirited Grinches, while those who encourage impulse spending and fight to free humanity from its material restraints with unlimited plastic understand spirituality.

It is the ultimate triumph of secularized halachic logic, in which the meaning of Christian culture gets redefined into something more comfortable and comforting to the diamond cutters of Brooklyn and the hordes of retail merchants dependent upon the materialism of Christian holidays for their sustenance. To them, any attempt to strip materialism from Christmas looks like a mean-spirited anti-semitic attack.

Good Christians that we are, we yield, because we wouldn't want to appear rude or divisive. So we obediently show this little animated vignette to our children each year and fail utterly to banish it to the Museum of Tolerance, or some other musty shrine to propaganda pieces that fail the test of commercial acceptance.

And, of course, the big name brand advertisers love it! They sign up in droves to sponsor its rebroadcast each year.

Our clergy cower before the seasonal gods of plastic indulgence, too timid to defend the words of a man hounded unto his death by Pharisees of old against the continued attacks of their modern descendants seeking to kill him yet again by obliterating his meaning:

"Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal.

"But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal.

"For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also."

May the true spirit of Christmas be with you!

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## SIGNIFICANCE OF THE NON-EXISTENT CHAMBERS

Many casual readers of this newsgroup ask "why all the fuss?"

Who cares if the accounts of gassings in Germany 50 years ago were not perfectly accurate?

There is a simple answer.

After the war, Germans were put to death for gassing inmates at camps where all now admit gassings never occurred.

Years after the show trials and retribution ended, people who attempted to set the record straight lost their jobs, were imprisoned, and have been assaulted and had their businesses burned.

The question of motive is important. If the Germans intended merely to move their Jewish population to some other land (following a stint at hard labor), then their behavior is no worse (and in many cases, much better) than the behavior of dozens of other peoples in the Twentieth Century who have attempted the same enterprise. The fact that many thousands died of disease and from starvation in the final months of the war, becomes, while tragic, understandable. After all, would Americans of Japanese ancestry interned by our liberals during the same war have met a more gentle fate if the Emperor's forces had captured California in 1944?

The false accusations of gas chambers in locations where none existed expose the murderous side of liberalism.

The falsehoods show clearly that beneath the manipulative masks of "compassion" and "caring", lies a brutality, lust for power and concealed ethnic hatreds that liberals do not want you to see.

That is what the revisionist fuss is all about.

Recently we have seen how some bizarre sexual practices within a Texas religious cult in Waco became an excuse for a tank assault and mass death by fire. The leader of the cult could easily have been arrested, and the slaughter avoided, on any one of his regular trips to the local grocery store.

We saw how a warrant for failure to appear on a misdemeanor charge is transformed into an

armed assault on a family living in harmless social isolation in Ruby Ridge, Idaho. The marginally literate offender appeared on the wrong date typed on his summons by a clerk and decided not to appear again. The local sheriff could have straightened out the misunderstanding and brought him in easily. Instead, federal marshals and FBI snipers rewrote the "rules of engagement" for this special occasion, and shot his 14 year old son and his wife. In each case, the liberal establishment portrays the objects of these armed slaughters as social undesirables. Because they are Christian fundamentalists with anti-egalitarian views, the government is free to treat them like wild animals and kill them wantonly, cutting off the normal procedures for a fair factual examination of their alleged wrongdoing.

Our liberal elites roundly approve.

The press and the media did their usual artful job of stirring up prejudice among the middle class and of procuring social acceptance for these slaughters of undesirables with images of a cult leader having sex with children, in one case, and of white separatist political beliefs, in the other.

Civilized countries are supposed to maintain dispassionate forums that isolate emotion and prejudice when finding the facts of guilt or innocence. However, our liberal elites reserve the right to apply the extra-judicial process of the sniper and the battle tank to fundamentalist Christians, anti-egalitarians and other political undesirables with politically incorrect ideas.

Liberals applied the same techniques 50 years ago following the Second World War, but on a broader scale.

50 years ago, German prison guards were machine gunned to death by American troops for gassing inmates at camps where no gas chambers ever existed.

Camp commandants were tried at Nuremburg, convicted and then hung or jailed for running gas chambers based on testimonies conceded by all 30 years later to be false.

More recently, we have the spectacle of dozens of impassioned witnesses in an Israeli court pointing at John Demjanjuk and identifying him as "Ivan the Terrible" of Treblinka, when documents from newly opened Russia demonstrated that Demjanjuk was not Ivan and was never stationed at Treblinka. (Demjanjuk was also 2 inches shorter than Ivan.)

One may be tempted to dismiss the inaccuracies as a natural byproduct of the urge for retribution by members of the ethnic group rounded up for deportation.

But much more is at stake here.



In a century when all of humanity was been breaking the bonds of colonialism and asserting the right to establish their own ethnic states and racial nations, the liberal power structure has come under profound threat.

As competing sources of raw materials multiplied during the 20th Century, it became tolerable for peoples outside of Europe and North America to liberate themselves from boundaries of states drawn without regard to ethnic and racial identity. However, with the value of knowledge and technology as inputs to the industrial process increasing, any extension of the same principle to the European race is profoundly threatening to the liberal order.

The real power in our world comes from control of peoples in advanced industrial economies.

The false gas chamber allegations were an essential prop for the creation of a new secular myth that makes any effort by European peoples to establish an ethnic or racial state "uniquely evil."

Billions of dollars have been spent propagating the message that any racially based movement for self-determination among whites must lead to "homicidal gas chambers." In the eyes of our murderous liberal elites, the lives of a few German guards and officers, like the lives of the Weavers, were well spent in a worthwhile endeavor.

And why, exactly, is this socialist enslavement so important to preserve? - Because liberals are free to import non-whites without protest, drive down the price of labor temporarily, identify new social problems caused by the "discriminatory outcomes" for non-whites and then increase taxes on the productive to solve the problem.

They also have the right to elevate final consumer demand through mass advertising free of any practical effects from the anti- materialist ideals of traditional religions or the anti- materialist values of racial independence movements.

Of the two opponents of the consumerist liberal enterprise, traditional religions can be tolerated. Racial and ethnic nationalism cannot.

For if you examine the record of the latter half of the twentieth century, you will quickly realize that there is only one force actually capable of reconfiguring borders, governments and tax burdens all at the same time. Traditional religions cannot accomplish such a task.

In the latter half of the Twentieth Century, our liberal elites have been forced by circumstance to apply such a blatant double standard to ordinary people of European ancestry that the truth is beginning to bubble to the surface.

Few people of European Ancestry would have drawn any parallels from the ethnic self-

determination movements sweeping the rest of the world if they had not been burdened by domestic racial preferences. The liberal establishment was forced to grant racial preferences to non-whites living within Europe and North America as the price of buying their votes.

It is the broad recognition that domestic racial preferences for non-Europeans impose real costs that creates a new feedback loop in which those bearing that cost re-examine society's taboos.

Do multi-racial empires anywhere actually work?

Is the integrationist moral paradigm motivated by self interest?

Is the integrationist moral paradigm part of a campaign to convince a once great people that the meaning of life really is wearing Levi's jeans and drinking Coke?

Must all European or Euro-American ethnic or race-based independence movements be "uniquely evil," as we have been taught?

Has European history of 50 years ago been distorted to deny Europeans freedom as the rest of humanity defines freedom?

Does the liberal elite have an intense interest in the images of slaughter from Bosnia while hoping you forget about the peace and prosperity in the newly created Czech and Slovak republics nearby?

A very small voice hidden among the branches of that mythic Nordic Tree of Life suggests that it might be time for free inquiry.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Hey Israelis, Show us Your Guns!

Interesting article in the Feb. 27, 1996 Edition of the Los Angeles Times, Page 1.

Apparently an Arab-American ran his car into a bus stop killing one Israeli and injuring 15 Jews and 8 Arabs.

"Police said skid marks left by Hamida's (the driver's) rented Fiat Uno showed he tried to brake before plowing into a bus stop in northern Jerusalem on the rain-slicked main road to the West Bank town of Ramalah."

The bystanders thought he (the driver) was a terrorist," police spokesman Eric Bar-Chen told reporters at the scene... The people innocently thought that it was a terrorist attack. They shot him and killed him."

"Many Israelis are licensed to carry arms, and Israel Radio appealed to people Monday to be cautious before opening fire."

Now ain't that interesting!

Senator Dianne Feinstein, the Democratic spearhead for handgun confiscation in America, says that she "feels unsafe" with Americans owning guns. And, indeed, in those states in which her co-religionists are most numerous, it is either illegal to own a gun (New York) or impossible to get a permit to carry one (California). But neither she, nor her co-religionists feels uncomfortable with Israelis packing handguns.

The difference, of course, is pure ethnic hatred - that is - hatred by 80% of Jews toward American whites. One set of rules for us, and another entirely different set for them - all based, in old fashioned Talmudic tradition - on who you are.

The question that each Euro-American must ask when they read this sort of news article is "do I have the same rights as Jews, or do I have lesser rights?"

Why should any Euro-American "feel safe" in a world in which only Israelis and their hireling police forces in the U.S. have guns? Sounds like a prescription for second class citizenship to me!

But even worse, what do the above quotations say about Israeli law?

Suppose that an American black skidded on a rainy street into a crowd of pedestrians, killing one and wounding 23 others. What would happen if white bystanders drew their guns and killed the motorist?

The gunmen would be charged with murder and hate crimes. However, it is perfectly OK for an Israeli Jew to kill the driver of a car that strikes pedestrians based on a superficial examination of the driver's racial identity!

In Israel, the police believe that the bystanders "innocently thought that it was a terrorist attack."

The Israeli media thinks it is ok to shoot possible terrorists as long as the gun-packing civilians doing the shooting are "cautious" before opening fire - presumably to avoid hitting other Jews.

In the United States, blacks violently assault whites 7.5 times more often than whites assault blacks (762,000 to 102,000, according to the latest BOJ statistics.) Corrected for their percent of the population, it is 49 times more likely that an individual black will assault a white than it is for a white to assault a black.

It is at least as probable that a black motorist striking white pedestrians in the U.S. is engaged in a racially motivated assault as it is for an Arab motorist striking Israeli pedestrians to be engaged in a terrorist act. In civilized countries, motorists get a chance to explain themselves. They are not shot by bystanders who the police then describe as "innocent".

The behavior described in the Article above is an absolute outrage, and people must begin to say so, loudly and in public.

Either Euro-Americans should be given the same rights of racial self-defense as Israelis, or the Jews who support Israel but work at the same time in the U.S. to deny us those rights should be silenced politically.

The worst outrage is that our Euro-American politicians routinely condone this double standard, and refuse to condemn the racism of approximately 80% of American Jews who argue one set of rules for Jews and another for the rest of us.

Yggdrasil

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

## YGGDRASIL

### Hey Israelis! Show Us Your Guns Again!

Now isn't this special!

The Mar. 23, 1996 edition of the Los Angeles Times, page A1, reports that the Arab residents of Israel are feeling the heat from the recent terrorist attacks:

JAFFA, Israel-The day after a suicide bomber blew himself up outside a Tel Aviv mall, bringing the nine-day death toll from Hamas terrorism to 62, Palestinian graduate student Farid Hamdan made the mistake of saying "good morning" to a Jewish acquaintance at Tel Aviv University. "There's nothing good about it," the woman snapped. "You see what you people have done?"

A few days later, several of Hamdan's students at Jaffa High School No. 12 had a similar encounter while waiting to see President Clinton in Tel Aviv. A young Israeli heard the group of 16-year-olds chatting in Arabic and hissed, "We will kill Clinton and we will kill you too."

Notice the clear us-them reaction on the part of the typical Israeli. People belong to groups and are presumed responsible for the attacks of other members of the group. No surprise to regular readers of this newsgroup.

But the inexplicable quote is the "hissed" statement about killing Clinton. Slick Willie made the trip to give Israel \$100 million in extra funds on account of the terrorist attacks.

So why would an Israeli want to kill him?

Not enough tribute?

Rather surprising that an L.A. Times reporter would print this stuff raw and in public.

But not to fear: "Goyim only read the sports page."

So go ahead, Israelis; show us your guns! Let the hate come out for all to see!

Yggdrasil-

\*\*\*\*\*

[Mar. 23, 1996 Los Angeles Times p A1]

## Arabs in Israel Are Now Wary

Many believed accords would end conflict between their state and their people. But backlash after bombings has revived old tensions.

By MARJORIE MILLER TIMES STAFF WRITER

JAFFA, Israel-

The day after a suicide bomber blew himself up outside a Tel Aviv mall, bringing the nine-day death toll from Hamas terrorism to 62, Palestinian graduate student Farid Hamdan made the mistake of saying "good morning" to a Jewish acquaintance at Tel Aviv University.

"There's nothing good about it," the woman snapped. "You see what you people have done? "

A few days later, several of Hamdan's students at Jaffa High School No. 12 had a similar encounter while waiting to see President Clinton in Tel Aviv. A young Israeli heard the group of 16-year-olds chatting in Arabic and hissed, "We will kill Clinton and we will kill you too."

Ashouag Khouny, who had gone to the meeting to express her sorrow over the bombings, was stunned.

"I wanted to say that we are not guilty," the 11th-grader said. "But I was a little afraid he meant it, so I didn't say anything."

For Israel's 800,000 or so Arab citizens, the deadly spate of suicide bombings by Islamic fundamentalists has been a double blow. Because three Palestinians were among those killed in the bombings in the past month, the blasts have sown fear among Arab commuters as well as among Jews.

On top of that, Palestinians in Israel say the bombings have dealt a dramatic setback to their hopes for gaining equal rights. Once again, they say, they are being blamed for the carnage carried out by a small group of Palestinian fanatics from the West Bank and Gaza Strip, and they have been subjected to a barrage of verbal and physical abuse.

In the face of such hostility, Arab Israelis are lying low. Some say they try not to "look . . ."

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

# YGGDRASIL

## OCCUPIED AMERICA - Part I - SAYANIM!

I dimly recall quite a fuss back in 1959 (I was quite young then) about Jack Kennedy and the question of "dual loyalty". The media declared loudly and publicly that many people questioned whether Kennedy owed his first allegiance to the United States, or to the Vatican.

Even at the tender age of 12, this descendant of Cromwell's round-heads thought concern about loyalty to the Pope a bit overblown.

The Pope seemed a "lord spiritual" in every respect, lacking any of the normal appurtenances of a "lord temporal", such as a standing army. Indeed, if one listened to the Pope or any of his Bishops, it was awfully hard to discern any worldly objective which a president of that faith might entertain that conflict with the worldly interests of the United States.

After all, the Vatican did not receive \$5 billions per year in aid from the U.S. Treasury.

Indeed, it was hard to understand why a Catholic should be treated differently from a Methodist or Presbyterian. Kennedy's religion (or lack thereof) seemed far more relevant to the question of his character and the kinds of moral values that might weigh in his decisions. The temporal interests of Rome seemed a bit distant.

Further, conspiracies cannot be concealed for long, and there was no hard evidence of any such thing by the Catholic Church.

Not so with the Jews!

There clearly is at least one international conspiracy, and it is run directly by the State of Israel.

Here is a short quote from the book "By Way of Deception" by Victor Ostrovsky (St. Martin's, 1990), formerly a Colonel in the Israeli intelligence service "Mossad."

Beginning on page 86:

"The next day Ran S. delivered a lecture on the sayanim, a unique and important part of the Mossad's operation. Sayanim - assistants - must be 100 percent Jewish. They live abroad, and though they are not Israeli citizens, many are reached through their relatives in Israel. An Israeli with a relative in England, for example, might be asked to write a

letter saying the person bearing the letter represents an organization whose main goal is to help save Jewish people in the diaspora. Could the British relative help in any way?

"There are thousands of sayanim around the world. In London alone, there are about 2,000 who are active, and another 5,000 on the list. They fulfill many different roles. A car sayan, for example, running a rental agency, could help the Mossad rent a car without having to complete the usual documentation. An apartment sayan would find accommodation without raising suspicions, a bank sayan could get you money if you needed it in the middle of the night, a doctor sayan would treat a bullet wound without reporting it to the police, and so on. The idea is to have a pool of people available when needed who can provide services but will keep quiet about them out of loyalty to the cause. They are paid only costs."

Continuing on page 87

"Suppose during an operation a katsa suddenly had to come up with an electronics store as a cover. A call to a sayan in that business could bring 50 television sets, 200 VCRs - whatever was needed - from his warehouse to your building, and in next to no time, you'd have a store with \$3 or \$4 million worth of stock in it."

"Since most Mossad activity is in Europe, it may be preferable to have a business address in North America. So, there are address sayanim and telephone sayanim. If a katsa has to give out an address or a phone number, he can use the sayan's. And if the sayan gets a letter or a phone call, he will know immediately how to proceed. Some business sayanim have a bank of 20 operators answering phones, typing letters, faxing messages, all a front for the Mossad."

And on page 88:

"Katsas in the stations are in charge of the sayanim, and most active sayanim will be visited by a katsa once every three months or so, which for the katsa usually means between two and four face-to-face meetings a day with sayanim, along with numerous telephone conversations. The system allows the Mossad to work with a skeleton staff. That's why, for example, a KGB station would employ about 100 people, while a comparable Mossad station would need only six or seven."

On page 221, Ostrovsky gives an example of what a Sayan can be expected to do for Israel's Mossad:

"The Mossad already had considerable information about the Exocet, thanks in part to a sayan who worked at Aerospatiale and had passed along details. They had also

conducted a small operation, sending a team to break into the plant accompanied by a missile expert flown in from Israel for the occasion. He was taken into the plant "with handles," and materials brought to him for his expert opinion. His task was to determine what they should photograph. The team spent four and a half hours inside the plant before leaving without a trace."

It is a crime, a felony, for a civilian to participate in spying operations in this manner.

Israel's Mossad is exposing tens of thousands of Jews around the world to considerable legal risk, and the sayanim, being sophisticated business people, surely know this. If that is so, then why does this system work? Why is the risk acceptable?

Here is Ostrovsky's answer from Page 87:

"One thing you know for sure is that even if a Jewish person knows it is the Mossad, he might not agree to work with you-but he won't turn you in. You have at your disposal a non-risk recruitment system that actually gives you a pool of millions of Jewish people to tap from outside your own borders. It's much easier to operate with what is available on the spot, and sayanim offer incredible practical support everywhere."

Now one might suggest that, for example, Great Britain could use a similar system and recruit among WASPS around the world. But they don't, because they can't. It takes an extraordinary degree of racial solidarity and racial motivation for such a "non-risk recruitment system" to work properly. Remember, all of these activities are spying, with long prison terms if caught. Americans of English, Irish and Italian ancestry may have some residual loyalties to the old "mother country." But this residue is nothing like the racial solidarity of the Jews. Such racial feelings are so strong and so pervasive among Jews that the Mossad knew in advance that their recruitment system was "non-risk." Britain, Ireland, Italy and the Vatican know better than to try.

While it may be true that Americans of English, Irish and Italian ancestry have dual loyalties, these white gentile dual loyalties are nothing like the degree of race-based loyalty possessed by the overwhelming majority of Jews. You have it on the authority of Mossad!

Ostrovsky explains, beginning at the bottom of page 122:

"We took the Brits seriously, but everyone in the building used to say they were probably deluded because of "the Bitch." That's what they always called Margaret Thatcher inside the Mossad. They had her tagged as an anti-Semite. There was one simple question asked when anything happened: "Is it good for the Jews or not?" Forget about policies, or anything else. That was the only thing that counted, and depending on

the answer, people were called anti-Semites, whether deservedly or not."

The problem is that Jews do not have dual loyalties!

90% of Jews have a single loyalty. The loyalty is not necessarily to Israel, but to the welfare and power of Jews generally. That is the only thing that matters. The only question that ever gets asked is; "How will this affect Jews?" No other interests are taken into account at all!

Indeed a corollary of "dual loyalty" is the goyish notion that if you sacrifice to help others, they will reciprocate. If someone helps Jews, there should be a reward.

European gentiles assume that comity and reciprocity are inherent in the psychological makeup of all humanity. Not so, according to Ostrovsky (page 231):

"The relationship between the Mossad and Danish intelligence is so intimate as to be indecent. But it's not the Mossad's virtue that is compromised by the arrangement; it's Denmark's. And that's because the Danish are under the mistaken impression that because they saved a lot of Jews in World War II, the Israelis are grateful and they can trust the Mossad."

No matter what you do for Jews and no matter how assiduously you toady to their interests, they will never respect yours.

That explains why destructive welfare state policies thrive despite 40 years of soaring black illegitimacy rates and the deepening destruction of the black family and community in America. Does the policy harm blacks! Of course! But that is irrelevant. Welfare dependence has created a block that votes 90% for candidates friendly to the welfare state and to Israel. Would blacks be better off as tradesmen and entrepreneurs with stable families? Of course, but then there would be no easy way to control their votes. The hopeless dependency of most blacks increases the political power of Jews. That is why the policy continues.

There is no comity, reciprocity or sense of obligation (dual loyalty) that causes Jews to moderate their attack on America's blacks. Now you might ask why Clinton, the "best friend Israel has ever had at the White House", would sign welfare reform. The answer is the same. The white illegitimacy rate has reached 25%. Millions of white girls in suburban and rural areas are going on AFDC while their skin-head boyfriends camp with them at night. There is no way our masters are going to use the tax dollars at their disposal to finance the creation of Dr. Pierce's 10 million man army 20 years from now!

It is one thing to fool 40% of Euro-Americans who have jobs and pay taxes into believing they can get something out of the system. It is quite another to subsidize the creation of a dangerous

subculture with real dollars. Jews just don't make those kinds of mistakes. Ways can be found within the bureaucracy to continue welfare to blacks. Hence Hillary Clinton's campaign to "fix" welfare reform.

A classic illustration of this phenomenon comes from a book entitled "Special Tasks" (Little-Brown, 1994, 1995) written by Pavel Sudoplatov and his son Anatoly.

Lieutenant General Pavel Sudoplatov was Joseph Stalin's NKVD director in charge of stealing atomic secrets. He reported directly to Beria.

From page 172:

"The most vital information for developing the first Soviet atomic bomb came from scientists engaged in the Manhattan Project to build the American Atomic Bomb - Robert Oppenheimer, Enrico Fermi, and Leo Szilard."

Robert Oppenheimer was the director in charge of the Manhattan project.

From page 186-87:

"When it became clear that the atomic project was a heavily guarded, top-secret American priority, Eitingon and I suggested that we use our networks of illegals as couriers for our sources of information. Vassili Zarubin, our Washington resident, instructed Kheifetz to divorce all intelligence operations from the American Communist party, which we knew would be closely watched by the FBI, and to have Oppenheimer sever all contacts with Communists and left-wingers."

On page 188:

"In 1943, a world-famous actor of the Moscow Yiddish State Art Theatre, Solomon Mikhoels, together with well-known yiddish poet Itzik Feffer, toured the United States on behalf of the Jewish Antifascist Committee. Before their departure, Beria instructed Mikhoels and Feffer to emphasize the great Jewish contribution to science and culture in the Soviet Union. Their assignment was to raise money and convince American public opinion that Soviet anti-semitism had been crushed as a result of Stalin's policies. Kheifetz made sure that the message they brought was conveyed to Oppenheimer. Kheifetz said that Oppenheimer, the son of a German-Jewish immigrant, was deeply moved by the information that a secure place for Jews in the Soviet Union was guaranteed. They discussed Stalin's plans to set up a Jewish autonomous republic in the Crimea after the war was won against facism."

Beria understood the psychology of unitary loyalty perfectly!

Continuing on page 189:

"In developing Oppenheimer as a source, Vassili Zarubin's wife, Elizabeth, was essential. She hardly appeared foreign in the United States. Her manner was so natural and sociable that she immediately made friends. Slim, with dark eyes, she had the classic Semitic beauty that attracted both men and women, and she was one of the most successful agent recruiters, establishing her own illegal network of Jewish refugees from Poland, and recruiting one of Szilard's secretaries, who provided technical data."

Oppenheimer's rationale was "fear that the Germans might produce the first atomic bomb." But all he had to do to beat the Germans to the punch was to build the bomb for America. And indeed, that would have been the natural result of "dual loyalties." He could have helped Jews and remained loyal to America at the same time.

But then helping America was not in the calculus at all. As Beria understood perfectly, he was concerned only with one unitary question; "How does this affect Jews?" And the answer was that just as organizing the blacks and browns to vote their antagonistic racial interests is critical to maintaining Jewish power over whites in the 1990's, giving the atomic secrets to Russia was the one way to reduce the power of whites in America in the 1940s and 50s. Oppenheimer's naive view (prior to the creation of the Israeli State) was that a nuclear armed Russia would provide one more possible haven for Jews with the power to protect them.

The goyim in our OSS (the forerunner of the CIA) would have assumed "dual loyalty" and concluded that Oppenheimer presented no security risk.

They were dead wrong, as Beria clearly understood.

So now the question becomes: - How many sayanim does it take to "occupy America"?

Is Madeline [Kerbel] Albright (nominee for Secretary of State) a Sayan?

Is William Cohen (nominee for Secretary of Defense) a Sayan?

Is William Berger (nominee for National Security Agency chief) a Sayan?

Is Anthony Lake (nominee to head CIA) a Sayan?

Is Robert Rubin (secretary of Treasury) a Sayan?

Is Alan Greenspan (chairman of the Federal Reserve) a Sayan?

Are these reasonable questions to ask?

In truth, of course, it is somewhat unlikely that these people, by far the most powerful group in the United States, would agree to spend their time schlepping TV sets for Mossad, or divulging secrets. They can do far more to serve Jewish interests by guiding U.S. economic, diplomatic and defense policies to serve Israel and Jewish interests than they ever could through risky behaviors like divulging classified data.

In fact, these people are in a far better position to put pressure on Israel than Israel is to put pressure them.

Are the people named above capable of articulating U.S. interests (as opposed to Jewish interests) on an intellectual level?

Of course! Quite skillfully, in fact!

Are they capable of acting upon those interests (our interests)?

That is a much tougher question. For a majority, it appears that the answer is clearly "no" if Jewish interests might also be involved. The psychological and emotional ties within the group are so strong, and they are so powerfully alienated from the white gentile majority that their decisions and actions will never match their words. Just as Oppenheimer's actions failed to square with his words.

Clinton's cabinet and the media moguls who control him are likely to have their own strong views on the question "Is it good for Jews, or not?" And they are not likely to take orders from Israel. Does that mean there is no "conspiracy"?

Other than the publicly documented spying and extortion operations run by the State of Israel, there probably isn't one. Rather, what we have is an obsessive concern for the interests of Jews and a psychological inability to represent the interests of others that is shared by such an overwhelming majority of Jews, that their uncoordinated actions appear pre-planned.

Colonel Ostrovsky notes in "By way of Deception" that Israel and its supporters have a concept of the relation between media and government that is powerfully at odds with our own Anglo-Saxon tradition that inspired the First Amendment.

From page 290:

"As usual in these affairs, the journalism fraternity in Israel knew about the operation all along-or at least, they knew what the Mossad and the prime minister's office wanted them to know - but they agreed to withhold the story until they were given leave to print it. There is a committee of editors, called the Vaudat Orchim, of all the major media outlets in Israel that meets regularly with government officials for background briefing on current events. Israeli television is government controlled, as is all but one rogue radio station, so that broadcasting is never a problem to control."

The Jewish - SDS flirtation with "free speech" at Berkeley in the 1960's was a temporary romance of convenience. Culturally, they are more comfortable with a "Vaudat Orchim" and controlled news.

Is Laurence Tisch (CEO of CBS,) a Sayan? Vaudat Orchim?

Is Robert Sarnoff (RCA and NBC) a Sayan? Vaudat Orchim?

How about Jeff Zuker (executive producer of NBC Nightly news)?

Is Jeff Sagansky (head of CBS entertainment division) a Sayan? A member of a Vaudat Orchim?

Is Stuart Bloomberg (head of entertainment programming at ABC) a Sayan? How about Vaudat Orchim?

Is Brandon Tartikoff (Paramount Pictures) a Sayan? Vaudat Orchim?

Is Gerald Levin (Time Warner Communications) a Sayan? Perhaps part of a Vaudat Orchim?

Is Michael D. Eisner (Walt Disney Co.) a Sayan? Or a Vaudat Orchim member?

Is Martin S. Davis (Paramount Communications) a Sayan? Or a Vaudat Orchim, perhaps?

Is Peter Chernin (20th Century Fox Film Corp.) a Sayan? Vaudat Orchim?

How about Sandy Grushow (Fox Entertainment)? Sayan? Vaudat Orchim?

Is Peter Guber (Columbia Pictures Entertainment) a Sayan? Vaudat Orchim?

Is Sumner Redstone [Murray Rothstein] (Viacom, MTV, Nickelodeon) a Sayan? A



Vaudat Orchim?

Is Lew Wasserman (MCA Inc.) a Sayan? Vaudat Orchim?

Is Ron Nessen (MBS radio news) a Sayan? - or a Vaudat Orchim?

How about Samuel and Donald Newhouse (31 newspapers, 12 broadcast stations, 87 cable systems, Parade, New Yorker, Vogue, Mademoiselle, Glamour, Vanity Fair, Bride's, Gentlemen's Quarterly, Self, House & Garden, etc.)?

Sayanim?

Is Arthur Ochs Sulzberger (New York Times, 33 additional papers, 7 radio and TV broadcasters a cable company and three book publishers) a Sayan? A Vaudat Orchim?

Is Katherine Meyer Graham (Washington Post, Newsweek) a Sayan? A Vaudat Orchim?

Is Peter Kann (Dow Jones & Co, Wall Street journal) a Sayan? A Vaudat Orchim?

How about Mortimer B. Zuckerman (New York Daily News, U.S. News & World Report, Atlantic Monthly)?

Sayan? Vaudat Orchim?

Do these people, and dozens more in similar positions meet to discuss how to manage the news? Again, the truth is probably not. Why?

Simple. They already know what messages must be censored and what events are newsworthy. They already know what to cover and what to leave on the cutting room floor. Except on rarest occasions, they do not need to be told what to do.

Each of these men will have his own passionately held convictions about what kinds of news and entertainment for goyim will best serve Jewish interests. These are not the type of men who would obediently follow instructions from Isreal. But then the deep racial paranoia and the intense loathing of Christianity that is taught to most Jews as children at the dinner table ensures that many Jews will pursue careers in media (such careers are "good for Jews") and will know what to do when they get to the top of a network. They generally do not need to be told!

And that, gentlemen, is the significance of "unitary racial loyalty" that exists among 90% of this world's Jews.

Pat Buchanan once referred to Capitol Hill as "Israeli Occupied Territory."

Can we justifiably say that we live in "Occupied America?"

No need to make up your minds yet. Might as well wait for parts two and three of the "Occupied America" series.

Then you can be the judge!

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## OCCUPIED AMERICA - Part II - MISGEROT!

In part one of this "Occupied America" series, we discussed the network of Sayanim; - tens of thousands of Jews throughout the world who assist Israel's Mossad in gathering intelligence.

We saw how most gentiles view this activity as a sign of "dual loyalty", in that Jews will have a loyalty to their native countries and to Israel, and that the loyalty to Israel is what prompts them to serve as Sayanim.

However, if you think about it, "dual loyalties" would create considerable risk for Mossad. It would be impossible for them to know in advance the strength of the "non-Israel" loyalty, and whether it might be strong enough to cause Jews they approach to turn agents in. (All of this activity is a serious felony in virtually all countries in which it takes place).

However, Victor Ostrovsky, author of "By Way of Deception" quite candidly states that the existence of millions of Jews outside the borders of Israel gives Mossad a "non-risk recruitment tool:"

"One thing you know for sure is that even if a Jewish person knows it is the Mossad, he might not agree to work with you - but he won't turn you in. You have at your disposal a non-risk recruitment system that actually gives you a pool of millions of Jewish people to tap from outside your own borders."

Now for this system to be "non-risk" these millions of Jews around the world must have only a single loyalty - loyalty to Jews and their interests. In the words of Ostrovsky:

"There was one simple question asked when anything happened: "Is it good for the Jews or not?" Forget about policies, or anything else. That was the only thing that counted ... "

As an example of how this unitary or "single loyalty" works, we then examined the case of Robert Oppenheimer, director of the Manhattan Project, and father of the American atomic bomb, who passed atomic secrets to Russia.

Finally, the prior post listed all of those eligible to be Sayanim in cabinet level positions in our government, and at the very top of all of our major mass media, thus setting forth a prima facie case that America is, in fact, occupied by an alien power. The means, motive and opportunity clearly exist, as does the corpus delicti of a decaying and rudderless America..

In this installment, we are going to examine the heavily armed Jewish groups established and run by retired Mossad officers throughout the world, as a means of examining the question whether this is "Occupied America."

From "By Way of Deception" (St. Martins, 1990) Page 291:

"Arbel's department was responsible for setting up Jewish defense groups, called "frames," or misgerot, all over the world, now including some parts of the United States, where anti-semitism is regarded as a threat. Often people with particular skills, such as doctors, are on reserve and called in for short periods to help with these frames. Normally, heads of the stations for the frames in the various countries are retired Mossad workers. The job is widely regarded as a sort of bonus for faithful service, a tshupar, the idea being that they've got all this expertise, why not use it?"

"The main job is to help the leaders of Jewish communities outside Israel plan for their own security. Part of this is done through the hets w-keshet, or "bow and arrow," Israel's paramilitary youth brigades. While all Israeli youths, boys and girls, belong to this "eduday noar ivry", or "battalion of Hebrew youth," often youths from other countries are brought over to spend the summer learning about security, picking up such skills as completing obstacle courses, pitching tents, and learning how to use a sniper rifle and Uzi assault rifle. Still others learn upgraded security skills, such as how to build a slick, for hiding weapons or documents, when and how to do security checks, as well as the fundamentals of investigation and intelligence gathering.

"Any use of the frames other than for self-protection has never been approved by any government official, although Mossad officials all know of such use. Thus, Yitzhak Shamir knew, but Peres, never a Mossad man, would not have known, even though he was prime minister. Israel does not sell the weapons directly to these foreign frames, but it does provide arms indirectly in a round-about arrangement with known arms dealers.

"The Mossad does not see these frames as information gatherers, although the station heads know from experience that the shortest route to getting praise is by supplying useful information. Many of the youths trained at the summer camps in Israel later become Sayanim, and it certainly provides a strong group of willing helpers, well trained, undaunted by the lingo, who have already shown the ability to take chances...."

Page 140:

"We were now also learning about Tsafirrim and the "frames" set up as a defense mechanism by Jews around the world. In this area we had a problem, or at least some of us did. I just couldn't agree with this concept of having guard groups everywhere. I

thought frames in England, for example, where kids learn how to build slicks for their weapons to protect their synagogues, were more dangerous than beneficial to the Jewish community. I brought up the argument that even if a group of people had been oppressed, with attempts made to exterminate them - as with the Jews - they had no right to act obstructively in democratic countries. I could understand this happening in Chile or Argentina, or any other country where people disappear off the streets, but not in England or France or Belgium.

"The fact that there are antisemitic groups, whether real or imaginary, is definitely not an excuse, because if you look into Israel's own backyard, you'll see anti-Palestinian groups. Did this mean we thought the Palestinians therefore had the right to store weapons and organize vigilante groups? Or would we call them terrorists?"

Let's summarize:

Israel maintains armed groups within our borders.

These groups are run by agents of a foreign power. (retired Mossad officers).

Jewish youths from all over the world are flown to Israel to learn how to use machine guns and sniper rifles.

Once in Israel, these youths receive this training as part of the "battalions of Hebrew youth," Israel's version of the Hitler Yungend.

Israel smuggles full-automatic weapons to these groups through arms dealers.

Retired Mossad agents supervise this activity and keep them out of trouble.

Three conditions must obtain before we can conclude that a country is "occupied" by a foreign power. These three conditions or symptoms of occupation must be clear.

First, the occupier must hold commanding positions in the government and in the media.

Second, the occupied police forces follow the agenda of the occupiers and ignore the illegal acts of occupation.

Third, the occupier must control the electoral process and exact tribute from the occupied.

Maintaining armed cells throughout the Western world under the direction of foreign agents is

profoundly illegal. Our FBI certainly knows about these Misgerot or "frames" but they do nothing about them.

No informants, no infiltrators, no arrests, no armed confrontations - nothing!

Nothing, that is, except deafening silence.

It is obviously not an enforcement priority.

Only the spy Pollard was apprehended and then only because Pollard was completely out of control. His copying of classified documents was so prodigious as to become an embarrassment to his Israeli handlers.

His discovery, as well as the revelations of Ostrovsky, had absolutely zero effect on our FBI. The only reasonable inferences to be drawn from these facts are:

That the FBI already knew who it works for;

That only a small number of people who read books would find out about these disclosures; and

That the people the FBI work for would remain in power, and that no change in enforcement policy is necessary.

It is ironic. The Soviet Union used the Communist party to spy in America back in the 1940's and 1950's. But they never dared flout U.S. law by arming the communist cells they controlled. Israel's activity is so absolutely and shockingly brazen that it leaves one breathless. The lack of response from our own law enforcement agencies is stunning silent testimony to the reason why Israel and its U.S. loyalists can openly ignore our laws.

Indeed, it is similar in many ways to the scene at Florence and Normandy during the Los Angeles riots. As Reginald Denny was having his brains beat out, a dozen armed police in three cars slowly and quietly backed away from the intersection. It was all captured on camera.

The message was clear. You white citizens are on your own! Do not expect us to protect you, even when we have the clear and overwhelming power to do so.

Message understood, boys!

What we get instead is Feinstein in the Senate and Schumer in the House ranting about how "uncomfortable" they feel living in a country in which people have guns, and trying to convince

the middle class to be uncomfortable also. Their discomfort with people owning guns is clearly selective. No mention of the Misgerot, with their full-automatic (and clearly illegal) Uzi's. Jews owning guns is comforting - gentiles owning guns is not!

Our FBI follows the Schumer - Feinstein agenda by assigning thousands of agents to monitor anti-government types. They send out hundreds of informants and provocateurs hoping to talk unsophisticated whites into selling guns or exploding bombs on their own property.

Not surprisingly, they are occasionally successful.

They have enough success that the press is supplied with lurid stories about militias and bombs so that middle class Euro-America will think that the anti-government opposition is physically dangerous and threatening to them.

It is a happy marriage of law-enforcement with news management. They are new at this game, so occasionally they will make public relations mistakes, as with the Waco assault and the killing of Vickie Weaver. But supervisors are reprimanded and reassigned until more media savvy types can be found to replace them.

The fact that our FBI has never busted a Sayan or a Misgerot gives you a pretty clear idea of who they work for. It is a necessary pre-condition of "occupied" status.

But apparently their masters are not happy with mere obedience and loyal service. They demand degradation and humiliation as well.

Several years ago, our FBI was assigned the task of monitoring and analyzing "hate crimes." In an article published by USA Today on Feb. 4, 1996 the FBI announced its statistics. There were 7947 hate crimes. 41% of the hate crimes were "intimidation". Another 23% were vandalism or spray painting.

Intimidation?

Our FBI has been assigned the task of monitoring name-calling.

Shouting an epithet at someone from across the street has become a "hate crime" in these United States of the Offended. And of course the graffiti that graces much of our urban landscape in these United States of the Offended has also become a "hate crime" if it contains politically incorrect thoughts or lands on a synagogue.

Our FBI has been reduced to Kindergarten hall monitors ever on the alert for politically incorrect insults.

There are 5 million assaults (unlawful beatings) committed each year in the United States. Blacks commit 7.2 times more interracial assaults than whites. When you correct for the fact that blacks comprise 12% of the population, it is 50 times more likely that a black will assault a white than it is for a white to assault a black.

So apparently, assigning the FBI the job of monitoring and gathering statistics on name calling and politically incorrect midnight artistry provides the media with the basic feedstock required to convince the soccer moms that it is the poor whites with anti-government views who are the dangerous criminals.

At the same time, of course, the Bureau of Justice Statistics has decided to stop gathering data on the race of crime perpetrators and victims. Too much grist for the Internet!

An occupying power will seek to degrade those who obey its command. Like mandatory "sensitivity training," making the FBI cross dress as Ms. Manners is an important psychological tool and an important emblem of power. It is a way of letting every agent know unmistakably who is in charge.

And so, perhaps, the FBI must accept its Ms. Manners - hall monitor role at the same time it serves up press conferences about statistically rare violations by rural militias. Never a nod to policing Israel's spying Sayanim or busting its illegally armed Misgerot. And of course, stopping the vast wave of real crime that engulfs our cities and makes them unsafe for the Soccer Moms to enter at night simply is not part of the agenda at all.

No matter how humbly the boys in the FBI shuffle, it will never be enough.

Having fun in Occupied America?

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

# YGGDRASIL

## **The Devil Makes them Do It!**

A fascinating article appeared on Page 1 of the Wall Street Journal on Nov. 12, 1996, entitled "One Family's Battle For Ancestral Land Poses Hard Questions."

It is a story of a Jewish-American lawyer asserting a claim in German courts to reclaim some 207 acres of land in Berlin, now having a value of about \$170 million, that his ancestors sold prior to 1938.

Apparently, the German courts found that the family was coerced into selling one parcel at a distress price, and awarded them that parcel, valued at 4.8 million, but held that they received a fair price for the remaining land and are not entitled to get it back.

The family is appealing in the German courts.

Now it happens that about 1000 people live on the property, including 225 homeowners, most of whom purchased from the government after 1989, and knew nothing of the Jewish family who used to own it, or their possible claims. These owners could be evicted if the Jewish claimants prevail.

Setting aside the Jewish identity of the claimants, this kind of claim will inevitably excite emotions.

So what does the principle claimant, one Peter Sonnenthal, do?

He holds a televised press conference in Berlin and behaves as follows:

"During his recent visit to Seehof, he told a German television crew he refused to be pushed around. "Welcome to reunified Germany," he said, looking straight at the camera. "There are Jews again in your backyard."

Now what could possibly be accomplished by making such a statement other than to provoke conflict?

Was the statement a calculated ploy to provoke anti-semitic outbursts and turn the land claim into a contest about anti-semitism? - A not so subtle effort to exploit German guilt feelings?

Or is it a simple case of instinctive and unrestrained Jewish hostility. - Goy-baiting of the kind based on social class that used to be popular in the cabarets of Berlin prior to 1933?

For Sonnenthal's statement; "Welcome to reunified Germany,. . ." "There are Jews again in your backyard," to make any sense at all, he must believe that his presence is irritating and that he can laugh at Germans publicly for their inability to do anything about it.

A strange way of thinking about yourself, no?

But Sonnenthal's statement begs questions that go far beyond instinctive (and I would argue, natural) white-hating.

Why had not Sonnenthal pursued his claim with East Germany earlier?

After all, the Soviet Union, creator of East Germany, went to considerable lengths to criminalize anti-semitism in the Nuremburg war crimes trials after the war. Why didn't East Germany feel compelled to compensate?

Why is it that attempted state confiscation on account of ethnic identity entitles one to compensation, while the universal confiscation of a state that does not believe in private property must be respected?

Is there some weakness or flaw inherent in liberal democracy itself that our enemies instantly recognize makes us vulnerable to extortion and racial attacks such as this?

Kudos to the Wall Street Journal once again for picking up on this little gem!

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Occupied America - Part III - Politics and Money

In our second installment of this "Occupied America" series, we noted that three conditions must obtain for a country to be considered "occupied." The third condition was that:

The occupier must dominate the political process and must exact tribute.

We will examine whether this condition is satisfied in this third installment.

Trying to understand government policy questions with a rational and "race blind" world view is crippling. You cannot explain why things happen the way they do.

You miss every time!

Why do we have welfare policies that have driven black illegitimacy from about 3% in 1950 to 70% today?

Why do we have welfare policies that cause 40% of black males to be in jail or on probation, to have contempt for serving customers, and to become unemployable?

Why are we constantly inventing new legal "rights" that tie the hands of police in stopping the massive wave of crime that engulfs our central cities?

Why do teachers focus on "self esteem" while dumbing down math and reading - producing constantly falling SAT scores?

Why do we have welfare policies that have driven the White illegitimacy rate from less than 1% in 1950 to 24% in 1995?

Why do we have uncontrolled immigration and falling wage rates for our less educated citizens despite 70% opposition by the electorate?

Our race-blind conservatives recognize that these policies are mistaken and believe that once they point out the error of these policies, our government will stop.

But race blind conservatives have been pointing out the error and destructiveness of these

policies for over 40 years! Yet the policies continue! Everyone understands that people and governments can make mistakes. But after 20 years of bad results, you would expect the policies to change!

But they don't!

Why?

There is a simple answer.

It is an answer that middle class Euro-America doesn't yet want to hear. The answer is that these policies are perfectly consistent with the racial and ethnic interests of their proponents.

Disregard the racial and ethnic agenda and you can never comprehend why government does what it does.

But in our society, understanding the ethnic and racial agenda is difficult, for it is an agenda that does not speak its own name in public. It is an agenda that tries mightily to conceal its purposes and the real reasons for its actions.

Not a word of these purposes will ever pass the electronic media. Very seldom will they pass in the print media. However, if you want to predict the outcome of a presidential election, or understand why we adopt horribly destructive social policies, understanding a few simple ethnic/racial agendas is critical.

There is a 100% correlation between government actions and the racial interests of those who participate most vigorously in the governmental process. The policies that seem so perverse and retarded are perfectly rational and effective once one understands the real motivations.

Conservatives open every criticism of these destructive policies with the ritual incantation that the liberals promoting them have "good intentions." But how do conservatives know that?

Where is the evidence of those good intentions?

The fact that conservatives never attempt to prove liberal good intentions tells you that they are passing before a very important social censor. The ritual incantation of "good intentions" is a protective device that prevents them from having to get to the ugly truth.

But it also prevents them from developing any motivational message capable of galvanizing voters to oppose the policy. If you cannot identify the bad motive behind the policy - if you are not allowed to identify the proponent publicly and how he benefits from the policy - then, you

cannot effectively attack his policy.

After all, the liberals never had any trouble naming Rockefeller, J.P. Morgan and the "rich WASPs" as the culprits blocking economic opportunity at the beginning of the 20th Century. They did this even though WASPs are, and always have been, a relatively impoverished group ranking behind every other White ethnic group in America and only marginally ahead of blacks in educational attainment and income.

So why the double standard? Why can't conservatives identify the culprits who benefit from destructive liberal policies?

I have a simple thesis.

The destruction and dependence of blacks, the dumbing down of our schools, the rising illegitimacy rates, and the soaring immigration and the driveling stupidity of television all relate to and reinforce one another in maintaining the power of our political elite.

On Jan. 24, 1995 The Wall Street Journal published a book review by Scott McConnell on page A 20 entitled "Strange and Powerful Allies" about the "Creation and Collapse of the Black-Jewish Alliance."

"Mr. Friedman, an official of the American Jewish Committee, shows that the history of blacks and whites fighting racial discrimination together was mainly a story of cooperation between blacks and Jews. Former Columbia professor Joel Spingarn, a Jew, chaired the NAACP shortly after its founding in 1909; for decades Jewish attorneys made up the majority of the NAACP's legal committee. A Jewish leftist named Stanley Levison was Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s closest advisor. Two-thirds of the whites who went South as Freedom Riders in 1961 were Jews, as were over half the white volunteers for Mississippi Summer of 1964.

"Left-wing Jews from the National Lawyers Guild were heavily involved in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the civil-rights youth group that emerged in 1960. Liberal Jews such as Allard Lowenstein (later a congressman) went South to volunteer their legal services for the cause of civil rights. And Jewish martyrdom is also part of the story: Andrew Goodman and Joseph Schwerner, two young New Yorkers doing voter-registration work, were assassinated on a deserted Mississippi road in 1964, with a Young black named James Chaney.

"Mr. Friedman writes as an old-fashioned liberal, with undiluted admiration for most of the Jewish activists who combated racism. Indeed, his book is an effective rebuke to black publicists who minimize the Jewish contribution to the civil-rights struggle. Yet there are times when his narrative cries out for a speculative approach."

The author of the review, Mr. McConnell, then coyly notes:

"These days, the movement that broke down the barriers of discrimination, integrated the schools and created the industry of civil-rights litigation is invariably presented as an unmitigated triumph. Yet black anger and despair remain in many ways deeper than ever.

"This prompts the question whether the path of the modern civil-rights movement was the only good one available to black Americans. Incredible as it may seem, there are still scarcely any black-owned grocery stores serving Harlem or Watts. Might it have been possible for black leaders to place more emphasis on building businesses, less on filing lawsuits against discrimination?"

It seems quite clear, in retrospect, that the Jews motives for fomenting the civil rights movement were bad. How do we know?

Simple.

The Jews themselves used industry, thrift, entrepreneurship, hard work, and study to get ahead. Yet for blacks, they counseled demands, entitlements, legal rights and claims against the majority.

Having already produced success for themselves, it is inconceivable that Jews ever really believed that the civil rights program they presented would produce equality or opportunity for blacks. You cannot make such a mistake when you have your own contrary experience to draw from.

It was a program intended from the beginning to produce a permanently dependent voting block of alienated people angrily opposed to the Euro-American majority. It has accomplished that purpose. The program was intended to impose costs on Whites, and divide them in such a way that only a super-majority could assert majority interests and win an election. It accomplished that objective as well. In short, the civil rights program was "good for Jews." Whether it was good for blacks was irrelevant. And in any event, it was quite different from the program the Jews followed to advance their own interests.

My thesis is that the dumbing down of Television entertainment, the dumbing down of our schools, the dumbing down of our elections, the creation of social welfare policies that entrap blacks - the general decline of our culture - are part of a single rational and sensible program for political control of the United States.

The theoretical underpinnings of this program were developed in the early part of this Century

by Jewish social scientists at the Frankfort School, and following their move to the U.S. in 1938, the New School For Social Research in New York. This school invented public opinion and polling. It invented new advertising concepts for the electronic media. Those who understood the power of advertising paid up to acquire the media empires. (See "The Radio Project and Little Annie" on the "breakthroughs" page at <http://www.88net.net/ygg/>.)

It was a more effective way of controlling the masses than totalitarian Marxism. Same program - same ultimate objective - just new techniques and new marketing.

Instead of yearning for capitalism to produce an economic collapse from which they could grab power, the alienated Jews would work to produce a cultural, moral and social collapse, toward the same end.

Can cultural decline really render a population easier to control?

Yes indeed!

The Nov. 15, 1996 edition of the Wall Street Journal had an article on the gender gap (the tendency of women to vote for Democrats more than men) on p A-14:

"A Wirthlin Worldwide poll taken on the evening of Nov. 5 for the Christian Coalition found that married women were split evenly, 44-44, between Messrs. Dole and Clinton. Whatever else, this isn't a "gap." Another poll by the Los Angeles Times showed that married voters as a group were within three points of one another when it came to choosing the President or Mr. Dole. Again, a competitive situation, but no gap. Exit poll numbers collected by the Voter News Service, a consortium of network TV and the Associated Press, are similar. They show married voters, male and female, divided 44 for Mr. Clinton and 46 for Mr. Dole."

"Seen in this context, what was seen as an issue of male vs. female actually emerges as the nuclear family vs. something else. What that something else might be isn't automatically obvious, but some educated guesses are possible. One is that the women who went for Mr. Clinton are living in a condition of relative insecurity or entitlement."

Indeed, family breakdown and "alternative life styles" produce dependent constituencies that vote for the welfare state, for Israel, and for further cultural decline. Expanding this voting block is "good for Jews."

Further, the dumbing down of our population and the decline in literacy automatically yields enormous political power to the electronic media.

According to a recent articles in the Wall Street Journal and National Review, 40% of the American voters "lack the capacity to associate their own policy preferences with candidates who shares those preferences."

A Dec. 17, 1996 article in the Wall Street Journal (page A-18) discussing the Clinton scandals notes:

"So how can the average American not get news about the scandals? Because the average citizen doesn't read, listen to or watch any of the above. A study of the 1992 campaign by the University of Michigan's Center for Political Studies found that 50% of voters paid no attention to newspaper articles about the campaign, and 77% paid no attention to magazine articles. This month the Pew Research Center released a survey showing that while the audiences for radio (19%) and on-line services (10%) have increased, once again television is the leading source for news for a whopping portion of the public, now 72%."

Modern election campaigns are won by TV advertising. These campaign techniques are designed to appeal not to policy preferences of the voter, nor to help the voter correlate those policy preferences with actual results produced by the candidate, but appeal instead to "feelings."

Our American electorate is being taught to vote for the candidate who displays the right "feelings."

It is obvious, if you think about it, that a politics dominated by actors projecting image and "feelings" gives enormous power to the media barons and big political contributors who pay for the advertising.

It is in their interest to slide the entire agenda of policy choices out of the public debate and into the back rooms where real agendas need never be disclosed and the politicians can cede control without embarrassment.

It is a way of stripping democracy of its substance. You convince the people that their votes count, while effectively denying them any chance to influence policy with those votes.

Indeed, the dumbing down of America ensures that campaigning politicians can bandy about slogans such as "fairness" and "making 'the rich' pay their fair share" without having to identify "the rich" and without having to produce evidence that their schemes will really distribute wealth and power rather than further concentrating it.

Academics produce a confusion of complex studies arguing about whether welfare produces the pathologies of inner-city America, or whether the lack of jobs (defects of free enterprise)



produces these pathologies. These complex arguments are useless, because they never ask the obvious question - who benefits from the policy?

But to further our inquiry into the question of whether the American political process is dominated by a hostile power, three things are necessary:

Disproportionate political contributions by Jews,

Direct policy demands presented to the politicians by Jewish contributors, and

Slanted Television coverage by Jewish media barons as a means of electing obedient candidates and defeating disobedient candidates.

#### A. Disproportionate Political Contributions:

From the Mar. 2, 1978 Wall Street Journal, P 18, article entitled "American Jews and Jimmy Carter" by James M. Perry, we read the following:

"The Jews are the most affluent group in our society. They are the most professional - 20% of the lawyers are Jewish, 9% of the doctors. \* \* \* "Jews are generous with their money. The White House's Mr., Siegel previously a longtime employee of the Democratic National Committee, estimates that as much as 80% of the big gifts that sustain the party, year in and year out, come from Jews."

How important is this money?

Business lobbyists tend to give in equal amounts to incumbents of both parties. They "hedge their bets." This leaves the big money men of the Israel lobby with the ability to throw the advertising advantage to whichever candidate they select.

Goyim simply do not contribute to campaigns. They believe that good government should be free, just as they learned in high-school civics.

Advertising costs money, and the big money men decide who wins and who loses. Every campaign finance "reform" that limits corporate and Political Action Committee donations merely increases the relative power of Jews and their political contributions.

#### B. Direct Policy Demands

Lets begin with presidential elections. I will offer up a thesis. Since 1932, the candidate friendliest to Jewish interests and Israel always wins. It is the only data you need to predict the

outcome of a presidential election.

The Roosevelt elections need no comment.

Truman - Dewey - 1948

Lets start with an example from the foreword to Israel Shahak's "Jewish History, Jewish Religion" (Pluto Press, 1994) written by Gore Vidal:

"Sometime in the late 1950's, that world class gossip and occasional historian John F. Kennedy, told me how, in 1948 Harry S. Truman had been pretty much abandoned by everyone when he came to run for president. Then an American zionist brought him two million dollars in cash, in a suitcase, aboard his whistle stop campaign train. That's why our recognition of Israel was rushed through so fast' "

\* \* \*

"I shall not rehearse the wars and alarms of that unhappy region. But I will say that the hasty invention of Israel has poisoned the political and intellectual life of the USA, Israel's unlikely patron.

"Unlikely, because no other minority in American history has ever hijacked so much money from the American taxpayers in order to invest in a 'homeland'. It is as if the American taxpayer had been obliged to support the Pope in his reconquest of the Papal States simply because one-third of our people are Roman Catholic."

Eisenhower - Stevenson - 1952

The real action, as far as Israel was concerned, was the Republican primary battle between Taft and Eisenhower. Taft opposed entry into World War II and was regarded as an "anti-semite" Eisenhower won the primary. As between Eisenhower and Stevenson, it was a yawner.

Eisenhower - Stevenson - 1956

Same, both candidates equally acceptable to Jewish interests.

Nixon - Kennedy - 1960

The most interesting activity takes place in elections in which Jewish interests are confronted by two unattractive alternatives. The 1960 election between Nixon and Kennedy is a classic.

From "Jews and American Politics" by Stephen Isaacs (Doubleday, 1974) page 157:

"Four years later, in 1960, the Republicans nominated Nixon. To most Jews, he was the archetypal Jew-baiter, the man who had smeared Helen Gahagan Douglas by calling her 'soft on communism,' whose supporters had reminded voters that the real name of her husband, actor Melvyn Douglas, was Hesselberg."

But Kennedy was not much more appealing to Jews. From "The Samson Option" by Seymour Hersh (Vintage Books 1993), p 96:

"It was a rough session. Kennedy had just returned from a brief vacation at the family compound at Hyannis Port, Massachusetts, and it was a prominent Bostonian, Dewey D. Stone, who set the tone with the first question, as recalled by Feinberg: 'Jack, everybody knows the reputation of your father concerning Jews and Hitler. And everybody knows that the apple doesn't fall far from the tree.' Kennedy's response was to the point: 'You know, my mother was part of that tree, too.' Ribicoff, who would join Kennedy's cabinet, understood the message: The sins of the father shouldn't fall on the son.' Fortunately for Kennedy, that message was enough for the men at Feinberg's apartment. Kennedy had gone upstairs to a separate room with Ribicoff to await their judgment, Feinberg recalled. The group agreed on an initial contribution of \$500,000 to the presidential campaign, with more to come. I called him [Kennedy] right away,' said Feinberg. His voice broke. He got emotional with gratitude."

Johnson - Goldwater - 1964

You cannot really understand the Johnson-Goldwater contest until you understand the problem Israel was having with John Kennedy in 1962 and 1963.

From "The Samson Option" Page 117:

"John Kennedy, profoundly committed to the principle of nonproliferation, continued throughout 1962 to pressure Ben-Gurion about international inspection (of Dimona, Israel's nuclear weapons plant) and continued to receive the prime minister's bland and irritating assurances that Israel had no intention of becoming an atomic power. The president was far too politically astute not to understand, as he angrily told his friend Charles Bartlett, that the Israeli 'sons of bitches lie to me constantly about their nuclear capability.' "

Page 120

"By spring of 1963, Kennedy's relationship with Ben-Gurion remained at an impasse over Dimona, and the correspondence between the two became increasingly sour. None

of those letters has been made public. Ben Gurion's responses were being drafted by Yuval Neeman, a physicist and defense ministry intelligence officer (Mossad) who was directly involved in the nuclear weapons program. It was not a friendly exchange' Neeman recalled. Kennedy was writing like a bully. It was brutal."

Concerning Johnson we read on Page 126:

"Johnson's ties to Israel were strong long before he became President. Two of his closest advisors, lawyers Abe Fortas (later named to the Supreme Court) and Edwin L. Weisl, Sr., while not particularly religious, felt deeply about the security of Israel. Johnson also had known of Abe Feinberg and his fund-raising skills since the Truman years; Feinberg was among those who had raised money for Johnson's successful campaign for Senate.' "

"There was a much deeper link, however, that had nothing to do with campaign funds: Johnson had visited the Nazi concentration camp at Dachau while on a congressional fact-finding trip at the end of World War II. His wife, Lady Bird, told a Texas historian years after Johnson's death that he had returned 'just shaken, bursting with overpowering revulsion and incredulous horror at what he had seen. Hearing about it is one thing, being there is another.' There are no photographs of the visit, but Johnson's Congressional archives contain a full set of U.S. Army photos taken two days after the liberation of the death camp on April 30, 1945."

In contrast, Goldwater's virulent anti-communism frightened Jews. The fact that Goldwater himself was half-Jewish made matters worse. Goldwater was the kind of uncontrollable person who might get up on the stand on inauguration day and do side-by-sides from Marx and the "Protocols", or translate selected passages from the Sanhedrin (the Talmud).

Goldwater posed a severe risk of unwanted disclosure. - of "spilling the beans" and placing on the table in a very public way questions about communism and communist slaughters of gentiles that might become very uncomfortable. He knew too much.

Predictably, the media attack on him was utterly merciless. Sort of what you would expect if the Republicans had nominated Israel Shahak in 1996!

Goldwater's actual motivations are murkier. While he eagerly sought to run against Kennedy, he showed little interest in defeating Johnson. Perhaps the assassins had deprived him of his motivating agenda.

In any event, Israel was the only country that had anything to gain by Kennedy's death. Motive and means! And then Jack Ruby! Does Mossad keep lists of terminal cancer Sayanim?

## Humphrey - Nixon - 1968

A possible exception that proves the rule. Having learned from his race against Jack Kennedy, Nixon had taken on advisors like Leonard Garment and fundraisers like Max Fischer. Kissinger ran his foreign policy. However, his election owed more to popular reaction to Lyndon Johnson's prosecution of the Vietnam War.

"The Yiddish word, "taam," means Jewish soul. Hubert Humphrey had it. Even Texas's Lyndon Johnson had it." (The Sampson Option, page 117)

## McGovern - Nixon - 1972

The McGovern - Nixon contest was a classic because no typical American voter of that day would have had a clue what issues were actually driving events. From "Jews and American Politics" by Stephen D. Isaacs (Doubleday, 1974), Page 1:

"This was George S. McGovern's debut at trying to raise "big money" for his attempt to win the Presidency of the United States and he had a right to be nervous. The men seated around that table were big money. Indeed, billions of dollars in personal net worth was represented at the table. Laurence Tisch had invited his friends... Alfred P. Slaner ... Morris L. Levinson ... Preston Robert Tisch ... Robert Bernstein ... Saul P. Steinberg... Arthur G. Cohen ... R. Peter Strauss ..., and Meshulam Riklis..."

Page 3:

"He (McGovern) said he supposed that the best way they could all get to know each other would be for him to answer questions. He remained standing and looked around the table. A slight, greying, carefully tailored man, seated several places to his right rose. He spoke with a noticeable Hebrew accent in identifying himself as Meshulam Riklis. ... 'Senator', Riklis asked, just what is your position on Israel?"

"The only hope for a just and permanent settlement in the Middle East, McGovern answered, looking down the table at Riklis, was not an imposed peace, but a negotiated one, worked out in a world forum like the United Nations."

"With that answer, McGovern blew most of the traditional big money from Jews in 1972, money that was to go first to Hubert Humphrey, then later into the Republican campaign in unprecedented amounts."

The hostility of the press and electronic media toward McGovern was surprising. McGovern was the most liberal man ever nominated by the Democratic party. The biased press should have

loved him if their biases were purely ideological.

But they didn't. It was a simple case of this conservative observer not understanding those biases.

Ford - Carter 1976

See below

Carter - Reagan 1980

All you need to know about the Carter - Reagan election comes from an article in the Mar. 2, 1978 Wall Street Journal, page 18 Column 4, entitled "American Jews and Jimmy Carter" By James M. Perry:

"Walter H. Shorenstein, a San Francisco developer who has raised millions of dollars for the Democratic Party and its candidates, isn't sure Jimmy Carter understands the way American Jews feel about Israel. \* \* \* "Not every leader in the American Jewish community is in such despair. But almost all of them are worried about what they perceive to be the administration's hard-line policy opposing Jewish settlements in occupied Arab territories. They are flatly- and emotionally - opposed to the administration's decision to sell advanced warplanes to both Egypt and Saudi Arabia and to cut back on the number of planes it is willing to sell to Israel. And, as a result, some of them are rethinking their commitment to Jimmy Carter."

A similar viewpoint comes from a Sep. 22, 1980 Wall Street Journal article on page 1 entitled "Estranged Friends" written by Albert Hunt:

"Viewing this Democratic disaffection, Ronald Reagan hopes to rival Richard Nixon's support from an estimated 35% of Jews in 1972. This month thousands of rabbis in New York State received New Year's wishes in the mail from Ronald and Nancy Reagan. The campaign is setting up "Rabbis for Reagan" and "Concerned Jews for Reagan" groups to spread the word of the GOP nominee's staunchly pro-Israel position. Reagan supporters also are circulating copies of a recent TV interview in which Democratic Sen. Henry Jackson said Mr. Reagan "has unique qualifications" to talk on the question of Israel, because he was one of the "original supporters" of the Jewish state."

Reagan - Mondale 1984

See Above

Bush - Dukakis 1988

See below

Bush - Clinton - 1992

The Bush-Clinton contest of 1992 is quite interesting. Big Jewish contributors assumed that Bush would be as inclined toward Israel as Reagan, and were delighted with his war against Iraq.

However, the Iraq war was not enough. As we read in the April 26, 1994 Wall Street Journal on page A22, in an article entitled "Pro-Israel Lobby Sees Role Shrink . . ." by Robert S. Greenberger:

"By contrast, former President Bush and former Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir were barely on speaking terms. Mr. Shamir fought U.S. efforts to broker Mideast peace and Mr. Bush blocked \$10 billion in loan guarantees for Israel. As a result, during the 15-year reign of hardline Likud governments in Israel, AIPAC officials often served as go-betweens or referees, defending Israel's government before an often hostile U.S. administration."

In contrast, Clinton was and is "the best friend Israel has ever had in the White House".

Clinton - Dole - 1996

Here is all you need to know about the 1996 presidential election from page 334 of "By Way Of Deception."

"U.S. Senator Robert Dole, during an interview while he toured Israel, suggested that the United States should consider cutting its massive aid package to Israel to free up funds for emerging democracies in Eastern Europe and Latin America."

Bob, you putz! You just don't talk like that about Israel. Especially if you plan to run for president!

It is relatively clear that Jewish demands are clearly and unequivocally put to American politicians in private. Our politicians then can accede to these demands in private, without having to suffer public humiliation.

It is the way of any good occupying power!

### C. Media rewards and punishments.

In Occupied America - Part I - I listed the chairman and CEOs of all of our American electronic media.

It is clear that a candidate perceived as being unfriendly to Israel, or independent of the Israel lobby, cannot pass through the lenses of these Television Moguls and still win an election. At least - it has never happened yet!

The sanction is not always money - that can be raised from Goyish business interests - but rather unrelenting hostile news coverage. Control of the electronic media is the sine-qua-non of occupation. The correlation between its displeasure and electoral results at the presidential level is perfect. And it will remain perfect because the public is unaware of it.

Given our current state of cultural decline and the consistent dumbing down of Television and education, the mechanics of applying these sanctions are shockingly simple. All the media barons need do is ensure that their employees avoid the candidate's planned sound bites, and air his occasional gaffes and his momentary frowns instead!

No need to regale the audience with lots of complicated arguments about policy, and no need to let the newsroom employees know the real reason the candidate has been targeted.

It is elegantly simple and wondrously effective.

Now the objection can be raised that it is unfair or illogical to blame all Jews for the actions of a "few activists."

The problem with this argument is that we know Jews display bloc voting of 80% to 90% for liberal candidates who support cultural decline, racial antagonism toward the White majority, and policies that create voting blocks dependent on government aid. This voting pattern bespeaks hostility and racial polarization.

It is an ethnic characteristic of the group.

A second objection is that we Whites are largely responsible for our own fate, and that objection is true. We want something for nothing. We do not want to pay for entertainment. So we watch their "free" Television and willingly imbibe the cultural toxins. We willingly participate in the dumbing down of our race.

Indeed, we would not be living in an Occupied America if we simply canceled our cable subscriptions and kept our TV sets turned off.



In "Occupied America - Part IV - Rays of Hope in an Ugly Trend" I will sum up and conclude this series.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

## YGGDRASIL

### Occupied America - Part IV - An Ugly Trend

A Jewish business partner runs up to me shortly after the L.A. Bank shootout and says, in an agitated voice: "Hey Ygg, how come you NRA guys won't agree to ban assault weapons?"

Hmm!

I can handle this two ways.

The first is the polite WASP way in which I would say something like; "Assault weapons are so rarely used in crime that banning them would not accomplish anything. If a few million people want to fondle their assault weapons in the privacy of their own homes, then let them. The statistics show us this activity is harmless."

But if I take the polite WASP approach, I feel like an idiot because I know my interrogator has not the slightest interest in controlling street crime. What he really means is this:

Hey! We know that you NRA guys and militia types aren't going to attack the military, so why on earth would you want assault rifles except to kill Jews?

He knows that outlawing guns will not slow down violent street crime. And he doesn't care about "gun control" in the abstract because the stockpiles of Uzzis maintained by the Jewish "misgerot" or frames here in the U.S. make him feel quite secure.

Forget crime control or "gun control", what he really wants is goy control.

So if I decide upon alternative two, what do I say? I could just blurt out something like; "Gee, never in the history of the U.S. has a white gentile used an assault rifle to kill Jews. Killing Jews just isn't very high on our list of priorities, so maybe you should adjust your head instead!"

Comes off kind of heavy, don't you think?

Maybe something a tad lighter: "If we could only develop a bullet that would automatically self-destruct whenever aimed at a Jew, this whole gun control issue would quickly wither on the vine."

The Sarah Bradys of the world would still be around, but the real force and intensity behind the issue among those who fund the Democratic party, and write the evening news and the TV shows would quickly disappear.

And that is the problem with the whole gun control debate. We are not allowed to identify in public the wildly paranoid fantasies that motivate the confiscatory urge. Facts cannot dislodge the fantasy.

Yet my Jewish acquaintances all know that my ancestors had 2000 years experience at being ruled by aliens. First the Romans, then the Germanic Saxons, then the Danes, and then the Normans. The Normans spoke a language that none of us could understand. We needed interpreters. We acquiesced in their taxes, (a fact not lost on the latest band of aliens). But unlike our current overlords, at least the Normans allowed us to keep the same weapons that were carried by their own troops.

When William the Conqueror's descendants misbehaved, we gathered up those swords, lances and longbows and presented them with the Great Charter. We taught the aliens the virtues of limited government at the point of the sword.

Words in a charter or constitution mean nothing unless the people are armed. Limited government and the "consent of the governed" were tools to minimize tribal conflict and war. These concepts were imposed upon rulers by force. They kept the peace better than totalitarian Marxism ever did.

And of course, the Jewish population is well aware of this history. It is our gentile prejudice to assume that they would empathize, and that out of respect for the culture of their countrymen, and a desire to live in harmony with them, would carve out niches within this modern world in which this ancient culture of arms (the father of limited government) could be preserved and remembered in a positive way.

But that is not what the culture destroyers want at all. They want to stamp it out.

Israel Shahak in his masterpiece "Jewish History, Jewish Religion," (1994 Pluto Press, London, Page 12) explains why.

"It was noticed by several scholars, of whom the most important was Moses Hadas, who claimed that the foundations of classical Judaism', that is, Judaism as it was established by Talmudic sages are based on Platonic influences and especially on the image of Sparta as it appears in Plato. According to Hadas, a crucial feature of the Platonic political system, adopted by Judaism as early as the Maccabean period (142-63 BC), was that every phase of human conduct be subjected to religious sanctions which are in fact to be manipulated by the ruler'.

\* \* \*

"Hadas claims that Judaism adopted what Plato himself summarized [as] the objectives of his program', in the following well known passage:

"The principal thing is that is that no one, man or woman, should ever be without an officer set over him, and that none should get the mental habit of taking any step, whether in earnest or in jest, on his individual responsibility. In peace as in war he must live always with his eyes on his superior officer ... In a word, we must train the mind not even to consider acting as an individual or know how to do it. (Laws, 942 ab)"

And what better description of life here in Occupied America could we have than this? The modern day Talmudic sages have given us 2000 pages of Internal Revenue Code, 8000 pages of Regulations interpreting that Code, and hundreds of thousands of pages of Revenue Rulings, Private Letter Rulings and interpretations.

We have legions of wetlands police, child endangerment police, Federal thought crimes police, fish and game police, industrial safety police, smoke, sewage and fertilizer police, pharmaceutical discovery police, investment police, business police, and electronic communications police all watching over us, each enforcing an additional hundred thousand pages of regulations and interpretations of Talmudic complexity.

As our society crumbles, with falling SAT scores, soaring violent crime, growing drug use among teenagers and growing welfare dependency, Jews in general are greatly comforted by the existence of this mass of rules and the armies of police to enforce them.

None of this was brought about by a conspiracy or a central "plan." Rather, it is the natural process by which a people confident of their culture struggles to establish the supremacy of that culture. And it is a culture that is only "comfortable" when hundreds of thousands of Rabbis (bearing modern secular titles) supervise every last detail of our lives. Conservatives wail about the fact that excessive regulation and police forces are legislated into existence even in the absence of a problem to solve. Indeed, that is the whole point! The "problem" is millions of Goyim wandering around doing what they please. That makes the rabinnate of the modern state (many of whom are Goyim who have internalized Jewish culture) very uncomfortable.

Conservatives seem never to understand that complexity confers power. A simple flat tax with one or two rates would be simple to overthrow because millions would be subject to the same rate and could organize to lower that rate. The complexity of multiple rates, various deductions, tax preference items and the alternative minimum tax divide the population into atomized

individuals, making organized political opposition based on self-interest exceptionally difficult. Complexity is "good for Jews."

The vast federal structure built up over the last 55 years to watch over us never had anything to do with improving education, stopping urban crime, ensuring that all Americans become productive or any other recognizable meliorative purpose.

Its purpose was to return 2.4% of our population to the comfort zone of the regulated life of classical Judaism.

Israel Shahak explains on page 15:

"This was the most important social fact of Jewish existence before the advent of the modern state: observance of the religious laws of Judaism, as well as their inculcation through education, were enforced on Jews by physical coercion, from which one could only escape by conversion to the religion of the majority, amounting in the circumstances to a total social break and for that reason very impracticable, except during a religious crisis."

\* \* \*

"However, once the modern state came into existence, the Jewish community lost its powers to punish or intimidate the individual Jew. The bonds of one of the most closed of closed societies, one of the most totalitarian societies in the whole history of mankind were snapped. This act of liberation came mostly from the outside; although there were some Jews who helped it from within ... [S]o it turned out to be very easy among the Jews, particularly in Israel, to mount a very effective attack against all the notions and ideals of humanism and the rule of law (not to say democracy) as something 'un-Jewish' or 'anti-Jewish' - as indeed they are in the historical sense - and as principles which may be used 'in the Jewish interest', but which have no validity 'against the Jewish interest', for example when Arabs invoke these same principles."

Shahak argues that much about Israeli politics that gentiles find impossible to understand can be attributed to this cultural nostalgia for a totalitarian and intensely communitarian past that existed in the pre-emancipation Jewish communities of Europe. I would argue that this same yearning - this same cultural nostalgia - explains the murderous political pathology of totalitarian communism, as well as the slyly genocidal regime of cultural destruction we experience from the modern "nanny state" better known as "liberal democracy."

Indeed, the most stunning proof of the essential Jewishness of communism is not so much the large number of Jews who staffed the secret police and the communist party in Russia from 1917 through the end of World War II, but rather that upon expelling Jews from the Russian

communist party in the 1950s, 60s and 70s, the Goyim who remained became disoriented, and could not longer understand what communism was and what it was trying to accomplish. Having no historical and cultural memory of life in the Jewish stetl, communism in Russia simply withered on the vine, as any nationalist would have predicted. The arrival and departure of communism in Russia are both quintessential racial phenomenon.

Shahak seems to agree. From page 19:

"[A] great many present-day Jews are nostalgic for that world, their lost paradise, the comfortable closed society from which they were not so much liberated as expelled. A large part of the Zionist movement always wanted to restore it - and this part has gained the upper hand."

Just before the 1996 election, the Ygg family took a drive through several small rural "German" towns of central Texas. After several hours of touring the scenic towns, I announced that we would find a place to eat lunch. I selected an authentic local barbeque joint and turned into the parking lot.

My 13 year old daughter screamed "No! No! We can't stop here! These people are crazy! They will kill us!"

Mrs. Ygg and I were stunned. We looked at each other in disbelief. I said "Where on earth did you get such a silly idea? These people are your distant cousins. They are your racial kinsmen. Why on earth would they want to hurt you?"

Once inside the establishment, teenage daughter calmed down. It turned out that these rural kids looked, talked and acted pretty much like the kids at her suburban high school.

During lunch Mrs. Ygg raised again the issue of whether daytime access to CNBC's market ticker was worth the collateral damage done in 2 hours on Friday nights. She suggested it might be time to cancel cable TV (yet again) and subscribe to BMI, Signal, trade station or whatever else did not carry with it the toxic wastes of Sumner Redstone's MTV.

I was reminded of a book I read 20 years ago by Benjamin Stein called "The view from Sunset Boulevard" (Basic Books, 1977). It is a classic warning by a neo-conservative Jew to his fellow tribesmen that the TV fare they produce is so far removed from reality as to be dangerous to Jews. Stein gingerly explains his mission on page x of the introduction:

"So, for the first time in my life, I started to watch a lot of television. It was a revelation. In the midst of the most inane and repetitious television shows, comedy and adventure, and even soap operas, there was a spate of political and social messages so clear and

interesting that they would have made Kracauer [a famous pre-War film critic Stein had studied at Yale] pass out with joy.

"The messages were deeply similar, or so it seemed to me. Businessmen were bad people and workers were good people. High-level police were bad people, representative of a rotten and deadening bureaucracy, and idiosyncratic, rebel cops were the salt of the earth and smart, too. This said something about organizations and bureaucracies, and about the value of rebellion as compared with acceptance. It spoke to questions of conformity and satisfaction with society.

"Small towns were superficially lovely, but under a thin veneer of cornpone there was lurking, terrifying evil, waiting to ensnare the innocent Natty Bumppo of the big city. But big cities, at first glance jungles where narcotics dealers disguised as real estate salesmen lurked on every corner, offering heroin and white slavery to small children, were basically friendly, cheerful places."

Continuing on page xii of the introduction:

"All of this means something elementary but interesting. The super-medium of television is spewing out the messages of a few writers and producers (literally in the low hundreds), almost all of whom live in Los Angeles. Television is not necessarily a mirror of anything besides what those few people think. The whole entertainment component of television is dominated by men and women who have a unified, idiosyncratic view of life. When a viewer understands that television is not supposed to be a facsimile of life but instead is what a Hollywood producer thinks life is, the viewer can then understand the match or mismatch between television and what he knows to be true."

Then, beginning on page 11 of the text of the work, Stein gets more specific about the identity of the problem:

"In television, the producers and writers are creative kings. What they say is law, and that law is transmitted on the airwaves into millions of homes (sometimes sixty or seventy million) per night. A popular variety or adventure show or a lovable sitcom will invariably draw a larger audience than an address by a president of the United States..."

"Who are these powerful producers and writers, and where do they come from?"

"With a small number of exceptions, they are all white [sic] males. They are almost never younger than 35. They are almost never second-generation Californians. A distinct majority, especially the writers of situation comedies, is Jewish. However, there are many Protestants and Catholics as well, especially among writers of adventure shows."

Then Stein examines the biases and fears of these writers and producers about small towns in more detail.

Page 63:

"There is a special genre of TV shows cutting across situation comedy and adventure, which deals with small towns. That kind of show might be called "the city innocent in jeopardy" tale. Every adventure show that deals even once with small towns uses it, and every situation comedy set in the city eventually takes a stab at it."

Page 70:

"There is also an ethnic difference that frightens some. The Hollywood TV writer tends generally, although not always, to be Jewish or Italian or Irish, and he sees people in the small towns as not being ethnic at all. He sees them, moreover, as not being friendly toward ethnics, especially Jews. \* \* \* And, of course, it could hardly be more natural for people who fear that they might be "beat up" in small towns because of their race to feel some anger toward them."

Page 71:

"Further, there is the political problem. \* \* \* The thought of a hinterland full of small towns who voted for Nixon, as Meta Rosenberg said, makes them uneasy. They see a strong challenge to the brand of politics they favor, and, quite naturally, that affronts them. Politics in the small town are not only different, but to a large extent they are also incomprehensible." \* \* \* "A variety of differences and fears separate the Hollywood TV writer and producer from the small town as he sees it. Fear of violence and animosity being directed at him because of race or religion, fear and lack of comprehension about the politics of small-town people, and a generalized fear of the unknown produce a powerful wave of dislike of small towns in the minds of TV writers and producers, which makes itself felt in TV programming."

When I first read this short masterpiece 20 years ago, I thought it hilariously funny to see Jews airing their dirty laundry in public. But at that time I had no idea about the extent of the cultural decline it would precipitate. As I said earlier, Ben Stein is a neo-conservative. He is a conservative in the sense that he knows the perceptions of these TV writers and producers are contrary to fact, and he assumes that once informed of their error, they will change their ways.

But that is not the way it works. While the paranoid view may be erroneous, its propagation beyond the Jewish nation is immensely advantageous for Jews in their struggle for dominance and power, for it places a wedge between educated suburban whites and their racial cousins. It



diverts suburban gentiles from their natural role as leaders of their rural kinsmen, turning them into allies of the Jews, equally uncomfortable with the "peasants" in the countryside.

If you can implant your fears into the broader mass of TV viewers, you do not need to convince them of the benefits of the Rabinnical State with rational arguments, but may rely on irrational fears and emotions. In the era before television, the intellectual assault of Marxism was intended to do precisely the same thing. The Marxist ideology made upper middle class whites fearful of their racial kinsmen thereby stripping the peasantry of the political power which the concept of democracy clearly implied they should have.

Conservatives assume that the irrational impulses that inform the content of television are "accidents" and will reverse themselves on exposure to truth. However, when these impulses are examined for their potential to redistribute political power, it turns out that they are "good for Jews" and have, of course, easily survived Ben Stein's courageous little book.

And the paranoia runs deep. From page 20:

"Allen Burns, partner of Brooks and also a brilliant writer and producer of the "Mary Tyler Moore Show" agrees that he is "pretty unsympathetic toward businessmen." He distrusts and dislikes big business because of its "bigness." He believes that large companies have private armies, which frightens him."

Wow! Only in Occupied America could such silly nonsense survive in our elites, men of immense power and influence!

From page 27:

"There are yet other explanations for why the businessman comes off so badly in Hollywood. The key one is that businessmen, especially big businessmen, are perceived as coming from a different class from that of the TV writers and producers - and an adversary one at that. Although not one producer or writer said so for the record, a number of writers with whom I became familiar spoke of businessmen from AT&T, or IBM in terms that contrasted their Gentile, Ivy League backgrounds with the more ethnic, "school-of-hard-knocks" backgrounds of the TV writers.

"There was a distinct feeling that, despite the high pay and the access to powerful media that TV writers and producers enjoy, they are still part of a despised underclass, oppressed psychologically and (potentially) physically by an Aryan ruling class of businessmen and others. This feeling is by no means confined to Jews."

"The belief in a ruling class of white, East Coast Protestants meeting occasionally in

corporate board rooms to give its orders to whoever happens to be elected to office is so strong that no amount of argument to the contrary makes a dent. And hostility to that real or imagined class is just as strong."

As for the American military, Stein reports on page 55:

"There is also at least a hint of ethnic animosity in the feelings of TV writers toward the military. Whenever the subject came up in private conversations that were not part of formal interviews, the writers clearly thought of military men as clean-shaven, blond, and of completely WASP background. In the minds of a few of the people I interviewed, these blond officers were always a hair's breadth away from becoming National Socialists. They were thought of as part of an Aryan ruling class that actually or potentially repressed those of different ethnic backgrounds."

Indeed, the deeper we dig into the Jewish psyche, the more we find blatant racial and tribal motivations.

Israel Shahak explains on page 52:

"Classical Jewish society has no peasants, and in this it differs profoundly from earlier Jewish societies in the two centers, Palestine and Mesopotamia. It is difficult for us, in modern times, to understand what this means. We have to make an effort to imagine what serfdom was like; the enormous difference in literacy, let alone education, between village and town throughout this period; the incomparably greater freedom enjoyed by all the small minority who were not peasants - in order to realize that during the whole of the classical period the Jews, in spite of all the persecutions to which they were subjected, formed an integral part of the privileged classes. Jewish historiography, especially in English, is misleading on this point inasmuch as it tends to focus on Jewish poverty and anti-Jewish discrimination. Both were real enough at times; but the poorest Jewish craftsman, pedlar, landlord's steward or petty cleric was immeasurably better off than a serf."

Continuing on page 53:

"Everywhere, classical Judaism developed hatred and contempt for agriculture as an occupation and for peasants as a class, even more than for other Gentiles - a hatred of which I know no parallel in other societies. This is immediately apparent to anyone who is familiar with the Yiddish or Hebrew literature of the 19th and 20th centuries."

"Most east-European Jewish socialists (that is, members of exclusively or predominantly Jewish parties and factions) are guilty of never pointing out this fact; indeed, many were themselves tainted with a ferocious anti-peasant attitude inherited from classical

Judaism. Of course, zionist 'socialists' were the worst in this respect, but others, such as the Bund, were not much better. A typical example is their opposition to the formation of peasant co-operatives promoted by the Catholic clergy, on the ground that this was 'an act of antisemitism'. This attitude is by no means dead even now, it could be seen very clearly in the racist views held by many Jewish 'dissidents' in the USSR regarding the Russian people, and also in the lack of discussion of this background by so many Jewish socialists, such as Isaac Deutscher. The whole racist propaganda on the theme of the supposed superiority of Jewish morality and intellect (in which many Jewish socialists were prominent) is bound up with a lack of sensitivity for the suffering of that major part of humanity who were especially oppressed during the last thousand years - the peasants."

Wow! Mr. Shahak, you are lucky to still be alive, and the only reason you are is that Rabbi Cooper of ADL and his ilk in Israel no longer care what is said in books! What they care about is control of the TV. You owe your very life to television!

On page 62:

"All over Poland the nobles used Jews as their agents to undermine the commercial power of the Royal Towns, which were weak in any case. Alone among the countries of western Christendom, in Poland a nobleman's property inside a Royal Town was exempt from the town's laws and guild regulations. In most cases the nobles settled their Jewish clients in such properties, thus giving rise to a lasting conflict. The Jews were usually 'victorious', in the sense that the towns could neither subjugate nor drive them off; but in the frequent popular riots Jewish lives (and, even more, Jewish property) were lost. . . . Similar or worse consequences followed from the frequent use of Jews as commercial agents of noblemen: they won exemption from most Polish tolls and tariffs, to the loss of the native bourgeoisie."

"But the most lasting and tragic results occurred in the eastern provinces of Poland - ... The towns were established by nobles and belonged to them - and they were settled almost exclusively by Jews. Until 1939, the population of many Polish towns east of the river Bug was at least 90 per cent Jewish, and this demographic phenomenon was even more pronounced in that area of Tsarist Russia annexed from Poland and known as the Jewish Pale. Outside the towns very many Jews throughout Poland, but especially in the east, were employed as the direct supervisors and oppressors of the enserfed peasantry - as bailiffs of whole manors (invested with the landlord's full coercive powers) or as lessees of particular feudal monopolies such as the corn mill, the liquor still and public house (with the right of armed search of peasant houses for illicit stills) or the bakery, and as collectors of customary feudal dues of all kinds. In short, in eastern Poland, under the rule of the nobles (and of the feudalised church, formed exclusively from the nobility) the Jews were both the immediate exploiters of the peasantry and virtually the

only town-dwellers."

Continuing on page 63:

"But, as we have remarked, the peasants suffered worse oppression at the hands of both landlords and Jews; and one may assume that, except in times of peasant uprisings, the full weight of the Jewish religious laws against Gentiles fell upon the peasants. As will be seen in the next chapter, these laws are suspended or mitigated in cases where it is feared that they might arouse dangerous hostility towards Jews; but the hostility of the peasants could be disregarded as ineffectual so long as the Jewish bailiff could shelter under the 'peace' of a great lord."

Continuing on page 64:

"During the whole period of classical Judaism, Jews were often subjected to persecutions/7 - and this fact now serves as the main 'argument' of the apologists of the Jewish religion with its anti-Gentile laws and especially of Zionism." \* \* \* "It must be pointed out that in all the worst anti-Jewish persecutions, that is, where Jews were killed, the ruling elite, the emperor and the pope, the kings, the higher aristocracy and the upper clergy, as well as the rich bourgeoisie in the autonomous cities - were always on the side of the Jews. The latter's enemies belonged to the more oppressed and exploited classes and those close to them in daily life and interests, such as the friars of the mendicant orders.8. . . . For this reason all the massacres of Jews during the classical period were part of a peasant rebellion or other popular movements at times when the government was for some reason especially weak."

So you see, limited government equals weak government equals pogroms.

And that is the nub of it.

It has nothing to do with whether private welfare would work better than the public dole, or whether educational achievement and upward mobility would be enhanced by educational vouchers. These conservative policies weaken the government and will lead to the killing of Jews.

Jews do not trust us with freedom or limited government.

It is a prejudice that has been around for 2000 years. "Pray for the welfare of the government" said Rabbi Hanina in the first century AD at a time when the New World Order of its day was imposed by Rome.

Those passages in which Shahak explores the blatantly racist precepts that underlie the Jewish religion and the related laws that demand concealment of the truth from outsiders are perhaps the most sensational parts of his book. However, they are not nearly so important as his historical insights quoted above.

His detailed descriptions of the public deceptions about the contents of the Talmud are spectacular.

You should order your own copy (\$16, I believe) by e-mailing to [ihrgreg@kaiwan.com](mailto:ihrgreg@kaiwan.com)

But I shall list some of those rules here to give you a flavor of how brazenly we are deceived when our leaders talk about the "Judeo-Christian" tradition:

1. A Jewish doctor must save a Jew (do otherwise forbidden work) on the Sabbath, but must not save a similarly circumstanced gentile. (Page 1)
2. A Jew is forbidden to take interest on a loan from a Jew, but is commanded to take interest from a gentile. (Page 42)
3. The killing of a Jew is a capital crime for which the death penalty applies, but the killing of a gentile by a Jew is a moral offense only and not a legal offense punishable by a court. (Page 75)
4. In times of war, all gentile civilian members of the hostile nation should be killed. (Page 76)
5. The obligation to save the life of a fellow Jew is paramount and supersedes all other religions obligations, but a gentile with whom (the Jews) are not at war must not be saved (for example if they fall into a well or into the sea). (Page 80)
6. A Jewish doctor is forbidden to treat a gentile, unless it is necessary to forestall hostility against Jews, in which case treatment is permitted (but not on the Sabbath). (Page 80)
7. Intercourse with a married Jewish woman is a capital offense for both participants, but since the concept of matrimony does not apply to gentiles, the concept of adultery does not apply to intercourse between a Jewish man and a gentile woman. Only the gentile woman must be executed "as is the case with a beast, because through her a Jew got into trouble" and the Jewish male must be flogged. (Page 87)
8. All gentile women are presumed to be prostitutes. (Page 88)

9. Jews must not, if they can prevent it, allow a gentile to be appointed to any position of authority over Jews. This rule also applies to converts to Judaism. (Page 88)

10. Gentiles are presumed to be congenital liars and are disqualified from testifying in Jewish courts. (Page 88)

11. Giving money to a Jewish beggar is an important religious duty, but giving money to gentile beggars is only permitted if it will prevent anti-Jewish hostility. (Page 89)

12. If a Jew finds the property of another Jew, he has an affirmative duty to seek out the owner and return the property. But if the owner was a gentile, the Talmud forbids him to return it. (Page 89).

13. It is a sin to deceive a fellow Jew in a business transaction, either by false statement or by failure to disclose essential facts. If the other party to the transaction is a gentile, then only false statements are forbidden. (Page 89)

14. It is forbidden to defraud a fellow Jew by "buying or selling at an unreasonable price," a prohibition that does not apply in a Jew's dealings with a gentile. (Page 89)

15. Non-violent theft is forbidden even if the victim is a gentile. However, armed robbery of a gentile by a Jew is forbidden only when in a gentile jurisdiction and not when in a Jewish jurisdiction. (Page 90)

In addition, a series of special laws apply to gentiles in the land of Israel.

1. Jews are forbidden to sell real estate in the Land of Israel to gentiles. (Page 90)

2. Leasing land to a gentile in the land of Israel is permitted only if the arrangement is temporary, and not at all if Jews have sufficient power and wealth to expel all gentiles. (Page 90)

Gentiles typically display one of two reactions to this information. The first is denial - that these xenophobic laws of Judaism must be a fabrication, because no group of educated human beings which so fervently advocates tolerance, compassion and diversity would risk such a brazen public fraud.

Hmm!

The second reaction is to dismiss these laws as ancient nonsense that nobody believes any more.

Christians make the mistake of assuming that Judaism is just another flavor of Christianity. They think that Jews have lost faith just as Christians have. But the content of the Jewish faith is so radically different from the Christian faith that it is much harder to lose.

It is one thing to deny the probability of supernatural events such as the divinity of Christ or the existence of God. But it is quite another to discard a set of standards for relations with strangers specifically tailored to further your self-interest at their expense. One must be especially skeptical when group behavior consistently indicates that the spirit and, whenever possible, the letter of the old rules is still being followed.

Israel Shahak claims that it is impossible to advocate "civil rights," "pluralism," "tolerance" and "compassion" without first renouncing the Jewish religion. In his view, any Jew who has not renounced Judaism and continues to advocate these liberal causes does so deceptively and only because he knows "pluralism" will weaken his adversaries.

So where does all this leave us?

A very important article appeared on page 1 of the Wall Street Journal on Aug 8, 1991.

"In June, the Council of Jewish Federations, in New York, released a survey showing that since 1985 slightly more than half of Jews who married married a gentile."

"Things were quite different 30 years ago. ... [B]arely 5% of Jews who wed picked non-Jews as mates. In their seminal 1963 book "Beyond the Melting Pot." Nathan Glazer and Daniel Patrick Moynihan wrote that Jews were among the most endogamous of U.S. ethnic groups. And that, the authors concluded, ensured Jewish survival."

My initial reaction was the typical "conservative" response. This seemed to be proof that Jews were not a problem separate and distinct from liberals generally, and that in 60 years their numbers in the U.S. would be substantially diminished. I was comforted in this view by the description of the ethnic consequence of these intermarriages set forth in the article:

"Studies show that the children of mixed marriages rarely consider themselves Jews; most have no affinity for Jewish institutions ranging from the local synagogue to the state of Israel. The demographics have been unfavorable for years."

It was not until I read Ostrovsky's "By Way of Deception," Seymour Hersh's "The Samson Option" and Israel Shahak's "Jewish History, Jewish Religion" that I recognized the obvious. This demographic threat coming from Jews' own aesthetic sexual preferences would cause the "remnant" to become much more dangerous.

Their conduct proves it.

We have Sayanim all over Europe and the U.S. spying for Israel, and providing them with the latest weapons technology. We have "misgerot" or armed groups of Jews ready to support forcible entry and extraction of Jews by Israel throughout Europe and America.

States do not waste their resources on these kinds of preparations unless they intend to use them.

We have entered into a new chapter in the history of the Jewish people. They are splitting into two groups. One group is generally non-political or not passionately political. They often vote wrong but are trusting enough to discuss their feelings honestly with us. They are often willing to be persuaded by reasonable arguments backed up by facts.

The other group is a wildly paranoid remnant of true believers, getting bolder and more brazen in their demands now that Israel has the missile technology to deliver their nuclear weapons.

The political activists come from this remnant. The State of Israel is controlled by them. They are broadly incapable of believing that non-jews have anything but murderous intentions toward Jews.

Unfortunately, members of this remnant are often the most intelligent.

In 1943, Oppenheimer and the other Jewish scientists working on the U.S. nuclear bomb passed nuclear secrets to Stalin because Stalin promised Oppenheimer a Jewish homeland inside Russia. It caused us 45 years of fear and an imponderably expensive arms race. Being Jewish means never having to say you are sorry!

Immediately following the establishment of the state of Israel in 1948, Ben-Gurion, Peres and Ernst Bergman began working on a nuclear weapon. Bergman had a thorough understanding of the theory. In 1957 a Jewish physicist named Raymond Fox emigrated from California to Israel. Fox "had access to weapons design information at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.... Fox's secrets would be invaluable to the Israelis at Dimona." (The Samson Option, p 91)

Ever since Dimona, the Israeli nuclear production facility, went live sometime between 1964 and 1967, we have seen an escalation in the belligerency and stridency of Israeli and Jewish demands. Prior to 1965 we did not hear much about the Holocaust. But the Holocaust propaganda has escalated markedly since then. It was the possession of nuclear arms that marks the escalation of demands for "reparations" from the industrialized countries of the world.

According to Hersh, Israel threatened to use nuclear weapons against their Arab opponents in



the 1967 war if the U.S. did not engage in a massive conventional military supply and assistance mission. Thereafter, the U.S. has paid \$5 billions annually and paid \$3 billions annually to bribe Israel's neighbors into peaceful relations.

Israel had discovered nuclear blackmail. The worse they behave the more money they make!

Since 1967, the holocaust drumroll has escalated in intensity. Germany now pays pensions to 4.1 million aging Jews under a program to compensate "holocaust survivors." There were only about 1.1 million Jews alive in the camps at the end of the war, but the size and the expense of the program has escalated dramatically in recent years. Indeed, Germany pays about \$14 billion (U.S.) per year defraying Israel's old age (Social Security) costs as well as the cost for much of the rest of world Jewry. There are about 16 million Jews worldwide, and 3.5 million of them live in Israel. It is a tiny country. \$5 or \$10 billions is an enormous sum to them.

What happens in 15 or 20 years when the number of Jews who can claim to have been alive during the Third Reich begins to dwindle rapidly? Does anyone really believe that Israel intends to begin paying its own old-age survivor benefits? Does anyone really believe that Israel will not come up with a new propaganda rationale for why Germany must keep paying, while rattling its nuclear saber in the private councils of European Governments?

Lately, the World Jewish Congress and Israel have set their sights on Switzerland, a wartime neutral, as well as Sweden and Norway. The original pretext for the extortion of Switzerland was that the Swiss had supposedly bought gold confiscated from Jews by Germany. Forget the post-war propaganda and cultural icons like "Sound of Music." History is once again being rewritten, and Switzerland has become like the U.S. and Germany, a bad guy. In order to silence the thunder of the media, Switzerland had to pony up \$200 millions (U.S.) even before the facts were investigated. The funds will be passed out to aging Jews without regard to whether they had any gold or not (which was the real objective from the beginning).

Israel has become utterly dependent on these extortions from other countries. If this aid were to be cut off, the Israeli economy and government would collapse.

To ensure that the aid will not stop, Israel has developed medium range missiles capable of delivering nuclear warheads anywhere in Europe or Russia. It is working on intercontinental ballistic missiles to ensure successful world-wide extortion. Does anyone really believe that if Israel goes to nation X and threatens to attack nation Y unless nation X pays, that nation X (assuming it is a European nation) won't knuckle under and pay?

Now, under cover of the Israeli Nuclear umbrella, the extortion rackets become ever louder and ever more brazen. For a people consumed with a 2000 year history of fearing "anti-semitism," the rush against Switzerland was incredibly heavy handed. The Swiss are certain to feel outraged and humiliated by this treatment. "Anti-semitism" is sure to increase as a result.

If you look to their actions, as opposed to their propaganda, it becomes clear that the remnant is no longer afraid of provoking anti-semitism. The remnant no longer cares how angry the Swiss get. Switzerland is within easy striking distance of Israel's medium range missiles and has none of its own. The logic of targeting Switzerland for blackmail is impeccable. The arrangement will evolve into a system of permanent tribute.

The U.S. and Russia both loudly proclaimed their nuclear capabilities to the public. Their strategy was to generate political opposition to "first use" within the opponent's domestic population. In contrast, Israel has chosen to remain silent in public about their nuclear arsenal. They are absolutely committed to "first use". But more important, they do not want the people of Switzerland, Austria, Croatia, Germany, Sweden, Norway or Italy thinking of them as a nuclear threat. They want these populations to remain as sympathetic as possible to the Jewish cause and agreeable to payment of tribute. However, Israel is quick to boast of its capabilities behind closed doors to the world's political leaders. The threat is clearly and loudly made to the world's governments.

While the U.S. and Russian military leaders proclaim that nuclear weapons are "too horrible to use," neoconservatives like Sam Cohen (inventor of the neutron bomb) write articles in National Review (Feb. 10, 1997 p 36) castigating our military for failing to prepare for the day when nuclear weapons will be used. The reason Cohen is so certain that such weapons will be used is that he understands Israel and Israel's ancient law that commands the slaughter of civilians in nations with which it is at war.

Meanwhile, back here in Occupied America, we differ from Palestinians only in our good fortune not to have been born in Eretz Israel. Instead, we have members of the Jewish remnant such as Benjamin Ginsberg, professor of political science at Johns Hopkins, openly bragging in his book "The Fatal Embrace" (University of Chicago Press, 1993) about how easy it was to take political power from us, and openly bragging that we gentiles are incapable of effective political resistance because of our inability to spot the real agendas within the smoke:

"During the 1960's, Jews joined with other liberal Democrats and with blacks in the civil rights and anti-Vietnam War movements. Through this alliance, Jews were able to weaken their conservative Southern adversaries as well as their Northern white working-class rivals within the Democratic Party, and to virtually destroy the traditional party machines upon which these forces depended for their power. In addition, the programs of Lyndon Johnson's Great Society enlarged the Welfare State and expanded the influence of Jewish professionals and academics in policy-making and administrative processes at the national, state, and local levels." (Page 225)

Occupied America is still a "free" country if you define freedom to mean the ability to do things that do not anger the powerful.

But then, every society that has ever existed grants this sort of freedom.

In America, you can still be a success and earn a lot of money. If you do, you will find yourself part of a small group supporting the racial grievance lobbies to the tune of \$100 billions per year, and you will be supporting a huge subculture of non-productive idlers, many in government employment.

With the money left over after the Rabbinical state is through with you, you might find your reward for your successful business career in the inevitable steady diet of McDonald's hamburgers and pizza or in the blare of mindless TV talk shows and hostile rap music.

You will never even get a thank-you note from the Zionist Occupation Government for the enormous tribute you pay. And inevitably, you and your intelligent cohorts in the glass and steel canyons of the information elites will be pushed ever harder to support the non-productive. After all, the non-productive in Occupied America have the smartest and most successful political leadership on earth.

You can call it freedom if you wish. You could even call it success. Our alien rulers and their front men like Bill Clinton certainly would call it that. But then their power over you depends on their skill at lying to you and their skill at manipulating your moral sentiments.

Your acceptance of the situation depends on your ability to lie to yourself.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

---

## What It Would Take to Cleanse Serbia

Apologies in advance for failing to post for the past couple of weeks. But the NWO is in such an agitated state of activity that I thought I should wait and gather some of the seemingly disparate threads into a more coherent whole that will shed significant new light on the NWO Elite, its internal myths, its functions and its foibles.

First, we have the nuclear spy scandals.

Our defense physics labs are full of foreign born Chinese and Indian physicists. In the words of the Wall Street Journal, American students will not take these jobs, so they must be staffed with less expensive foreigners. And of course, these Chinese and Indian fellows working in splendid isolation at these labs are confronted with two very real problems. First is comprehending the idea of an American Nation and why its secrets must be protected. These scientists have been taught multi-culturalism by our own institutions, and the ultimate message of multi-culturalism is that the American Nation simply doesn't exist. It is a small leap to the conclusion that America is the entire World, and therefore, its secrets belong to the world. Second, it is only natural for them to feel that their kinsmen who run China and India would never do anything to destroy the human race, and that it is unfair and degrading for them not to possess the modern instrumentalities of sovereignty and independence which these scientists have in their custody. Hence the faxes from Huntsville and Oak Ridge and the e-mails of test code from Los Alamos. It is another massive failure of the multi-cultural vision - a spectacular instance of the costs of maintaining a multi-cultural empire.

Our multi-cultural establishment in Washington (of both the Democrat and Republican variety) has a very hard time handling this security problem because to do so demands that they define the American Nation and its interests in a way that makes the actions of these Scientists look like a betrayal. Of course, this is impossible to do. Who exactly did these Chinese and Indian scientists betray? American Whites?

It is precisely the same conundrum that stopped America in its tracks back when Oppenheimer (according to Sudoplatov) was passing nuclear secrets to Stalin in hopes that nuclear arms would provide safety for his ethnic kinsmen in Russia.

So it is a near certainty that China has 50 years worth of nuclear test data as well as the

programming code that allows the design and testing of new, related weapons by computer, without having to test. The code is worth hundreds of billions of dollars and 50 years. It reduces the cost of developing the very latest nuclear weapon technology to a point that is within the reach of many nations.

Through its multiculturalist delusions, our NWO elite has dribbled away its crown jewels and vented the source of its power. Ironically, at the same time our Nuclear secrets are dribbling out over the internet, the NWO is flexing its muscle in Serbia in pursuit of a second and more fantastic multiculturalist delusion. It is that delusion which I want to focus upon today.

I should mention as background that our NWO elite is a complex organism. It consists of an inner party that is overwhelmingly (but not exclusively) ethnically based. This inner party controls the media and makes all the important decisions. The motives and power of this inner party cannot be mentioned in public because the party has gained official victim status through the Holocaust story, which places them above criticism or discussion.

Next there is the outer party. This outer party consists of three parts. The first, and least important are the elites from two other minorities that have been granted victim status by the inner party. The loyalty of these minority elites is purchased through affirmative action. In exchange, these affirmative action elites must make sure that their racial kinsmen vote for politicians and policies supported by the inner party. There is a finely tuned balancing act of stirring up racial anger sufficient to motivate voting, but not to such a degree that members of the inner party elite are threatened. The moral price these affirmative action elites pay is that they must betray the interests of their own racial group by motivating them to vote for policies that, by design, deprive them of control over their own evolutionary destiny and guarantee that they remain in a state of permanent dependence.

The second, and more important part of the outer party consists of alienated members of the majority group who fervently support the inner party because they have been led to believe that they benefit as individuals, even as the costs of the multi-cultural program are imposed primarily on their own kind. They support the inner party as a form of revenge against their own racial group.

Finally, the third and largest segment of the outer party is the "loyal opposition " which is permitted by the inner party as long as it does not publicly identify and attack the inner party as a group, and as long as it supports the multi-cultural vision. This "loyal opposition" within the outer party is very useful as a vehicle for channeling and directing any dissatisfaction that may arise among the majority who are paying the cost of the multi-cultural enterprise. This organized "loyal opposition" gives the middle class majority an opportunity to express dissent and dissatisfaction in ways which do not threaten the inner party.

The allegiance of the "loyal opposition" is tentative at best, and its loyalty depends on the

delivery of economic benefits. In his classic work, *The Collapse of Complex Societies*, Joseph Tainter argues that all complex civilizations must deliver perceptible economic benefits, or citizens will withdraw from it and the civilization will collapse to a lower order of complexity and a lower level of cost. The inner party staffs and manages the administration of economic policy. The primary benefit they deliver to the "loyal opposition" segment of the outer party is expanding credit on relatively easy terms. This allows the local entrepreneurs, developers and real estate agents who comprise the core of the loyal opposition to expand their businesses and provide jobs.

For the great mass of the opposition, the working middle class, the benefit delivered is less visible, but is described by Niccolo Machiavelli in his classic *The Prince*:

"A man who is made a prince by the favor of the people should work to retain their friendship; and this is easy for him because the people ask only not to be oppressed."

The middle class majority which tends to vote for the loyal opposition party is content with the jobs and economic growth that are provided by easy credit and easy money. Most of the time this easy money also produces a rising stock market which confers additional tangible benefits.

Naturally, the inner party would prefer that its own party of state power win every election. However, the opposition party of less government and low taxes is a valuable safety valve which the inner party uses to calibrate the maximum amount it may safely extract from the middle class in taxes. When the "loyal opposition" party starts winning, the inner party knows it must cut back modestly and provide more benefits. While members of the inner party provide 100% of the financing for the party of state power, they finance about 40% of the loyal opposition party's budget as well, and it is a good investment - enough to prevent ambitious politicians from attacking the inner party directly by identifying its objectives and advantages.

Thus, the two party system in America provides a finely calibrated device to ensure sufficiency of rewards and benefits, thereby securing the power of the inner party. That is its only purpose. The current two party system will serve this end effectively so long as cheap credit is capable of generating enough benefits and enough loyalty to prevent an attack on the inner party.

So what does the inner party get out of all this? The answer is financial advantage, security and World domination.

Remember that the inner party is international in both citizenship and scope. The inner party uses the Treasury of the American Empire to fund a host of international credit creation and emergency lending organizations. These organizations provide the inner party with valuable inside information allowing them to make timely investments in distressed countries. The inner party members who staff these international agencies guarantee these investments. In addition, maintaining the World's reserve currency reduces the cost of the empire by about \$25 billions

each year, thereby lowering the cost of benefits it must provide to the outer party. This reserve currency role also vastly increases the ability of American consumers to borrow for consumption and run vast trade deficits with other nations - another benefit that can be distributed to the outer party at no cost to the inner party.

The inner party uses the Treasury of the American Empire to fund international organizations which write and enforce laws criminalizing opposition to the inner party and its activities. It also uses the Treasury of the American Empire to fund propaganda that it cannot sell at a profit through its mass media, in the form of Holocaust Museums and other monuments that reinforce the official victim status of the inner party and reinforce the secular religion of tolerance and multiculturalism that the inner party has established for the outer party.

The inner party uses the Treasury of the American Empire to provide about \$5 billion per year in subsidies to its place of refuge in times of trouble, Israel. It also uses the armed might of the American Empire to guarantee the continued existence of Israel against all of those nations which Israel attacks or offends.

And just recently, the inner party began using American military might to enforce its vision of multi-cultural and "open" societies upon the rest of the world. Let us in to do business, or we will bomb you!

On the surface, it might seem a bit ironic that the inner party would allow multi-culturalism to dissipate its most valuable assets in the Nuclear labs at the same time that they are bombing autarchic closed societies populated by hostile races (Iraq and Serbia) back to the stone age.

But I opened this essay with the espionage story to illustrate by example the central point, which is that the members of the inner party operate according to shared visceral emotions - their own unique evolutionary psychology- and not according to any rational plan. The program of multi-culturalism arises from the emotional insecurities of the inner party. Thus, multi-culturalism is enforced even in situations where it will severely damage the practical interests of the inner party. And naturally, this impulse to enforce multi-culturalism in situations where it does harm provokes arguments among the inner party. These arguments never question the fundamental drive for World domination. Rather, they are about the tactics to be used in pursuit of that objective. These arguments invariably break out in the public print media and are there for all to see. Indeed they provide us in the "real opposition" our only window on the truth.

By way of illustration, the most famous and obvious of these arguments evolved into the publication of "The Bell Curve," a book about the effects of IQ on American life. For 30 years prior to its publication in 1994, Professor Herrnstein of Harvard (very much a member of the inner party) had been conducting research into the heritability of intelligence and the racial differences in its distribution. He loudly proclaimed within fairly narrow academic circles that those parts of the secular religion which the inner party has established for America - womens'

liberation, easy abortion, alternative life styles, etc. - have the effect of lowering average IQ among the majority, which threatens to reduce the economic power of the U.S., and thus, the power and influence of the inner party itself.

Herrnstein pointed out that the effects of self absorbed life styles on majority IQ are compounded by the inner party's welfare system that subsidizes births among those with IQs a full standard deviation below the national average. When the effects of welfare are added to the effects of the inner party's multi-cultural program of immigration, which imports people with IQs that average a half a standard deviation below the existing U.S. average, we have a prescription for economic and social collapse.

The public reaction to the Herrnstein book was instructive. That first segment of the outer party - the minority affirmative action elites - viewed the book as an insult and a betrayal. And indeed, the pundits of the inner party took alarm that its publication might threaten to increase the cost of controlling these elites.

The second fraction of the outer party - those alienated members of the majority group who fervently support the inner party - also viewed the book as a betrayal and a humiliating vindication of the views held by the lower orders of the majority from whom this sector of the outer party seeks to differentiate itself.

Members of the loyal opposition who read beyond the sports pages chuckled and went about their business of having and getting.

Finally, despite Herrnstein's best efforts over 30 years, the message that not all herds of human cattle are equal seemed to have little impact on the members of the inner party itself, particularly the proverbial dentist in Peoria who belongs to that inner party by birth but is not particularly active in its programs.

Rational self-interested planning is not the driver behind the inner party's multi-cultural attack - facts and evidence cannot alter its course. And now the inner party, Cohen, Albright (nee Corbel), Burger, and Wesley Clark (nee Nemerovsky) have embarked on a brand new adventure. Their attack on Serbia is an effort to enforce multi-culturalism on an unwilling population through violence. It is an unprecedented expansion of the program of the inner party. This new war is purely ideological, and in this respect it resembles the numerous wars fought 500 years ago in Europe over religion.

But the virtue and wisdom of traditional religions is that, by and large, they confined their doctrinal assertions to transcendental truths not susceptible of disproof in the real World.

In contrast, the inner party seeks to impose on the World a purely secular religion based entirely on earthly propositions that are easily demonstrated to be false. General Clark's now notorious



dictum is a classic example:

"Let's not forget what the origin of the problem is. There is no place in modern Europe for ethnically pure states. That's a 19th century idea and we are trying to transition into the 21st century, and we are going to do it with multi-ethnic states." [CNN April 24-25, 1999.]

There are a dozen more or less ethnically homogeneous states in Europe - Iceland, Ireland, Norway, Finland, Slovenia, Andorra and Leichtenstein in the "pure" category, with Denmark, The Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Poland in the "more or less" category, to name just a few. In addition, we have three new ethnically pure states formed by NATO itself - including Croatia, Serbian Bosnia, and soon-to-be Kosovo purged of its Serbian minority. This blood drenched campaign to impose the religion of multi-culturalism is pure delusion.

The campaign in Kosovo looks like a three stooges farce of incompetence and bumbling for that very reason. The campaign was conceived and planned by an isolated cadre of the inner party who simply cannot see reality. They thought the Serbs would surrender in three days. They never imagined that their bombs would induce the Serbs to escalate the civil war against the separatist Kosovars and had no relief supplies ready for refugees. They failed to anticipate Russia's reaction, and utterly failed to understand how China, Japan and India would see them.

Indeed this failure to respect the Chinese view is beyond imagining. After all, the Chinese have just bought the inner party's President (a classic outer party - category II type) in a picture perfect imitation of AIPAC. Given this virtuoso performance by the Chinese, it is impossible to understand how the inner party could not know that the cat is out of the bag.

In retrospect, It should have been clear to the inner party that China has been aware of who they are and how they run things for over 50 years. Here is a quote from Premier Chou En-lai (November 2, 1949):

"There is a relationship between the controllers of the government of the Soviet Union and the central government of the federation of North American States that can only be described as strange. Although bitterly divided on such subjects as economics and religions, they will cooperate when faced with what they regard as a mutual danger. The curtain that hides the relationship pulled aside slightly in 1933 when Maxim Litvinov's position was changed from Minister of Finance to Minister of Foreign Affairs and he left for the city of New York to confer with the controllers of government; from there he proceeded to the facade of government in the city of Washington.

"We Chinese, at the present time, are unable to understand the strange relationship and, until we do, we will proceed with extreme caution in international relationships."

Now who should the inner party suppose Chou En Lai was describing here - Siberian Eskimos?

Indeed, the inner party is utterly incapable of comprehending how their actions are perceived by others. All comments, criticisms and feedback, even if constructive, are motivated by "hate" and dismissed out of hand.

Professor MacDonald asserts that the inner party has developed an evolutionary psychology that facilitates survival as a tiny minority scattered in diaspora. One critical aspect of this mentality is the ability to sincerely believe you are a victim race even as you and your fellow tribesmen dominate other races in the areas you inhabit. In other words, the very mental qualities that ensure the ability of the inner party to maintain its genetic isolation while settling in small numbers in every sizeable community throughout the European world, make them utterly unable to understand how others see them. Indeed, such empathy would constitute a mortal threat to their group identity.

As you might imagine, this Three Stooges war in Kosovo has provoked intense argument within the inner party. The argument has two sides. One side is horrified that the bombing has proceeded in an unplanned fashion and fears extreme danger if the Serbs, duly enraged by the inner party's bombs, are allowed to remain in control of their own destiny and plot revenge. In the words of Niccolo Machiavelli:

"And here it has to be noted that men must either be pampered or crushed, because they can get revenge for small injuries but not for fatal ones. So any injury a prince does a man should be of such a kind that there is no fear of revenge."

The dogs of war among the inner party have begun to realize that any settlement with Serbia invites the disaster of revenge through exposure. Serbia has a massive incentive to stir up nationalist sentiments and to expose the inner party in other more powerful nations as its least expensive and most effective means of preventing further attacks.

To illustrate this one side of the argument within the inner party, I have gathered for your review below four articles which advocate collective guilt, war against civilian populations, and a strategy of occupation and re-education in which the offending rebel against multi-culturalism is stripped of its independence and fed a steady and exclusive diet of consumerist, multiculturalist and NWO propaganda in schools and electronic media run by the occupiers.

The first is an article by Bruce Fein published in the Washington Times on Feb. 20, 1991 entitled "No Quarrel with the people of Iraq?" Mr. Fein argues that the Iraqi people are the enemy and should be treated accordingly. It is an incredible article. Mr. Fein condemns the Iraqi people for the crime of "complacency" and "indifference" to the misdeeds of their president, Saddam Hussein. To our knowledge it is the first example of this argument applied to a current conflict in the popular press. It is important to note that this article advocating collective civilian

guilt was written by a neo-conservative and published in a neo-conservative paper. The inner party infiltrates all political movements, including conservatism, and will try to direct the agendas of these political movements so as to benefit the inner party.

The second article is by Thomas L. Friedman entitled "Stop the Music." It was published in the New York Times on April 23, 1999 and argues that the Serbian people are the enemy and must be punished for their sins against multi-culturalism. At this point, Friedman and the Times advocate only punishment, and have not yet focused on the reality of a settlement which leaves the Serbian people angry and in control of their own destiny.

The third Article is a piece by Daniel Jonah Goldhagen published in the New Republic of May 17, 1999 entitled "A New Serbia." This article elaborates on the theme of collective civilian guilt and remedies the defect in Friedman's piece by advocating the conquest and occupation of Serbia, turning it into one large re-education camp.

The fourth article was published on May 9, 1999 in the New York Times "Week in Review" column entitled "What It Would Take to Cleanse Serbia." It is a compilation of quotes from other members of the inner party seconding Goldhagen's view that Serbia should be occupied and re-educated.

OK folks, it is time to place this series of incredible articles under the jeweler's loop.

I would argue that the very appearance of these pieces is a sign of weakness within the inner party. The inner party was safer back in the closet.

First, the time line of these articles and their thematic development argue that the hatred of Serbia and the bombing arose from visceral emotion, and not accordance with any rational plan. The articles provide hard evidence of that in two very important ways. The articles are brimming with destructive passions that will make most Americans in the "loyal opposition" very uncomfortable. They are bad politics. Further, the time line shows that none of these passionate members of the inner party thought out this program of occupation and re-education in advance. To the extent these members of the inner party are possessed of reason, it is reactive to the calamities occasioned by their own emotional delusions about how their bombing campaign would be received in Belgrade.

Second, the very publication of these articles is improvident. Note that Goldhagen admits there is zero chance that his vision will actually be implemented. If that is so, then why publish? For by publishing these pieces on the Cleansing of Serbia, Goldhagen et al use the occupation of Germany as an graphic example. Most Germans under the age of 50 are unaware of just how heavy handed their reeducation was, and are utterly unaware of the extent to which their new government is the product of anti-German hatred.

Why dredge this up and set it before the youth of Germany in these graphic terms when there is nothing to be gained? It is a classic example of collective self-delusion by the inner party. How do they expect that normal German youth would react to such information? On the surface, it looks like these pieces exist to satisfy the lust for blood and revenge among the members of the inner party who feel as Goldhagen does. But on closer examination, it is a satisfaction that can only be delivered to a population for whom print words are a substitute for facts and realities on the ground. It is the primal scream of the inner party with its hands on the reigns of power. "If only we were really in charge!"

The youth of Germany, like most of European youth World wide, has been crippled by popular culture and many not react. But there is no chance that the message of these columns will be missed by the Chinese, Japanese, Indian, Arab and Russian elites who have clipping services that analyze this sort of thing (including this web site). All except for Japan have problems with ethnically based separatist movements within their borders, and will quickly perceive the threat that the inner party will use alleged mistreatment of rebellious ethnic groups as grounds for conquest, occupation and re-education.

Whatever doubts Chou En Lai may have had in 1949 about the real government of the U.S., any such doubts in the minds of his successors have surely been put to rest by the articles you see below.

In addition, this excellent adventure in Serbia has brought out into the open the proverbial "elephant in the living room" - the power of the electronic media and the reality that television is the ultimate weapon of the inner party. Television not owned by the inner party will be the first asset to be attacked in their upcoming conquests. Any state owned media that asserts or maintains a national identity for its people is an enemy, subject to attack. The natural corollary illuminated in these articles is that the American media, privately owned by the inner party, is the primary instrument of re-education that can and will dictate electoral outcomes in any democracy.

So after their Kosovo bombing adventure, is it now more or less likely that any of these nations will allow our media into their countries and open up their elections to its influence?

In fairness, I should describe the second viewpoint put forth in this intramural debate within the inner party. There is a sizable but distinct minority group within the inner party that argues against resort to bombs, and against demonizing the Serbs. But the argument boils down to tactics. In effect, the peace contingent within the inner party argues that the seductive power of Western consumer goods and Western entertainment will subdue the entire World in due time, rendering the populations of Eastern Europe, India, China and Japan as tractable to the agenda of the inner party as are the peoples of the United States and its NATO allies.

Reduced to its essence, the argument of the peace wing of the inner party is that the peoples of

the World have an entirely different evolutionary psychology than that of the inner party. The sudden appearance of invaders with weapons drawn always arouses them to a violent defense and immense self sacrifice. Why arouse them in this way? By resorting to bombs, the inner party is playing on their turf, and leading to their strength! By initiating violence, the inner party arouses all of the collective racial and tribal instincts of survival. Once aroused, these passions can last a generation.

In its essence, the argument continues; why not lead to their weakness? The evolutionary psychology of the Nations is pre-programmed for simplicity, honesty and trust toward all they find as their neighbors. Once you settle among them, they will bend over backwards to avoid giving offense. They will not question why you take offense at their morals, ethics and religions, but will abandon or modify them in an effort to avoid offending you. They will not question why you call them bigots for preferring the company of those most like themselves, and will abandon their very racial and cultural identity to avoid giving you offense.

The long term effects of this abandonment are no different that the effects of armed conquest.

So why change a winning game?

Why indeed?

Now in the further interests of fairness I should mention that some born to the inner party decline membership. But their numbers are few, as they must pass a three-part test of willingness to treat our nation as the equal of their own nation. First, are they comfortable with our separation and our control of our own evolutionary destiny? Second, are they comfortable with our old time religion, morals and ethics, or do they choose to be offended by them? Third, do they actively seek punishment of the haters within their own group? For example do they actively seek to get Goldhagen fired from his job at Harvard?

If these tests are failed, then their arguments are about the wisdom of alternative tactics for domination and not an argument for our equality as a separate people with rights to self-determination and control of our own evolutionary destiny equal to their own.

Our friends and allies do not hector us in matters of our own identity and collective survival.

As for the conflict in Serbia, I can only state the obvious. The Albanian Kosovars are our European brothers. So are the Serbs. The Albanians began a low intensity civil war to induce the Serbs to give up Kosovo. Our paramount duty is to avoid taking sides or otherwise expanding this conflict. Our secondary duty is to offer our good offices to help engineer a mutually agreeable settlement of differences if that is practical and possible. Otherwise this tragic "brothers war" must play itself out in isolation according to the strengths of the parties.

In the mean time, those of us trapped in multi-cultural America face a grim future. It is a future of certain economic decline and collapse engineered by multi-culturalism, as so brilliantly outlined by Herrnstein. It is a future of heightened military risk as our technological secrets leak across the globe, and we passively submit to rule by an elite driven by delusional dreams of World domination and fantasies of degraded subservience on the part of all the peoples of the earth before the inner party's baubles and debauched entertainments.

Pray for awakening, strength and renewal.

We will need them.

Yggdrasil-

-----

The Washington Times

Feb. 20, 1991

No Quarrel with the people of Iraq?

Bruce Fein

President Bush's sharp rebuff of Iraq's latest "peace" overtures and call for the overthrow of Iraqi President Saddam Hussein has created a false image of toughness.

It has camouflaged Mr. Bush's woolly headed acquittal of the Iraqi people of any responsibility for the arch villainous actions of their president.

The adverse consequences of Mr. Bush's bad thinking are threefold:

Unsound military tactics in seeking to destroy Iraq's will to resist the U.S. led coalition forces in the Middle East.

An apparent forgoing of reparations claims for Iraq's pillage of Kuwait, its murderous attacks on civilians, and the military deaths, purloined supplies and costs among the coalitions forces that have been occasioned by Iraq's crimes against peace.

And a message to peoples living under despotisms comparable to that holding sway in Iraq - for instance the Syrian regime of President Hafez Assad - that they have neither a legal nor moral obligation to resist cooperation with a government earmarked by savagery and repression

insolent of international law.

Mr. Bush notwithstanding, the United States does have a substantial quarrel with the people of Iraq. In differing degrees, they are responsible for the aggression and war crimes of their president. If the Iraqi people had refused to obey Saddam's clearly illegal orders under international law, Kuwait's territorial integrity would be impaired, no Scud missiles would have been launched against civilian targets in Israel and Saudi Arabia, no POW's held by Iraq would have been the victims of war crimes, and coalition-force deaths and injuries would not have been required to rebuke Iraq's crimes against peace.

Some might argue in mitigation that Iraqis are only following orders and that defiance would be punished. But the "following orders" defense was rejected in the Nuremberg war crimes trials of Nazis and has never earned a place in military jurisprudence where, as in the case of Iraq, orders from a superior are manifestly illegal. A following orders defense should certainly fare no better outside the military for civilians implicated in international law transgressions.

The vast majority of Iraq's population has actively assisted or permitted Saddam's international lawlessness by either participating in the Iraqi military or providing food, fiber or logistical support for military aggression and barbarities, or displaying complacency with Saddam's tyranny. Citizen passivity to oppressive rule is unacceptable to civilized life, especially when the oppression carries international repercussions. As Thomas Jefferson trumpeted in the Declaration of Independence, "any peoples confronted with a design "to reduce them under absolute despotism" are saddled with a "duty to throw off such government and to provide new guards for their future security."

The Iraqi war effort would collapse instantly if Iraqi soldiers either quite fighting en masse as Russian soldiers did in World War I or if massive sabotage was practiced by Iraqi civilians, or if the Iraqis ousted Saddam from power as the Italians unceremoniously cashiered Benito Mussolini in World War II by exercising their right to revolt. Mr. Bush is thus wrong to treat the Iraqi people as victims of Saddam no more blameworthy than Kuwaitis, Israelis, Saudis, Egyptians, Americans or other nationals for the coalition force countries. The Iraqis have fathered their own plight.

Why therefore, should Mr. Bush instruct the U.S. military scrupulously to avoid civilian targets in Iraq even if a contrary policy would more quickly destroy Iraqi morale and bring it to heel. During World War II, the allied powers ruthlessly bombed Berlin, Dresden and Tokyo for reasons of military and civilian morale. Winston Churchill instructed the Royal Air Force to "make the rubble dance" in German cities. Why is Mr. Bush treating Iraqi civilians more solicitously than the enemy civilians of World War II?

Mr. Bush's blanket exoneration of the Iraqi people for the countless illegalities and brutalities of Saddam has apparently lead to a decision against post-war reparations. The Bush postwar

economic plans seems to contemplate greater wealth sharing amongst Middle East nations, and a Middle East investment bank to assist the rebuilding of Iraq and Kuwait. But why is any nation either morally or legally obligated to share wealth with another? To recognize such an obligation would be a source of endless wars. In addition, why shouldn't the Iraqi people pay reparations for war related injuries and damage inflicted by their nation. German taxpayers paid enormous reparations for the World War I and World War II villainies of their government. Why should a more lenient standard obtain for the Iraqis?

Finally, actual or would be tyrants are unlikely ever to make even a cameo appearance on the endangered species list. To minimize the harms inflicted by such rogues, the peoples over which they rule should be encouraged to resist by holding them accountable in reparations and exposing them to the hardships and hazards of war for the international crimes of their governments. To act otherwise fosters citizen inertness and indifference, the indispensable weapons for the triumph of evil.

-----  
Apr. 23, 1999 New York Times

Foreign Affairs

Thomas L. Friedman

Stop the Music

Give the air war a chance.

It is said that a camel is a horse designed by a committee. It may not be pretty but it gets the job done, especially in the desert.

By that standard, NATO's air war over Yugoslavia is a military strategy designed by a 19 member alliance. It's also not pretty, but its very weakness could be a strength.

Bombing the Serbs from 15,000 feet is the only military strategy that all 19 NATO members, the U.S. Congress and the Russians can agree upon as tolerable in Yugoslavia today. While there are many obvious downsides to war from 15,000 feet, it does have one great strength - its sustainability. NATO can carry on this sort of air war for a long, long time. The Serbs need to remember that.

While it is true that NATO will never liberate Kosovo from the air, there is still a chance that this sort of sustained bombardment can achieve our basic objectives - which are to compel



Slobodan Milosevic, either tacitly or by negotiation, to enable the return of the Kosovo Albanians to their homes, with self-rule, protected by an international peacekeeping force that would parol a fence between Albanians and Serbs.

But if NATO's only strength is that it can bomb forever, this it has to get every ounce out of that. Let's at least have a real air war. The idea that people are still holding rock concerts in Belgrade, or going out for Sunday merry-go-round rides, while their fellow Serbs are "cleansing" Kosovo, is outrageous. It should be lights out in Belgrade: every power grid, water pipe, bridge, road and war related factory has to be targeted.

Like it or not, we are at war with the Serbian nation (the Serbs certainly think so), and the stakes have to be very clear: Every week you ravage Kosovo is another decade we will set your country back by pulverizing you. You want 1950? We can do 1950. You want 1389? We can do 1389 too. If we can frame the issue that way, Mr. Milosevic will blink, and we may have seen his first flutter yesterday.

Will this strategy halt the barbarism still going on in Kosovo? No. The war to prevent the refugees from being thrown out of Kosovo, or abducted, was lost the first week - when NATO and the Clinton team bombed the Serbs without having either adequate ground or air power in place to deter them, and without understanding Mr. Milosevic's capabilities or his intentions. That was a strategic blunder for which the Kosovars have paid dearly.

The question now is how best to reverse that, without the U.S. and NATO becoming so enmeshed in the Balkans that it will weaken their ability to operate anywhere else, and straining their cohesion as never before. The only way is a merciless air war.

[ \* \* \* ]

That is just one reason that, for now, we must stick to a strategy that at least holds out the hope of achieving our objectives without NATO ending up owning the Balkans. Because nothing would do more to sap public support for American internationalism than America's taking over history's oldest hornet's nests.

Give war a chance. Let's see what months of bombing does before we opt for weeks of invasion, where, if we win, we get to occupy the Balkans for years. Let's make Kosovo Mr. Milosevic's Vietnam, not ours.

-----

New Republic--May 17, 1999

## A New Serbia

by Daniel Jonah Goldhagen

If you rebuild it...

In the early '40s, Germany and Japan were waging brutal imperial wars, conquering country after country, expelling subjugated populations from their homes, and perpetrating mass murder. In the 1990s, Serbia has been waging brutal imperial war, seeking to conquer area after area, expelling unwanted populations, and perpetrating mass murder. Germany and Japan were colossal powers, ravaging on a continental scale, together dragging the world into war. Serbia is a small, local power, ravaging on a regional scale, dragging NATO into a limited air war.

In all three instances, both the imperialism and the perpetrators' vicious treatment of the victims have been supported by a large majority of the country's populace that was beholden to an ideology which called for the conquest of Lebensraum and the vanquishing of the putative enemies. They believed fanatically in the rightness of these actions, even though they knew that the world saw them to be crimes. In all three instances, the crimes themselves were carried out often by ordinary members of the societies who willingly took these dehumanizing beliefs to radical conclusions when their governments moved them to do so. In all three instances, the majority of the people whose country was committing these enormous crimes deluded themselves into believing that they were the real victims and that any attempt, such as bombing, to halt the imperialism and mass murdering was the real crime. In all three instances, dissident minorities opposed the crimes but were too weak to stop them.

Serbia's deeds are, in their essence, different from those of Nazi Germany only in scale. Milosevic is not Hitler, but he is a genocidal killer who has caused the murders of many tens of thousands of people. The Serbs are not seeking the total, geographically unbounded destruction of another people, as the Germans did with the Jews. But they, too, are pursuing an eliminationist project to purge whole regions of Albanians and, earlier, Bosnians. The Serbs did not begin their imperial and mass murdering wars as the Germans did, without suffering injury or any conceivable threat, but did so in the context of simmering ethnic conflicts and having suffered some injuries themselves at the hands of Croats and of even Bosnians and ethnic Albanians. But the Serbs have nevertheless done their best to remind the world of the Holocaust. The majority of Serbs may not be, as many Germans were, in the grip of an apocalyptic ideology that essentially calls for, and produces policies that would lead to, an end to Western civilization. But the vast majority of the Serbs are animated by a particularly virulent variant of the nationalism characteristic of Western civilization. The horrifying result is all the dead civilian Bosnians and Albanians, who, whether or not one calls this genocide, are just as dead as were the murdered Jews, Poles, Russians, gays, and others during Hitler's time.

By the end of 1945, the Germans and Japanese had stopped killing. Within a few years, they

were no longer a threat to their neighbors. Germany and Japan became democracies, good neighbors, and responsible, leading members of the international community. Germany, in particular, has become a force for democracy, cooperation, and prosperity beyond its borders. These parallel transformations are two of the greatest political successes of the twentieth century. How did such thoroughgoing transformations occur? And could they be reproduced in Serbia?

Germany and Japan were totally defeated and occupied. They were compelled by their conquerors to adopt democratic institutions and to remake themselves, to rid their public spheres of their nationalist, militaristic, and dehumanizing beliefs. Gradually, new political cultures and practices took root. Mentalities changed. The postwar world could not have been so peaceful and prosperous for Germany's and Japan's neighbors, or even for the Germans and Japanese themselves, if the war had ended with some negotiated settlement, the criminal leaders had been left in power, and the then-dominant cultural myths and beliefs that called for the violent subjugation and elimination of other peoples had continued to reign.

As long as Milosevic is in power, as long as Serbs continue to harbor the burning hatred of ethnic nationalism and are afflicted with delusions about themselves, their neighbors, and the rest of the world (that its wish is to victimize the innocent Serbs), there will be no peace in the Balkans, and the danger of renewed "ethnic cleansing" will continue. As with Germany and Japan, the defeat and occupation of--and the reshaping of the political institutions and prevailing mentality in--Serbia are morally and, in the long run, practically necessary. With an allied-occupied Serbia, and a redrawn map that would certainly include a Kosovo detached in whole or in part from Serbia, peace and eventually prosperity could come to the region. The various countries and ethnic groups would be physically secure and in position to break out of the current spiral of hatred and vengeful dreaming. The existing Serbian democratic forces would be able to assert themselves, and the incentives would be created for more people to devote themselves to supporting democratic institutions, practices, and ideals. A new democratic educational system and public sphere could teach Enlightenment values such as toleration and the moral equality of all human beings.

The remaking of Serbia is desirable for the well-being not just of its neighbors but also of its inhabitants, now caught in the grip of delusions, hatreds, an ever-more-belligerent society and culture, war, and death. Occupation is the prerequisite for producing a thoroughgoing democratic transformation in Serbia and, more broadly, in the former Yugoslavia (there should be no illusions that all the Serbs' neighbors are angels). The common notion that outside powers cannot impose peace upon or set in motion the transformation of a belligerent society is belied by the historical record. In Serbia, it would be a much smaller and less costly task, in both material and human terms, than it was in Germany and in Japan.

The myriad costs to the NATO allies would, of course, still be substantial. Allied soldiers would die; the war and the occupation would be expensive in dollar terms (though so would a ground

war to free Kosovo followed by an indefinite quarantine of Serbia); diplomatic rifts within NATO would likely develop; the Russians would probably become more hostile. Before NATO would embark on such action, the will of member nations would have to be engendered to bear the costs and to stay the course. So far, there is little indication that the NATO countries' leaders and elites have the moral fiber and political courage to do so.

But this does not mean that a plan to occupy and transform Serbia is not, in principle, both feasible and morally right. The moral objections against occupation and the forced reshaping of Serbia are slender. Any people that commits imperial war, perpetrates wholesale murder, and assaults entire peoples--not just their armies but unarmed men, women, and children--has forfeited the protections that the norms and conventions of sovereignty usually afford. Similarly, if a people's self-understanding of self-determination includes conquest, mass expulsion, and mass murder, the principle of self-determination is rendered moot for that people because it is a principle that is secondary to more fundamental ones, such as the right not to be murdered.

Any people that commits such deeds in open defiance of international law and the vehement condemnation of virtually the entire international community clearly consists of individuals with damaged faculties of moral judgment and has sunk into a moral abyss from which it is unlikely, anytime soon, to emerge unaided. The majority of the Serbian people, by supporting or condoning Milosevic's eliminationist politics (see "Milosevic's Willing Executioners," by Stacy Sullivan, *tnr*, May 10), have rendered themselves both legally and morally incompetent to conduct their own affairs and a presumptive ongoing danger to others.

Essentially, their country must be placed in receivership. The international community's secondary principles of sovereignty and self-determination should be suspended in the name of the primary principles of protecting the lives and fundamental liberties of the assaulted peoples. The criminals among the Serbs--Milosevic, the Serbian leadership, and those who have butchered, expelled, and raped Albanians and Bosnians--need to be punished; the rest of the criminals' supporters, composing a large percentage of the Serbian people, need to be made to comprehend their errors and rehabilitated. The Serbian people should regain full sovereignty only when they demonstrate that they have a real democracy that respects international law, including, of course, the genocide convention.

Some may object that NATO, by embarking on such an exercise, would be guilty of moral arrogance and selfrighteousness, would itself be acting in an imperial manner, or would be impermissibly selective by doing in Serbia what it has not done elsewhere. All of these unconvincing objections are answered by the undeniable rightness and success of the World War II Allies' analogous interventions in western Germany and Japan. These accomplishments are not diminished by the failure of the allies, then and today, to have taken similar action in other genocidal or quasigenocidal instances--from the Chinese Communists who perpetrated genocide for decades to the 1994 genocide in Rwanda.

The major pitfall to be avoided in occupying Serbia would be the temptation to be highly punitive. A relatively benign occupation would strengthen the democratic forces within Serbia just as it did in western Germany. The allies, partly through the character of an occupation that would help rebuild the country and the region economically, would have to make it clear to the Serbs that their purpose is not to exploit Serbs or to profit from their actions and that the basis of their actions is composed of universal morality and defensible principles of justice. The notion of collective guilt, conceptually and morally indefensible, must be rejected. Only those individuals who actually committed crimes should be treated as criminals. That such an occupation would be multilateral is therefore highly desirable, for that would both make it easier eventually to persuade Serbs that the moral underpinnings of the occupation are just and also make it less likely that the occupying forces would seek to pursue separate and illegitimate interests. And, if the 19 NATO countries will not unanimously consent to such a policy, the United States and others should pursue it outside of NATO's auspices.

The allied countries should not undertake such a project lightly, particularly because they, especially their leaders, can hardly lay claim to moral purity. There should be a high threshold for such intervention. A plausible standard for such an intervention was established de facto in 1945, along with the principle that a people that participates in or endorses systematic mass murder by its government--whether outside or inside its borders--can be occupied and have its country reshaped according to democratic principles. By any reasonable measure, Serbia has met this standard. The only weighty arguments against occupying and transforming Serbia are the costs, in casualties and resources, to the allies, which would not be small, and the need to deal with Russia, which would certainly oppose such a policy.

Nevertheless, if people accept this principle of intervention, and if people accept that it was both morally correct and wise to occupy and transform Germany and Japan in 1945, it follows that they must endorse, in principle, the desirability of pursuing a similar course in the Serbia of 1999. Those who refuse to draw this conclusion should at least not pretend that the range of policy options are restricted to negotiation, sanctions, bombing, or ground troops for Kosovo alone. They should also present a workable conception of how to restore peace and some semblance of normality to the region after the Serbian troops are removed from Kosovo.

To the shame of the world--particularly the Europeans and the United States--no one intervened when the Hutus were committing genocide against the Tutsis in Rwanda. To the shame of the United States and its allies, they stood by after defeating Saddam Hussein and watched him commit mass murder against the Iraqi Shia. The cost of inaction in a world where murderous rulers lead hate-filled people in eliminationist, even genocidal onslaughts is high enough that even those suspicious of, and reluctant to use, American or NATO arms should realize that there is no moral option but to defeat, overwhelmingly and finally, the genocidal killers of our day. Otherwise, the perpetrators will continue to kill and will likely begin to kill again. And future potential genocidal killers will think--as all the recent ones have--that they, too, will enjoy impunity.

The Federal Republic of Germany regained its sovereignty after four years of such an occupation and proceeded, at first haltingly and then with great determination, to build a successful democracy and good relations with its neighbors. Old enmities can be overcome with the guarantee that violence is not a policy option for oneself or one's enemies, with people's participation in democratic life, and with education. Education includes seeing oneself through the corrective lenses of others--for the Germans of 1945, those of the Allies; for today's Serbs, it would be those of the NATO countries. After all, the once-bitter enmities between Germans and French and between Germans and Poles have been overcome; this would not have been possible if the Allies had merely beaten Hitler's armies back to Germany's old borders, set up a "quarantine," and then left either Hitler or a like-minded successor, such as Himmler, in power.

NATO has done little more than hurl pious words and ineffectual bombs while the Serbs have continued to slaughter and expel hundreds of thousands of Albanians and, before them, Bosnian Muslims. On the assumption that NATO--now embarrassed by its seeming impotence, worried about its credibility, and under increasing pressure from its publics--decides to roll the Serbs back from Kosovo, NATO's leaders still need to articulate a strategy to restore genuine peace and to create the possibility for a positive future in the region. The question in stark form is: Would Albanians, Bosnians, Croats, Europeans, North Americans, and even Serbs be better off if Serbia were governed by a Saddam Hussein or a Konrad Adenauer?

Daniel Jonah Goldhagen teaches political science at Harvard University. He is the author of *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust* and is writing a book on genocide in the twentieth century.

-----

May 9, 1999 New York Times p 1

Week in Review

What It Would Take to Cleanse Serbia

By BLAINE HARDEN

Along the blood-spattered timeline of Slobodan Milosevic's Yugoslavia, Kosovo is merely the hideous Now. There was a Before -- in Croatia and Bosnia. Assuming that Milosevic retreats from Kosovo with his dictatorship intact, as now seems likely, Balkans experts foresee an unspeakable After.

It may feature: Fratricidal civil war in Montenegro. Ethnic cleansing of Hungarians in the Serbian province of Vojvodina. Mass murder of Muslims in the Sandzak region of Serbia. No

need, for the moment, to bother about the location or correct pronunciation of these obscure places. The world will likely learn. Just as it learned where Kosovo is -- or was -- before more than 700,000 human beings were chased from their homes in a systematic military campaign of burning and intimidation, theft and murder.

If the pattern holds, Milosevic will soldier on, using Big Lie manipulation of television to tap into a collective soft spot in the Serbian psyche. Even as legions of non-Serbs are dispossessed or killed, he will continue to inflame the Serbs and preserve his power by reassuring them that, yes, they are the victims.

Given the character of Milosevic's regime and knowing that there is almost certainly more horror to come, a bold, if impractical, question is just now beginning to be formulated. Is it finally time for outside powers to make the effort necessary to cure a national psychosis inside Serbia that has been destabilizing a corner of Europe for a decade?

Put another way, has the time come for NATO to do in Serbia what the Allies did in Germany and Japan after World II?

To follow that model, Serbia's military would have to be destroyed, and Milosevic crushed, by an invasion that almost certainly would cost the lives of hundreds of U.S. soldiers. After unconditional surrender, the political, social and economic fabric of Serbia would be remade under outside supervision so that the Serbs could take their place in a prosperous and democratic world.

The question cuts three ways. Will it happen? Should it happen? Could it possibly work?

The answer to the first part of this question, at least for the foreseeable future, is a resounding No Way. The other answers, however, are provocative enough to make it worthwhile to suspend disbelief and indulge the fantasy of a post-Milosevic Balkans.

Let's start, though, with the real world. Policy-makers and long-time students of the West's slow-motion intervention in Yugoslavia during the 1990's see no possibility of Milosevic's military defeat or of Serbia's occupation.

An agreement last week between the West and Russia outlined the kind of solution the outside powers would seek instead -- a withdrawal from Kosovo of the Yugoslav army, police and paramilitary fighters, with an international security force to replace them. Details of the deal are still being argued over, but one thing was clear: If the outside powers can get him to sign on, Milosevic would remain in power in his shrinking Yugoslavia. Thus, he would have the opportunity to "cleanse" another day. The West's calculation seems to be that avoiding a land war, keeping NATO together and cementing relations with Russia outweigh the long-term costs of letting Milosevic off the hook.

That, then, is the real world.

Such a course does nothing, of course, to eradicate extreme Serb nationalism.

The only way to stamp out the disease, protect Serbia's minorities and bring lasting peace to the Balkans is a Japan- or Germany-style occupation of Serbia, according to Daniel Serwer, who until two years ago was the director of European intelligence and research for the State Department. Serwer concedes that occupation has never been on the West's list of serious options, but he echoes many experts on the Balkans when he argues that it should be.

"It is very hard to see how Serbia undergoes this process all on its own," said Serwer, now a fellow at the U.S. Institute of Peace, a research group in Washington. "This regime is deeply rooted. It is not like some dictatorship that you take off its head and it will die. It is so corrupt and the corruption is not superficial."

Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, a Harvard historian who wrote "Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust," published a kind of manifesto last week that demands Serbia "be placed in receivership."

"Serbia's deeds are, in their essence, different from those of Nazi Germany only in scale," Goldhagen wrote in *The New Republic*. "Milosevic is not Hitler, but he is a genocidal killer who has caused the murders of many tens of thousands of people."

It is worth remembering, though, that Milosevic is an elected leader, having won three elections that were more or less fair. That, along with the Serb leader's soaring popularity in the wake of NATO bombing, support an argument that what ails Serbia goes far deeper than one man.

No one makes this argument more powerfully than Sonja Biserko, director of the Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Serbia and a former senior advisor in the European department of the Yugoslav Foreign Ministry. Ms. Biserko, who fled Belgrade a week after the NATO bombings began, said in New York last week that Serbia's fundamental problem is not Milosevic, but a "moral devastation" that has infected her nation.

"People in Serbia are undergoing a mass denial of the barbarity of the ethnic cleansing in Kosovo," Ms. Biserko said. "This denial is itself commensurate to the crime taking place before the eyes of the world."

Ms. Biserko, who met 10 days ago with Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and urged her to consider occupation, believes that Serbia's opposition politicians are incapable now of coming to grips with a culture of victimhood. "Serbs have managed now with the NATO bombing to convince themselves they are victims and as victims they cannot be responsible for what



happened in Kosovo," she said.

A surreal sense of victimhood in Serbia is nothing new. During the siege of Sarajevo, when Serb forces ringed that city with artillery and routinely killed its civilians, Belgrade television reported that Bosnian Muslims were laying siege to themselves. "The Serbs continue to defend their centuries-old hills around Sarajevo," said Radio-Television Serbia.

To shatter this Looking Glass victimhood, Ms. Biserko offers a prescription: Indictment of Milosevic by the War Crimes Tribunal. A military defeat of Serbia and demilitarization of the country. Highly publicized trials that will force Serbs to confront the savagery committed in their name. A Western takeover of the mass media, with strict prohibitions against the dissemination of extreme Serb nationalism. A Marshall Plan for the Balkans.

Asked why the West should be willing to undertake an occupation that would risk many lives, cost billions and take years, Ms. Biserko shrugged: "What other choice is there?"

"The Western world has lost its political instinct," she said. "To bring substance to the ideals of human rights, at some point you must be willing to commit troops."

But could the occupation of Serbia work? Could it break the cycle of violence? Two prominent historians believe it could, if done properly.

"The key in Japan was unconditional surrender," said John W. Dower, a professor of history at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and author of "Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II." "The Americans went in and they did everything. They had a major land reform. They abolished the military, simply got rid of it. They drafted a new constitution. This is what you can do when you have unconditional surrender."

Dower was struck by the eagerness with which a defeated people welcomed reform. "In Japan, the average person was really sick of war, and I think that would be the case in Yugoslavia," he said. "The Americans cracked open a repressive military system and the people filled the space."

The occupation of Germany also suggests ways of dealing with Yugoslavia, according to Thomas Alan Schwartz, a historian at Vanderbilt and author of "America's Germany."

"When Germany was totally defeated, it provided opportunity," he said. "You could be physically there, controlling the flow of information and using war-crime trials to show the Germans that atrocities were done in their name."

Without something similar in Serbia, Schwartz said, "We can look forward to more trouble in Serbia."

"What reminds me of Germany is the comparison to the end of World War I," he added. "Then, the Germans had this powerful sense of being victims. There was a deep resentment that Hitler was able to exploit. It will be the same in Serbia when NATO bombing stops."

The Japan and Germany analogies, of course, are flawed. Those major-league powers ravaged parts of the world that America cared about. Occupation was nothing less than emergency triage for the worst violence in history.

Milosevic, by comparison, is small potatoes. He leads a minor-league country that periodically lays waste to poor, unpronounceable, strategically irrelevant places. Pristina is not Paris.

There is, though, an inkling that the West has begun to try for a solution. In Bosnia, 32,000 NATO-led troops and High Commissioner Carlos Westendorp are even now doing the hard, slow, complex work of healing that country.

Westendorp has not attempted a Japan-style remake of the Serb-populated half of Bosnia (just as nobody has tried to do that in neighboring Croatia, with its own accomplishments in ethnic cleansing). The indicted war criminals Radovan Karadzic and Ratko Mladic have not been hunted down. Radical Serb parties have not been banned. But tough action is being taken. Westendorp ordered radical Serb nationalists out of state television. He has fired the nationalist zealot who was elected the Bosnian Serbs' president. If Serbs violently object to what the peacekeepers do, NATO-led forces shoot to kill.

In a recent interview in Sarajevo, Westendorp said most Bosnian Serbs are cooperating because they are sick of war. It will take time, he said, but the West has enough money and muscle in Bosnia to extinguish the will to war. The one insoluble problem, he said, was the leader in Belgrade.

"If getting rid of Milosevic fails," he said, "then everything fails."

---

[Back to the Jewish Role Page](#)

(c) 1999 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



## Yggdrasil

---

### Princeton Tries to Explain a Drop in Jewish Enrollment; or "What is Communism?"

Folks, as you can tell from the title, this post is about the "inner party." For an explanation of "inner party." see ["What It Would Take to Cleanse Serbia"](#)

Specifically, it is about the durability of the inner party. Can it keep its power? Can it last?

The drop off point for our discussion is the war in Kosovo and the central question that no commentators have seen fit to ask. Cohen, Albright (Korbel), Berger, Clark (Nemerovski) and the rest of the inner party crew embarked upon this war to impose multiculturalism on Serbia. From press reports it appears that all of the principals believed that Milosevic and the Serbs were cowards and that they would surrender within 3 days

The question is, how could they entertain such an idea?

Suppose Israel lacked nuclear weapons and we were to bomb them from 15,000 feet over some policy disagreement. Would the geniuses of the inner party assume that the Israelis would give up in three days?

Are we to assume then that in the minds of the inner party Serbs and Israelis have fundamentally different human natures?

In truth, the Inner Party doesn't know a thing about the Serbians. They think they do because Milosevic seemed "biddable" when dealing with the fate of irredent Serb populations in Croatia and Bosnia earlier in this decade. However, the notion that he would be equally biddable once the bombs began falling on Serbia proper was inexplicably naive.

But it was more than Naive.

The visceral inner party hatreds against Serbia are driven by the perception that Serbia is a nationalist state that defines itself as existing for the benefit of a distinct people. Thus, the very quality that provokes hatred from the inner party should logically compel the conclusion that Serbia and its leaders would resist fiercely, as would the Israelis under similar circumstances. After all, both are racial states (albeit in thinly costumed drag, for the benefit of the media and public opinion).

On the surface the critic might be tempted to conclude that this expectation of easy victory is one more evidence of irrationality by the inner party - and on one level it is. But this fundamental misjudgement tells us something much more important about the inner party.

In fact, the assumption that Serbia would quickly surrender tells us more about the inner party's opinion of us - the Euro-American sheeple with which they are familiar - than of a Serbian nation of which they are obviously ignorant.

After all, it is certainly true that Connecticut would have surrendered in three days!

The inner party believes that Euro-American racists are cowards, so why wouldn't Serbs be cowards as well? As professor [Kevin MacDonald](#) has pointed out, the evolutionary psychology of the inner party causes them to believe their own propaganda. Belief prevents Freudian slips and has survival value for minorities living in diaspora. Unlike the claptrap we were fed as undergraduates, Professor MacDonald's theories have predictive and explanatory value in the real world of current events.

The living members of the inner party simply never encounter racially aware members of the Euro-American majority in their daily lives. They cannot imagine a European elite that would suffer along with their own kind to ensure their ethnic independence and integrity, because they never meet such people in The U.S.

To the inner party, Euro Elites throughout the world protect their own power and economic status as individuals or as members of a class. Thus, the fundamental message of the Kosovo war is that, in the eyes of the inner party, any interest the Euro peoples of the world may have in cultural or racial survival is unrepresented. Thus, in the minds of the inner party, the natural state of Western Cultures and Western societies is decapitation. They are leaderless and defenseless.

The very thought of a renegade European state - Serbia - that has not been decapitated - that is not leaderless or defenseless - is an affront to the inner party. It is a threat to their hegemony over the European peoples of the World.

Having described a modern instance, it is time to move to the very core problem.

But by way of introduction, I must discuss the three basic strategies of the inner party for coping with exposure.

If the facts underlying the exposure are wrong, the media will quickly carry stories from the university professor contingent of the inner party and demonstrate that the facts are false.

If the facts underlying the exposure are true, then the inner party will use its anti-defamation forces to demonize the one doing the exposing. The argumentum ad hominem is the most important visible tool in the inner party's defensive arsenal.

However, the most damaging forms of exposure typically are those that would threaten the cooperation of the elites of the outer party and thus endanger inner party' control over these elites. The inner party has a strategy for handling such exposures. They are ignored. I call it the "blackout" strategy.

Thus, the most interesting and important facts about the inner party are those which are unmentioned and ignored. Truly dangerous critics of the inner party are routinely subjected to the blackout. Gore Vidal slipped down the memory hole a long time ago.

And indeed, the most important intellectual quality that we can develop - the most important for the long run survival of our people - is to detect a "blackout " and pursue its mysteries until the underlying riddle is understood.

And the "holy grail" - the mother or all inner party blackouts - is the utter void of information or meaningful commentary about the process by which the members of the inner party were maneuvered out of the top ranks of the Soviet Hierarchy from 1928 through about 1940.

How could the inner party, who's members occupied 90% of the top positions in the Soviet Union in 1924, including virtually all the top positions in the secret police, concentration camp system and intelligence agencies ever be displaced by Stalin and his badly outnumbered allies?

Enquiring minds want to know.

It is the central puzzle of the Twentieth Century. Solve that puzzle and we will - for reasons I shall explain later in this essay - gain significant insight into the odds of our survival.

Put bluntly, the central question is whether it is possible for the inner party to sustain, over any considerable period of time, a cohesive multi-cultural elite which will allow them to rule over us behind a universalist mask.

The truly fascinating thing, from an anthropological perspective, about the 1930's changes

within the Communist party was that these changes involved the composition of a relatively small group of people - sixty or so - who knew and interacted with one another. All of them shared a powerful universalist and anti-nationalist ideology that demanded a multi-cultural elite.

But once these people from different backgrounds began struggling for power within that elite, a wondrous thing happened. The dominant nationality - the inner party - was exiled or killed in a series of purges that eliminated them from the upper reaches of power.

So then the question arises whether this result was a random event - one that would not necessarily be replicated under similar circumstances - or whether it was an inevitable result of the friction generated by the differing evolutionary psychologies of the participants. Did those different methods of thinking and communicating inject a modicum of mistrust into a tense environment in which small amounts of mistrust were fatal? Powerful support for this thesis can be found in "Stalin's Letters to Molotov" Lih, Naumov, and Khlevniuk (Yale University Press, 1995). See especially pp. 18 - 26.

To the particularist within the inner party, the question is best framed by asking if these purges were one more proof that Theodor Hertzl was right? Or more universally, does professor Kevin MacDonald's thesis have overarching predictive power in the real world of political affairs?

Or in the words of the ole Ygg, - Is this idea of a multi-cultural elite just an inner party delusion?

The Jewish Encyclopedia states that the inner party did quite well in the Soviet Union until 1948 - the beginning of the cold war - and that anti-semitism wasn't a factor in Soviet life until then. And while it is true that the inner party continued to occupy a hugely disproportionate number of desirable occupations and positions within the Communist party until 1953 (The doctors' plot), their exclusion from the upper-most reaches of power had been completed by 1938 or 1940.

The mystery is why the organs of the inner party fail to attribute this earlier displacement to anti-semitism.

Given the stakes involved, and given that this first displacement enabled the second to begin in 1948, the silence is deafening. It is the quintessential blackout.

In an attempt to get answers I began re-reading Anatoly Sudoplatov's "Other Tasks." Sudoplatov was in charge of the assassination of Leon Trotsky, an inner party competitor of Stalin's who had been exiled to Mexico. Ideally, there should be no better source of insight than an insider who participated in the events of the time.

But like the first time through, Sudoplatov disappointed. He and his co-authors, a son entitled through his mother to Israeli citizenship under the Law of Return, and Jerrold Schecter, the inner party Moscow bureau chief for Time Magazine, obviously feel no obligation to provide a

convincing explanation of the events which set the stage for the anti-semitic purges of the inner party nomenclatura from 1948 to 1953. He attributes it all to Stalin's personal ambition and insecurity, giving no special note of the near uniform ethnic identity of those purged prior to 1940.

In frustration, and as if by fateful accident, I picked up Walter Sanning's revisionist classic "The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry," a book I have owned for some time but never read, to see if it contained any clues.

Sanning's essential thesis is that, because of the well documented evacuation of Jews from Western Soviet territories prior to their occupation by Germany following Germany's attack in 1941, Germany never had more than about 3.5 million Jews under its control from 1938 through 1945. Given the 900,000 to one million Jews alive in the camps at the end of the war, the maximum number that could have been killed appears to be about 2.5 million and not six million. Sanning then goes on to produce a number of very complex estimates and calculations in an attempt to show that the number unaccounted for after the war was far less than 2.5 million.

To my surprise, I found buried within Sannings work the "holy grail" - hard statistical evidence of how communist society actually worked - its very core and essence exposed for all to see! Surprisingly, Sanning himself apparently missed its true significance.

In preparation for war with Germany, Stalin build huge factories in Siberia - half of them empty - to supply his war effort if Germany should thrust into Russian territory and capture it. In addition, he developed plans for the movement of manufacturing equipment and the evacuation of key industrial personnel in the event that the industrial cities in Poland, Belarus, Ukraine, the Baltic republics and Western Russia should be captured. The publicly stated idea was to preserve Soviet industry in the event of successful attack and to deny that industrial capability to the Germans if the Western Russian territories and republics should be overrun.

But, of course, there was a second unspoken purpose to this evacuation program as well. In this evacuation approximately 55% of the urban or city population was evacuated along with the industrial machinery.

The entire rural or agricultural population was left for the Germans to capture along with about 45% of the urban population.

Ok, so who stays and who goes?

Answer that question and you have captured the essence of communist society - its actual deeds and not its words. From page 81:

"Ukrainians were a minority in their own cities; only 47.4% of all city people in the SSR Ukraine were Ukrainians and the remaining 52.6% were largely accounted for by Russians (25%) and Jews (23%). Both of these latter two nationalities occupied most of the important positions in industry, party and administration; in the eyes of the Ukrainians they represented the long and heavy hand of Moscow. The entire grotesque situation is depicted in the professional structure of the Ukraine's pre-war population:"

### Ukraine's Pre War Population

Eduation and Profession	Ukrainians	Russians	Jews
Percent of population:			
Primary College	8%	13%	24%
Secondary College	10%	24%	60%
Percent of total in occupation:			
Enterprise managers	34%	20%	41%
The Arts	27%	31%	36%
Doctors and medical aides	38% mostly orderlies	23%	32% mostly doctors
Industrial blue and white collar	40%	22%	32%
Construction	38%	51%	?
Mining	31%	58%	?
Servants	60%	28%	5%

When the Germans "liberated" the Ukraine, they found a decapitated society, largely incapable of producing the essentials of civilized life, or indeed, of feeding themselves. In the words of a German officer responsible for performing a quick census [page 62]:

"The Russian and Jewish upper classes withdrew together with the Red Army. The leading Ukrainians have been partially deported and, if they held leading positions in administration and industry, they were also forced to move east of the Dnieper. Numerous tractor and other specialists on the countryside met the same fate. In June, many young men were called up and put in garrison in the interior of the USSR.... Because of this development there is a tremendous scarcity of people capable of assuming responsible positions in administration, industry and agriculture in the



Ukraine..."

Similar patterns of packing minorities into the upper middle classes of the ethnic republics can be seen in the Baltic Republics (Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia) as well as Belarus.

Indeed, it appears that the very essence of Communism is ethnic manipulation and population transfer. It is a pattern that holds true even at the top of the communist party structure. In the early days following the revolutions of 1917-1918, none of the top officials in Moscow were ethnic Russians. In fact, a large number grew up in New York. Most of the top leaders felt compelled to change their names to conceal their ethnic origins. Among the first politburo, inner party members like Leon Bronshtein (Trotsky), Hirsch Apfelbaum (Zinoviev), and Lev Rosenfeld (Kamenev) felt compelled to change their names. Lenin himself was a mix of German, Swedish, Jewish, Kalmyk (Asian) and Russian ancestry - the very poster boy for a world in which nationality had been abolished - or so it would seem. Nevertheless, the inner party had a compelling need to cover up his ancestry and paint him a pure-bred Russian (instead of the grandson of a well-to-do Jewish Doctor).

At the center in Moscow it was Georgians (Stalin, Beria), Latvians (Berzin) and Ukrainians (Kruschev) supported by a large cast of inner party members who shape party decisions by controlling the information flow. In the ethnic provinces the local administration consisted of ethnic Russians along with the inner party members.

The entire Communist system was based on manipulation of race and national origin for control - and the central mechanism for maintaining that control was decapitation - the extermination or the mass transfer of the leaders of an ethnic group, and the total dependence of the remaining native population upon imported or native minorities who managed the government and the business enterprises and dominated the learned professions.

The important point is that all forms of inner-party communism, the violent Bolshevik variety and the newer "democratic socialist" variety invented by the Frankfurt school, direct their demographic engineering effort at the elites - not the ordinary working people.

The sine-qua-non of inner party power is a multi-cultural elite alienated from its tribal and racial kinsmen.

It is the native elites - the indigenous leaders who might resist the inner party's drive for power - that are always the target.

To the inner party, the masses of any nation are at all times totally irrelevant to their goal of acquiring and keeping power. The masses of the nations were important in the Soviet Union as labor, a fungible factor of production in an economic system focused on output. The Marxist concept that each hour of their labor was of equal value tells you all you need to know about the

inner party's regard for them.

And in war time, the masses were readily abandoned, as the real nation proved to be a relatively small and mobile alliance of minorities and uprooted majority careerists.

For the reform version of communism developed by the Frankfurt School that now dominates the "liberal democracies" and the NWO, the masses of the nations are important as consumers - cogs in the machinery of debt creation and credit card impulse purchases. The masses of the nations are to be manipulated by television and opinion polls - Annie the Analyzer of Radio Project fame and focus groups to pre-test manipulative messages.

What remains relevant to the inner party are the inner party's potential competitors, the native national elites with community ties to their brethren.

In the Soviet Union, the inner party elites (using Lenin and Stalin as their cover) resorted to murder and forced resettlement to remove the native national elites, a fast, direct and brutal form of decapitation.

In the "liberal democracies" the inner party uses a slower and less visibly brutal method of decapitation. Thus, in the liberal democracies of today we have "affirmative action" - a set of laws that places tremendous pressure on private businesses to displace native elites at the top with minorities who will be less plausible targets of discrimination lawsuits. These laws exist everywhere in the European world, and with the exception of the U.S. were enacted long before any significant minority constituencies (other than the inner party itself) existed to lobby for their passage.

The entire program of displacement and decapitation within the liberal democracies was carefully drawn up and explained in "The Authoritarian Personality" by Theodor Adorno, et. al.(1947). It is a prescription for identifying any person who displays any bond of obligation to his own kind and the will to resist those who threaten the interests of his kind.

Such "authoritarian personalities" are to be denied university admission and consigned to low status occupations, which is precisely what the laws of affirmative action and social rules of political correctness accomplish.

Indeed, as I read the tables from the 1939 Soviet census published in Sanning's work I recalled my own research showing that the inner party, representing 2.4% of the U.S. population comprises 28% of the student body at Harvard, while the descendants of European Christendom comprising 70% of the population supply only 18% of the students. The American Majority has been effectively displaced at Harvard. Relative to their share of the Population, they have 2.4 times fewer students than do the inner party's Afro-American coalition partners.

In the top 15 national universities in the 1997 ranking by U.S. News, the results are similar. The inner party has 22% of the students, while the descendants of European Christendom have only 32% - roughly half of their share of the population.

The United States Department of Labor has maintained a tracking study of 12,000 young people who were between the ages of 14 and 22 in 1979 known as the National Longitudinal study of Youth ("NLSY"). The CD Roms with all the data can be purchased from Ohio State University. These data show that at each given level of IQ (all participants were tested) the income and educational attainment of the descendants of European Christendom is much lower than for Blacks, Hispanics and Inner party members of the same IQ.

In what will surely be a surprise to most middle and upper middle income Euro-Americans, the effects are most pronounced at the highest IQ levels. In other words, it is the majority elite that suffers the widest disparity in income and education when compared with Blacks, Hispanics and Inner Party members within the same IQ range. When the effects are broken down by sex, we find that among males the disparity is most pronounced in the highest IQ ranges and disappears entirely by the time you descend to the 50% mark. The widest disparity exists among the top 2% of the population (those with IQs above 130).

Majority males with IQs below 100 earn the same or slightly more than their Black, Hispanic and Inner Party counterparts.

It is among the female descendants of European Christendom, those most likely to support "affirmative action", "women's liberation" and the other demographic engineering efforts of the inner party, that we find the widest and most shocking income disparities. Among females, the disparity is not confined to the top half of the IQ spectrum, but persists from top to bottom at consistent levels at each IQ range.

Indeed, if one were to view these data as the result of a purposeful system, then the object of the multi-culturalist enterprise is clearly two fold - first to displace and disadvantage majority males at the top of the IQ spectrum and second, to exploit majority women from top to bottom. At each level of IQ they are paid dramatically less than their Black, Hispanic and inner party counterparts with the same IQ.

Displacement of majority elites might not be as complete in the U.S. in 1999 as it was in The Soviet Union in 1939, but the trend is clear and runs in the same direction.

Indeed the most important data reproduced in Sanning's little book are tables setting forth the demographic composition of towns and cities in Central and Eastern Poland and statistics on the distribution of occupations from a 1931 Polish census:

## Eastern Polish Cities

### Total Population and Jewish Population as of Dec. 9, 1931 Polish Census

Province	City	Population	Jewish Population	% Jewish
Wilna	Wilna	195,071	55,006	28%
Nowogrodek	Baranowicze	22,818	9,680	42%
Bialystok	Bialystok	91,101	39,165	43%
	Grodno	49,669	21,159	43%
	Lomza	25,022	8,912	36%
	Suwalki	21,826	5,811	27%
Polesia	Brest	48,385	21,440	44%
	Pinsk	31,912	20,220	63%
Wolhynia	Kovel	27,677	12,842	46%
	Rovno	40,612	22,737	56%
	Lutsk	35,554	17,366	49%
	Włodzimierz	24,591	10,665	43%
Lvov	Lvov	312,231	99,595	32%
	Boryslav	41,496	12,996	32%
	Drohobycz	32,261	12,931	40%
	Jaroslav	22,195	6,272	28%
	Przemysl	51,038	17,326	42%
	Rzeszov	26,902	11,228	42%
	Sambor	21,923	6,274	29%
Stanislaw	Kolomyja	33,788	14,332	42%
	Stanislaw	59,960	24,823	41%
	Stryj	30,491	10,869	36%
Tarnapol	Tarnapol	35,644	13,999	39%
	23 Cities	1,282,167	475,648	37%

### Easern Polish Cities: Continued

Group by % Jewish	Cities	Population	Jewish Population	Jewish %
53-63%	2 Cities	72,524	42,957	59%
40-49%	11 Cities	452,706	195,631	43%
30-39%	7 Cities	517,845	169,971	33%
27-29%	3 Cities	239,092	67,089	28%
27-63%	23 Cities	1,282,167	475,648	37%
	remaining Cities	1,221,809	448,364	37%
	All Cities	2,503,976	924,012	37%
	Countryside	10,898,567	405,069	4%
	East Poland	13,402,543	1,329,081	10%

### Professions in Poland: Jews and Non-Jews as of Dec. 9, 1931 Polish Census

Economic Sector	Jews	%	Gentile	%	Over-Under Representation
Agriculture	125,123	4%	19,221,825	67%	-94%
Non Agriculture	2,988,810	96%	9,580,021	33%	+189%
Non Ag Categories:					
Self Employed	699,244	22%	763,617	3%	+747%
White Collar	91,970	3%	555,274	2%	+53%
Blue Collar	277,555	9%	2,473,344	9%	+4%
Othes	54,256	1.7%	420,206	1.5%	+19%
Not Employed	1,865,785	60%	5,367,580	19%	+222%
Total	3,113,933	100%	28,801,846	100%	

These tables are important because Poland was not a part of the Soviet empire at that time, and the demographics did not result from Soviet policies of forced removal and forced decapitation as they did in Eastern Ukraine.

The data shows that in eastern Poland (which, along with Moldova, Belarus and Western Ukraine [the "Pale of the Settlement"]) formed the very cradle of the inner party) the Polish majority population had existed in a "decapitated" state in 1931, and almost certainly for the preceding 200 years as well. These areas were owned and governed by a thin class of nobles sharing supposed ethnic and religious kinship with peasants consigned to the poverty of agricultural labor. A majority of the middle class and an overwhelming majority of the professional occupations were held by the inner party ethnic minority.

Viewed from the perspective of these statistics, it seems that European Communism (in its orthodox Bolshevik form as well as its reform "liberal democratic" variety) is a thinly disguised effort to force upon the entire European World the ethnic status and occupational relationships existing in Eastern Poland and the Pale of the Settlement at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution - relationships in which the inner party had a commanding share of the middle class and professional occupations and a ready supply of shiksas as servant girls - relationships which guaranteed the inner party safety because economic life and the tax base which sustained the nobles would collapse without them.

Indeed, the emancipation of the serfs and the industrial revolution presented a profound threat to their comfortable world of ethnic dominance. The new factories brought hundreds of thousands of very rough and threatening peasants to the towns and cities. Prior to the Industrial Revolution, the inner party got warning of peasant revolts because the peasants had to gather in the countryside and march to the towns. Because of the industrial revolution, these dangerous people lived right next door and attended the same schools.

In the words of Irving Howe, in "World of Our Fathers" p. 21:

"The emancipation of the serfs had a damaging effect on those Jews, not large in number but still important in the Jewish economy, who had worked as agents of the nobility or as economic middlemen disposing of the peasants' produce. Jewish petty officials and traders tended to be squeezed out, and as a result many rural Jews were compelled to seek employment in the cities."

To make matters worse, out of every million Polish peasants drawn to the cities and educated in the schools, twenty thousand had IQs above 130; and over 160,000, a full 16%, had IQs above 115, matching the distribution of IQ of the top half of the inner party. It was a nightmare. The inner party could easily be displaced. It was no longer indispensable. In fact, some of these peasants actually started factories of their own and became wealthy. Being only one or two generations off the farm, there was always a threat that they might use this newfound wealth to organize their fellow peasants.

The Inner Party developed ideologies of "human equality" as weapons to preserve the status quo

ante. According to this ideology, intelligence was a product of the environment, which justifies socialized, middling incomes for the peasants. Socialized incomes mean middling environments, which, in turn, justify the attribution of equal and middling intelligence to their children. This ideology provided the moral cloak that would allow the inner party to exclude the children of these new arrivals from the schools and universities they controlled (including the art academy in Vienna), and confine them to middling occupations. Each hour of their labor was worth the same, thus stripping the talented of any means of upward mobility and depriving them of any opportunity to compete with and displace the inner party. For the unwashed new industrialists there was the progressive income tax and the inheritance tax, all designed to prevent them from converting economic power into political power.

The entire program stood in militant opposition to Horatio Alger's "Struggling Upward."

The demonstrably false beliefs of liberalism, which appear so perverse and illogical to loyal opposition conservatives, serve a very rational and logical purpose once you take the trouble to answer the question "how will these principles be applied in practice, and who benefits?"

And it is trouble indeed if you have the temerity to answer that question in public.

For the demonstrably false ideologies of liberalism are all essential to the program of keeping the nations of the world in an impotent and leaderless state.

In the orthodox Communist model, the inner party grabbed power by force. To the extent that the talented children of peasants were needed to administer and manage an increasingly complex society, they were transferred to some alien place where they would not identify with the local peasants and could not stir up rebellion based on ties of kinship or nation.

In the reform model of Communism adopted in all liberal democratic societies, power was seized more slowly, by breaking the chains of the genetic and religious isolation imposed upon the inner party by Orthodoxy, and by mixing aggressively with the potential leaders of the nations and aggressively influencing their social and cultural perceptions. By this means, the inner party placed itself in a blocking position within the culture and the arts so as to prevent expressions of racial and national awareness among the native elites. In addition, the inner party recognized that accepting lower returns on their investments in the press and the media was the least costly and most effective means of converting economic power into political power. This strategy guaranteed the inner party a blocking position sufficient to prevent these organs of public opinion from being used to organize the new arrivals from the countryside to challenge the inner party.

Once the industrial revolution rendered the closed and ethnically stratified society within the Pale of the Settlement untenable, there arose a passionate commitment to the "open" society, an ideological construct in which individual upward mobility would be extolled in words, but

would be prevented in fact by central economic planning and high marginal tax rates, and where "freedom of thought and expression" would be extolled in words, but where massive social and economic pressure would be brought to bear on any thought or expression that identified the speaker as an "authoritarian personality."

It was essential to identify the talented newcomers and then alienate them from their roots just as the Polish nobles had been alienated. Like the nobles, majority elites could be taught contempt for their less prosperous brethren, and liberated from any sense of ethnic or racial obligation by attacking the traditional religious faith they shared and replacing the moral restrictions and obligations of those traditional religions (that had preserved them over the centuries) with the vices of the cosmopolitan city packaged in ideologies of "freedom" and "choice". Again, those who resist the blandishments of vice and degraded culture are called bigots, homophobes, fundamentalists, racists, etc. and are banished to occupations in which they have no power or influence.

The central reality of Communist action is racial and ethnic engineering. It is all slaughters and mass transfers of various Christian nationalities behind a universalist mask which denies even the slightest consciousness of these nationalities' existence.

The program continues to this day. Cuban exiles in Miami tell me that the population of Cuba was 70% white in 1956. After 40 years of Castro's Communism, it has fallen to 30% (in their estimate). Like Lenin, Castro is, according to his daughter Alina, an inner party half-breed.

By now you should be asking, what does all this have to do with undergraduate admissions at Princeton?

As it happens, the answer is, a great deal.

At the beginning of this post, I asked whether the idea of a multi-cultural elite was just an inner party delusion. I suggested that the ease with which Stalin maneuvered the inner party from power might be a warning that this idea of a multi-cultural elite may be a chimera.

Indeed this is the central thesis of Benjamin Ginzberg's masterpiece "The Fatal Embrace," in which he argues that the philo-semitic posture of the native elites in the U.S. is conditional and will last only so long as these elites continue to benefit from their philo-semitism and liberalism.

Implicit in the act of writing and publishing that work is the idea that these native elites no longer benefit. Ginzberg gives us a stunningly detailed and frank portrait of the process by which the inner party seized political power in the U.S. and he marvels at the ease with which it was done. So easy in fact that Ginzberg suspects a trick, namely, that governmental power may no longer be as relevant or significant as it once was, and that controlling government, if not a waste of time, might be dangerous because of the potential for mistakes and blame.



In any event, aside from the followers of Theodor Hertzl, who have forthrightly volunteered to plow the fields and sweep the streets of their own nation, the rest of the inner party desperately wishes to continue its charmed life free of such chores and has adopted (perhaps in response to the experience with Stalin) a decentralized strategy of acquiring and keeping power through private activity.

As I mentioned in the previous essay "what it would take to cleanse Serbia", a necessary consequence of this strategy is a multiplicity of unplanned and conflicting initiatives driven by visceral emotion - a fertile field for the very visible blunders and mistakes which Ginzberg fears.

A second drawback of that strategy is that the laws of demographics and large numbers apply in spades to the exercise of power through private activity. The fact that the number of inner party kids enrolling at Princeton has fallen from 18% in 1973 to 9% in 1995 is very significant news. In 1973 the inner party filled about 45% of the seats at Harvard. In 1997 they filled only 28%.

Even more stunning is the statistic that "Jewish students represented only 6.3 per cent of the freshmen at private colleges in 1996, down from 16.8 per cent in 1973, according to a survey of freshmen conducted annually by the Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California at Los Angeles."

The article reprinted below makes clear that the inner party faculty members at Princeton suspect invidious discrimination - and this despite the fact the the President of Princeton is an inner party member. So once again we hear the primal scream of the inner party with its hands on the reins of power: - If only we were really in charge!

But the reason for the decline is much simpler and more obvious.

I checked the NLSY-1979 sample (a group that has mostly completed their child bearing years), and it appears that the fertility rate for inner party females is a dismal 1.2 per woman (it is a very small sample so the error is in the 15 to 20% range). For the descendants of European Christendom, the number is 1.6 - a troublesome number but much better than that of the inner party.

The reason that there are so few inner party kids at Princeton is that the kids are not being born in the first place.

Professor MacDonald argues that the evolutionary psychology unique to the inner party is so strong that no amount of out-marriage and no degree of infertility will threaten their group survival nor change the essential characteristics of the group. However, the issue here is not group survival (an outcome I concede as readily to the inner party as to every other race or nation on earth - there is room for all of us!). The issue here is power - and more specifically the

inner party's ability to hold political and social power based on a strategy of displacing native elites.

It is a collective and cumulative political power that is ultimately dependent on numbers.

The consequence is clear. A complex society requires a large number of intelligent people to manage its functions. To exercise power effectively with a decentralized displacement strategy you need large numbers - numbers sufficient to place representatives in every office to spot and censor every instance of politically incorrect thought and behavior.

The smaller the numbers, the more difficult control becomes.

While Professor MacDonald may be right that a small and intense core of the inner party can reproduce itself; nevertheless, it is equally clear that the strategy of fanning out into and controlling an "open" society by corrupting the culture has poisoned the inner party at the same time.

Sir Arthur Keith was the first to recognize that the extension of the ideals of compassion, equality and brotherly love beyond one's own tribe or racial nation (where they are necessary for collective survival) and the universalization and application of those ideals to all of mankind inevitably means that such ideals are being used as aggressive tools of retribalizing elites engaging in hostile, race forming behaviors intended to set themselves apart as a separate class from their kinship group, while rendering members of their kinship group unsuspecting deracinated targets. Modern liberalism always has a subconscious malevolent driver.

And indeed this central insight of Keith's makes him more dangerous to the inner party than any other social critic of this ending millennium. It justifies his academy award level blackout treatment as well as the heavy posthumous doses of slander and calumny which he will wear as badges of honor forever. For Keith's analysis tears the Marxist mask from "class conflict," thereby conferring automatic moral legitimacy on any future "peasant revolts" while making clear what programs must be followed to restore nature's order and prevent an immediate recurrence of the multi-cultural disease.

And indeed, portions of the small, native Polish middle class (along with native elites throughout Europe) were indeed attracted to the Marxist ideology as a means of "managing" the mass migration of peasants to cities.

Thus, the theoretical underpinnings of Marxism - environmental determinism of ability, equality of reward for work, and central planning and allocation of opportunities and rewards, were perfectly rational as weapons to forestall the threat of upward mobility and displacement inherent in the migration of peasants to cities in the industrial revolution. Further, it was perfectly rational for the inner party to spread these doctrines among native elites as a means of

preserving their dominant position.

If you are a tiny minority elite living scattered among your host, prosperity is only assured by acquiring the power to retain your own rent seeking position within the economy and not by producing generalized economic growth and prosperity for all.

Thus, orthodox Marxism was remade into its reform variety, wherein ethnic and racial identity is used to motivate minorities to join political coalitions with the inner party as a means of controlling political outcomes in the "liberal democracies." Reform Marxism also requires immigration of additional minorities as a means of augmenting inner party political power. This basic strategy of ethnic and racial engineering for political advantage is reinforced by a system of punishment for any form of explicit racial defense among the majority European group. These punishments consist of social and economic sanctions that now exist throughout the European world, as well as laws criminalizing all such expressions in all European countries except for the U.S. and Russia.

This mirror image of the orthodox Communist program, adapted to democracy, is completely rational from the perspective of the inner party.

But that part of the reform Communist program which seeks to estrange the outer party European elites from their racial kinsmen by corrupting them is fraught with danger - dangers that are quite obvious in retrospect. And it is this part of the program that has split off a small group of inner party dissenters known as neo-conservatives.

Before the inner party decided to undertake a public campaign to seduce the outer party elites through prosperity and vice, it should have checked to make sure its own members had taken the vaccine!

This is especially critical when power depends on numbers. Before it began its attack on Christianity and its promotion of "women's liberation" and "alternative life styles" such as unmarried motherhood, lesbian and gay lifestyles, and self-absorbed childless yuppie consumerism, it should have carefully shored up its own cultural defenses.

And as the falling numbers of inner party college students attest, the inner party has no vaccine. Truth be told, they never even thought through the consequences before the onslaught began. It is another one of those inner party delusions driven by visceral emotion.

There is one central and overwhelming aspect of this attack in particular that should have caused the inner party to reconsider. For seducing the outer party elite to vice could only be accomplished with the image of the Aryan, blonde female flooding through an endless stream of advertisements and movies over 50 years. As sir Arthur Keith noted, ethics are a tribe's rules of survival. If you can destroy those ethics you can destroy the tribe or race.

But Keith also noted that aesthetic preferences and images of beauty and sexual attraction are equally important to group survival. And when the inner party sought to destroy our ethics and morals by drowning us in exceptionally rare and beautiful images of the blond Aryan female, they made a classic mistake.

While recoiling viscerally at the implications of Darwin's idea of natural selection, the inner party neglected to consider carefully the mechanisms of that selection. Within human groups, sexual selection is by far the most important mechanism, more important than mortality from disease, starvation or combat. Ironically, by dramatically decreasing mortality from disease and combat, modern life has made sexual selection paramount. Prior to the inner party attack, Christian ethics restrained the effects of sexual selection. The attack opened the floodgates.

Call it the survival of the prettiest.

Unwittingly, the inner party has dramatically accelerated the pace of natural selection.

When my teenage daughters compare themselves to the ideals thrust upon us by the inner party media and advertising moguls, models such as Claudia Schiffer and Heidi Klum, they realize that they do not quite measure up. But at the same time they instantly recognize that they are visibly of the same tribe as those stars - tall, slender and light hair. They are second round draft picks, which is about as good as it gets in the real world away from the Hollywood images.

But once the typical inner party teenage girl from Brooklyn discovers how totally enthralled the inner party boys are by these Aryan images, she knows she is doomed. The ones who look like young versions of Madeline Albright or Dr. Ruth Westheimer must lower their sights, or, like Monica Lewinski, accept the most demeaning of competitive poses.

Most fly like moths to the flame of women's liberation, thereby politicizing the personal, blaming failure on impersonal societal forces (which is indeed true, relative to the reproductive success that they would have enjoyed back in the Pale of the Settlement before World War I), and finding comfort in the company of others similarly situated.

The average consequence shows clearly in the fertility numbers.

The inner party attack is a disaster for us and a worse disaster for them. Who knows; perhaps they really believed those idiotic studies conducted by Franz Boaz in 1911 which argued that immigrants heads changed shape shortly after arrival on these fair shores.

Indeed, the Aryan ideal of female beauty is overpowering. Ben Stein writes a "life and style" type column in the neo-conservative American Spectator. In one column he recalls a stroll on the Venice Beach boardwalk and a chance encounter with a shockingly beautiful blond Slovak

or Romanian girl on roller skates. Stein comments that he wanted to take over the INS and admit only girls who looked like her. A darker treatment of the power of this same image can be found in Eldridge Cleaver's "Soul on Ice."

But there is a second aspect of this aesthetic conditioning that is never discussed - except perhaps in my own writings, and that is its effect on majority males.

In a tribal or pre-industrial society, the ideas of aesthetic attraction we are born with are influenced and refined exclusively by the real women we actually see in our neighborhoods. The slave boy in the dialog *The Meno*, was shown a puzzle by Socrates and taken through two erroneous proofs. He recognizes their falsehood after hearing explanations by Socrates. But the slave boy instantly recognizes that the third proof is correct and defends it against later sophistical arguments against its validity. So too, the presentation of rare Aryan images of female beauty are "true" to young majority males. The endless repetition of that image gives it supercharged power.

The exact dimensions of this phenomenon first struck me when I saw a brochure produced by some National Alliance boys at the local University. They had selected for the cover of their brochure an incredibly beautiful, slender blond woman playing with her two preschool children. There were no words or argument. None were needed. It was simply understood that this image was under attack. It was this image that they and their organization were fighting to defend. *In hoc Signo Vincet*.

It was a very effective brochure.

Ironically, they lifted the image from an ad published by the local phone or electric utility. The commercial advertiser knew that this image would cause customers with a particular evolutionary psychology to identify positively with the company and buy its products.

What I had not clearly recognized before was the obvious; - that this aesthetic image of beauty propounded by Hollywood has created for millions of young white males an image of our race that has never before existed.

If you stop and think about it, a race is a very difficult thing to conceptualize. It is quite doubtful that any humans carried around an image of their race in their heads prior to the twentieth century. After all, there is a great deal of individual variation within the extended tribe, and humans cannot conveniently synthesize mental images of thousands of their varied kinsmen into a unified whole.

In the past, they carried images of different looking strangers, but not a single unified image of themselves as a race. Indeed, you can search European literature and find scant mention of the idea of race until the 19th Century. And even then, race was defined only in reference to the

different look of the stranger. The stranger is a specific type. We are not a race. Rather, WE are the one true universal man, and those alien others are "races".

In this sense, race is a uniquely modern idea. In the past, all humans (with the exception of the inner party) whether organized by tribe or nation defended a territory. Patriotism demanded sacrifice for the defense of a strip of land from which the tribe or race obtained sustenance. In the past, we did not carry around in our heads a uniform aesthetic ideal of beauty we were defending. Our own death and defeat did not deprive life on earth of a living aesthetic symbol of overarching and transcendent value.

Inadvertently, the inner party bosses of Hollywood and the advertising industry, with explicit theoretical blessing from the Frankfurt School, have given us something unique. It is an image of our future, the map of our evolutionary destiny. It is the image of what we can collectively become.

It is an image that has replaced territory in its power. It is an image that millions of young males would fight and die for.

And that, folks, is not particularly good news for the inner party.

I should also note a second process of de-territorialization that has potential consequences.

The vast majority of successful business executives I met during my working career were, like myself, essentially two generations off the farm. We all thought of ourselves as sophisticates when it came to identifying the interests of the business and defending those interests in the political process. But in the pit of our stomachs, we all viewed the political system as alien, mysterious, irrational and dangerous. In truth, none of us had a clue how it really worked or even the right questions to ask.

Like me, many of these executives were plucked from the wrong side of the tracks by the standardized test, moved about the American Empire hither and yon, landing in corner offices in our own de-territorialized diaspora of the glass towers.

Like all Europeans of Christian heritage, our own evolutionary psychology is bound up in the defense of land. For thousands of years, large hosts have periodically gathered and invaded. We needed to develop and encourage the skills of violence and war to defend against such hosts. But we also needed habits of courtesy and civility so that we could maintain good relations with hundreds of neighboring tribes over a large enough area to encompass an army sufficient to defeat the largest alien host.

And we needed a sense of obligation, duty and loyalty to those neighboring tribes so that we

could respond to an attack on their land as if it were an attack on our own.

But as a byproduct of success in the modern world, we have become de-territorialized. The proof is in white flight to the suburbs. When our surroundings become unpleasant we vote with our feet and flee. It is the South African "chicken run" in which flight defines us and territory is repeatedly abandoned.

But when we flee, we are fleeing to a gathering of people very similar to ourselves. The statistics say that only about 12% of American women can afford to stay home and raise the kids. And as a guilty participant now in a number of "chicken runs" I must tell you that the women who manage to land a job as "stay-at-home mom" are a shockingly uniform bunch. They can be seen walking with their young children during the day in expensive new suburban developments, and I must say that they are uniformly slender, tall, and very attractive. Their husbands, on the other hand, are good deal less uniform in appearance but probably just as uniform in their earning power.

When life gets unpleasant we flee not to a place, but to that image. And yet we are torn by our own evolutionary psychology and the deep betrayal that the chicken run implies for the less fortunate left behind.

In the process of de-territorializing us, filling our heads with alien multi-culturalist philosophies, and destroying our traditional culture, the inner party has inadvertently created an even more powerful replacement as the object of our desires and defensive impulses.

Without realizing it, the inner party has implanted deep within our psyches an easily visualized and universally embraced image of our future and our potential.

The reaction will be swift and cataclysmic once cultural decay directly and visibly threatens the de-territorialized chicken run enclaves in which the image is now become deeply enshrined.

In the twentieth century, we Europeans of Christian heritage nearly destroyed ourselves in two immensely destructive wars to expand or defend our land based empires. One can argue whether the encouragement we received in this madness from the inner party was conscious of the destructive consequence. But one thing seems clear. We have been de-territorialized to the point that we are most unlikely to participate in any similar disaster in the future.

But the combative instinct still exists. Its object is in the process of being transferred from the defense of land to the defense of a people. Thanks to the inner party, we all know clearly what it is we will defend. What we lack in our de-territorialized diaspora, is a uniform vision of the triggering threat.

In the old days, the sight of an armed host on the horizon would provoke an immediate and

unanimous response. But in our new diaspora, we all have individual thresholds for action.

As reluctant as I am to hand to the snooping agencies in Washington another flag to wave at Congress come budget renewal time, I am nevertheless constrained to remark that an inevitable consequence of our slow process of de-territorialization is our growing awareness and understanding of the borderless war.

Without going into excessive detail, imagine a time 20 years from now when working age populations are falling throughout the entire G-8 plus China, worldwide demand is falling (in 1999 it is merely stagnating), and in the U.S. the baby boom generation has already begun selling their stocks to support themselves in retirement and has driven prices to 40 year lows in the process. The boomers are becoming desperate about support from Social Security. Tax revenues are falling and La Raza has started a guerrilla war of secession in the southwestern U.S. Our institutions no longer have the resources to buy them off. Similar low intensity conflicts bubble from time to time in our cities. Imagine also that a solid 10 to 20% of the majority population now has a clear picture of the threat and is committed to jury nullification on behalf of their defenders.

And suddenly there are two thousand Eric Rudolphs running around loose with lists of meaningful targets. The original Eric Rudolph severely taxed the system. Several hundred at once would overwhelm it.

It is becoming increasingly clear that politicians and political institutions are constrained by the forces around them. There is no need to attack or threaten those political institutions. They are as irrelevant in this particular borderless war as the military and the police. Only very tiny minorities lurking in the shadows support bombing defenseless countries into submission to impose a multi-cultural ideology. Only tiny minorities in the shadows work towards displacement of majority elites and racial and ethnic engineering. These people cannot even describe these activities in public without crippling their program. Given the issues involved and the utter lack of public support for them, the programs of ethnic displacement and culture destruction are "personnel dependent" and will simply go away as soon as the personnel working them go away.

Reshape the forces in the shadows (either by competition or by conflict) and suddenly a different kind of politician wins office and different messages flow from our media.

The process could be largely invisible to the great mass of sheeple, and need not inconvenience them in any significant way.

A fundamental frailty of government by wire-puller is that it functions flawlessly as long as the stakes are financial favors to special interests. As long as the stakes are limited to money, the wire-pullers can remain safely in the shadows.



However, ethnic displacement and culture destruction are just too heavy a load to place upon the system. The stakes are too high. In the information age, the participants who are using the system for such a purpose can be identified and located with relative ease by the victims, and the government cannot protect them at public expense without exposing them and the reasons for their protection to a much wider base of the population. Any attempt to guard them would make clear in the most graphic, physical and intrusive way the distinction between the controllers of government and the facade of government.

Further, it is unlikely that the government can figure out who to protect. A quick perusal of some of the data tells me that a large fraction of the relevant players cannot be identified by ethnic origin (despite my use of the term "inner party" in an exclusive ethnic sense heretofore in this essay).

Further, self-identification is impossible because there are millions of paranoid and ideologically overdosed people who would want expensive escorts. Many of the most important players would not self-identify, because, as any good evolutionary psychologist would predict, they are in denial about what they are doing.

And so we wait and watch.

In between now and that hypothetical scene 20 years from now, the U.S. will need to educate a far larger number of intelligent young people to run our complex society than the upper middle class, with its disastrously low birth rates, has produced. Our society is going to have to do a much better job of finding and motivating the 50% of our kids in the U.S. with IQs above 130 who do not attend college.

Inevitably it will involve combing the hills of West Virginia and East Tennessee, as well as Iowa, Nebraska and Utah. Our society will have to search these haunts for high IQ just as dilligently as it now does for fashion models and actresses.

We shall see how the inner party adjusts.

Yggdrasil-

- -----

The Chronicle of Higher Education From the issue dated May 14, 1999

A history of quotas makes the issue uncomfortable and emotional By BEN GOSE How many Jews should there be at Princeton University? Until the 1950s, Protestant leaders at many elite

private colleges, including Princeton, came up with an ugly answer to such questions, establishing quotas to keep Jewish students out. Now, after a generation in which once-robust Jewish enrollment at Princeton has been cut in half, the question is being asked again -- this time, by professors and students who want to see the number go up.

In the fall of 1996, the latest year for which data are available, 9.1 per cent of Princeton freshmen described themselves as Jewish in a survey -- roughly half the percentage of freshmen who called themselves Jewish in 1973. The proportion of Jewish students at Princeton is less than half that of Harvard and Yale Universities, according to estimates by Hillel, the national Jewish student organization.

Some Princeton faculty members have grumbled quietly about the decline for years. But it was broached publicly last month, when *The Daily Princetonian*, the student newspaper, wrote a four-part series about "Princeton's best-kept open secret."

Many professors and students believe that the number of spots for Jewish students is being whittled away, as Princeton strives to recruit from a wider geographical base and enroll more minority students.

"The legacy of anti-Semitism is no longer represented at any level whatsoever," says Anthony Grafton, a professor of history, who is Jewish. "Nonetheless, this is an institution that has a certain past -- is one altogether comfortable with an admissions process in which Jews are 'deselected?'"

Princeton officials dispute the importance of the decline, and say that the admissions office does not track the religion of applicants. Officials also note that the slide parallels a drop in Jewish enrollments nationwide. Jewish students represented only 6.3 per cent of the freshmen at private colleges in 1996, down from 16.8 per cent in 1973, according to a survey of freshmen conducted annually by the Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California at Los Angeles.

"Given Princeton's unfortunate history of 40 years ago, there's an inclination to jump to conclusions about what a decline in numbers means here," says Justin Harmon, a Princeton spokesman. "That's the wrong thing to do."

Nonetheless, the proportion of Jewish students at Princeton lags far behind that of the two institutions to which it most often compares itself, Harvard and Yale. Twenty-one per cent of the undergraduates at Harvard are Jewish, as are 29 per cent at Yale, according to Hillel. (Neither Harvard nor Yale participated in the Higher Education Research Institute's survey. A spokesman at Hillel's national office, in Washington, says that its numbers are simply "guesswork," by Hillel professionals, and a rabbi at Yale concedes that its number could be as low as 20 per cent.)

Some Jewish professors at Princeton pin part of the blame for the decline on Fred Hargadon, who has been dean of admission at Princeton since 1988. One professor calls him a "czar," and several say he seems unconcerned about the drop in Jewish enrollment. "He's been given a very free hand in the way he conducts the admissions process," says Froma I. Zeitlin, a classics and comparative-literature professor, who directs the Jewish-studies program.

Mr. Hargadon did not return phone calls from The Chronicle. But he told the Princetonian that he felt more like a "short-order cook" than a czar -- meaning he has to serve several campus constituencies with different interests.

With just over 1,100 students in each freshman class, Princeton has fewer undergraduates than most other institutions in the Ivy League. Once you subtract the spots for students who receive preferential treatment in admissions, the number of available places becomes much smaller.

Several Princeton faculty members note, delicately, that Jewish students tend to lack the characteristics that win what are known as "flags and tags" from the admissions office. Princeton's interest in ethnic and geographic diversity obviously hurts Jewish students, who tend to come from the East Coast.

And the university's preferential treatment for recruited athletes -- it fields 38 varsity teams -- probably benefits other groups more than Jews, according to Ms. Zeitlin. "I'm not saying there aren't Jewish athletes, but athletics might not be the first priority" for many Jewish students, she says.

Some counselors at Jewish high schools say it has become increasingly difficult for their students to gain admission at Princeton. Albert Goetz, a college counselor at Ramaz Upper School, a private school in Manhattan for Orthodox Jews, says his students are far more likely to be admitted to Harvard or Yale than to Princeton. "There was a period during the late '70s and early '80s when we would have three to seven students matriculating at Princeton each year," Mr. Goetz says. "We don't get more than one or two acceptances per year there now." Phoebe Weisbrot, a counselor at the Frisch School, a Jewish day school in Paramus, N.J., offers a different perspective. "Our numbers have remained constant," she says. She notes that Princeton's president, Harold T. Shapiro, is himself Jewish.

Mr. Shapiro did not return phone calls. The decline in Jewish enrollment "is pretty much a mystery to me," he told the Princetonian. Princeton professors who worry about the decline refuse to indicate what proportion of Jewish students would be satisfactory. "I don't think you can ask that question," Mr. Grafton says. "You can ask if the admissions process and the relationships with the secondary schools are as good as they can be. You can ask about selection processes, which are constantly being refined."

Last fall, a committee on which Mr. Grafton serves, the Undergraduate Admission Study Group, recommended that Princeton begin admitting an additional 125 to 150 students per year. The committee's report urged that the spots be reserved for "academically excellent students," with no increase in the number of recruited athletes. The committee also strongly recommended more emphasis on applicants' intellectual pursuits, such as music, poetry, or chess.

The recommendation was not intended to bolster Jewish enrollment, but that might be a side effect if it were approved, Ms. Zeitlin says. The Board of Trustees may vote on it within the year, a Princeton spokeswoman says.

Not all students and faculty members blame the decline on the admissions office. Some believe that fewer Jewish students are choosing to apply to Princeton.

Some Jewish students may prefer urban institutions, where Jewish communities tend to be larger and Jewish culture is stronger. For example, not one of Princeton's 11 "eating clubs," the centers of social life at the university, offers kosher meals. Princeton students who follow a kosher diet eat at the dining hall in the Center for Jewish Life, which opened in 1993. Columbia University and the University of Pennsylvania, two institutions with large Jewish populations, are the most popular Ivy League colleges for Frisch students, according to Ms. Weisbrot.

"It could be that there are just alternatives [to Princeton] that seem more interesting to Jewish students," says Jonathan D. Sarna, a professor of American Jewish history at Brandeis University, where more than half of the undergraduates are Jewish.

Many people on the Princeton campus agree that the university has done a lot in recent years to welcome Jewish students, including establishing a program in Jewish studies and building the Jewish-life center. Students can choose from among three types of worship -- Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform -- for Friday-evening Sabbath services. A recent "swing" dance sponsored by the center drew about 300 people.

"Jewish life is thriving on this campus," says Todd S. Rich, a junior and president of the Jewish-life center. "There's something for every different type of Jew."

It is not completely clear how many Jews are actually on the campus. Mr. Rich says that each year, the Jewish-life center receives a list of about 100 Jewish freshmen who indicated their religion on a survey. The center typically identifies an additional 20 Jewish freshmen over the course of the year.

Nina Kohn, a Jewish senior at Princeton, says she chose not to disclose her religion on the survey because students who do so are "bombarded with material" from Hillel and other organizations. "If you don't want to be solicited by campus organizations, then you're not going to fill out that sheet."

The observant Jews at Princeton are the ones who are most concerned about the drop in numbers. Orthodox Jews, for example, need to have 10 men for a minyan, or quorum, to hold worship services. "If the number [of Jewish students at Princeton] is too small, it becomes very hard to have a healthy and active Jewish community on campus," says Mr. Grafton, the history professor.

Concern over the decline has prompted suggestions of unusual remedies. Mr. Goetz, the Ramaz counselor, says Princeton's admissions office should give Orthodox Jewish students the same special attention that athletes receive. "Once you commit to having an Orthodox population on campus, that population has to be cultivated," he says.

Mr. Rich says admissions officers should schedule more recruitment visits at Jewish schools and suburban schools with large Jewish populations. "I would like to see Princeton provide us with the same aid that other minority groups get," he says. Some other students, including Ms. Kohn, say such an approach would be wrong.

"I don't think religion should be a basis for making decisions about people," she says. "If the legacy here -- the history of anti-Semitism -- says anything, it's that you should not be paying attention to people's religion when you're admitting them."

---

**BACK**

Design © 1998 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



## CAMPUS FOLLIES

This is Yggdrasil's Campus Follies series. This series deals with particularly bizarre things that go on in our Universities - including political correctness, diversity programs, and "date rape". A must-read for any college student!

1. [Orientation](#)
2. [Politically Correct](#)
3. [Star Chamber](#)
4. [The Death of History](#)
5. [Afrocentrism](#)
6. [The Feminist Challenge](#)
7. [The Campus Rape Crisis](#)
8. [Date Rape Guidelines](#)
9. [Decay at Harvard Law](#)
10. [The Veiled Attack](#) 

---

[BACK](#)



## **Orientation**

### **Campus Follies Lesson One**

It would be inappropriate to begin any series entitled "Campus Follies" without first talking about that ritual, "orientation".

Since it is obvious that modern college students do not experience anything like what their parents experienced, let me tell you what orientation used to be in the good old days.

Back then, a resident dorm supervisor would conduct most of the orientation. You did a tour of the buildings, a nice speech from the Dean about how your tuition only covered a portion of the costs (more like 200% of the costs undergraduates incurred, but that is a subject of another lesson), and then a short recitation of the rules.

There was no training of any sort. The whole process took a few hours. You see, back then anyone admitted to a university was expected to already know how to behave. Norms of behavior were widely understood throughout society. No need for remedial training in the first week!

But now, let us explore the moonscape of freshman orientation as it exists today, and then proceed to the deep outer space of the Modern Language Association (MLA) and the College Art Association (CAA) conventions.

You are going to love it!

**Yggdrasil** recommends that you read the following:

---

### **Sep. 29, 1992 Wall Street Journal A-14 Orientation**

BY HEATHER MAC DONALD

It is never too soon to learn to identify yourself as a victim. Such, at least, is the

philosophy of today's college freshman orientation, which has become a crash course in the strange new world of university politics. Within days of arrival on campus, "new students" (the euphemism of choice for "freshmen") learn the paramount role of gender, race, ethnicity, class and sexual orientation in determining their own and others' identity. Most important, they are provided with the most critical tool of their college career: the ability to recognize their own victimization.

An informal survey shows that two themes predominate at freshmen orientation programs - oppression and difference -- foreshadowing the leitmotifs of the coming four years. Orientations present a picture of college life in which bias lurks around every corner. This year, for example, the University of California at Berkeley changed the focus of its freshman orientation from "stereotyping" to "racism, homophobia, status-ism, sexism, and age-ism." According to Michele Frasier, assistant director of the new student program at Berkeley, the program organizers "wanted to talk more specifically about specific issues the students will face". The objective of the emphasis on discrimination is "to make students aware [of the] issues they need to think about, so they're not surprised when they face them."

### **Various Forms of 'Isms'**

Dartmouth's assistant dean of freshmen, Tony Tillman, offered no less bleak a vision of the academic community. A mandatory program for freshmen, "Social Issues," presented skits on "the issues first year students face," which he defined as "the various forms of 'isms': sexism, racism, classism, etc." If the content of the skits overlapped, such overlap was, according to Mr. Tillman, unavoidable. The experience of discrimination cannot be compartmentalized: "It's not as if today, I have a racist experience, tomorrow, a sexist [one]. In any one day, one may be up against several issues. Some issues of sexism have a racist foundation, and vice versa."

The point of the program (and, indeed, of much of the subsequent education at Dartmouth and other schools) is to "try to weave a common thread" through these various instances of oppression. If one can't fit oneself into the victim role, however, today's freshmen orientation offers an alternative: One can acknowledge oneself as the oppressor. Columbia University brought in a historian from the National Museum of American History in Washington to perform, in effect, an ideological delousing of the students. Her mission, as she said in her speech, was to help students recognize their own beliefs that foster inequality. By describing the stereotypes in American society that support racism and prejudice, she hoped to give students a chance to "re-evaluate [and] learn new things."

Learning to see yourself as a victim is closely tied to seeing yourself as different. At Columbia, freshmen heard three of their classmates read essays on what being different-- gay, black and Asian American - had meant in their lives. According to assistant dean Michael Fenlon, "the goal is to initiate an awareness of difference and the implications of difference for the Columbia community. And this is not a one-shot program. We expect it will continue through their four years here, not just in the classrooms, but in the residence halls, on the playing fields, and in every aspect of student life."



"Faces of Community," a program organized by Stanford's "multicultural educator," presented freshmen with a panel of students and staff who each embodied some officially recognized difference. James Wu, orientation coordinator of Stanford's Residential Education program, says that the "Faces" program "gives students a sense that everyone's different." At Bowdoin, the assistant to the president for multicultural programs hosted a brown-bag lunch for freshmen entitled "Defining Diversity: Your Role in Racial-Consciousness Raising, Cultural Differences, and Cross-Cultural Social Enhancers." Oberlin shows its new students a performance piece on "differences in race, ethnicity, sexuality, gender, and culture," and follows up with separate orientation programs for Asian-Americans, blacks, Latinos, and gay, lesbian and bisexual students.

The presupposition behind the contemporary freshman initiation is the need for political re-education. Columbia's assistant dean for freshmen, Kathryn Balmer, explained that "you can't bring all these people together and say, 'Now be one big happy community,' without some sort of training.... It isn't an ideal world, so we need to do some education." That students have somehow managed for years to form a college community in the absence of such "education" has apparently escaped administrative attention.

Stanford's outgoing multicultural educator, Greg Ricks, revealed the dimensions of the task: "White students need help to understand what it means to be white in a multicultural community. We have spent a lot of money and a lot of time trying to help students of color, and women students, and gay and disabled students to figure out what it means for them. But for the white heterosexual male who feels disconnected and marginalized by multiculturalism, we've got to do a lot of work here."

\* \* \*

### **Obsessive Emphasis on Difference**

If all this sounds more appropriate for a war-crimes trial than for the first year of college, the incoming student can at least look forward to one unexpected area of freedom at Duke. According to President Brodie, "gender" is a "preference" that should be respected. Anyone who feels oppressed by their chromosomes can apparently simply "prefer" to be of the opposite sex."

Today's freshman orientations, prelude to the education to come, raise one of the great unexplained mysteries of our time: how the obsessive emphasis on "difference" and victimization will lead to a more unified, harmonious culture. Students who have been taught from day one to identify themselves and their peers with one or another oppressed or oppressing group are already replicating those group divisions in their intellectual and social lives.

\* \* \*

Ms. Mac Donald is a lawyer living in New York.

---

**Dec. 31, 1992 Wall Street Journal A-6**  
**'Heterotextuality' and Other Literary Matters**

BY ROGER KIMBALL

NEW YORK--One sure way to deepen the post-Christmas gloom is to attend the annual convention of the Modern Language Association of America. With over 32,000 members, the MLA is the largest and most influential scholarly organization in the country. It has also become one of the most blatantly politicized.

The annual conventions of the MLA are like fever charts of contemporary academic life. Every radical trend besetting the academy is on florid display: 57 varieties of Marxism, feminism, homosexualism, anti-dead-white-European-male-ism, all dispensed in smug academic doublespeak. I have attended several MLA conventions. Each time I leave thinking things couldn't get any worse. Each time I have been wrong.

This year, close to 12,000 professors and graduate students descended on the New York Hilton and other midtown hotels to join in the four-day festivities, which concluded yesterday afternoon. They came looking for employment and to revel in the latest academic trends, which were fully represented in more than 700 panels: a total of more than 2,000 presentations.

### **Radical Political Sermonizing**

As always, there were a handful of sessions convened to discuss such venerable figures as Chaucer, Spenser, Milton and Virginia Woolf. No doubt some of these were intellectually respectable. But the real action, and crowds, were at panels devoted to "Cultural Studies" - a fancy term for radical political sermonizing-- and other defiantly nonliterary subjects.

Even the panels ostensibly concerned with literature often turned out to be occasions for radical proselytizing. The session on Goethe, for example, titled "Outing Goethe and His Age," included such delights as "In and Against Nature: Goethe on Homosexuality and Heterotextuality."

"Heterotextuality"? That's about as close as many panels ever came to literature. Unfortunately, it is also about as close as many teachers come to literature in the classroom today. In its promotional literature, the MLA defensively claims "that professors of English literature continue to base their teaching on works from a widely recognized body of traditional literature.' But when one looks more closely, it often turns out that what seemed like a class on, say, Shakespeare is really a platform for denouncing "Western colonialism and imperialism." Although academics love to castigate Western society for being racist, sexist, imperialistic, etc., they do not at all like being criticized themselves. Several panelists railed against the hostile, obtuse journalists who would unfairly criticize the MLA in the days to come.

Is the criticism unfair? One eminent literary scholar who attended this year's proceedings (and who attended his first MLA convention long before I was born) reflected sadly on the degradation of literary studies on view at the MLA. Many of the sessions at the convention, he said, seemed to him like so many Chinese "honey boats," little vessels of excrement snaking their way downriver.

He was particularly struck by the extraordinary prominence given to exotic sexual subjects. These ranged from the blunt ("Sex Problems on the Left") to the extravagant ("Hermaphrodites Newly Discovered: The Politics of Gender"). A panel called "Lesbian Tongues Untied" offered, among other new research, papers titled "Cruisin' for a Bruisin': Hollywood's Deadly Lesbian Dolls" and "The Ins and Outs of Lesbian Sex: Bi-Morphic Re-presentations of Desire."

One could also hear "Henry James and Queer Performativity," "Status of Gender and Feminism in Queer Theory," and many other papers of "literary" interest. Of course, even citing such titles opens one to charges of "homophobia" by the MLA's PC police. But the real issue is the astonishing prevalence of teachers who regard the investigation of their sexual interests as a form of scholarly research.

Nor is it simply a matter of provocative titles. In a panel devoted to "Gay Subjects, Mass Culture," David Halperin, who teaches at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, treated a large and enthusiastic audience to "Shane and the Guilty Pleasures of Male Spectatorship." The point of that classic movie western, according to Prof. Halperin, is that "in order for a boy to grow up to be strong and straight, he must first be seduced and abandoned by an older man."

In the course of this presentation, Prof. Halperin-like several other panelists had many negative things to say about American society and its "regime" of "compulsory heterosexuality." His central complaint was that in America physical combat, not (and here we paraphrase him) sexual intercourse, furnished the model for masculine development. In this context he concluded that "Shane" "demonstrates" that "heterosexuality can literally be murder." Much more attractive, for Prof. Halperin, were the practices of a certain New Guinea tribe in which boys regularly consort with boys or older men as part of their sexual initiation.

\* \* \*

Many of the papers delivered at the convention were as grotesque as Prof. Halperin's. But the most alarming performance I heard was the presidential address by Houston A. Baker Jr., the Albert M. Greenfield Professor of Human Relations at the University of Pennsylvania. The first black president of the MLA, Prof. Baker regaled his eager audience of more than 1,000 academics with an orgy of political oratory. His main point was that teachers of literature should subordinate literary concerns to the task of fostering radical political activism. He began, to thunderous applause, by celebrating "the rebirth this past November of the possibility for hope in the humanities." He also congratulated the MLA for having had the "courage" to denounce "the courts, councils

and programs of the wicked," i.e., the Reagan and Bush administrations and everything about them. Republicans, he made it clear, are not welcome at the MLA.

This president of the Modern Language Association of America mentioned few literary figures in his harangue. His longest quotation was an approving sound bite from the rap performer Sister Souljah: an appropriate reference for a man who once charged that literacy perpetuated "Western hegemonic arrangements of knowledge." Prof. Baker also scoffed at the idea of imparting "reading skills," calling instead for "local pedagogy," his currently favored term for political activism.

\* \* \*

This leaves us with two questions; Will students continue to allow themselves to be cheated of an education by teachers who are more interested in radical politics than imparting knowledge? And will parents, trustees and alumni continue to capitulate as our educational institutions are transformed into centers for political indoctrination and cultural radicalism? The spectacle of the MLA does not encourage optimism. Mr. Kimball is managing editor of *The New Criterion* and author of *Tenured Radicals* (1990, Harper-Perennial).

---

## **Mar. 24, 1993 Wall Street Journal A14 Rogues' Gallery: Art Scholars on Display**

BY LYNNE A. MUNSON

Thanks to the bizarre goings-on every year at the conventions of the Modern Language Association, the politically correct activities of English professors are notoriously familiar to readers of the popular press. But it's not only English departments that have become politicized. In fact, scholars from across the disciplinary spectrum have followed the trail toward an activist curriculum.

Few have done so with more dogged determination than art historians. The annual meetings of the College Art Association--the professional organization of more than 12,000 scholars of art history and studio art--have become the sites of academic antics that rival those observable at any session of the MLA.

Last month's CAA conference in Seattle was typical. It featured scholarly papers such as "Their Bodies! Our Thoughts? Problematizing Western Understandings of Mesoamerican Body Fragmentation." A panel on "Lesbian Looks: Politics, Erotics, and Art" included a presentation by Julie Zando, a video artist and professor at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. In her paper, titled "The Personal Is Private: Bypassing the Political in a New Theory of Masochism," Prof. Zando explained that she "would like to undermine the reasoning behind anti-sadomasochistic arguments."

She showed her audience a clip from one of her own works in progress, a video of "cowgirls . . . involved in a sadomasochistic orgy."

In the same time slot, at a somewhat less visually startling panel down the hall, listeners staged a revolt. After four scholars gave papers on race and museum "presentation," one member of the audience stood up and contested the all-white panel's credentials to speak to the issue of race. Questioner after questioner castigated the panel and its organizer for their insensitivity.

The panelists reacted by apologizing and heaping criticism upon themselves for nearly half an hour. One scholar went so far as to dedicate, somewhat belatedly, her paper to a black feminist colleague. Another questioner, a professor from Boston University, accused the panelists of "quotationage," which she defined as the practice of quoting too many male authorities. It wasn't necessary to attend an actual session of this year's CAA conference to notice how far attention has turned away from the study of art objects. Tabletops at the entrance to the conference were covered with handouts dealing with almost every cause--from Colorado's Amendment 2 to the feminist clash over pornography. One of the few pamphlets that addressed the subject of art advertised the work of community-college Prof. Tom O'Day. Prof. O'Day's art consists of performance pieces in which he buries, burns or blows up other artists' works.

The 1993 conference met the standard CAA has set in recent years for making radical interests central to its program. Last year's meeting, in Chicago, devoted an entire panel to "women/power, pleasure/ Pain." One paper delivered at that conference was called "Introducing the Outsider: - Tarzan, Van Gogh and the Marlboro Man." Another was illustrated with 10-foot of color projections of women's genitals lifted from pornographic magazines.

At the 1991 meeting in Washington, D.C., the CAA convened a panel to discuss "The Problem of Fetishism." It featured a talk in which a scholar discussed the phallic forms he detected in the light reflections depicted in 17th-century Dutch stilllife oil paintings. He was followed by a Northwestern University professor who gave a paper arguing for the art historical significance of what he characterized as the childhood trauma of "'peering up' at a parent's genitals."

Public attention has recently spurred the Modern Language Association to hire a public-relations heavyweight to help make its annual convention seem less of a spectacle. Meanwhile, just published materials announcing CAA's 1994 conference suggest an even more iconoclastic agenda. Among the topics slated for discussion: "The Grotesque Body" and "Pornography Made Me Do It." Intellectual discretion advised.

Miss Munson is a research associate at the American Enterprise Institute.

---

BACK

© 1996-1998 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



## **Politically Correct**

### **Campus Follies Lesson Two**

In [lesson one](#), we examined the ritual of freshman "orientation." From the first moment on campus, white males are taught a new status hierarchy; - the long list of groups they must defer to; and they are told that within this unfamiliar status hierarchy, they are at the very bottom.

The rest are taught the hierarchy of claims they may assert and of the deferential behaviors they should expect arising out of their minority or oppressed status.

Thus, orientation is the first exposure that students get to the demands of (and privileges conferred by) political correctness.

Lest anyone suspect that our campuses might focus overmuch on the divisive distinctions of sex and race, and may no longer be serious about their educational mission, we then took a quick tour of the Modern Language Association and College Art Association conventions to remove any doubt.

This week, we attempt to define "politically correct" with a selection of excerpts from five articles out of the Wall Street Journal. The first two are concrete examples of "political correctness" in action. Excerpts three and four are surveys of the campus scene with an emphasis on speech codes and "thought crimes", the core of what we commonly understand as "political correctness."

The fifth excerpt concludes this session with a hilarious chronicle of the chaos that broke out when the University of California at Santa Cruz attempted to implement a few simple curriculum changes to advance this new balkanized vision of America.

In truth, "political correctness" has very little to do with politics. Rather, it is a set of behavioral norms or manners imposed and enforced by disciplinary codes of the universities.

To most adults educated more than 20 years ago, the activity described in these articles is going to sound extremely odd. For hundreds of years, Western Civilization has attempted to downplay particularist group traits such as race or ethnicity and promote the more generalized individual qualities such as talent and performance. It is going to be very difficult for older adults to understand how this sudden emphasis on particularist

group traits can possibly lead to improved understanding and harmony.

Rather, it looks very much as if our universities have abandoned the whole idea of "integration" or the dissolving of differences, in favor of a competitive tribalism in which differences are accentuated and feelings of ethnic insult are encouraged. It is a society in which racial harmony is achieved by imposing submissive behaviors on males of European extraction.

Care to take any bets on whether such a vision of America will succeed?

**Yggdrasil** recommends that you read the following:

---

### **Jan. 12, 1993 Wall Street Journal A-14 Notable & Quotable**

At Wellesley College, the Women's Studies department has sent letters to all the students who declare Modern European History as their major. This letter accuses these students of perpetuating the "dominant white male" attitudes and behavior that have been oppressing women for generations. Mothers, don't let your girls grow up to be historians.

---

### **Jan 5, 1992 Wall Street Journal A-14 Language Censors**

The language censors have been sighted again at one of their favorite campuses - the mammoth University of Michigan. A student got in trouble there this fall for writing a term paper. More accurately, he got in trouble for the paper's vocabulary.

The undergraduate has been accused of harassment by a female teaching assistant on the basis of a hypothetical example he put in a term paper. The crime? It seems the hapless student was unwise enough to ignore the political science department's "Checklist for Nonsexist Writing."

Here's the offending passage, written by sophomore Shawn Brown for Political Science 111, Introduction to American Politics: "Another problem with sampling polls is that some people desire their privacy and don't want to be bothered by a pollster. Let's say Dave Stud is entertaining three beautiful ladies in his penthouse when the phone rings. A pollster on the other end wants to know if we should eliminate the capital gains tax. Now Dave is a knowledgeable businessperson who cares a lot about this issue. But since Dave is "tied up" at the moment, he tells the pollster to "bother" someone else. Now this is perhaps a ludicrous example, but there is simply a segment of, the population who wish to be left alone. They have more important things to be concerned about - jobs, family,



school, etc. If this segment of the population is never actually polled, then the results of the poll could be skewed."

Now, it seems to us a sensible referee would see that what we have here is a wash: "Dave Stud" may strike some as a 15-yard penalty, but note that the student did use the sexless "businessperson" as well. In any event, Mr. Brown's point about the reliability of polls today is an interesting one. But none of these considerations caught the attention of his teacher, Debbie Meizlish. Instead, Ms. Meizlish was horrified at what she perceived as Mr. Brown's verbal assault on her. She wrote:

"You are right. This is ludicrous & inappropriate & OFFENSIVE. This is completely inappropriate for a serious political science paper. It completely violates the standard of non-sexist writing. Professor Rosenstone has encouraged me to interpret this comment as an example of sexual harassment and to take the appropriate formal steps. I have chosen not to do so in this instance. However, any future comments, in a paper, in a class or in any dealings w/me will be interpreted as sexual harassment and formal steps will be taken. Professor Rosenstone is aware of these comments - & is prepared to intervene. You are forewarned!"

Thus threatened, Mr. Brown made a sensible decision. He dropped the course, presumably in the hope of finding a political scientist at Michigan who was interested in teaching him political science instead of political correctness.

\* \* \*

It is very hard to see how this enterprise can lead to much good end. If we know anything from history, it is that such exercises in the policing of language and thought drive people into lifetime opposition. The gender-fastidious profs and teaching assistants at Michigan may still be conveying something useful about America's political system, but they are also likely turning out many ardent enemies of their relentless and watchful cause.

---

## **Nov. 6, 1990 Wall Street Journal p A10 Politically Correct**

Every day now echoes of trouble on the nation's campuses sound louder. Some time ago the powers that be at many of our colleges and universities agreed that the true mission of higher education was to advance a new political consciousness, to provide instruction in the inequities and injustice perpetrated by Western culture. The effects are now beginning to sink in, the chief one of which is an extraordinarily potent effort in academia to stifle dissenters from what has come to be known on campuses around the U.S. as Politically Correct views.

Political Correctness, though it is pervasive now on American campuses, is a subject that has received remarkably little attention beyond the schools themselves, perhaps because

it strikes outsiders as silly. It isn't; it's worse than that. Political Correctness requires that students, faculty and administration project "right" opinions about women, sexism, race and the numerous other categories of victimology (white males have been identified by the Politically Correct as history's primary force of oppression). The chief victim of this effort is, of course, intellectual freedom.

At Clark University, philosophy Professor Christina Hoff Sommers objected to a university form requiring her to explain how she planned to incorporate "pluralistic views" and concerns in a proposed course. Professor Sommers explained that in her view course proposals ought to be politically neutral and that she objected to thought control. This, however, was an offense against the most politically sacrosanct of sacred cows on campuses today -- multiculturalism, the official euphemism for studies emphasizing the oppression of women and minorities.

In addition to the campus rally organized against her in response to this violation, Clark's dean of students, Douglas Astolfi, let it be known that it was Professor Sommers and her objection to thought control that were the threat to academic freedom.

At Smith College, a hub of Political Correctness, administrators have issued a list of definitions designed to provide students with the appropriate, sensitive and progressive vocabulary. The list, titled "Specific Manifestations of Oppression," includes an exotic range of offenses. One of these is "Ableism," defined as "oppression of the differently abled by the temporarily abled." The document explains that words like handicapped and disabled are unacceptable. The list also includes "lookism -- the belief that appearance is an indicator of a person's value." "Heterosexism" is explained as oppression of gay and lesbian people; "this can take place by not acknowledging their existence."

In colleges and universities the country over, political re-education has been institutionalized. At Tulane University, the administration's statement on race and gender enrichment puts forward the view that "racism and sexism are fundamentally present in all American institutions" and "We are all the progeny of a racist and sexist society."

At Haverford College -- and elsewhere -- students who want to graduate must fulfill a "Social Justice Requirement" -- which means at least one course in subjects like "Postcolonial Women Writers," "Psychological Issues of Lesbians and Gay Males" or "Feminist Political Theory."

In New Jersey the Department of Higher Education has funded something called the New Jersey Project that will, according to its bulletin, integrate issues of "women and gender, race, class, ethnicity and homophobia and heterosexism" into all the state's colleges.

Nor is life easy for the student who challenges the official view. One University of Pennsylvania student, appointed to a committee for "diversity education" wrote a memo to a fellow committee member referring to her "regard for the individual." A college official sent the letter back with the word "individual" circled and the warning that the word was "a red flag phrase today which is considered by many to be racist." The official warned of the inequities that resulted from championing individual over group rights.

Next month the annual meeting of the Modern Language Association, the professional organization for the English and Humanities departments, will offer a host of scholarly panels that faithfully reflect the subject matter holding center stage on campuses. Where once scholarly papers were offered on Shakespeare, Marlowe, Donne, Yeats and other such male Eurocentric oppressors, today's MLA panels offer "The Lesbian Phallus -- or Does Heterosexuality Exist?" and "Strategies for Feminist Team Teaching of Hispanic Women Writers."

\* \* \*

We suspect that Political Correctness will ultimately meet the same fate as all totalitarian endeavors -- a demise hastened by its inherent absurdities. Opposition groups, such as the National Association of Scholars, are forming and attracting professors, increasing numbers of whom are lifelong liberals repelled by the ferocity of their Politically Correct colleagues. The current issue of the New York Review of Books carries a critique of the phenomenon by philosopher John Searle. In due course the parents shelling out some \$20,000 a year tuition for a Politically Correct education may also start to take note of just what it is they are paying for.

---

## **June 10, 1992 Wall Street Journal A14 Speech Codes and Censors**

The academic year ends as it began. Campus enforcers of political conformity are still busy denying that any effort to restrict free speech exists. The concern over "political correctness," they say, is overstated. Such denials don't alter the clear evidence that freedom of speech and scholarship is no longer assured in many colleges and universities.

We have only to look at all the schools where nervously compliant administrations have established "harassment" policies. These behavioral codes, which more often than not bear a close resemblance to a political sermon, would clearly restrict freedom of speech as well as a few other freedoms. Laughing at the wrong kind of joke, for instance, is sometimes listed among the punishable forms of harassment.

Last month, at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst, protesters demanding more minority control of the Collegian, a student newspaper, twice invaded the paper's offices, destroyed property, and threatened and attacked staff members. One protester chased an editor and threatened him with a baseball bat.

In the face of this violence, the administration took a loftily evenhanded view. The whole thing was, U. Mass Chancellor Richard O' Brien told us, a struggle "between the ins and the outs," and that he did not think the university should take sides. The chancellor did not tell us what degree of mob rule and violence it would take for the administration to decide it could venture an opinion on the matter. He might, of course, have consulted his university's own harassment policy, which includes in its definition of harassment

physical attack.

Unless, of course, editors of the school paper representing what the chancellor calls "the status quo" aren't the sort of people eligible for protection under the code.

On a lighter note, though no less telling, we have the case of Camille Paglia and the Connecticut College summer reading list. Ms. Paglia, who specializes in making hash of the wilder reaches of feminist scholarship, is the author of a book titled "Sexual Personae." When the book was included on the reading list, members of the Women's Studies Committee and other centers of feminist theology, and their campus allies, set about removing it.

Assistant professor of art history Robert Baldwin told the school's student paper the book was "offensive to human beings, especially women." Others complained that Ms. Paglia's book was hate literature, like "Mein Kampf." The campaign to remove Ms. Paglia's book from the list succeeded.

\* \* \*

Anyone doubting that an unhealthy and repressive climate exists on campuses today has only to look at the policies on harassment put in place at - to name just a few - Stanford, the University of Pennsylvania and Minnesota, Florida and Brown.

At Brown, as at other institutions, the code says that harassment can be defined as any behavior that produces "feelings of impotence" or "anger" or "disenfranchisement." And the harassing speech or behavior doesn't have to be deliberate. "It can be intentional or unintentional."

Colby College's policy decrees that any behavior or speech that causes someone to feel "loss of self-esteem," a "vague sense of danger" is harassment. Emory-like many other institutions - says that harassment is any behavior or language directed at others on account of race, age, gender, sexual orientation, handicap, etc. that has the "reasonably foreseeable effect" of creating a hostile environment for those in the above identified categories.

We are clearly sunk here in a marshland of never-ending offenses, where anything from a look or a laugh can be defined as harassment--and has been. Harassment is punishable by all sorts of measures - including "separation from the university." The University of Minnesota includes in its faculty guidelines the suggestion that the faculty "monitor" the classroom climate by having students "comment anonymously - in writing - about . . . things they have seen or heard that they want to acknowledge." All that is missing is the suggestion that students be convened for mass confessions, or trials where they can all come forward and repent of having laughed inappropriately (an offense at the U. Conn.).

\* \* \*

In the 1950s--the era of senator Joe McCarthy and other zealots - college students often

sang a protest song called "Die Gedanken Sind Frei"-My Thoughts Are Free. A song of leftist origins sung by Pete Seeger, it nevertheless came to be the anthem for students of all political persuasions who detested efforts to stifle dissent. "My thoughts will not cater to duke or dictator," went one of the lines. Who, then, could have believed that the nation's campuses would a few decades later become the only place in American society where censorship and intimidation rule, and where ideological dukes and dictators flourish?

---

## **Dec. 12, 1990 Wall Street Journal p A10 So Very PC at UCSC**

BY JEROME NEU

SANTA CRUZ, Calif. -- All across the country, universities have been confronting the problems posed by an increasingly diverse and contentious society. The future may have already arrived at the University of California at Santa Cruz.

Two years ago, at one of Santa Cruz's eight residential colleges, there was what came to be known as the "Asian Food Affair." A dinner with Asian (some say, Philippine) food and themes was planned for early December. A staff member noticed that the date coincided with Pearl Harbor Day and, following her suggestion, the Asian celebration was postponed and the menu changed. When word of the change got out, there were demonstrations by students in another college, and letters were written to the press charging racial insensitivity and racism (for grouping all Asians together, and for seemingly blaming the living for the actions of certain Japanese long ago).

Despite apologies, claims of good intentions and the fact that the staff member who had recommended the change was herself of Japanese descent, the champions of tolerance showed little tolerance. Charges and counter-charges proliferated, there were resignations, lawsuits and serious illness induced by stress. The memory lingers.

Last year, five professors of good will, with diverse backgrounds and from different fields (biology, philosophy, literature, linguistics and sociology), got together in an effort to design an innovative course to meet the challenge of growing ethnic diversity in the student body and the growing need for multicultural understanding in the society at large. They put together a two-quarter "World Culture" course that studies a number of different societies from a number of different perspectives. Now a required "core" course for freshmen at one of Santa Cruz's colleges, the course is meant to be a model for new multicultural campus-wide courses. It is being taught this year for the first time.

Signs of trouble emerged early. One professor, a biologist, began a lecture about Darwin with an apology for speaking about the work of a "dead white male." The same professor (himself a living white male, originally from Canada) choked with emotion at a session with other professors and graduate teaching assistants over the fact that he was not a member of any oppressed minority.

A few weeks into the course, another of the professors (a former Jesuit from Spain) spoke about Islam. As his final topic, he considered the role of women in Islam, reading passages from the Koran and from the statutes enacted in Iran with the coming of the Ayatollah Khomeini. As might be guessed, the depiction was rather grim.

After the class, the lecturer received a letter from another professor in the course (self-described as a "scholar of color," he is a sociologist who studies race and is himself black) complaining that he was "deeply disturbed" by the lecture. He asked for half of the next lecture to respond. The lecturer refused to yield his time.

Then there came another of the sessions of professors with graduate student teaching assistants. The scholar of color rose and announced that he had been "deeply disturbed" by the lecture on Islam. He proceeded to spell out what had disturbed him. It turned out that he did not disagree with any of the statements the lecturer had made. He believed that all of the quotations from texts were accurate. Rather, he was upset at what had been left out. In particular, he noted, no mention had been made of the fact that the U.S. kills people in the electric chair, that it had dropped the atom bomb on people of another race, that for a long period it had practiced slavery and so on.

\* \* \*

Animosities and recriminations flew. People took sides. It happened that the scholar of color was scheduled to give the next lecture. Since all the professors (as part of this innovative model course) regularly attended each other's lectures (to help establish recurring themes), the ex-Jesuit threatened that he would walk out in as noticeable a way as possible if the scholar of color used the occasion to criticize him before the undergraduates for what he had not said in his lecture on Islam. The ex-Jesuit was persuaded not to attend -- but had someone record the lecture for him. The scholar of color also had the lecture recorded. Apparently nothing untoward was said.

While there have been meetings and reconciliations since, the scholar of color subsequently announced his resignation from the course, and will not be participating next quarter. All this in a model course designed to teach students new approaches to cross-cultural understanding and pluralistic sensitivity. The former Jesuit, who had grown up in Spain and taught in Germany and Japan before coming to California, concluded: "These days, it is not possible to be pluralistic enough."

Most recently, two residential colleges pooled resources to have a "Native American College Night." One might have thought that this pre-Thanksgiving event was a nicely timed effort to look at things from another side. It produced an angry letter to the campus paper from the "Student Alliance of North American Indians," complaining of the failure of the colleges to "fully involve" the organization in the planning of the event. The performance was described as "mediocre," and the alliance declared "we cannot support or condone events which do not involve Native-Americans in the planning process."

Does one have to be a member of a given minority in order to understand that minority, or to say anything about it? In a university?

I mentioned at the beginning that the World Culture course is being offered as a "core" course at one of Santa Cruz's residential colleges. It is the same college that was the site of the "Asian Food Affair" (and thus was presumably in special need of multicultural sensitivity and understanding). There is now apparently a question about whether the college will sponsor the World Culture core course for its originally planned second quarter. The second quarter was supposed to include consideration of Japanese culture. People are nervous. . . .

Mr. Neu is a professor of philosophy at the University of California at Santa Cruz.

---

[BACK](#)

© 1996-1998 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



## **Star Chamber**

### **Campus Follies Lesson Three**

Robert Fogel, an econometric historian, won the Nobel Prize this year for a book he wrote 20 years ago dealing with slavery in the United States. It happens that Prof. Fogel wrote a perfect introduction to this lesson in his very controversial classic of historical revisionism, "Time on the Cross."

"Thus while the existence of slave marriages was explicitly denied under the legal codes of the states, they were not only recognized but actively promoted under plantation codes. That the legal basis for slave marriage was derived from codes which held sway within the jurisdiction of the plantation, points to a much neglected feature of legal structure of the antebellum South. Within fairly wide limits the state, in effect, turned the definition of the codes of legal behavior of slaves, and of the punishment for infractions of those codes, over to planters. Such duality of the legal structure was not unique to the antebellum South. It existed in medieval Europe in the duality between the law of the manor and of the crown; it was a characteristic of the regimes under which the American colonies were governed; and in lesser degree, it exists with respect to certain large institutions today (for example, with respect to university regulations)."

There you have it! A warning by a nobel prize winning historian that American Universities have a separate legal system, unrecognizable to those familiar with American civil and criminal law.

And so it is!

The subject of this lesson is what happens when the "law of the manor" at these Universities falls into the hands of the forces of "multiculturalism" and the "politically correct". What might the typical serf expect?

The first excerpt is a survey of the treatment of our modern serfs by campus star chambers. The second excerpt tells us what can happen even at a relatively "conservative" school with a religious background when ideologues must grapple with a rather odd accusation of "date rape".

The final pair of excerpts are a "moon shot" to the University of Pennsylvania where one of its own, a security guard, is disciplined for apprehending students stealing the entire



supply of an alternative student newspaper. The Wall Street Journal, once again, has done a marvelous job of capturing the "rationale" of administrators meting out justice.

Parental discretion advised for readers under the age of 18. You may have to explain how the act of stealing alternative student newspapers to suppress their editorial content becomes subject to a special set of "Open Expression Guidelines" requiring that campus security recognize such acts as "protest" and call in special "Open Expression Monitors."

**Yggdrasil** recommends that you read the following:

---

## **Sep 27, 1993 Wall Street Journal p. A22 A Mockery of Justice on Campus**

BY SCOTT GOTTLIEB

With the dawn of a new academic year, college students and their parents should take note of a disturbing trend afflicting America's institutions of higher learning: The rise of powerful student judicial boards.

The boards, often jointly run by students and a smattering of willing faculty members, are charged with meting out everything from whiny disputes between students and infractions of speech codes to allegations of criminal battery and date rape. They are given considerable license to determine guilt or innocence and have no obligation to recognize U.S. civil procedures or legal traditions. But most troubling is that student judiciary boards are rapidly turning into new front groups as campus radicals fight the backlash against political correctness.

At my school, Wesleyan University, a panel of seven students-the Student Judiciary Board--promises to hear all charges brought before it. The board deliberates in secret, provides no explanation of why it reached a particular decision and doles out punishments ranging from letters of reprimand to expulsion. As at most schools, few students at Wesleyan, myself included, have faith in the student-run board. I'm not sure if anyone ever did.

Students are terrified to appear before the board, paying close attention to their own actions lest one false move land them before the SJB.

### **Trumped-Up Charges**

\* \* \*

The current crisis in confidence at Wesleyan can also be traced back to last year, when a

professor charged that a Wesleyan student stole her wallet. The evidence? She claimed to have seen this student sneaking around the women's locker room. The local police investigated briefly, but lacking evidence they decided to drop the investigation. The SJB, however, decided to hold a hearing on the matter.

The evidence in the mock trial was scant: the testimony from the walletless professor. The rest was circumstantial as well: The student was seen returning athletic gear near the locker room around the time of the theft. But despite the flimsy evidence, the accused was found guilty and, just weeks away from graduation, was suspended for one academic year. The sentence was eventually overturned, but only after the professor recanted her testimony and the school president intervened.

There have also been a number of cases where students were given punishments that in no way approximated the seriousness of their offenses. At Williams College this spring, a male student left a message on the telephone answering machine of a fellow male student with whom he had a dispute. In the message, the student tried to provoke his adversary by pretending he was a well-known gay student and saying he wanted to go on a date with the student who owned the answering machine and engage in homosexual activity. When confronted about the message, the student admitted his role in the matter and apologized. But according to Williams's judicial codes, the caller had violated a rule barring "offensive" speech and was suspended for an entire academic year.

An appeal of the ruling was denied.

There was a similar injustice perpetrated at Brown University this spring, where a male sophomore was accused of stealing food from a campus eatery by a female student. After returning to his room in a drunken state that night, the student left three vulgar messages on the woman's answering machine. (He later had no recollection of the content of the messages, owing to his inebriation.)

The Brown judiciary committee (comprising equal numbers of students, faculty and administrators) found the student guilty of "behavior which shows flagrant disrespect for the well-being of others." The punishment for this minor, admittedly juvenile, transgression netted the student a whopping 4 year suspension. The implication was that the student's drunken barbs were so offensive that the female student could not study in such an environment and the presence of the caller was thus a barrier to learning. The student will not be eligible to reapply to Brown until 1997, when the woman he telephoned is scheduled to graduate.

These incidents and many others make it clear that student judicial boards have become increasingly politicized to punish those who dare to stray from the prevailing ideological hegemony. Schools create powerful judicial boards by codifying lists of very harsh and specific penalties for violations of their internal codes and combine them with offenses kept as generic as possible. The vagueness of the offenses and the possibility of ominous, complicated proceedings before the mock courts have created the desired air of uncertainty and intimidation, in writings by students, in oral presentations in class, in physical relationships, and even in private dealings with another student who might

report to the speech police.

\* \* \*

In one publicized case this spring at Yale that makes a mockery of standard American notions of justice, the College Executive Committee expelled a male undergraduate for the alleged rape of a female student, though he denied the charge and there was no medical evidence supporting the accusation. Lacking the proper qualifications to handle criminal accusations, the Yale committee disregarded standard Western legal procedures and traditions. As at most schools, the accused was denied full representation by outside legal counsel during his hearing and was prevented from questioning his accuser, or even hearing her testimony. He was also required to give testimony that could be later used against him in a real court of law (in most cases students are not read their Miranda rights). This is not uncommon. Wesleyan tapes the testimony given in all of its hearings and saves the recordings. Not surprisingly, in one case a few years ago, tapes from the hearings were subpoenaed as evidence in a real criminal trial.

In many cases, the results of allowing facile accusations to be adjudicated by mock tribunals is that innocent people are certain to be targets of censorship and character assassination at the hands of a zealous squadron of thought and speech police. In other cases, when the student members of these boards make politically unpopular decisions, such as exonerating accused rapists, campus activists are often outraged. Protests erupted four times' in the past two years at Wesleyan when male students accused of rape were found' not guilty by Wesleyan's SJB. It is significant to note, however, that in all four of these cases not one of the accusers took her charges to the local police department.

### **Shirking Responsibility**

\* \* \*

In the meantime, there are other things that can be done. Both the Williams and Yale students, for example, have filed lawsuits against their respective schools. If the fracas continues, one can be certain other aggrieved students will follow their example. How college officials square all this absurdity with their claim to teach students about truth, freedom and justice should be an interesting revelation.

Mr. Gottlieb is a senior at Wesleyan University in Middletown. Conn., and editor of the Wesleyan Review.

---

**Apr. 12, 1994 Wall Street Journal p. A1  
Campus Dilemma**

**The Risk of Lawsuits Disheartens Colleges Fighting Date Rape**

# **Measures to Assist Victims Lead to Bitter Wrangles Over Rights of Others Amateurs on Hearing Panels**

BY EDWARD FELSENTHAL

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

VALPARAISO, Ind. - Set in a quiet town whose biggest activity is an annual popcorn festival honoring native son Orville Redenbacher, Valparaiso University is almost quaintly old-fashioned. It still imposes curfews on freshmen. Male and female students can't visit each other's rooms after hours. Despite vigorous campus protest two years ago, the health center won't distribute condoms.

"As a Christian institution," explains student Anne Shepler, "this place has always tried to avoid dealing at all with sexuality."

But school officials haven't been able to avoid contending with the national outcry about date rape, and with the perception that it is rampant. Two years ago, officials at the Lutheran-affiliated university began working on a policy to combat sexual assault.

Last spring, at a "Take Back the Night" antirape demonstration, about 100 students wore armbands to signify that at some time in their lives they had been assaulted. After the rally, several women stood before a microphone at the campus coffeehouse and told of being raped at Valparaiso.

## **Redress for Victims**

The school's president, Alan Harre, quickly convened a meeting with a group of administrators at which he asked some of the women to discuss their experiences. The gathering lasted until about 3 a.m. and left some of the administrators close to tears, says Kirsten Lee, a student who helped organize the event. Among the students' aims: to help victims get some redress without having to endure the emotional trauma of a criminal trial.

\* \* \*

Mr. Harre says he was "touched by the poignancy of the issues"; by the start of the current school year, Valparaiso had a sexual-assault policy in place. In addition to providing for disciplinary procedures, the school posted in every dormitory room a list of suggestions on how students could avoid being accused of assault or avoid being assaulted themselves. Valparaiso also set up a special counseling office for victims, housed in the same building as the home-economics department.

## **Leading To Lawsuits**

\* \* \*

But in the age of litigation, helping one group often leads to lawsuits by another.

\* \* \*

It was to be much the same at Valparaiso. When the new sexual- assault policy was invoked last fall, the aftermath severely tested the university's resolve to deal with date rape. Shortly after the semester began, a woman accused a man she had known since high school of raping her. In late August, she told campus authorities, she asked the man to dinner at the student union because he had been making advances toward her and she wanted to explain that she wasn't interested in a romantic relationship. Later that week, assuming she had made the message clear during the dinner, she accepted the man's invitation to a fraternity drinking party where, she said, the man led her into a small room, locked the door and raped her.

### **Conflicting Versions**

The man told a very different story. He said that the woman had been flirting with him and that she had participated voluntarily in a fraternity-party drinking game. Around 3 a.m., he said, the two of them had sexual intercourse. He maintained that the sex was consensual and that she accused him of rape after having "second thoughts and guilt" about betraying her boyfriend, according to the man's lawyer, John Bushemi.

\* \* \*

If a student chooses to press charges, a campus date-rape case may wind up in criminal court, where sorting through conflicting stories with little independent evidence is daunting even for professional law enforcers. In campus proceedings, school officials find the task still more complicated as they try to follow university policy exactly and avoid making any missteps that could hold legal implications.

\* \* \*

"The kind of amateurism that is inevitable in the proceedings makes you very vulnerable," observes Thomas H. Wright Jr., vice president of Princeton University.

### **The Disciplinary Process**

The Valparaiso disciplinary panel convened to hear the case in a small classroom in Christ College, home of the university's academic-honors program, according to Students who were participants. The panel, composed of four administrators, listened to testimony from several students and eventually ruled that the man had violated Valparaiso's sexual-assault guidelines and would be suspended.

Defending the disciplinary process, which is similar to that of other colleges, Valparaiso spokeswoman Pat Downing emphasizes that "these procedures have nothing to do with

whether a student is guilty or not guilty at civil or criminal levels."

But two weeks later, in federal district court in Hammond, Ind., the male student sued the school and the panel members, calling the hearing a sham and seeking \$12 million in compensatory and punitive damages. The man charges that, in the school's zeal to assuage campus concerns about date rape, it violated his rights by refusing to allow testimony from several students he wanted to speak on his behalf. The school also unreasonably refused to delay the hearing for a week so that the man could prepare his case, he contends.

In court papers disputing the charges, Valparaiso responds that the man missed the deadline for changing his lineup of witnesses and that students who were on his list before the deadline got to testify.

The woman who made the rape accusation hasn't sued anybody, but she is bitter about the disciplinary process. She says "the backlash was so bad" that she considered leaving Valparaiso.

\* \* \*

---

## **July, 26, 1993 Wall Street Journal p. A10**

### **Penn: The Report**

Not long ago, during the memorable Water Buffalo trials at the University of Pennsylvania, we also reported on the concurrent suspension of Donald Fitzgerald, director of security for Penn's University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology. Mr. Fitzgerald, it appeared, had run afoul of the Penn administration -- which has some markedly peculiar notions about the duties of security officers -- because he tried to apprehend two women students running out of the museum carrying three large plastic bags.

It turned out that the women were not, as Mr. Fitzgerald worried, running off with museum pieces. Part of a group of black activist students aggrieved by the views aired in the student paper, the women had confiscated all the copies of "The Daily Pennsylvanian" at the museum, as their friends were doing elsewhere around campus. On April 15, virtually the entire press run of the paper was appropriated and carted off.

The administration, headed at the time by President Sheldon Hackney (who recently won confirmation as head of the National Endowment for the Humanities), determined at once that Mr. Fitzgerald should be suspended from his security duties. He would remain on suspension many weeks, while a "blue ribbon panel" appointed by the Penn administration deliberated over the events of April 15.

Those deliberations have at last come to an end. With that end has also come a report

on the panel's findings -- one so remarkable for the depths of its fastidiously argued nonsense that we thought it only fitting to reprint portions nearby (see related editorial: "Doublethink at the University of Pennsylvania" -- WSJ July 26, 1993). The document is a pure specimen of political cravenness. But such cravenness is hardly limited to the University of Pennsylvania.

The unhappy fact of university life today is that there are many Penns and many administrators who thought they were purchasing peace by accommodating political zealots.

The degree of that effort to accommodate is reflected in the central pronouncement of the Penn panel's report -- namely the judgment that the theft of the newspapers was a "form of protest" and therefore not criminal behavior. Apparently, then, any assault -- including, presumably, the removal and destruction of library books some group considers offensive -- might be held immune from prosecution if it's a "protest."

The report goes on to say that rather than taking action, the police should have contacted entities at Penn called "Open Expression Monitors" to study the students actions. Think we're making that up? Read the nearby excerpt. The panel concludes that the Museum security director's pursuit of the women with the shopping bags was "inappropriate" once those students had left the property of the Museum and was not in "accordance with . . . his job functions." Presumably, then, any thief who wishes to appropriate some invaluable museum piece can now consider himself immune from pursuit, if he can get past the door and grounds.

The report recommends that for his inappropriate behavior, security director Fitzgerald's superiors should review his role for possible disciplinary action. Mr. Fitzgerald -- who has been returned to active duty -- received a letter of reprimand and will, along with other security personnel, have to attend sensitivity training classes.

\* \* \*

George Orwell had the word for this sort of reasoning -- and for the entire tenor of the Penn panel's report. That word is "doublethink" -- a description unfortunately as relevant today as it was in the 1930s.

\* \* \*

---

## **July, 26, 1993 Wall Street Journal p A10 Doublethink at the University of Pennsylvania**

Following are excerpts from the report of a panel of University of Pennsylvania administrators appointed to study the theft of one entire press run of the student newspaper. The papers were seized all over campus by black activist students opposed

to The Daily Pennsylvanian's editorial content.

The report, which criticizes security guards, absolves the students of any wrongdoing -- except failure to show I.D. cards. The panel analyzed what supposedly transpired at each of the campus sites involved.

A related editorial appears today { see related editorial: "Review & Outlook (Editorial): Penn: The Report" -- WSJ July 26, 1993}.

### **Individual Incidents on April 15, 1993**

1. Biomedical Library/Johnson Pavilion (6:52 a.m.): Incident involving two students and two officers responding to a call from a School of Medicine security guard.

The panel found that one officer behaved in a discourteous manner toward the students by ordering them to leave before determining who they were or giving them an opportunity to explain their presence.

The panel found that his actions violated Section 8.4.02 of the "UPPD University of Pennsylvania Police Department Policies and Procedures Manual" and should be reviewed by his supervisor for possible disciplinary action.

The panel found that the Medical School security guard behaved appropriately by contacting the UPPD.

The panel recommended that all security personnel receive training on working and interacting with people from diverse backgrounds. This training should include information about the diversity of the Penn community and the expectation that all members of the community should be treated with civility and respect regardless of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, religion, national or ethnic { sic } origin, age, disability, or status as a disabled or Vietnam era veteran.

2. Blockley Hall/Johnson Pavilion (7:48 a.m.): Incident involving two students, one Medical School security officer, one Medical School Supervisor of Security, one security officer . . . and four police officers responding to a call to UPPD that "A black male at Blockley Hall tried to take all the DP's { Daily Pennsylvanians}."

The panel found that one officer behaved in an unprofessional manner in violation of Section 8.4.02 of the "UPPD Policies and Procedures Manual" by cursing at the student and used excessive force . . . by striking the student with his baton. The panel also found that the officer failed to conduct a proper and thorough investigation because he neglected to interview the security personnel who were in pursuit.

3. David Rittenhouse Laboratories (8:20 a.m.): Incident involving two students, four officers, and the UPPD dispatcher. When two officers stopped the students carrying a large trash bag outside of DRL, they were informed by the students that this was a



protest action.

The panel found that the responding officer . . . violated Section 5.22.0 of the "UPPD Policies and Procedures Manual" by not requesting that a supervisor be dispatched to the scene in response to a demonstration.

The panel found that the dispatcher violated UPPD Divisional Directive 92.08 by making a command decision without consulting a supervisor.

4. University Museum/Sports Medicine (8:16 a.m.): Incident involving two students, a Museum security guard, a Museum administrator and two officers. The Museum administrator pursued the students, who took the DP's from Kress Gallery, and caught up with them in Weightman Hall, where he made a "citizen's arrest" and detained the students.

The panel found that the Museum administrator's actions in pursuit of the students were inappropriate after they left the property of the University Museum and not in accordance with the authority and responsibility of his job functions. His actions should be reviewed by his supervisor for possible disciplinary action.

The panel found that the students should have shown their Penn cards.

- - -

In summary, the panel concluded that once the incident occurred at DRL David Rittenhouse Laboratories, the UPPD should have recognized that the removal of the DP's from at least three different locations was a form of student protest and not an indicator of criminal behavior. According to the University's "Emergency Procedures Protocols" . . . the UPPD should have contacted the Office of the Vice Provost for University Life as soon as it recognized that the students were involved in a form of protest. Once the VPUL was notified of the protest, Open Expression Monitors would have been dispatched to observe and monitor the students' actions, in compliance with the existing Open Expression Guidelines. Since this act was a form of protest and not a criminal offense, it would have been more appropriate for Open Expression Monitors, not police officers, to mediate and attempt to resolve any further conflicts that resulted from the removal of the DP's. The Open Expression Monitors could have informed the students about the Open Expression Guidelines, notified them if their actions violated the Guidelines, and identified students who violated the Guidelines.

## **Recommendations**

It is vital that all UPPD personnel receive additional training about appropriate responses . . . to student demonstrations and protests. This training must include extensive information on the University's Open Expression Guidelines and the role and responsibility of Open Expression Monitors.

The UPPD Policy on handcuffs, Section 5.7.06, should be reviewed . . . to ascertain if there are circumstances when it may be inappropriate to handcuff detainees. . . . The application of any newly implemented policy should be monitored . . . to ensure that the policy is applied consistently, is non-discriminatory, and has no adverse impact on any group of people. After the policy is implemented, data should be maintained by the Department on the race and sex of individuals handcuffed, nature of offenses, and reasons for handcuffing.

---

BACK

© 1996-1998 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



## **The Death of History**

### **Campus Follies Lesson Four**

If you are wondering what has gone wrong with American Education, this week's lesson, and the assembled readings will give you an excellent start on understanding the problem.

This week we regress and examine a series of articles dealing with the rewriting of history texts for American High Schools. The first article is a classic from 1979 that outlines the pressures leading to a rewrite of the history text, "America! America!". Getting a history text through the state review bureaucracies is no small feat. But more harmful than the collective loss of memory that occurs in the rewriting, is the process of "dumbing down" that is wittingly and unwittingly encouraged by the state review panels.

The second is an excerpt from a 1994 article outlining the latest rewrite of "Triumph of the American Nation". The downward spiral from the late '70s continues as the authors note:

"The new 1,090-page book has a streamlined four-color look. A pictorial, jazzy, broken format has replaced the stolid design of the previous volume. The core text has been cut in half, replaced by illustrations and white space. That's bad enough. But Todd and Curti's new content is more disturbing than its format. The final chapters are a medley of racial and gender themes, radical gestures and trendy global 'concerns.'"

The third excerpt describes the guidelines for teaching history that have been promulgated by the State of New York.

The fourth describes the National Standards for United States History, approved by the National Education Standards and Improvement Council, a part of President Clinton's Goals 2000 Act.

The problem with teaching history is that you must produce enough data - facts about events occurring in the past - that conclusions may be drawn about why the event might have happened. In history, we are interested in why things happened the way that they did.

It is clear that the "critical thinking skills" being served up to America's high school

students consist not of correlating events with motives and interests of the participants, but rather identification of the good guys and bad guys. They are served cliches.

For well over 130 years, the public schools in America were very anxious to grab at the opportunity to interpret the experience of the dominant majority to the children of that majority. American History had a bias, and that bias was to emphasize the rather unique liberal and inclusionary accomplishments of Western Civilization, and to strongly encourage the continuation of those positive general trends.

But now, curiously, the educational establishment has given up interpreting the meaning of Western Civilization to the European- American majority. Rather, history simply identifies that majority (or at the very least, the young males of that majority) as the "bad guys".

The ultimate question for all of us participating in this grand experiment is what might be the consequence of this conscious abandonment of the liberal tradition in Western Civilization. The vast majority of European-Americans have never discriminated against anyone. Most have never been in a position to do so. Thus, their everyday experience is powerfully at odds with the image of themselves presented in the modern texts. But informing them that they (or all other individuals around who look like them) are the "bad guys" is bound to cause problems.

Where do these new multiculturalists think that European- Americans will turn to learn about their own identity? Left with such a vacuum, who is going to interpret their experience for them?

All the alternative sources, including talk radio, family, church, and the many right-wing bookstores and computer bulletin boards are now utterly free from the constraints that a positive public interpretation of the meaning of Western Civilization might impose on their messages.

If you think about it, the consequence seems quite predictable.

**Yggdrasil** recommends that you read the following:

---

## **Sep. 5, 1979 Wall Street Journal P1 C1 Revised Texts**

**School History Books, Striving to Please All, Are Criticized as Bland As Market Factors Outweigh Quest for Truth, Editions Even Find Woman Pirate But Out With the Hippies**

By LAWRENCE ROUT Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

"America! America!" isn't a traditional history book. In its pages are black cowboys, woman pirates, Haight-Ashbury hippies, an Indian boy, a Chicano grandmother and a middle-aged Oriental. There's something for everybody in this two-year-old American history textbook for eighth-graders, and that's by design.

"We don't want to get complaints from any anybody;" says Landon Risteen, editorial vice president at Scott, Foresman & Co., the book's publisher. "No matter where you come from, you're going to find yourself in this book."

His concern is understandable. Scott Foresman shelled out \$500,000 and four years of effort to put out "America! America!" With 20 other eighth-grade history texts battling for shares of the \$7 million-a-year business, the competition is fierce. Moreover, the competition is fierce throughout the \$700 million elementary and high school textbook market.

### **A Major Influence**

But more is at stake than profits. Some 20 million students are in those grades, and their views of the world are being shaped largely by their books. A look at how these books are developed shows that they are more often reflections of a changing marketplace than chroniclers of a constant truth.

The reason is that the publishers feel they are being forced to please the parents, religious groups, political organizations, and state and local authorities, that are wielding increasing influence over textbook selections. If a book should offend any group, veterans or war protesters, smokers or nonsmokers-its chances of being a big winner are narrowed. So publishers carefully consider their presentation of minorities, treatment of Vietnam and pictures of tobacco fields, aiming to mollify as many of these groups as possible.

"There are all those people out there who will go through our books. so we have to judge what the market will accept," says Ralph Sterling, director of marketing at Houghton Mifflin Co. in Boston. "We can't afford to have a book sit on the shelf."

### **Deficiency of Students**

That attitude. however, is condemned by many critics. "I've been teaching history to college sophomores since 1962," says Prof. Barry Karl at the University of Chicago, "and it has never been as bad as it is now. I get students who just don't know any history."

Many of his colleagues agree, and they blame it largely on the uninspiring blandness of American history textbooks. The problem, they say, is that by trying to please everyone, publishers take the edge off history, eliminating the exciting stuff that the past is made of.

"Textbooks minimize the real conflicts in history, like pretending the Civil war solved the problem of race relations in this country," says Douglas Price, a former high school

history teacher and current manager of Jocundry's bookstore in East Lansing, Mich. "If the real regional and racial tensions were written about," he adds, "the textbooks wouldn't sell to all the markets."

Justin Kestenbaum, a professor of history at Michigan State University, agrees. He says, for instance, that while textbooks describe the reform movement of the 19th Century, they ignore "its ugly overtones, like the anti-Catholicism. They don't want anybody to appear in an unfavorable light."

### **Balking at Blandness**

In Stanford, Calif., historian Thomas Bailey refuses to write for the high-school and junior-high markets because of publishers' attitudes. "If you want to sell a maximum number of books, you have to make them so bland that you don't get into the tougher issues," he says. "But you also don't tell the truth." Mr. Bailey grouses that efforts to include women and minorities make the books more ideological than intellectual. He admits that he grudgingly included 1972- presidential candidate Shirley Chisholm in one of his college books, even though "she was so unimportant that I wouldn't have normally put her in. When you write history, you should write about the main actors in the show."

Publishers argue that it isn't their place to take stands on controversial issues. Besides, they say just presenting ideas is, for some readers, tantamount to condoning them. "Authors may want to tell it like it is, but with the constraints on us, we really can't do it that way," says Dorothy Collins, an executive editor at Allyn & Bacon Inc. in Boston.

Many people also argue that the inclusion of women and minorities makes a book more historically accurate. "It used to be that what was important was generals and presidents, and none of those was a woman" says Donald Prince, vice president in the education division of Rand McNally & Co. "But there are a lot of other people very important, and one of those might be a slave woman who kept her family alive. I'm not sure that didn't take more courage and brains than riding a horse up the Shenandoah Valley."

The emphasis on these groups is also said to have dispelled many of the stereotypes that filled history books just a few years ago. Dorothy Davidson, an associate commissioner for general education in the Texas Education Agency, recalls a book that quoted a letter written by Abigail Adams to her husband, President John Adams. "Abigail says things like, 'I hope to get the drapes up,' " Miss Davidson says. "You know she must have had some thoughts on the administration, but the publisher instead chose to show her as a housewife at the White House, waiting for the furniture to move in."

"America! America!" with its black cowboys and female pirates reflects concerns that were uppermost in Mr. Risteen's mind when work on the project began in the early 1970's. Scott Foresman's market research had shown that the public was looking for a book with "more variety exemplifying the Pluralism of America" Mr. Risteen says, and "we were determined to have that in there."

## **A Group Project**

It was also in the minds of the authors as they did their research for the book. Charles Mitsakos, the assistant superintendent of schools for curriculum and instruction in Andover, Mass., was researching the role of the buccaneers in the late 17th Century when he came across Zoabinda, one of a few woman pirates. "If you go through most American history texts, the women didn't exist at the time or if they did, there's no mention of them," Mr. Mitsakos says in explaining Zoabinda's importance in "America! America!"

Mr. Mitsako's enthusiasm for ethnic variety was one the things that attracted a Scott Foresman editor who traveled with the company's sales people in 1973 in search of potential authors. The idea was to come up with three or four historians and school administrators who could work with the editors on the book. "The day of the single author is past" in history textbooks, says Gordon Hjalmarson, president of Scott Foresman. "We feel a group authorship brings various strengths."

These strengths include more than the author's field of interest or his or her familiarity with American history programs. Authors are also considered for their regional popularity. A professor from Texas, for instance, may help sell the book in that big market, and a Hispanic teacher could make a book more marketable in New York City.

In the case of "America! America!," four authors were finally selected: two male university history professors, a male school administrator and a woman who had worked as a consultant to schools in curriculum development. A professor from Texas who was originally part of the group dropped out, Mr. Risteen says, because he wasn't "willing to let us run the show."

## **Influence of States**

The influence of large states goes beyond the selection of authors, they also have a major effect on a book's content. "We are very sensitive to the markets, particularly Texas and California," Mr. Risteen says. "It wouldn't make sense to publish a book and leave out the history related to those states. He says for instance, "We made sure we didn't underplay the Texas independence."

The power of those two states is magnified by the fact that they are two of about 26 states that have state-wide "adoption committees. These committees select a certain number of books from which local school boards can choose and still receive state funds. Adoption "doesn't guarantee that the book will sell in the state, exclusion of the book guarantees that it won't. In other states such as New York, which is second to California in market size, any eighth-grade American history textbook can be considered by any school at any time. "The chief thing is that there is less competition once you get through the adoption committees," Mr. Risteen says, and that increases the chances of the book's success.

In California. "a book is almost automatically thrown out if it doesn't have ethnic balance," says James Eckman, a high school teacher who was on the textbook committee that evaluated "America America!" two years ago. Not surprisingly, "America! America!" is the biggest seller for eighth-graders in the state today. A book is also dumped in any state if its reading level is too high. Authors typically have trouble "writing down" to a young audience, and editors must often rework manuscripts.

Scott Foresman tests its books by counting the number of words in a sample section that aren't on a list of "appropriate" words and by counting the number of words in sentences. The editors then can come up with a number indicating the book's reading level. Mr. Risteen's staff took 70 samples of 100 words each to ensure that "America! America!" would be acceptable among eighth grade teachers.

That approach, which is taken by practically all publishers, is assailed by many critics. "The publishers write to such a formula that they lose sight of conveying facts in an interesting manner," says Barry Fetterolf, an editor at Random House Inc., which publishes primarily college books. "If a kid who reads on a ninth-grade level finds his parents' sex book which is on a 15th grade level, he will read it and understand it," Mr. Fetterolf says. "But they can't read a history text on a seventh-grade level because it's so boring." Still, he concedes "you have to look at it, since that's what the market asks for."

## **Big Seller**

\* \* \*

Significantly, one of Mr. Hicks's reasons for liking the book-- its limited listing of facts-- may work against it over the next few years. The "fads" in American history textbooks change quickly, and publishers currently are seeing a swing back toward the more-traditional approaches that dominated until the late 1960s.

Mr. Risteen expects to undertake a major revision of "America! America!" in about two years, and the inclusion of more hard facts may be part of that revision. "I hope we don't get to the point where we think to be good a book has to be big and grim," says Mr. Risteen. "But I see some signs that we might be."

---

## **Mar 1, 1994 Wall Street Journal p A18 Triumph of Textbook Trendiness**

BY GILBERT T. SEWALL

A few American textbooks become legends, known familiarly by their authors' names as editions and titles change over time. Todd and Curti, which first appeared in 1950, is one such book. Under the title "Triumph of the American Nation," in the 1980s it became the largest selling high school American history book in the country.



But lately Todd and Curti has been a troubled title. In 1991 Georgia rejected the book, criticizing its "outdated approach, inattention to multiculturalism, inadequate critical thinking questions, and choppy narrative flow." Holt, Rinehart & Winston made the book over from scratch, giving it a new name, "Todd and Curti's The American Nation," and publishing it last month with a 1995 copyright.

The new Todd and Curti exemplifies disturbing trends in social studies publishing today. It is a big step backward, a case of "dumbing down" and revisionist folly in search of a larger audience. No "triumph" remains in the title, and no triumphalism exists in the text, except for the many forces in contemporary culture that seek to transform the curriculum along the fault lines of multiculturalism.

The new 1,090-page book has a streamlined four-color look. A pictorial, jazzy, broken format has replaced the stolid design of the previous volume. The core text has been cut in half, replaced by illustrations and white space. That's bad enough. But Todd and Curti's new content is more disturbing than its format. The final chapters are a medley of racial and gender themes, radical gestures and trendy global "concerns."

Liberal crusades and activism receive uncritical accolades. Two photographs of protesters in wheelchairs (and a third, captioned: "A woman with visual impairment demonstrating for civil rights.") reflect the force of pressure groups on the shape of schoolroom history. So do profiles of Native Americans Russell Means and Wilma Mankiller. The 1974 Bilingual Education Act receives prominent attention as a multicultural initiative. The 1946 Employment Act shrinks to two sentences. The saga of the postwar computer industry vanishes; the computer is presented instead as a machine that helps "make the workplace safe for people with disabilities." Recent American letters are represented by Gish Jen, Sandra Cisneros and Jessica Hagedorn.

A map entitled "A Multicultural Country" color codes the U.S. into 22 ethnic and "high diversity" areas. The results are confusing or plain wrong. Students will now learn that northwestern Nevada and central Montana are "high diversity" areas, just like Los Angeles and Miami. American blacks have been relabeled "African Americans," an unsettled designation that, like others, has become nearly universal in social studies textbooks.

\* \* \*

We meet Murphy Brown having a baby and learn that "many Americans were abandoning the idea that marriage was necessarily a lifelong commitment." We deal with sexual harassment and homelessness, "which increased during the 1980s, partly as a result of President Reagan's economic policies." An estimated three million Americans are homeless, according to the book, four to six times the number in reputable surveys.

Todd and Curti states, "Ronald Reagan appealed to a wide range of voters disenchanted with liberal politics." It never explains the appeal or the disenchantment. "To gain support for their causes, the New Right established research centers such as the Heritage Foundation and launched direct mail campaigns" to elect Mr. Reagan, says the book,

which conflates Jerry Falwell's Moral Majority and voter insurgency in the 1980s.

A chapter on the environment sounds a different alarm: "One 1992 report claimed that at least 140 species were vanishing each day! Activists are campaigning to slow this process and save at least some species from extinction."

Such distortions are all the more distressing at a time when:

- The number of mass-market educational publishers continues to shrink. The recent departure of Macmillan from school publishing and the absorption of McDougal, Littell by Houghton Mifflin are the latest chapters in the depressing tale of ingestion, consolidation and lost autonomy in the field.

- History as a basic and required subject increasingly competes with social studies electives that are concerned mainly with building students' self-esteem.

- Educational publishers are tempted to retreat entirely from history, a troubled and costly area of the curriculum where little agreement on content exists and where marketing headaches abound.

The new Todd and Curti confirms the ongoing decline of a narrative core in history texts and profound changes in high school history courses. It indicates the continuing success of pressure groups that want to reconstruct the nation's official record of its past for young people.

As it happens, I spoke a while back to the co-author of the original text, Merle Curti, now a 96-year-old retired professor at the University of Wisconsin and a Pulitzer Prize-winning historian. Mr. Curti said he "lost control of the book years ago." The new book is written under the signature of Paul Boyer, also a historian at the University of Wisconsin and a respected textbook author. I know several of the historians listed as "content reviewers" in the front of the text and have favorably reviewed their own works of history. I cannot believe they had anything more than the narrowest of encounters with the final product.

Mr. Sewall is director of the American Textbook Council, which reviews history texts and curricula. Most recently, he is the co-author of "After Hiroshima: The U.S.A. Since 1945" (Longman, 1993).

---

## **June 27, 1991 Wall Street Journal p A14 Biased Panel Serves Up History With a Twist**

BY DOROTHY RABINOWITZ

The teaching of history and social studies was again the subject of hot debate in New York state last week, thanks to a new report issued by a panel of educators.

The curriculum revisions suggested by the panel will come as no great surprise to anyone familiar with the preoccupations of the multiculturalists, whose views are the reigning orthodoxy within the nation's education establishment. The 97-page document is titled "One Nation, Many Peoples: A Declaration of Cultural Interdependence." A good many New Yorkers think it might more aptly be titled "One Ideology, Many Propagandists."

State Education Commissioner Thomas Sobol ordered up the study in response to the near universal ridicule brought down on him by a curriculum report issued two years ago-- a document saturated with anti-Western hostility. The new report differs from that of the first only in its tone and moderated language.

\* \* \*

Like the first report, this one finds that school texts reflect a heavily "Eurocentric" bias. It charges they fail to inform students that the arrival of Columbus and other Europeans was a catastrophe for the native peoples of the new world that led to "the eradication of many varieties of traditional culture and knowledge." It is a given that the enemy of justice and humanity is Western man.

One of the report's most interesting features is its additions to the vocabulary of the Politically Correct. It charges that the current curriculum is guilty of bias because it describes the desert of Africa as having a "hostile" climate but fails to say the same about Europe, which has freezing rains and snows. The fact that the snows and freezing rains of Europe are seasonal - as opposed to the permanently hostile weather of the desert - did not appear to deter the panelists.

The report decrees that the word "slave" be dropped in favor of "enslaved person." The rationale for this, as panel member Francis Roberts, superintendent of a Long Island school district, explains it, is that schoolchildren hearing the word "slave" might conclude that being a slave was your everyday occupation-- such as gardener or cook.

\* \* \*

The multiculturalist majority included African Studies Prof. Ali Al'Amin Mazrui of the State University at Binghamton, whose scholarship has focused largely on enumerating the evils of Western civilization. Prof. Mazrui does appear hopeful, however, that imminent triumph over this evil is not far off, for, as he declared not long back: ~"The decline of Western civilization might well be at hand. It is in the interest of humanity that such a decline should take place."

Another panelist was Asa Hilliard, professor of education at Georgia State University, and a leading spokesman for multicultural education. Prof. Hilliard is a proponent of the view that most of the world's scientific and medical attainments and its greatest artistic and cultural works were the achievements of black Africans and stolen by white Europeans. He is the author of a school resource text titled "Free Your Mind: Return To the Source," which explains that many famous personages were black, among them the poet Robert

Browning, the French writer Colette, and the grandmother of Queen Victoria.

Prof. Hilliard has complained that schoolchildren are always told that Europeans discovered America, but are never told that the Indians may have discovered Europe. He believes that there is "exciting documentation" to support this view. A journalist asking how the Indians could have conceivably crossed the Atlantic in their little birch canoes received the answer that "the possibility should at least be put before the children." Another panelist, Prof. Edmund Gordon of Yale, co-chairman, recently authored a work tracing the tentacles of European- American hegemony and outlining the way in which European- Americans monopolized control over all knowledge. Prof. Jorge Klor de Alva, a Princeton anthropologist believes that Americans have no common culture.

One of the dissenting panelists nicely underscored the difference between the ideologized wanderings of the panel and the values of the public for whose interests they were supposed to speak. In the words of Pulitzer Prize-winning historian Kenneth Jackson, "The people of the United States will recognize, even if this committee does not, that every viable nation has to have a common culture to survive."

Ms. Rabinowitz is a Journal editorial writer

---

## **Oct. 26, 1994 Wall Street Journal p A26 The End of History**

BY LYNNE V. CHENEY

Imagine an outline for the teaching Of American history in which George Washington makes only a fleeting appearance and is never described as our first president. Or in which the foundings of the Sierra Club and the National Organization for Women are considered noteworthy events, but the first gathering of the U.S. Congress is not.

This is, in fact, the version of history set forth in the soon-to-be-released National Standards for United States History. If these standards are approved by the National Education Standards and Improvement Council-part of the bureaucracy created by the Clinton administration's Goals 2000 Act--students across the country, from grades five to 12, may begin to learn their history according to them.

The document setting forth the National Standards divides American history into 10 eras and establishes two to four standards for each era, for a total of 31. Each "standard" states briefly, and in general terms, what students should learn for a particular period (e.g., "Early European Exploration and Colonization: The Resulting Cultural and Ecological Interaction"). Each standard is followed, in the document, by lengthy teaching recommendations (e.g., students should "construct a dialogue between an Indian leader and George Washington at the end of the [Revolutionary] war").

## **Paradoxical Constitution**

The general drift of the document becomes apparent when one realizes that not a single one of the 31 standards mentions the Constitution. True, it does come up in the 250 pages of supporting materials. It is even described as "the culmination of the most creative era of constitutionalism in American history"-- but only in the dependent clause of a sentence that has as its main point that students should "ponder the paradox that the Constitution sidetracked the movement to abolish slavery that had taken rise in the revolutionary era."

The authors tend to save their unqualified admiration for people, places and events that are politically correct. The first era, "Three Worlds Meet (Beginnings to 1620)," covers societies in the Americas, Western Europe and West Africa that began to interact significantly after 1450. To understand West Africa, students are encouraged to "analyze the achievements and grandeur of Mansa Musa's court, and the social customs and wealth of the kingdom of Mali."

Such celebratory prose is rare when the document gets to American history itself. In the U.S. context, the kind of wealth that Mansa Musa commanded is not considered a good thing. When the subject of John D. Rockefeller comes up, students are instructed to conduct a trial in which he is accused of "knowingly and willfully participat[ing] in unethical and amoral business practices designed to undermine traditions of fair open competition for personal and private aggrandizement in direct violation of the common welfare."

African and Native American societies like all societies, had their failings, but one would hardly know it from National Standards. Students are encouraged to consider Aztec "architecture, skills, labor systems, and agriculture." But not the practice of human sacrifice.

Counting how many times different subjects are mentioned in the document yields telling results. One of the most often mentioned subjects, with 19 references is McCarthy and McCarthyism. The Ku Klux Klan gets its fair share, too, with 17. As for individuals, Harriet Tubman, an African-American who helped rescue slaves by way of the underground railroad, is mentioned six times. Two white males who were contemporaries of Tubman, Ulysses S. Grant and Robert E. Lee, get one and zero mentions, respectively. Alexander Graham Bell, Thomas Edison, Albert Einstein, Jonas Salk and the Wright brothers make no appearance at all.

\* \* \*

The National Standards, by contrast, concentrates on "multiple perspectives" and on how the American Revolution did or did not serve the "interests" of different groups.

\* \* \*

The National Standards, which mentions Clay once and Webster not at all, gives no hint

of their spellbinding oratory. It does, however, suggest that students analyze Pat Buchanan's speech at the 1992 Republican convention. The only congressional leader I could find actually quoted in the document was Tip O'Neill, calling Ronald Reagan "a cheerleader for selfishness."

What went wrong? One member of the National Council for History Standards (the group that oversaw the drafting of the standards) says that the 1992 presidential election unleashed the forces of political correctness. According to this person, who wishes not to be named, those who were "pursuing the revisionist agenda" no longer bothered to conceal their "great hatred for traditional history." Various political groups, such as African-American organizations and Native American groups, also complained about what they saw as omissions and distortions. As a result, says the council member, "nobody dared to cut the inclusive part," and what got left out was traditional history.

The standards for world history are also soon to be made public. By all accounts, the sessions leading to their development were even more contentious than those that produced U.S. standards. The main battle was over the emphasis that would be given to Western civilization, says a second council member. After the 1992 election, this member reports, the American Historical Association, an academic organization, became particularly aggressive in its opposition to "privileging" the West. The AHA threatened to boycott the proceedings if Western civilization was given any emphasis. From that point on, says the second council member, "the AHA hijacked standards-setting." Several council members fervently protested the diminution of the West, "but," says the second council member, "we were all iced-out."

## **Official Knowledge**

UCLA's Center for History suggests that its document on standards be viewed as a work in progress rather than a definitive statement. But there is every reason to believe that the certification process put in place by the Clinton administration will lead to the adoption of the proposed standards more or less intact-as official knowledge-with the result that much that is significant in our past will begin to disappear from our schools.

Preventing certification will be a formidable task. Those wishing to do so will have to go up against an academic establishment that revels in the kind of politicized history that characterizes much of the National Standards. But the battle is worth taking on. We are a better people than the National Standards indicate, and our children deserve to know it.

Mrs. Cheney, who was chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities from May 1986 to January 1993, is a fellow at the American Enterprise Institute.

---

**BACK**

© 1996-1998 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



## **Afrocentrism**

### **Campus Follies Lesson Five**

In lesson four, we discussed the decline in teaching history at the high school level. As a consequence, students arrive at universities with such a weak grasp of the facts of the past that it is quite easy to convince them of just about anything.

This week's lesson provides you with examples of the most egregious politically motivated rewriting of history at the College level - "Afrocentrism". The dividing line between propaganda and serious inquiry has blurred.

At the conclusion of [lesson 4](#) we asked whether it was wise for liberals to weaken and propagandize the history curriculum. After all, there are alternative sources that would be happy to interpret the meaning of Western Civilization to curious European-Americans without the intervention of liberal integrationist professors.

As you review the readings below, you should ask whether integration and assimilation are realistically possible when a group becomes so alienated from the majority that it manufactures a vision of the past regarded by the majority as fanciful.

Can this be an optimistic sign for the future?

**Yggdrasil** recommends that you read the following:

---

### **April 7, 1993 Wall Street Journal p A14 Afrocentrists Wage War on Ancient Greeks**

BY MARY LEFKOWITZ

Recently I heard a lecture at Wellesley College that, not so long ago, would have seemed strangely out of place in an academic setting.

As if there were no question about the accuracy of his information, the speaker, Yosef A. A. ben-Jochannan, assured his young audience that Greek civilization dates from only



1000 B.C. (In fact, Greek speaking peoples occupied the Greek mainland for at least half a millennium before that.) He went on to suggest that Socrates was a figment of Plato's imagination. (In fact, the great philosopher is mentioned by several other contemporary writers, such as the comic poet Aristophanes and the historian Xenophon.) As for Plato himself, Mr. ben-Jochannan claimed that the philosopher had studied for 11 years in Egypt. (It is very unlikely that he even went there.) He said that Plato learned from Egyptian sages in Masonic Grand Lodges an Egyptian "mystery" system. (In reality, there was no such system, and a literature about Greco-Egyptian philosophy did not come into existence until 500 years after Plato's death.)

Then, as if to drive home the message of the treachery and inferiority of the ancient Greeks, he asserted that Aristotle sacked the Library of Alexandria and stole his philosophy from the Egyptians. In fact, the library was not built until after Aristotle's death and there is no evidence that Aristotle ever went to Egypt, much less stole his philosophy from there.

When a colleague and I asked Mr. ben-Jochannan to identify the ancient sources on which he based his assertions, he declined to answer. When we pointed out one or two errors of fact, he accused us of arrogance and insolence. One student apologized to the speaker for our rudeness, and walked out. After the lecture other students surrounded us, saying: "You think you know the truth, but HE is telling the truth. What you learned is wrong."

Despite appearances, this was no political rally, or at least it wasn't billed as such. It was the Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Lecture in the Wellesley College Chapel, located on a campus that has until now prided itself on reasoned discourse and behavior. The speaker had been introduced by our college president as an "eminent Egyptologist and historian."

One could just laugh and forget about it, if occasions like this were exceptional. But similar "facts" about the ancient world are routinely taught to some Wellesley students, and to other students throughout the country--at Temple, City University of New York and Cornell, to name only a few other schools--by professors eager to present an "Afrocentrist" perspective on the ancient world.

These "historians" are determined to show that Africa is the true mother of Western civilization, and that Greek philosophy and religion were not invented by the Greeks but rather stolen by them from the ancient Egyptians. They depict the Egyptians, and other ancient peoples of Africa, as victims of a conspiracy: In their view, European historians have banded together to suppress the truth about the derivative and fraudulent nature of European civilization.

This conspiracy theory gives the promoters of the Afrocentrist view of history license to ignore many established facts of history and to report (or invent) only data that support their paranoid account of ancient history. If someone can teach that the Greeks stole their philosophy from Egypt, he might as well claim that Jews (rather than Christian Europeans, Arabs and Africans) were primarily responsible for the 19th century slave trade. At Wellesley, the same instructor who assigns books like the Rev. G.G.M. James's

"Stolen Legacy" in a course on ancient Africa employs the anonymously authored, notoriously anti-Semitic treatise "The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews" in a course on modern U.S. history.

Those who believe in this conspiracy have a surprisingly easy time imposing their views in American universities today. They are protected, of course, by the doctrine of freedom of speech. But for many academics honoring this doctrine means never questioning the validity of what their colleagues are teaching, partly out of fear that some modern-day Joseph McCarthy will rise and begin to examine what they teach in their own classrooms.

\* \* \*

It is clearly time for academics to come out of the closets of their specializations and complain, not only about biased interpretation but about deliberate misrepresentation and manipulation of facts, whether in their own subject areas or in someone else's. Unless they do, generations of students will come to believe that Aristotle put his own name and titles to nonexistent Egyptian treatises that he stole from a library that had not yet been built in a country that he never visited! Subjects like history and philosophy will be replaced by indoctrination, and each of us will believe the brand of "truth" that best serves his or her own selfish purposes.

Ms. Lefkowitz, a professor of classics at Wellesley College, is the author "Women in Greek Myth" (Johns Hopkins, 1986).

---

## **Sep. 29, 1992 Wall Street Journal A14 They Call It 'Diversity'**

The bill is now coming due for the commitment among colleges and universities to "diversity" and "multiculturalism." It could have been foreseen early on, and was indeed argued by dissenters from these theories, that their logic would lead to separatism and division. Now the reality has arrived in a bitter, and bitterly ironic, dispute at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

A group there, led by the Black Student Movement, has demanded a freestanding cultural center for black students, has issued non-negotiable demands to university administrators, and has threatened black faculty members who questioned the strident tone of the demands.

Directing attention to one such faculty member (and longtime civil rights activist), the head of the black student organization announced at a rally that this was a revolution and that there were black folk standing in the way of progress. Further, speaker Michelle Thomas warned those blacks, "You better be ready because you're next."

Film maker Spike Lee also arrived on campus September 18 to vent his opinion to a rally of some 5,000 students. The director, who recently proposed that people skip school and work to attend the opening of his new film, suggested a playing boycott by black athletes. If black athletes got together, he said, "There wouldn't be no Final Four, no Rose Bowl . . ." etc.

There were also exhortations by Muslim Minister Louis Farrakhan's representative, Khalib Muhammed. Socrates, Mr. Muhammed announced, was a "faggot" - a comment received with laughter and applause by many in the crowd. David Molpus, the National Public Radio correspondent who reported on the event, says it wasn't clear whether the crowd was applauding the attack on homosexuals (of which this was not the only example) or the one on Socrates.

Mr. Muhammed followed this cultural insight with streams of invective directed at "blue-eyed devils" and "crackers." "We are," he announced, "tired of a blond-haired, pale-skinned blue-eyed buttermilk complexioned cracker Christ or peckerwood Jesus." The NPR reporter on the scene tells us that he approached speakers and organizers after the rally to ask them what they thought of all this and could find no one who had any disagreements with the comments.

Some do, of course, but in the current campus climate they may not speak up. One UNC student told the News and Observer newspaper: "I understand their frustration. But now a lot of people will be afraid to speak up and be called racist. But we're afraid of our community being split up."

The school administration's early position was that the idea of creating a student center distinctly separate from the rest of the campus would contradict the original ideals of the civil rights movement. It doesn't surprise us, though, that the current generation of university students, including those rallying at UNC for a separate center, would by now be quite confused about the civil rights movement's unifying ideals.

All those students who have been targeted by faculty for inculcation in the diversity movement - blacks, Hispanics, homosexuals, women - are taught to recognize and value their "distinctness." Can anyone seriously be surprised when they take the logic of this terribly unbalanced argument into separateness?

\* \* \*

President Chace noted the existence of a "sad honor roll" of institutions that have allowed and encouraged students to declare certain books and ideas illegitimate - and to consider as appropriate "only that which reinforces or exalts a group:" (In the columns nearby, Heather MacDonald describes the lengths some famous schools are now going to on behalf of group exaltation.)

With a bicentennial fund-raising campaign near, North Carolina's Chancellor, Paul Hardin, has now taken the position that he might conceivably back such a center - if it agrees not to be separatist. We suspect Chancellor Hardin is acutely sensitive to the

possibility that, in a catastrophic irony, this student center would resurrect on his campus the awful and false "separate but equal" standard of Plessy v. Ferguson. Unless a whole lot more people start to speak up, this is where the proponents of multicultural diversity will take us.

---

## **July 31, 1991 Wall Street Journal The Tragedy of Multiculturalism**

BY IRVING KRISTOL

It is difficult, and even dangerous, to talk candidly about "multiculturalism" these days--Such candor is bound to provoke accusations of "insensitivity" at least, "racism" at worst. Even some of the sharpest criticisms of multiculturalism are content to limit themselves to demonstrating how "illiberal" it is, how it violates traditional ideas about the substance of liberal education, and how it represents a deplorable deviation in the way our young-Americans, so heterogeneous in their origins, are to be educated to live together. This criticism is certainly valid and welcome. But it also implicitly concedes too much by going along with the assumption that there really is such a thing as multiculturalism--i.e., a sincere if overzealous effort by well-meaning educators to broaden the horizons of the conventional curriculum. Such educators doubtless exist, but their efforts end up being the victims of a far more aggressive mode of multiculturalism.

Though the educational establishment would rather die than admit it, multiculturalism is a desperate--and surely self defeating--strategy for coping with the educational deficiencies, and associated social pathologies, of young blacks. Did these black students and their problems not exist, we would hear little of multiculturalism. There is no evidence that a substantial number of Hispanic parents would like their children to know more about Simon Bolivar and less about George Washington or that Oriental parents feel that their children are being educationally deprived because their textbooks teach them more about ancient Greece than about ancient China.

### **After-School Instruction**

To the degree that there is any such sentiment in these minority groups, it can be coped with in the traditional way--by a few hours a week of after-school instruction for their children, privately arranged. (At the college level, of course, instruction in the relevant languages, literature, and history has always been available.) But most adult Hispanics and Orientals do not have any such concern. They are fully preoccupied with the process of "Americanization." The "roots" these groups seek are right here in the U.S., not among the Aztecs or in the Ming dynasty.

Most Hispanics are behaving very much like the Italians of yesteryear; most Orientals, like the Jews of yesteryear. Because of differences in cultural background, their integration into American society proceeds at different rates--but it does proceed. The

process is not without pain and turmoil, but it works. Ironically, and sadly, it has not worked so well for American blacks, among the earliest arrivals. Hence, out of desperation, the turn to multiculturalism.

Multiculturalism comes in varying kinds and varying degrees of intensity. A child may come home from elementary school knowing more about Harriet Tubman than about Abraham Lincoln. This can be disconcerting to white parents and baffling to Hispanics or Oriental, but presumably they can shrug it off as a transient phenomenon. The question is: Do such trivial pursuits of worthy but relatively obscure racial ancestors really help black students? There is no evidence that it does. In theory, it is supposed to elevate their sense of self esteem as individuals and as blacks. But genuine self-esteem comes from real-life experiences, not from the flattering attention of textbooks.

In fact, as is well known by now, the problems of young blacks do not arise in our schools, nor are they remediable there. They are the product of their homes and environments-a terrible social problem, not an educational problem.

\* \* \*

Role models are largely a sociological fantasy. We all, when young, have known (or have known of) adults whom we respected and admired-until, with time, their images fade as our interests shift. Very few of us have gone through life gazing at role models we have known. And, unfortunately, there is as yet little evidence that black teachers have a significant, differential effect on the academic achievements of black students.

It is in its most intense and extreme form, however, that multiculturalism is on its way to being a major educational, social and eventually political problem. This version is propagated on our college campuses by a coalition of nationalist- racist blacks, radical feminists, "gays" and lesbians, and a handful of aspiring demagogues who claim to represent various ethnic minorities. In this coalition, it is the blacks who provide the hard core of energy, because it is they who can intimidate the faculty and the administration, fearful of being branded "racist." This coalition's multiculturalism is an ideology whose educational program is subordinated to a political program that is, above all, anti-American and anti-Western. It is no exaggeration to say that these campus radicals (professors as well as students ), having given up on the "class struggle"--the American workers all being conscientious objectors-have now moved to an agenda of ethnic-racial conflict. The agenda, in its educational dimension, has as its explicit purpose to induce in the minds and sensibilities of minority students a "Third World consciousness"-that is the very phrase they use. In practice, this means an effort to persuade minority students to be contemptuous of and hostile to America and Western civilization as a whole, interpreted as an age-old system of oppression, colonialism and exploitation. What these radicals blandly call multiculturalism is as much a "war against the West" as Nazism and Stalinism ever were.

\* \* \*

## **Concession After Concession**

It is now becoming ever more common within the American educational system for increasing numbers of young blacks to learn that what we call "Western civilization" was invented by black Egyptians and feloniously appropriated by the Greeks, or that black Africa was a peaceful, technologically advanced continent before the white Europeans devastated it. Such instruction can only inflame an already common belief among blacks that "white America" and its government are deliberately fostering drug addiction and diabolically tolerating the AIDS virus in the black community. Multiculturalism, as its most ardent proponents well understand, is a technique for "consciousness raising" by deliberately stroking this kind of paranoia.

One does not wish to be apocalyptic though thoughtful and honest teachers may be forgiven for thinking their world is coming to an end. Most of those who tolerate or even advocate multiculturalism in our schools and colleges have educational, not ideological, intentions. But the force is with the extremists, who ride roughshod over the opposition by intimidating it with accusations of "racism." So the opposition timidly makes concession after concession while seeking shelter in anonymity.

Recently, a journalist telephoned five leading professors of Egyptology, asking them what they thought about the claim of a black Egyptian provenance for Western civilization. They all said it is nonsense. At the same time, they all withheld permission for their names to be attached to this risky, "politically incorrect" position.

There is no doubt that today, multiculturalism is beclouding and disorienting the minds of tens of thousands of our students-- mainly black students. It is not an educational reform. It is an educational and an American--tragedy.

Mr. Kristol, an American Enterprise Institute fellow, co-edits *The Public Interest* and publishes *The National Interest*.

---

## **May 17, 1994 Wall Street Journal p A18 Segregation Resurrected**

BY STANLEY CROUCH

On this 40th anniversary of *Brown v. Board of Education* it is important to recognize that such attempts to extend American democracy were based upon setting aside superficial differences in the interests of individual possibility. Since then, however, another agenda has seized the wheel of the cultural bus. I'm referring to Afrocentrism.

In fact, the emergence of Afrocentrism makes explicit a continuing crisis in the intellectual assessment of race, history and Culture in our nation. It serves as another example of how quickly we will submit to visions that are at odds with the heroic imperatives of shaping a cohesive society out of its fragmentary parts. When it comes to skin tone, we remain ever gullible, willing to sponsor almost any idea claiming to make

fresh judgments of our society. Just as virtually anything can sell as art, no matter its lack of facility, most ideas can make their way onto our campuses and into our discussions of policy. As a movement, Afrocentrism is another clever but simple-minded hustle that has descended from what was once called "the professional Negro," a person whose "identity" and whose "struggle" constituted a public commodity. James Baldwin became a master of that form, as a writer, speaker and television guest, but he arrived before his brand of engagement by harangue was departmentalized. Now like most areas of specious American ideas claiming to "get the story straight," this commodity sells as academic pancakes, buttered by the naive indignation of students and sweetened by gushes of pitying syrup.

## **Afrocentrism**

At its core, though, Afrocentrism has little to offer of any intellectual substance. It benefits in spades from the decline of faith so basic to how intellectuals have fumbled the heroic demands of our time. The discontinuity of ideals and actions, the blood spore that is history, and the long list of atrocities committed in the name of God and country have convinced many Western intellectuals that the only sensible postures are those of the defeatist and the cynic.

As with the tenured Marxist, Afrocentrists will use the contradiction to define the whole, asserting that Western civilization is no more than the work of imperialists and racists who quest for an order of geopolitical domination that is inextricably connected to profit and exploitation, white over black. Where the Marxist looks forward to a sentimental paradise of workers uber alles, the Afrocentrist speaks of a paradise lost and the possibility of a paradise regained--if only black people will rediscover the essentials of their African identity.

For all its pretensions to expanding our vision, the Afrocentric movement is not propelled by a desire to bring about any significant enrichment of our American culture. What Afrocentrists almost always want is power--the power to define. no matter how flimsy their cases might be.

As with most movements built on conspiracy theories, only the sources of argument and the "proof" provided by Afrocentrists are acceptable; all else is either defined as willfully flawed or brought to debate solely in the interest of maintaining a vision of European domination throughout history and within the province of ideas. Thus, the worst insult is that critics are "Eurocentric." When charged with shoddy scholarship, the Afrocentrist's retort is that his or her purportedly revolutionary work arrives through means of research and assessment outside "European methodology."

Afrocentrism, then, presents itself as ethnic liberation, a circling of the wagons within the academy, an attempt to impale Eurocentric authority on the dilemma of black intellectual rebellion. At the same time, Afrocentrism is like all of the protest versions of study that are actually extensions of soap operas in which the stars are paid to emote the effects of injustice. It's about achieving the respect held for traditional disciplines while not measuring up to the standards of traditional research. Though ever scoffing at the academy, the Afrocentrists want all of the prestige and the benefits that come with

being there. No one should be surprised, since we live in a time in which it is not considered hypocritical to seek employment within a structure you claim is contemptuous. A central component of the Afrocentric argument is that Egypt was black and that Greco-Roman civilization resulted from its influence. This means that the foundation Of Western civilization is African - It's a relatively sophisticated version of Elijah Muhammad's Yacub myth, in which the white man is invented by a mad black scientist determined to destroy the world through an innately evil creature.

Why this obsession with race and ancient Egypt? First, monuments. There is no significant African architecture capable of rivaling the grand wonders of the world, European or not. Second, there is no written language or body of thought comparable to that upon which Western civilization has built and developed its morality, politics, technology, economy and arts. More than a few of us yearn for pedigrees, wishing for access to aristocracy through the accumulated majesty of a long family line. If family won't do, then we might snatch the unwieldy crown of race for a coronation that defines the group as innately aristocratic.

\* \* \*

College students swallow Afrocentrism whole and conclude that all of their problems result from lacking an "African centered" worldview that would provide them with an education suitable to their history and to their needs in a racist society.

These are all responses to humiliation-expressions of having taken the insults of the opposition too seriously, retreats from engagement, dismissals of complexity, racial isolationism. Essential to the justification for the myopic vision that emerges is a list of real and imagined atrocities. The great tragedies of the white South were the loss of the Civil War and the humiliation of Reconstruction; for the black nationalist, they were slavery, the colonial exploitation of Africa, and the European denial of the moral superiority of African culture and civilization, beginning with Egypt.

\* \* \*

## **Tribal Views**

In essence, Afrocentrists want to live on a high-grade reservation so they can ignore the national vision of human rights when it conflicts with their own tribal views. By attempting to win the souls of black college students and influence what is taught to black children in Public schools, Afrocentrists seek a large enough constituency to maintain what power now exists and extend it to what segregation once promised- "separate but equal".

\* \* \*

We can never forget that our fate as Americans is, finally, collective. We fail our mission as a democratic nation whenever we submit to any sort of segregation that would remake the rules and distort the truth in the interest of creating or satisfying a



constituency unwilling to assert the tragic optimism so intrinsic to our national heritage.

Mr. Crouch wrote other versions of this for the Manhattan Institute's booklet "Alternatives to Afrocentrism " and the summer issue of the Institute's City Journal.

---

[BACK](#)

© 1996-1998 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



## **The Feminist Challenge**

### **Campus Follies: Lesson Six**

This week we move into the fever swamps of male hating, - specifically, white-male hating. Somehow, if the NBA ends up being 80% black, nobody complains. However, if the education system, and the skill sets necessary for success in business reward white males, then there are plenty of complaints.

If the system doesn't produce the desired rewards for the "right" people, then the answer is to "change the rules." Females are hardly of a single mind on the issue, as illustrated by the two excerpts written by females set forth below. From these excerpts, you will see that the militants unhappy with sex roles have distorted fact and have arrived at a set of social prescriptions which make the Afrocentrists of [Campus Follies 5](#) look like moderates.

Yggdrasil had occasion to visit the University of California at Santa Barbara last year. As most of you should know, the school has a reputation for fun and parties. It has the lowest minority enrollment percentage in the UC System. When rating party schools, Playboy magazine concludes that it would be unfair to rank UCSB because they are "pros".

It is the kind of campus that attracts females interested in men.

But it also attracts a small but virulent cadre of midnight spray painters given to slogans not seen on Ivy League schools attended by much higher percentage of feminist male haters.

The feminist graffiti included such gems as "you are being trained to be breeding cows!" And "sex is rape! - keep your slimy hands off our bodies!". When the spray painters graduate, they doubtless move on to more professional protests of sexuality.

They graduate from graffiti to "remaking education" and ridding it of dangerous concepts like "excellence," as Peggy McIntosh, profiled in the first excerpt, has done. Or they move on to producing research tomes such as "Shortchanging Girls, Shortchanging America," a study that argues that girls' self esteem is being wounded in tens of thousands of elementary and high school classrooms. It is a proposition heatedly disputed by the second and third excerpts in this lesson.

Again, the fascinating question is why so many who live and prosper within Western Civilization are so profoundly unhappy with it. Perhaps Western Civilization is not for all. Perhaps it cannot be tailored to fit all of the World's peoples. Perhaps access to it should be restricted to those who are, if not comfortable with it, at least neutral toward its prime tenets and its survival.

**Yggdrasil** recommends that you fasten your seatbelts and enjoy the following:

---

## **Jun. 14, 1994 Wall Street Journal p A1 Blackboard Rumble**

For Peggy McIntosh, 'Excellence' Can Be A Dangerous Concept

Her Ideas to Remake Schools On Feminist Theory Get Praised--and Ridiculed

BY DENNIS FARNEY Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

WELLESLEY, Mass. - "It's not their fault," Peggy McIntosh once observed of white males. "They didn't ask to be born white males."

Standing at a blackboard here, chalk in one hand and eraser in the other, the associate director of the Wellesley College Center for Research on Women looks like the classroom teacher she once was. Her manner is shy, but her words and writings challenge some of the most cherished assumptions of American culture. It's not their fault, she argues, that white males find themselves cast as "winner-killer" combatants in a struggle for power and position. And white females? It's not their fault that, although often oppressed, they themselves can be oppressors. Before congratulating themselves "I came up from nothing . . . from pink booties to briefcase on Wall Street" - they should remember that they may well be beneficiaries of "skin-color privilege."

No, she argues, these are the results of a culture that projects harmful roles upon people of both sexes and all races, shaping the way they see themselves. And so Peggy McIntosh is trying to reshape that culture - by reshaping the institution that, arguably, is more intimately bound up with the American dream than any other.

She wants to change what schools teach and how they teach it. At a time when "educational excellence" is a national catchword, she warns that excellence can be a dangerous concept. At a time when national leaders from President Clinton on down urge the nation to gird for global economic competition, she warns that competition in the classrooms can be hurtful, cautions against giving out gold stars, and envisions schools that go "beyond win/lose."

Such ideas make this soft-spoken, almost hesitant woman of 59 a protagonist in a

broader upheaval in American culture. Shared values and traditions that once provided society's glue - notions of how to teach and how to learn, how to live and how to die - are fragmenting. Increasingly, they are now the province of academicians and lawyers, plaintiffs and defendants, politicians and pressure groups. Culture - the bundle of values and assumptions that American society lives by - has become politicized.

Dr. McIntosh has spoken about her ideas in some three dozen states, Europe, Asia and the Middle East. She was a contributor to the Wellesley center's report for the American Association of University Women, "How Schools Shortchange Girls," which, in turn, helps underpin a package of education bills moving through Congress. She co-directs a program, Seeking Educational Equity and Diversity, or SEED.

So far, SEED has enrolled about 3,000 educators, in some 30 states and nine other countries, in voluntary, teacher-led seminars on multiculturalism and what she calls "gender-balanced" curriculums. Drawing upon feminist and multiculturalist theories, SEED programs aim to sensitize teachers to the perceived perils of "male privilege" and "white privilege." They encourage teachers to put more emphasis on cooperation among pupils, and less on competition between them. They advocate fundamental changes in what students learn; history, for example, should be "the history of inclusion" - a history that heralds the doings of ordinary people (often women and minorities) doing ordinary, unheralded things. But critics assail such views as egalitarianism run amok, a kind of schoolhouse socialism that both trivializes and politicizes course work.

Indeed. Dr- McIntosh's critics, who cut across traditional liberal-conservative political lines, see her as a threat to academic standards - even an affront to Western Civilization itself "She has a Pol Pot approach to education" charges Brookline, Mass-. parent David Stillman. "She seems to be trying to make everybody equal by making sure that nobody knows anything."

Mr. Stillman and his wife Ronni Gordon, were civil-rights marchers in the 1960s and Dukakis liberals in the 1980s. But they have since helped found the Brookline Committee for Quality Education, a 100-member organization that is fighting what it regards as politically correct thinking, fostered by Dr. McIntosh among others, infusing Brookline's public school curriculum.

"The very type of stereotyping we fought against on the Civil- rights lines is now the basis of her educational policy," he says. "What we fought against was the assumption that race or ethnicity or sex determined character, cognition and ability. And now we find someone like Peggy McIntosh arguing that they do." Should American schools emphasize American culture - and just what is "American" in today's welter of ethnic groups and cultural traditions? Or, to take the opposite tack, is it possible the American curriculum is already too "American" --that is, too bound up with the classic American dream of striving and winning? Is it elitist, or worse, for parents to want their children to strive for the gold star and the brass ring-or simply common sense?

## **Notions of Controversy**

A measure of the explosive nature of such questions is the passion Dr. McIntosh's ideas provoke. Gender-equity advocates are cheered by her theories. "She simply put into words what I had observed in myself," says Cathy Nelson, a former Minnesota teacher and now co-director of that state's SEED project. "I had taught for years without talking about women in history. I just assumed they hadn't done anything."

But Lynne V. Cheney, while chairman of the National Endowment for Humanities during the Bush administration, wrote a broadside against political correctness that singled out Dr. McIntosh, and her notions, for sharp criticism. "The aim of education, as many on our campuses now see it," Ms. Cheney wrote, "is no longer truth, but political transformation - of students and society." Now a fellow at the conservative American Enterprise Institute, she argues that Dr. McIntosh represents a strain of feminism that regards truth and evidence as simply a 'perspective' that white males have on the world. . . . This is the most basic assault on the West that you can imagine, because it is an assault on rationality itself."

\* \* \*

## **Fading Stars?**

\* \* \*

Dr. McIntosh didn't design the Brookline curriculum, but she clearly left her mark on it. She was hired several years ago to address Brookline staff-development conferences; later a then- assistant superintendent for curriculum praised her ideas at length before a League of Women Voters forum. Today, superintendent James Walsh says that Dr. McIntosh, while "terrific" in her presentations, had "no systemic effect" on the Brookline curriculum.

Critics think otherwise, and she has come to symbolize much of what they are fighting against. A videotape of one of Dr. McIntosh's staff-development talks - obtained by the Brookline education committee, then copied and recopied like a kind of underground movie - has become Exhibit No. 1 for critics of the curriculum generally, and Peggy McIntosh specifically.

In that talk Dr. McIntosh decried a culture that assigns a "deficit identity" to many people except "young, preferably blond, white males" - and burdens even them with a "win-lest-you-lose" mentality. This culture, she said, "has made a few, especially our young, white males, dangerous to themselves and the rest of us, especially in a nuclear age." She envisioned a curriculum freed of this male "ideal of excellence."

## **Accusations of Hypocrisy**

Such thinking appalls her critics, who accuse her of the very things for which she berates others - rampant sexism and condescension. "Let me take a bold stand here," wrote Robert Costrell, then president of the Brookline education committee, in a letter to the Brookline Citizen newspaper. ". . . We want our children to strive for excellence,

even if they don't achieve it.... Who could have dreamed this would be a point of contention?"

"What we see is the dumbing-down of the curriculum," argues Ms. Gordon. "Between social engineering and psychotherapy, there's little time for anything academic.... What's the ultimate aim of this? It's a way to redistribute power and money [in society]. And isn't that always the name of the game at the political level?"

Dr. McIntosh asserts that the committee is a "small, very powerful" pressure group that, in conjunction with conservative foundations, is part of a concerted effort to discredit multiculturalism. (Committee members deny this, saying the group grew out of strictly local concerns within the 5,000-student school district.) She says her critics carry an "ideology of individualism" to extremes.

"Some people cannot think beyond winning and losing," she says. "'Excellence'--they associate it with test scores. I'm about excellence, too. But there is another way of seeing where it doesn't have to be 'win' or 'lose,' their children against other children, dog-eat-dog."

In a sense, her way of seeing is a reaction against lessons she learned in grade school and junior high in the New Jersey suburbs. Her schools, she says, rewarded "the ability to be right. The ability to be controlling. The ability to be judgmental, in the sense of knocking down others' arguments. The ability to work in isolation. The ability to compete against each other."

All those lessons, she now feels, were "incomplete" lessons. She excelled academically, in fact, she would eventually graduate summa cum laude and Phi Beta Kappa from Radcliffe College. But what she remembers vividly from those early days is her "terror of being wrong."

\* \* \*

As grand theory, Dr. McIntosh's thinking is too much for critics to swallow. "What she's expressing is a kind of '60s counter-cultural baggage," says historian and educator Diane Ravitch, an assistant education secretary in the Bush administration. "It would be nice if there were no winners or losers. That was the socialist dream, wasn't it? And as we know, it hasn't worked out very well."

Moreover, as applied in the classroom, the McIntosh thinking has some parents up in arms. Mr. Stillman and Ms. Gordon, the Brookline parents, pulled their 12-year-old daughter Mimi out of school last September and are educating her at home. They say their decision was the result of several years of agonizing about curriculum changes brought about by McIntosh-like thinking. But a particularly telling incident for them was when a fourth-grade teacher placed Mimi, a gifted student at a table with three children of lower achievement levels and directed the four to work as a team on math problems. Then the teacher gave a collective grade to the table as a whole.

"I thought the collective grade was a message," says David Stillman. "She will be penalized if they don't learn." (Superintendent Walsh doesn't dispute the parents' recollection, but says that collaborative learning is used by "every school system in the country" to teach "teamwork and respect for differences.")

It also alarmed Mr. Stillman and Ms. Gordon, authors of foreign-language text books, when the school system removed an advanced-placement European history course from the curriculum; angry parents got it put back after a year of skirmishing with administrators. To Mr. Stillman, the removal was part of a more pervasive "hostility toward anything European."

David Stillman and Ronni Gordon have never met Peggy McIntosh. In the end, their world views pass like ships in the night. Of Dr. McIntosh, Mr. Stillman says: "What she's done has turned her own guilt into an education program."

Of no critic in particular, Dr. McIntosh says: "It can be a tremendous shock for some people to see themselves as oppressors, when all they're doing is what was expected of them. My sympathy is with anybody whose world falls apart."

---

## **Oct. 3, 1994 Wall Street Journal p A20 The Myth of Schoolgirls' Low Self-Esteem**

By CHRISTINA HOFF SOMMERS

The American Association of University Women was founded in 1881 to foster excellence in women's education. In recent years, however, its leadership has put the organization's longstanding reputation for professionalism and probity in question by aggressively promoting the sensational but empirically unfounded thesis that gender bias is causing a debilitating loss of self-esteem in our nation's schoolgirls.

In 1991 the AAUW announced the results of its survey "Shortchanging Girls, Shortchanging America." The conclusion: American girls "do not believe in themselves." A massive and effective media blitz spread the word that the organization had uncovered "an unacknowledged American tragedy." Gloria Steinem, Anna Quindlen and other prominent feminist writers sounded the alarm. In the meantime, the AAUW jettisoned its starched image. You can now call an 800 number to order AAUW gender-bias products such as "Shortchanging Girls" T-shirts and coffee mugs.

Lately, the survey's results have taken on new life. A new book by Peggy Orenstein titled "Schoolgirls"--inspired by the AAUW survey--attempts to illustrate its conclusions with on-the-scene reports from two California middle schools. As might be expected, Ms. Orenstein's "findings" have been treated with reverential respect by reporters and TV hosts. The effect has been to reaffirm the "scientific" validity of the idea that schoolgirls suffer from low self-esteem.

## **Another Look**

It is perhaps time to remind ourselves just how bad the AAUW survey really is.

Soon after the study began to make headlines in 1991, Science News ran a story noting the skepticism of leading researchers toward its findings. Indeed, the majority of scholars in the field of adolescent development see no significant gender difference in self-esteem. What the AAUW study relies on, instead of verifiable science, is bogus inference and shoddy methodology.

Consider this major piece of evidence adduced by the AAUW to highlight the difference in boys' and girls' aspirations for success: "The higher self-esteem of young men translates into bigger career dreams. ... The number of boys who aspire to glamorous occupations (rock star, sports star) is greater than that of young women at every stage of adolescence, creating a kind of 'glamour gap.' "

A glamour gap? Most kids do not have the talent and drive to be rock stars. The sensible ones know it. (The No. 1 career aspiration among girls, by the way was lawyer.) What the responses of the children suggest, and what many experts on adolescent development will tell you, is that girls mature earlier than boys, who at this age apparently, suffer from a "reality gap."

The AAUW was careful not to publicize one very awkward finding: African-American boys, who are educationally most at risk, scored highest of all on the AAUW's self-esteem indexes. This finding casts doubt on the critical assumption that what the AAUW is measuring as "self-esteem" is linked to academic and career achievement.

The so-called teacher attention gap is also unproved. Take, for example, this striking and much repeated AAUW claim: "Boys in elementary and middle school called out answers eight more times than girls. When boys called out, teachers listened, but when girls called out, they were told 'raise your hand if you want to speak.' "

The AAUW's "teams of scholars" are distorting the original source. Here is what the source they cite--but do not quote-- actually says: "Boys, particularly low-achieving boys, receive eight to ten times as many reprimands as do their female classmates.... When both girls and boys are misbehaving equally, boys still receive more frequent discipline."

Having surveyed 3,000 children, the MUW declared that girls are undervalued, "silenced" and ignored by their (mostly female) teachers. But according to the Education Department's 1988 and 1990 longitudinal study of 25,000 8th to 10th graders, more girls than boys feel the teacher is interested in them, and by 10th grade 72% of girls, compared with 68% of boys, said the "teachers listened to what I have to say."

Perhaps most important, the Education Department's Digest of Education Statistics and Condition of Education show that boys are not doing better than girls. Far more boys



than girls suffer from learning disabilities, delinquency, alcoholism and drug abuse; five times as many boys as girls commit suicide. Girls get better grades; more girls graduate from high school and college. Even the frequently cited claim that girls score lower on standardized tests is misleading. In the 1992 National Assessment of Educational Progress Test of 17 year-olds, boys outperformed girls by four points in math and 10 points in science, but girls more strikingly outperformed boys by 12 points in reading and 17 points in writing. Girls are catching up in math and science; boys continue to lag far behind in reading and writing.

Yet even in the face of such evidence, the low self-esteem myth persists. Why? One reason may be the sensationalism with which it is presented. In "Failing at Fairness: How America's Schools Cheat Girls" (1994), Myra and David Sadker, two principal AAUW researchers, predict the fate of a six-year-old girl on top of a playground slide: "There she stood on her sturdy legs, with her head thrown back, and her arms flung wide . . . full of energy, self-reliance and purpose. She feels confident about what she can do and who she can become.... Photographed . . . at twelve, instead of six, . . . she would have been looking at the ground instead of the sky, her sense of self-worth would have been an accelerating downward spiral."

Writing in *Mirabella*, Jane O'Reilly (a founder of *Ms.* magazine) contrasts two groups of girls playing at a lake shore, the younger "ardent, vital and confident," the older girls "mannered, anxious and doubtful." Ms. O'Reilly can "practically see the older girls' self-esteem draining away with the rivulets of lake water running down their legs." Anita Diamant (in *Parenting* magazine) says that she went on "red alert searching for ways to protect my daughter's God-given sparkle and snap."

Such overheated rhetoric has had its effect--in popular culture, as we have seen, and even on Capitol Hill. Armed with its celebrated survey, the AAUW has successfully lobbied Congress to attach a Gender Equity Package to the current Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The package provides millions of dollars for gender-equity programs, workshops and materials that will supposedly (in Rep. Patricia Schroeder's words) "help make schools an environment where girls are nurtured and respected, where they can learn that their lives are valuable."

In a passionate speech Sen. Edward Kennedy referred to the AAUW's "landmark" research and vowed that, "wherever possible, we intend to incorporate gender-equity provisions in all federal education programs." The Gender Equity Package has passed both houses and is now in conference committee.

\* \* \*

### **Real Problems Ignored**

In sum: A politicized AAUW has effectively used its own advocacy research to promote the myth of a pervasive demoralizing bias against schoolgirls. It has created a cult of the persecuted girlchild among feminist writers. And it has gotten legislators to allocate millions to address a "gender gap" in the nation's schools.

And to what end? The sad fact is that the focus on "bias" and "gender equity" diverts attention and resources from the underlying causes that put children of both sexes at risk: the increasing incivility, violence and increasing sociopathologies in our society, and the decline in academic standards.

The main beneficiaries of congressional largess will inevitably be the apparatchiks in the thriving gender-bias industry, who will be called on to cope with the newly identified "American tragedy" of defeated schoolgirls-a tragedy that does not exist.

Ms. Sommers is author of "Who Stole Feminism?" (Simon & Schuster).

---

## **Mar. 1, 1994 Wall Street Journal p A16 Girls 'Cheated' at School?**

By Rita Kramer

The past quarter century has witnessed a dramatic rise in the educational achievements of American women. According to the National Center for Educational Statistics of the U.S. Department of Educational Statistics of the U.S. Department of Education, more girls than boys are going on to college (67% of high-school girls compared with 58% of boys) and women have gone from being only 41% of undergraduates 20 years ago to 55% today.

In graduate education the progress of women has been even more impressive. Since 1970, the percentage of women earning master's degrees has risen to 53% from 40%; that of women receiving doctoral degrees has jumped to 39% from 14%. Thirty six percent of those now receiving medical degrees are women, up from 8%, and this year 42% of first-year medical students are women, while the percentage of women earning law degrees has climbed to more than 40% from 5%.

These are impressive figures, but they are not impressive enough for Myra and David Sadker, whose new book, "Failing at Fairness" (Scribner's, 347 pages, \$22), maintains that girls are systematically discriminated against in American schools from kindergarten onward. It's a subtle business, this discrimination, and you had best be guided by the Sadkers' writings or enroll in one of their workshops if you hope to have your eyes opened to the various ways in which teachers continue (the figures above notwithstanding) to ignore girls and fail to steer them to math, science, medicine and law.

It is the Sadkers' contention that teachers pay more attention to boys than to girls, call on boys more often, and wait longer for boys to answer a question before going on to the next pupil. But how scientific are their studies? The Sadkers have never had their conclusions replicated by an objective outside authority. Their book looks scholarly, with more than 30 pages of footnotes, but on close examination some of the sources prove to

be out-of- date or unpublished, and many more footnotes cite either the authors' own previous work or that of their students.

Even if it were true that classroom teachers pay more attention to aggressive boys than to more reticent girls, it is a leap of faith from that observation to the conclusion that boys therefore are learning more. It may be that teachers employ various techniques that have more to do with keeping order among the generally more obstreperous boys than with pedagogy per se. It is even possible that quiet girls are processing more information, acquiring more knowledge than the more active boys in the class, since girls go through school getting better grades than their male counterparts, although boys do better on objective tests.

\* \* \*

But that is still not good enough for the ideologically driven among radical feminists. Buying into the current trend toward the Balkanization of American society-- which has groups defined by race, ethnicity and gender vying with one another for victim status and compensatory entitlements--both the report and the Sadkers' book will probably be widely cited as evidence of the need for new legislation. That will, of course, require funding a bureaucracy to enforce the regulations, and eventually we can expect demands for tests that women will pass in percentages corresponding to their percentage of the population.

\* \* \*

We should be worrying about why our youngsters of both sexes are near the bottom of the ladder in international tests of math and science and excel only in measures of self-esteem. The Sadkers' polemic will do little to remedy that situation.

Ms. Kramer is the author of "Ed School Follies: The Miseducation of America's Teachers."

---

BACK

© 1996-1998 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



## **Campus Rape Crisis**

### **Campus Follies: Lesson Seven**

Being a parent is tough these days. There are so many issues that require parental intervention and explanation.

Take the "campus rape crisis" that is the subject of this week's installment of Campus Follies. Having three daughters makes one very observant. And in the 1990's there is a great deal to observe.

When the Ole Ygg was a teenager, we used to "date." For the benefit of the younger generation, that means that young men and young women followed a fairly well-understood set of rules and conventions of courtship. A set of assumptions underlying this activity made life much simpler.

For example, when a young man interacted with a young lady, romantic interest was assumed. There was absolutely zero risk that the young woman would mistake your intentions or assume that your attentions were platonic.

The felicitous consequence was that whenever young men and young women were together, they were expected to think of sex and romance. Further, it was possible to begin relationships with shy females quite easily. The females did not need to be aggressive or provocative, and the males did not need to be right every time about the young lady's feelings. It was OK to make the approach and be wrong. The shy and the awkward had a much easier time of it. The social conventions, while frustrating in certain respects, were a tremendous convenience to all involved.

Everyone (including the young lady's parents) understood full well that the young man's intentions were evil in the short-term. Nevertheless, the young lady was expected to take some time to get to know the young man, figure out if she liked him, and determine whether his attentions were enduring (For it was a truth universally acknowledged that enduring attentions lost their character of evil).

Nowadays, things are much more complex. Young men and women live in coed dorms, and are expected to be platonic and disinterested "friends" most of the time. There is a whole new set of rules or "signals" that the female must give and the male must understand before asserting a romantic interest. Because of this expectation of platonism most of the time, there is significant risk that romantic signals by females will

be missed or ignored by the males or that approaches by males will be interpreted as harassment or boorishness by the females.

As a consequence, relations between the sexes require far more social skill than they did back in Ole Ygg's day. Several consequences follow.

First, most young men are going to require a much clearer signal of initial "romantic readiness" from the female than many young females are comfortable giving. The consequence is that social success will disproportionately favor young ladies with an aggressive sexual demeanor (or at least the capacity to turn on such a demeanor at will).

Second, from a lack of clear rules as to what constitutes a "signal," and from a lack of experience, many young men are going to misinterpret the signals much of the time.

Third, aggressive, gregarious males will be far more demanding of most females, restricting their range of female friends to an "easier" circle to minimize risks.

Fourth, shy males are in real trouble. They will remain essentially dateless until economic attraction begins to supplement the physical and romantic. Loneliness and cynicism abound on most campuses. On campuses like Stanford, the aggression and hostility of males (who outnumber females 2 to 1) is so thick you can cut it with a knife.

Enter the additional complexity of "diversity" and "multiculturalism".

Recently Yggdrasil had occasion to attend an athletic competition at a predominantly Latino junior high school. It was make-out city. The boys and girls were all over each other. All in all, it was a healthy, normal American school atmosphere. A bit more active than the schools the Ole Ygg attended as a kid, but what the heck, this is the 90s.

The contrast with the very exclusive suburban high school Ygg's daughters attend could not be starker. You wander around campus after school and you can feel something is missing, but you can't quite put your finger on it. It is only after the visit to the Latino Jr. High that you know what it is. You are hard pressed to see any sign of affection between the sexes among the kids. No hand holding, no kissing, no nothing. It is weird.

Your first suspicion, being a parent, is that the kids must be extraordinarily skilled at concealment. But then you take a hard, non-fatherly look at the young ladies wandering around campus after school, and you realize that something is dreadfully wrong. They do not give off any sexual signals whatever. For a slight majority, the chemistry is utterly missing. They seem, for the most part, utterly unaware of themselves.

The Ole Ygg had occasion to be a "security guard" at a junior high dance at this same school. Now in junior high, you do not expect particularly high levels of sexual awareness from European-American children. But there was a small group of kids, perhaps 10%, who occupied the dance floor and were surprisingly advanced for their

age. By the way they were dancing, and the things they were doing to one another as they danced, you had to wonder whether this conduct and knowledge came naturally, or whether they had observed adult sexual activity in the home. In any event, it became clear that kids who are active sure aren't concealing it. They are quite brazen.

But then what of the attitudes of young men outside that 10% (or 20%, by the time high school arrives). You see, when the Ole' Ygg was a boy, young women were expected to restrain themselves for moral reasons. Back in the old days, young men assumed that the young ladies were as interested in sex as they, but that the young ladies had a greater desire to be "good". Now that those moral reasons are largely gone, one cannot help but wonder exactly what young men must think of teenage girls.

Goodness is no longer a reasonable assumption. Disinterest is.

Thus, from the standpoint of a young male, the competition for desirable mates must appear a whole lot more ferocious than it otherwise would from the roughly even numbers of the sexes.

Yet when you ask a teenage male, you are likely to get no response at all, not even as to why he and his friends watch the S&M scenes in the Madonna videos that worry you so. If you ask at all, you ask with care, and you wonder.

Most fathers seem delighted with the idea that their daughters don't date- that they go out with groups of kids. The girls are less likely to "get in trouble", so the reasoning goes. And yet one cannot help but wonder where this lack of interaction might lead. Most young men never take responsibility for a young lady for an evening (except maybe at prom) and never shoulder the obligation of having a pleasant time even if romance does not happen.

One wonders how on earth these non-dating European-American youngsters are going to connect with the opposite sex. In an era requiring complex behaviors and complex signals, many radiate no signals at all. Without dating, experience and skill cannot fill the void left by nature. In any event, it becomes obvious that any sort of feminist ideological onslaught such as the "date rape crisis" will be refracted through entirely different lenses depending on your ethnic background. The children of color will know instantly that the whole fuss is not about them, and that someone else must have a real problem dealing with the real world.

And so it is that the "date rape crisis" on our campuses protrudes in many different directions depending on your perspective.

The campuses all publish "date rape guidelines" for the benefit of the males. There are rape crisis centers set up in conspicuous buildings on most campuses. They have big signs in front of them, as if to comfort visiting parents.

An outstanding article on this topic appeared in the June 27, 1991 edition of the Wall Street Journal entitled "The Date Rape Scare."

In the words of Professor Gilbert, the author:

"If one believes the figures most frequently quoted, "one in seven women now in college have been raped and over half the college victims know their attackers." These figures are cited in the introduction to the Safe Campuses for Women section of the Violence Against Women bill currently before the Senate Judiciary Committee. By presenting them as established facts, the authors of this bill (introduced by a bipartisan group of 26 senators) lend credibility to a view widely expressed by members of the rape crisis movement, many of whom identify themselves as radical feminists, that a silent epidemic of sexual assault has infected college campuses throughout the country."

Now if one in seven, or 15% of college women have been raped, then that is substantial evidence of male frustration. But perhaps things are not that bad. Perhaps the numbers are infected by ideology. As the author notes:

"Where does the figure of one in seven, actually 15%, come from and what does it mean? So widely cited that it has gained authority by repetition, this estimate of rape on college campuses is derived from a 1985 survey conducted under the auspices of Ms. magazine, with a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health."

\* \* \*

"If we accept the number of students raped in just one year, according to Ms. survey researcher Mary Koss's definition, then over a four-year period about 25% of female students will be raped, and half of these women will be victimized twice. An additional 40% of female students will be victims of attempted rape, and more than half of this group will be victimized twice. All together, over four years almost two-thirds of female college students will suffer an incident of rape or attempted rape, and most of these women will be victimized more than once. (In addition, 45% of college women will be victims of "sexual coercion.")"

Now the fascinating thing about these numbers is that the United States has a female college population of about 2.8 million. At 15%, about 420,000 have been raped - and at least twice that number, or 840,000, by the time four years is up.

The Bureau of Justice (BOJ) performs extensive surveys each year on 25,000 households to determine the number of crimes committed in the United States. They do the surveys because many crimes are under-reported. The BOJ reports that there were approximately 145,000 rapes in 1992 spread over the entire U.S. population. If rapes on campus were no more or less frequent than rapes generally, and if we assume that all rapes occur only within the younger half of the population, then we would expect only two-tenths of one percent, or about two per thousand college girls, to be raped.

Fortunately, the author provides us with an explanation and that explanation is, as

expected, ideology:

"To begin with, these figures are based on Ms. Koss's definition of rape; when asked, 73% of the college students classified as rape victims by the researcher did not think they had been raped."

\* \* \*

"When recently asked if college women should view every man they see as a potential rapist, a spokeswoman for student health services at the University of California at Berkeley told the local press, "I'm not sure that would be a negative thing." A few weeks earlier, an assistant dean of student life at Vassar College was quoted in Time magazine as condoning false accusations of rape. According to the Vassar dean, men falsely accused of rape can benefit from the experience. Upon reflection, they may come to understand what they must have done to upset the woman. As for the distress caused men by false accusations, she reveals "it is not a pain I would necessarily have spared them."

\* \* \*

"[R]ape crisis centers have been established on virtually every major campus in the country, providing counseling and supportive services. Despite the availability of these services and such events as Rape Awareness Week, the number of rapes actually reported on major college campuses is remarkably low--on the order of two to five incidents a year in schools with thousands of women."

\* \* \*

"At the University of California at Berkeley, for example, the coordinator of the Rape Prevention Education Program insists that according to what she sees on a campus of more than 25,000 students, one woman in four stands a chance of being raped. Yet only two rapes were reported there last year."

Many of the European-American students arriving on campus have little or no sexual experience. Surveys claim that 70% of college bound girls are virgins. The propaganda hits them at a particularly vulnerable time. Our modern Universities no longer have "mixers" (or dances) as they used to in the old days. Indeed, Ygg, Jr. reports that, aside from lots of gay and lesbian dances, the only structured "social activities" on campus that men and women are invited to attend together are rape awareness lectures and the like. Young college students have been left to fend for themselves. And indeed there is not the slightest official recognition of heterosexual activity or relationships.

In the January 17, 1994 edition of the Wall Street Journal an editorial entitled "Swarthmore's Confused Correctness" gave a poignant, if severe, example of misinterpreted signals on our college campuses.



"Swarthmore now has the distinction of having forced the departure of a male student on no better grounds than the accusation that he caused a young woman to feel "intimidated."

\* \* \*

"The Swarthmore case began in September when freshman Alexis Clinansmith complained to a dean that Mr. Yearwood had harassed and intimidated her by hanging around, leaving a sign telling her she was a beautiful woman, going to her room uninvited, by tossing his lacrosse stick back and forth while he talked to her, which she found alarming. By the time it ended this month Ewart Yearwood had been forced out and was being portrayed--by school officials and a public relations team hired by Swarthmore--as having deep and dangerous psychological problems."

"Ewart Yearwood ... is a young man not given to smiling much. When angry, he looks angry. According to the accusing woman and her friends, there was "something" about Ewart that frightened and intimidated them. This vague testimony is what the administration cited as proof of the charges against him. In this age, as we've seen before, it is no longer necessary to provide clear proof of an offense. The student need only feel intimidated and harassed. Upon the first complaint that he made Ms. Clinansmith "uncomfortable," Mr. Yearwood was directed to follow a pattern of "active avoidance."

\* \* \*

"Subsequently the complainant charged Mr. Yearwood at a dance had muttered unpleasant comments to his friends that Ms. Clinansmith overheard and had looked at her during a football game. He was forced to leave campus for six days till a deans' tribunal could be convened." \* \* \*

"As his pro bono lawyer Harvey Silverglate explains, there are now apparently crimes so terrible that innocence itself is not an adequate defense. Shortly after the 40-foot order, Dean Ngina Lythcott informed Mr. Yearwood that he was charged with having come within 15 feet of Ms. Clinansmith--in the dining hall--and another time, as close as four feet. Matters went downhill from there."

The article concludes:

"It is a time so shaped by a preoccupation with personal "rights" and the terrors of male sexual aggression that a case of crude amorous persistence can be converted into "criminal stalking."

\* \* \*

"Once upon a time Lerner and Loewe wrote a musical called "My Fair Lady" in

which a rejected suitor called Freddy hung about and sang "On The Street Where You Live." It was all terribly romantic. Today a young man hanging around is likely to be charged with intimidation and terrorization."

This is not a pleasant time for young males to attend College. They must restrain their speech so as not to give offense to queers, blacks or other minorities. As we have seen in other installments of Campus Follies, these queers, blacks and other minorities are allowed to say anything they wish to or about white males.

Perhaps more significant, white males are taught that amorous advances toward females not wanting them are grounds for expulsion. Should any young man mistakenly expect that the probability of complaint is low, they are put on clear notice that the institution is teaching young European-American women to be suspicious and resentful of males.

Perhaps this is all one grand psychology experiment to see how far our society can go in infuriating white males before they organize and overturn the system. Perhaps at the first sign of serious trouble, the campus administrators will say "just kidding" about all this political correctness, multiculturalism and enforced male-hating, and the trouble will pass.

But to the average white male on campus, it could reasonably appear to be a well orchestrated attack from a number of different directions. Once the wheels of revolt begin to turn, they may be very hard to stop.

Thus far, most seem to retain hope and restrain themselves. They expect the torture will end when they get out into the real world of work.

Maybe, but maybe not! Stay tuned!

---

**BACK**



## **Date Rape Guidelines**

### **Campus Follies: Lesson Eight**

In [Campus Follies 7](#) we dealt with the "campus rape crisis".

In this installment, it is time to take a more detailed look at this same topic. And to accomplish that, we shall return to that notorious party school, the University of California at Santa Barbara.

You see, the Ole Ygg decided to visit that school a while back with Mrs. Ygg and Ygg Jr.

The Ygg family happened into a dormitory, and in a glass case the ever observant Ole Ygg spotted a document entitled "Date Rape Guidelines."

Now suddenly, a routine tour of yet another college campus was transformed into a special delight. Not only did the Ygg have a chance to observe life on a U.C system campus famed for fun, but was to receive a lesson in applied ideology as well!

Now the particular example of ideology had special significance, posted as it was on a "men's" floor at a notorious bastion of fun-loving sexism.

After all, this was not Berkeley. The Ole Ygg was dying of curiosity to see what a University Administrator might have to say to all of these young revelers ensconced in Santa Barbara.

To Ygg's amazement, he found not ideology but something quite different. It was in fact a set of instructions:

-- You may not follow a woman student. Following a woman student is harassment or stalking.

-- You may ask a woman for a date, but you may not ask repeatedly, as such repeated requests constitute harassment.

-- You must never touch or attempt to kiss a woman unless you have permission. When in doubt, ask first.

-- When kissing a woman student, you may not commence other more sexually oriented activity without first obtaining her consent again to this additional activity.

-- If engaged in kissing or other forms of foreplay and the woman says "no" to further advances you must immediately desist. Do not attempt to persuade her or change her mind.

-- Never have sex with a woman student who has been drinking or who you know to be intoxicated. Having sex with an intoxicated woman is rape.

-- Before you commence sexual intercourse with a woman you must ask for explicit permission and the woman must clearly answer with a "yes" before you may proceed. Silence means "no".

-- If, as you are about to commence sexual intercourse, or during the act of intercourse, the woman changes her mind you must immediately withdraw and stop all sexual activity.

Now the Ole Ygg was stunned. While it has been a while, the Ole Ygg had relations with a statistically significant sample of young ladies years ago and never once did one of them "change her mind".

So Ygg pointed out these date rape guidelines to Mrs. Ygg. Upon seeing the subject, Mrs. Ygg immediately said "stop reading that - ignore it - don't make a scene!" It was a typical middle class reaction. When someone does something rude, you just ignore it.

To Mrs. Ygg, the date rape guidelines provoked the same reaction as someone farting in public. You pretend it didn't happen and move on. And indeed that is the reaction of most middle class people to public displays of nonsensical ideology. Ignore it and move on.

But then the Ole Ygg asked: Wouldn't the average female be offended by these guidelines?

After all, what is the assumption here? That they are weak? That they are all manipulative little princesses incapable of enjoying sex, and prone to changing their minds in the middle of the act as some peripheral status calculus distracts them from the urgent business at hand?

Now Mrs. Ygg was at something of a disadvantage here. Never having bedded other women, there is a great deal about women, and the wide range of female response, that Mrs. Ygg simply could not know.

But she instantly recognized that the assumptions underlying these guidelines were

quite offensive to women. However, she assumed that every woman would immediately think these guidelines ridiculous and ignore them.

Then Ole Ygg asked how she imagined the young men would react to these guidelines.

You see, back in Ole Ygg's day, men grew up with an elaborate and, on balance, helpful mythology about sex and women.

At its most basic level, the assumption was that young women refrained from sex because they were being "good." We believed they wanted it just as bad as we did, but they were less prone to sinful behavior than males.

A second "liberal" version of this same myth held that many people were sexually dysfunctional because they were "repressed" by traditional religions. Destroy these sexually repressive religions and humanity would burst forth from its chains in sexual liberation and orgasmic fulfillment.

Both versions of the myth concealed the wide variation in female libido and response.

These date rape guidelines didn't even give a passing nod to the old unifying myths of female virtue or sexual repression.

But if the old myths are gone, then how do young men in the 1990s explain their frustrations? What has taken its place?

Do 18 year old boys understand and accept the premise of these guidelines? Do they really believe that in the middle of a romantic physical encounter the average young woman is likely to become bored, confused, or manipulative and change her mind?

Do young men nowadays agree with Faye Resnick, Nicole Simpson's biographer, when she says "I am aware there are women who don't enjoy sex...."

Back in Yggdrasil's day, only a very few experienced young men knew this, and they, by definition, were not frustrated by their knowledge.

But for the father of three daughters, these date rape guidelines written by the University of California cause no end of anxiety. It is one thing to know that young men gaze on your daughters with lust. It has been that way for millennia.

But the idea that the average young man will now gaze on your daughters with both lust and institutionally implanted suspicions about their probable responsiveness is indeed new and disturbing.

Not only do these date rape guidelines tell you that young women must be presumed unresponsive, but if you happen to become entangled with one, you are at risk of her

"changing her mind" midstream and lodging an ugly harassment or date rape charge. Young men are going to be wary indeed of this peculiar disease in women so graphically described in the guidelines.

What these date rape guidelines create is a presumption in the minds of young males that the average young lady is frigid and manipulative. Frigid women are not only frustrating but carry ugly little legal liabilities as well. Young women are going to have to overcome this presumption very quickly before any relationship can start. Socially aggressive young ladies with slutty demeanors will have little trouble putting male anxieties to rest.

But, as outlined in [Campus Follies 7](#), most college bound European-American girls are relatively inexperienced at age 18. The presumption is profoundly unfair. Most of them simply lack the skill to overcome this presumption while still communicating the ability to remain steadfast and devoted when necessary. Many who have the "native ability" simply are not going to understand what is going on. Or why young men react the way they do.

The presumption of the "date rape guidelines" is the last thing that most young ladies need at a time when they are forming lifelong attitudes about themselves and their own attractiveness.

But for those young women who are romantically unsuccessful, the male-hating ideologies surrounding the guidelines will form a useful excuse for sexual failure. In frustration, many will latch on to the idea that all sex is "rape" to be avoided. The ideology will form a convenient cover for a genetic shortcoming.

What the modern "liberators" of women have created is a cruelly Darwinian sexual landscape where conflict and frustration are maximized and in which all sorts of hurdles will be placed in the way of normal behavior for less gregarious young men and women. By the time they reach their mid-twenties, most will sort this all out and avoid any permanent harm. Some will not.

Curiously, nobody ever asks what sort of ideologies young men are absorbing as a result of the newly Darwinian social landscape in which they find themselves.

The liberal multi-culturalists are, of course, horrified at the potential that modern universities create for assortive mating for intelligence among European-Americans. The universities are doing a very effective job of selecting the most intelligent people from our society and then placing them in close social proximity. If those people intermarry and reproduce, the number of extremely intelligent people (those at the very tip of the bell curve) would increase very dramatically. To the liberal multi-culturalists, the prospect must be greeted with horror.

If one were a hater of Western Civilization, then nothing would be more important than preventing (or at least delaying for several years, on average) assortive mating for intelligence by European-Americans. Nothing could strengthen Western Civilization more

than increasing by 10 times the number of European-Americans with IQs above 140.

But the liberal multi-culturalists need not worry. For it would be hard to design a more thorough set of culturally specific impediments to assortive mating by Euro-Americans than the odd multi-cultural stew of racial preferences, enforced male-hating, cynicism and sexual Darwinism that now exists on our campuses. That stew creates a potentially crippling set of disabilities for young European-American men and women to overcome.

But then it is dangerous to ascribe to design that which may more naturally and probably result from spontaneous and chaotic efforts of frustrated and angry people. As an investor betting the odds, the Ole Ygg has to discount the likelihood of a conspiracy to hold Euro-America in its "place". Better to think of it as an example of Sir Issac Newton's third law, but call it instead "campus follies".

---

[BACK](#)

© 1996-1998 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



## **Decay at Harvard Law**

### **Campus Follies: Lesson Nine**

We leave the fever swamps of feminist male hating and the "campus date rape crisis" to enter another fever swamp -- Harvard Law School.

Reprinted below are excerpts from three articles from the Wall Street Journal dealing with Harvard Law School. The Journal publishes them, as any daily paper must, in scattershot fashion one by one.

Gathered together, they have a much greater impact, and give you a much clearer view of Harvard Law.

The first article demonstrates the difficulty Harvard Law encounters employing white males on its faculty. To regular readers of Yggdrasil's posts, the fury engendered by the employment of white males is well known. The article just places Harvard Law in the "terra cognita" of race conscious hiring so familiar to us all.

The second article is much more important. It demonstrates the internal dynamics of escalating racial demands inherent in all affirmative action programs. In that article, a Harvard Law Journal editor with impeccable feminist credentials manages to offend two "affirmative action" law student editors by replacing them on a "tenure" article submitted by an "affirmative action" professor in need of more protection in the editing process than the two "affirmative action" students were qualified to give.

And so it goes.

The third article was written by a Harvard Law Student back in 1982 and gives you an excellent earlier perspective on the trend toward radicalism and politicization that eventually leads to the racial strife you see chronicled in the 1992 articles.

But there is another reason for reprinting these three articles for you. They are written from a classic conservative Republican perspective.

All three exhibit a certain naive charm; - a sincere sense of surprise and hurt that a prestigious institution, one that they hold in such esteem, could push them into such a stressful position of cognitive dissonance.



Collectively, the articles display a common response of the conservative mind when confronted by clear evidence that an institution they revere hates them and all they stand for. A conservative will take the naive view that the revered institution is possessed of the best of intentions, and will right itself and correct the problem once the conservative explains to that institution the error of its ways.

This naive view fails to take into account how elite universities attract students and make money.

First, if all one wants is a solid legal education, one can get that at any number of excellent state schools at a tiny fraction of the cost of Harvard. For example, Michigan, Wisconsin, Ohio State, Boalt Hall, and Hastings all will provide in-state students with as good a background to become a business lawyer as Harvard.

The difference is that if you go to a good state school, you must graduate in the top 10%. If you do, and if you have an LSAT that would qualify you for Harvard, then you can get as good a job as any Harvard Law grad. With that background, you can go from the state school to any city and any law firm in the nation.

Thus, attending a state school and saving yourself \$80,000 is a gamble. Are you competitive enough to make the top 10%?

What Harvard is really selling is insurance against the possibility of failure. Harvard's primary market is the children of well-to-do who, if they cannot graduate in the top of their class at Harvard Law, at least want the status of a Harvard Law diploma. Their egos could not stand merely graduating in the top third or top half of the class at a state school.

Thus, Harvard is selling status.

And it must differentiate itself from the mundane state schools in this regard to stay in business.

The state schools are "practical", "conservative" and "stodgy". Why would anyone pay extra to go to Harvard Law if it too were practical, conservative and stodgy? Harvard must remain "avant garde" and "radical" or it will fail to attract the status conscious children of parents of means, who are its financial main-stay.

The Harvard Law diploma provides \$80,000 worth of ego protection against the threat of downward mobility. By devoting itself to "radicalism" it flaunts its students' ability to rise above the "practical," indulging their need to demonstrate that, while they certainly could have succeeded in a competitive contest with upwardly mobile state school students, they had the luxury of not having to try, - saving their energies instead for more high minded pursuits.

In truth, Harvard will never change. It can't change and survive in the primary market

that it serves.

After reviewing these excerpts, one might fairly ask why conservatives, who are so effusive about the virtues of private enterprise, have such difficulty spotting obvious "invisible hands."

---

## **Mar. 25, 1992 Wall Street Journal p A12 C3 Rule of Law**

BY L. GORDON CROVITZ

Harvard -- "4 White Men Offered Tenure" read the shocked headline in the school's official newspaper. This news shared page one with an article detailing the plans of a black law professor to continue his walkout strike until the school agrees to hire a black woman. Welcome to Harvard Law School, where the stodgiest faction of faculty and students is being forced to come to terms with some new realities.

\* \* \*

Harvard Yard is now roiled by news of the four new professors, which Mr. Clark calls the result of "nine months of discussions, arguments and one-on-ones with the faculty." Adding new members of the faculty would be routine at most law schools. These four are politically noncontroversial. Still, the miracle is that a majority of the faculty relented to approve.

"Since I've been dean I've struggled to break this deadlock of the clash between CLS and the other scholars," Mr. Clark said. "This year we finally did." He called this a "tremendous achievement," but "many of the students don't see it. They just see, 'Four white men.' "

Indeed, this month a group of students took their law school to the highest court in Massachusetts, saying that they were harmed by a lack of minority professors. The students call their case the "Brown v. Board of Education of the 1990s," alleging legal injury because while minorities "may be welcome to sit in the back of the classroom, they are not welcome to stand up in front of the classroom."

"This case is not Brown v. Board of Education," a lawyer for Harvard told the judges, "and Rosa Parks is not in this courtroom." He said this was a political lawsuit to have judges rule that Harvard is "too male, too white and too heterosexual." A lower court ruled that the students don't have legal standing to sue under laws aimed at protecting job applicants. Ironically, Harvard's 20% is probably the highest share of minorities on the full-time faculty of any prestigious law school.

Only in the curious world of university campuses could anyone argue that professors

should be judged by their skin color, gender or sexual practices instead of their merits as teachers. Yet this is the battle cry that Derrick Bell has raised for the past two years. Mr. Bell, the first black appointed to the Harvard Law faculty, declared that he would not continue as a law professor at Harvard until a black woman was given tenure. His form of going on strike has been to teach instead at New York University.

"The merit argument is no more than a smoke screen," Mr. Bell told a group of Harvard students. "It is a way of continuing a racist, sexist, homophobic tradition with words whose viciousness is cloaked by promises to seek more diversity - always, of course, within the context of what appears to be an insistence on excellence." Mr. Bell was back at Harvard this month to argue unsuccessfully that he should get an exemption from the rule that faculty members lose their tenure when they are away for more than two years.

Mr. Clark has an insight into why affirmative action is such a big issue. "We have the highest percentage and absolute number of minority students of any of the top 20 law schools. At some level, they are worrying about what role affirmative action played in getting them here.

"The minority students need a sense of validation and encouragement, with the fundamental problem being a need for self confidence that plays itself out as, 'Why doesn't Harvard Law School have more teachers who look like me?'" Mr. Clark said. "In a sense, we're dealing here with one of the symptoms of affirmative action. This means this debate could be a recurring theme through the 1990s or until we get to some equilibrium."

Not all the faculty yet has the courage of Mr. Clark's conviction that it's safe again to appoint faculty on merit. It passed a resolution requesting the appointments committee to "bring to the faculty for its consideration as soon as possible and no later than this fall, several promising candidates who are not white males, whatever the committee's recommendations about those candidates may be."

\* \* \*

With 1,800 students and a staff of more than 300, Harvard Law has been the paralyzed giant of American legal education. For more than a decade it has earned a reputation for divisive politics, not incisive scholarship. If Mr. Clark can stay on his reform course, maybe Harvard Law can even help answer the ultimate legal mystery of why this country breeds so many lawyers.

---

**Nov. 8, 1992 Wall Street Journal A17**  
**Affirmative Action Backfires at Harvard Law Review**

BY ABIGAIL THERNSTROM

Harvard Law School, long acclaimed for its academic excellence, may soon become best known for its ugly internal strife. Among students and faculty, the political left and right are barely on speaking terms. The school lurches from open warfare to uneasy truce. Last year the dean and the appointments committee were both under attack for alleged insensitivity to the needs of women and minorities. And now the left has turned on one of its own, charging racism, sexism and an abuse of power--labels usually reserved for those in the enemy camp.

The current crisis involves the Harvard Law Review, to which trouble is no stranger. Last spring, the Review's annual satiric "Revue" contained a tasteless spoof that was widely seen as a symptom of the school's "hostile environment of sexism and misogyny," in the words of Prof. Laurence Tribe. On the Review itself, however, the atmosphere was expected to change with the election of Emily Schulman as president this year. Ms. Schulman, a third-year student, has impeccable credentials as a radical feminist, with close ties to critical legal studies advocates among the faculty.

Ms. Schulman has clearly meant to do right. It has just turned out to be harder than perhaps she imagined, and therein lies a tale for our times.

As president of the Review, she is ultimately responsible for its quality. But she has a problem: Not every editor can be assumed to do good work. Jobs on the entirely student-run Review used to go only to those with the highest academic qualifications. Today, while some still come to the Review by the old-fashioned, good-grades route, other editors are picked on the basis of their writing alone; still others are chosen to fill affirmative action slots. Only minority students fall into the last category. As a result, not even the most correct among the politically correct, faced with assigning editorial work to an untested black student, can be totally sure that student will be up to the job. Did the student get on the Review because of academic excellence or because of his or her minority status?

In the case of Emily Schulman, her anxiety was undoubtedly heightened by her early discovery of inadequate work by one of the black women editors. The work was quietly reassigned, although not quietly enough, since that action became part of the subsequent case against Ms. Schulman. The real trouble came, however, after a piece by Charles Ogletree Jr., an assistant professor at the law school, arrived. Mr. Ogletree is black - the "right" sort of black, moreover. (He served as an adviser to Anita Hill.) His article was immediately accepted by the Review.

Normally, articles accepted for publication are edited by a student picked from a pool of those who have, in effect, raised their hands. (When a piece is accepted for publication, a notice is usually posted, giving student editors an opportunity to express interest in doing the work.) The editing of Law Review articles often involves additional research and substantial rewriting.

In the case of Mr. Ogletree, however, the normal competitive process was circumvented. The article was simply assigned by the co-chairmen of the articles office to two black women - a decision Ms. Schulman, it is alleged, immediately labeled "a disaster." One of the editors to whom the work was assigned was in her third year at the law school and

thus well known on the Review; the other was a newcomer. Editors charge not only that Ms. Shulman called the decision to assign the piece to the third- year student "complicated," but that, through her faculty connections, she tried to check on the grades of the second-year student in order to assess her level of actual skill.

In a nutshell, here's the paradox of affirmative action. This was Mr. Ogletree's tenure article, the one upon which his future in theory depended. But because he is black, the staff (it seems) assumed he might need extra protection; if treated like everyone else he might not succeed. Hence the unusual process by which the editing of his article was assigned. And because the student editors are black, Ms. Schulman apparently feared they could not be trusted to provide the requisite help.

Affirmative action policies, in short have cast their usual cloud of suspicion upon the work of every black at the School. In the eyes of even the most racially sensitive; (in which camp Ms- Schulman would certainly place herself), skin color still denotes quality.

Of course, the Ogletree tale, as well as that which preceded it, prompted outrage among the black students. That outrage has been widely shared, in part because most students on the Review think of themselves as politically left and in part because Ms. Schulman's style of management had already alienated a good many students. In any case, the sustained anger and consequent turmoil (interminable meetings, ostracized students, ugly memos and letters) have now removed the matter from the hands of the student editors. The Review's board of trustees, which includes Dean Robert Clark, has appointed an outside investigator to explore the entire mess. The students involved have retained lawyers.

\* \* \*

Perhaps more important, however, the basic problem that triggered the current crisis will remain. In an affirmative action setting, white signifies "competence": while black denotes "needs help."

No facts uncovered in the course of an inquiry can possibly calm the anguish and anger among both blacks and whites that message brings.

Mrs. Thernstrom is an adjunct professor at Boston University and author of "Whos' Votes Count: Affirmative Action and Minority Voting Rights" (Harvard, 1987).

---

## **Aug. 6, 1982 Wall Street Journal p14 c4 Learning the Law at Harvard**

BY ALEXANDER TROY

The proper role of the judiciary in creating and directing social policy has been a

contentious issue In American politics. At various periods courts have challenged the constitutional limits placed on their powers, either by abusing judicial review or, more recently, by adjudicating political problems they have traditionally avoided. For example courts have in recent years undertaken the management of school systems, hospitals and prison facilities. Judicial management of our society is now so extensive that Congress is considering legislation to remove jurisdiction over certain issues from the federal courts. But whatever Congress does, legal education, particularly at Harvard Law School, will continue to contribute to the problem of an overweening judiciary.

Harvard Law School's reputation for producing corporate lawyers belies the school's current educational environment. Among the Harvard community, visions of remaking society are now much preferred to expressions of interest in a corporate career. The law school faculty, which to a large degree shares the antipathies and aspirations of its students encourages these visions with its instruction. The first year Harvard student is taught today that a lawyer need not be an attorney for a corporation or an individual client, but rather an advocate for society at large. The student is informed that the lawyer's principal activity, litigation, is often less a means of resolving a dispute between two adversaries than a device for implementing social change. In short, Harvard's legal education now seems aimed at developing social engineers rather than lawyers as traditionally envisioned.

### **A Euphemism for Controversy**

Civil procedure, the course that focuses on the nature of litigation, emphatically proclaims at Harvard the decline of the traditional notions of the lawyer and the lawsuit. Traditionally, the lawsuit was regarded as the battle for retrospective redress, and the Impact of the contest was generally limited to its participants. This notion of litigation has been replaced, one Harvard professor explains, by a new model called "public-law litigation."

Public-law litigation is a euphemism for all the controversial activities that judges have undertaken: creating remedies unrelated to the lawsuit's principals or even to the issues before the court, administering the remedies over years, and even delegating the responsibility for creating these solutions to experts and masters. Public law litigation, as conceived of and taught by Harvard professors, is a very powerful mechanism for achieving specific notions of social reform.

Obviously, the relegation of the traditional lawsuit to a less significant status signals a corresponding change in the roles of lawyer and judge. The lawyer, formerly an advocate for a client, is now the initiator of a bureaucratic process that supplements or overrides legislative efforts. He may choose to represent people who do not know him and have not consented to his representation, and he seeks redress for conditions that he believes require sweeping social change.

The judge becomes a broker of remedies, often actively participating in a continuous bargaining process between the adversaries in an effort to negotiate a solution to a problem often more political than legal. Judge Arthur Garrity is an example of the new type of jurist. His management of Boston's public-school system for the past 10 years, a

complete failure, is exactly the sort of activity envisioned by proponents of public law litigation.

Notably, only the clients have diminished in importance In public law litigation. In the typical public-law case, clients merely fulfill the requirement that the lawyer represent someone. The presence of clients gets the case into court, so that judges can wrestle with the larger social issues that lawyers seek to address.

\* \* \*

### **Judicial Restraint Needed**

\* \* \*

It's unlikely, however, that students who accept the public-law perspective will infer any need for judicial restraint from their policy-preparation courses. Many students enter Harvard Law School with firm convictions about the need for swift change in American society. For them, the message of public-law litigation is a welcome one, delivered by professors who sympathize with the causes these students support. On the other hand, students who enter Harvard unfamiliar with the law and uncertain about their reasons for studying it are being molded into social engineers, a disparaging phrase invented by the late dean of Harvard Law, Roscoe Pound.

Whatever the merits to Harvard's legal training, its presentation and conclusions capture an attitude that permeates the law school. That attitude, explicitly stated in a New York Times editorial by Harvard Law School Professor Lloyd Weinreb, is an impatience with the workings of a democratic society: "One might accept the call for judicial restraint with more equanimity if it were accompanied by as loud a call for greater activism elsewhere."

In short, if the pace or the direction of government is not to the liking of Harvard's Mr. Weinreb, the court system should provide a speedier alternative to the goals that he and some legal elite support. At root, the attitude is anti-democratic, and, if it is accepted by the students it is offered to, the nation can anticipate destructive conflict between its legislative and judicial institutions.

Mr. Troy is a student in Harvard's combined law and business program.

---

**BACK**



## **The Veiled Attack**

### **Campus Follies: Lesson Ten**

In previous installments of this "Campus Follies" Series, we have examined the sensitivity training for white males at "orientation," and the persecution of the politically incorrect in university run star chambers. We have witnessed the rewriting of history to accommodate the feelings of minorities. We dealt at length with the new sexual Darwinism enforced by the campus date rape scare and the date rape guidelines.

In several of these lessons, we have asked whether this might all be a racially motivated attack. After all, it doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out that the only reason for ranting about "dead-white-males" is to vent hatred and disdain for the young, live ones who are still around.

Every year, at about this time, I get numerous inquiries from parents in Southern California. The inquiry is always similar.

"My son (or daughter) was rejected by Berkeley (or UCLA) but had GPA and SAT scores that were well above average for that school. What is going on?"

Now people who live in Newport Beach are much too polite to say what is really on their minds.

Affirmative action is supposed to bump the bottom 10% or so of whites to make some room for underperforming minorities. So as long as affirmative action leaves whites free to compete for 70% or 80% of the slots, they feel their children will not be significantly harmed.

Because of this thinking, many of these people accept quotas and preferences. After all, blacks comprise a mere 9% of the population of California and Hispanics 22%.

It is only the rejection of their child, with qualifications that place him or her in the top half of all "others", that causes doubts to creep in.

With that as background, and an invitation to launch, I reply to these inquiries as follows:



You know, when it comes to the UC System, race preferences have diverted your attention from the obvious.

Forget about affirmative action and look at the admissions criteria themselves. First they say that the top 12% of California high school graduates will be admitted. The typical suburbanite feels terrific. Surely their children are in the top 12% of all in the state!

But then you examine the admissions criteria and you see nothing about 12%. Rather, you see that all the U.C. schools take the GPA, maximum 4.0, multiply it by 1000 and then add the combined SAT score. When you do the math, you quickly realize that the difference between a 3.6 and a 3.9 will overwhelm a 200 point SAT advantage.

In addition, they cap the GPA at 4.0 thereby disregarding the effects of advanced placement courses typically offered in the competitive suburban schools that can boost the GPA to 4.25.

And that should trigger alarm bells.

Upon reading these criteria, the average suburbanite falls victim to the classic "fallacy of composition." They assume that all schools are just like their own neighborhood school, and that any student in any other school who has not learned as much as their child (and scores lower on the ETS achievement tests) will have a lower GPA.

The problem, of course is that all you have to do to get a 4.0 in Compton or L.A. South Central is to refrain from stabbing the teacher and read at a level that allows you to understand commercials on TV.

Any criteria that treats a 4.0 from Compton the same as a 4.25 from Palos Verdes, Encino, or Newport Beach will severely disadvantage the "very good" students from the highly competitive suburban schools. The admissions criteria have Willie Brown's scent all over them. (Willie "we sure fooled those white boys" Brown was Speaker of the California Assembly for 2 decades and is now the mayor of San Francisco.)

The purpose of the admissions criteria, put baldly, is to ensure that suburbanites are forced to go to private schools, and pay \$30,000 tuition instead of \$4000.

They nail most of the middle-class suburban whites with the admissions criteria. But they don't stop there. Special treatment is meted out to the truly exceptional students of the upper- middle-class.

Twice in the past 10 years, valedictorians from Newport Harbor High, with 4.2 GPAs and combined SATs above 1400 were rejected by Berkeley. Now Berkeley publishes a scale. At this level, admission is automatic. They are not following their guidelines.

Interviews are not allowed in the U.C. System. So many parents assume it must have been the essay. Parents and students have visions of Nobel prize winners and tenured

professors sitting around reading admissions applications essays, and deciding the fates of their children. But there are approximately 200,000 essays filed with the system each year. As the UC System admits, most essays are not read at all. If they are, it is by a clerical employee who would not qualify if applying as a student.

But there are two short, easily understood lines on the U.C. admissions application that are pregnant with import. They are the lines for "race" and "income".

Most suburbanites are simply too naive to connect the two until their own child is rejected. But the connection is obvious. Any suburban white who answers the race question "white" and then admits that his parent's annual income is, say, \$250,000 has a near certainty of being rejected at Berkeley or UCLA no matter what his or her qualifications.

Besides, it is much easier to make judgments based on two short entries on a form, than to slog through those horrible essays.

The system will honor its 12% commitment by admitting such a student to UC Riverside (if he or she applies). (It is the campus with the lowest SAT average in the system and is 50% hispanic.)

(Parenthetically, I should confess that Ygg Jr. was admitted to the impacted computer science - electrical engineering major at Berkeley, but he left the "race" and "income" lines blank. He and I were just dying to see if the application would be rejected as incomplete. It was not. He decided not to attend when he sat in on an engineering class and the professor cracked a joke in Japanese. Everyone in the room laughed except Ygg Jr.)

The ironies in all this multiply. Our prosperous upper-middle classes want to believe that, as part of an elite, they benefit from the system. No official has ever told them directly that they are part of any elite, nor that they benefit. Most successful people just assume its true. It is just one of those handy excrescences of egalitarian propaganda.

Despite the obvious signposts, they refuse to believe that they are the sheep being sheared by the system. They refuse to admit that the bureaucracies spawned by Liberal Democracy, staffed disproportionately by minorities, have infinite quiet ways of achieving their hostile agendas.

But of course, the attack does not stop with the admissions office. It extends to campus culture and activities as well.

There are two schools within the U.C. system that have nearly identical SAT averages, but are cultural "polar opposites." I speak of U.C. Irvine and U.C. Santa Barbara. Both, however, have disciplinary bureaucracies staffed and managed by minorities.

U.C. Irvine is (according to official statistics) 70% Asian. (However, a stroll across

campus gives the impression that the campus is 90% Asian). U.C Santa Barbara is 67% white.

For years, U.C. Santa Barbara has had a reputation for being a party school. And indeed, on a return trip from Stanford and U.C Santa Cruz several years ago I can recall saying to Ygg. Jr. that there was probably no point in stopping at UCSB on a Friday night because all the students would be gone home. (Boy is Dad dumb!)

Of course, when we got there at about 7:00 PM there was a line of cars backed up on the freeway ramp for a mile waiting to get in to U.C.S.B.!

Reputation apparently corresponds with reality.

For years, UCSB has been famous for its Halloween party in the off-campus neighborhood of Isla Vista. Gradually, the administration and the state police have shut the party down.

In 1995 there were 1700 police called in to patrol Isla Vista. As one wag quipped in the student newspaper, "would have been a great party, but everyone wore the same damn cop costume!"

At Berkeley (30% white, according to the official statistics), students are allowed to smoke marijuana in public. At UCSB, hundreds of students are arrested and prosecuted each year (by campus cops) for the possession of beer. There is a mandatory fine of \$200 and a mandatory driver's license suspension of one year. It is one of those laws passed by the state legislature to mollify Mothers Against Drunk Driving.

Apparently, none of those Republican "white boys" in the Assembly realized that this law would be selectively enforced only against white students who are not driving at all, but have prudently decided to party on foot. Most local police departments refuse to arrest the under-age children of voters when caught with beer because of the pressure from the parents at the loss of a driver license. In the ghettos, where possession of beer is the very least of anyone's problem, such laws are simply ignored by police more worried about armed robbery and murder.)

The State Police squad at UCSB is four times as large as the squad at UC Irvine, even though the campuses have the same number of students (15,000 each).

At UCSB, the state police have roving squads of plain clothes detectives who enter local bars, get students to admit they are under age, and then arrest them on minor-in-possession charges. Bar owners are not arrested.

At UCI there is a club on campus that serves alcohol. IDs are only lightly scrutinized, and there are no patrols of undercover state police checking for false IDs. There are no such patrols visiting any of the bars down on Balboa Peninsula, were many UCI students live and party.

In fact, when you walk the campus at UCI, police are seldom visible. You can trespass on the athletic fields, use the all-weather track, pee in the bushes when the johns aren't open on Sunday, and the police will never bother you. You get the feeling of freedom from intrusion that was typical of a real university back in the sixties.

Now 1700 police is quite a resource allocation. They do not show up at Halloween by accident. It is the administration in Berkeley that makes these decisions and implements them through the kings and queens of discipline on the various campuses. (The community of Isla Vista is on state owned land).

Is Isla Vista really dangerous? Is there any objective reason for having so many civil servants attending the youngsters at UCSB and not at UCI? Or Berkeley, for that matter?

The easiest way to check is to call your auto insurance company. Higher crime areas always have higher auto insurance premiums. Drug use, auto theft, and high arrest rates for violent felonies correlate with high auto accident rates.

You guessed it! Rates are lower in Isla Vista than they are in Irvine California. Repair costs are the same. Insurance rates are certainly a great deal lower in Isla Vista than they are in Berkeley California. In fact, auto insurance rates are lower in Isla Vista than they are in neighboring Santa Barbara.

The truth is that kids are safer walking the streets of Isla Vista than they would be walking the streets of Santa Barbara or the San Fernando Valley. Safe, that is, from everything but state police looking for beer.

Is UCI really that much safer than UCSB?

You know its interesting. There was a female UCI student named "Rosa" who was dumped by a white male a few years back. She called a few boys from the old "hood." 20 showed up with base ball bats and killed 2 white students by beating their brains out (the involved white male was not harmed).

On another occasion, a UCI student of Vietnamese ancestry fired several rifle rounds through the dorm wall of another student of Japanese ancestry.

During Thanksgiving vacation, after a track workout, I happened to disturb a tailgate party of about 17 Samoan gang members, complete with loud boom boxes and mock violent challenges to one another in the parking lot of the Bren Center, not 200 yards from the police station. The crowd fell silent on my approach. "Just passing through gents!" Not a state policeman in sight, anywhere.

The disciplinary "problem" at U.C. Santa Barbara is being filtered through minority tinted glasses. According to a deputy district attorney and recent graduate, the war against the majority has been going on a long time. It started in the mid- 1980's with a crackdown

on fraternities with expulsions for "hate speech" and "harassment". When the bureaucrats lost a few court cases, they fixed upon the new minor-in-possession penalties as a way of pursuing the same objective.

Apparently, dope smoking at Berkeley and Santa Cruz (20% lesbian, by reputation) is just fine with the U.C. administration. Ditto queer sex in the libraries, and minority racial demonstrations. But let a few heterosexual whites have a little fun on the beach and its "Call in the cops!"

A veiled attack based on race?

A chaotic accident?

Does California lead the nation?

You be the judge!

---

**BACK**

© 1996-1998 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



## AWAKENINGS

This is a selection from Yggdrasil's Miscellaneous series, a collection of posts on various topics of interest to European-Americans.

1. Culture Wars - Talking in "Code" Part I 🧐
2. Culture Wars - Talking in "Code" Part II 🧐
4. Hate Crimes and Rules of Evidence 🧐
5. Statistics on Interracial Marriage
10. Remain Calm
12. The Turner Diaries
16. Welfare as a Racial Transfer
17. The Cultural Chasm
18. 'Have Less' Whites
19. Polarizing Election
20. "California Dreamin'" - A Low Wage Third World America
21. Immigration and Conflict
22. Immigration Reform Gutted
23. Republican Immigration Fantasies
24. Immigrant Welfare Gap 🧐
25. George Bush - And The NRA 🧐
26. Those Hopeless Republicans
27. The Cult of Economics
28. Fear of "Divisiveness"
29. Status Yearnings
30. Colin Powell - Subsidy Sucker!
31. Powell, O.J. & the Middle Class

32. Brown Hatred in 'Aztlan'
  33. Inflation Lies and the Markets
  34. The Running of The Tide
  35. Our Elites Decompose? Nah!
  36. Modern Weapons and the Multi-Racial Empire
  39. A Drive Through The Empire 🧐
  41. Mainstream Science on Intelligence
  42. Racism in the Name of Diversity
  43. Diversity is not a Virtue
  44. Diversity's Losers - Part I 🧐
  45. Diversity's Losers - Part II: The Universities 🧐
  46. The Way We Were - Part I 🧐
  47. The Way We Were - Part II 🧐
  48. The Way We Were - Part III 🧐
  49. Harvard Comes Knocking 🧐
  50. Harvard Comes Knocking Again 🧐
  51. The End Game. 🧐
  52. Last Things. 🧐
  53. The Domestic End Game. 🧐
  54. The New Feudalism. 🧐
- 

**BACK**

(c) 1996-1998 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Culture Wars #1 - Talking in "Code".**

This series of posts will deal with a wide range of topics concerning culture. By culture, I mean our behavior, what we listen to, watch and what we enjoy.

The focus is upon behavior that we must change if we are to survive.

We European-Americans have a very dangerous habit of assuming that everyone thinks just like us and has good intentions. We have a very hard time spotting alien-unspoken agendas. We fail to spot these agendas because we are not looking for them.

We must learn to stop and think.

Let me illustrate with a classic example.

Recently Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray wrote a book entitled "The Bell Curve." The book raised a big rukus and reviews appeared everywhere. At any given time approximately 1/2 the bandwidth on alt.politics.nationalism.white was consumed with arguments about that book.

Now according to the authors, the main message of the book is that our elites are becoming dangerously isolated from the common man. But according to the reviewers, the main message of the book was that some brown races have lower IQs!

Now why do you suppose that the authors and the reviewers disagree so profoundly about the theme and the purpose of the book?

Who do you suppose is right?

Fascinating questions! As I open my copy and count pages, it becomes apparent that the authors spend 509 pages on the evidence that intelligence is hereditary and that our "information elites" are being selected on this hereditary basis.

The authors then spend a mere 17 pages (Chapter 21) on their central thesis - the dangers created by the isolation of this new elite.

Now let me warn you. When an author sets out to write a book about the dangers of a new



hereditary elite, spends 500+ pages proving that such an elite has been created, but only 17 pages on the dangers (their sole stated purpose) something very important is going on. Your "code-speak" antenna should arise.

And indeed when you read those 17 pages of chapter 21, you get very thin gruel. These pages reiterate what is said in the preface; - that this new cognitive elite is isolated. Never, ever does the book give you one illustration, example or even a hint of exactly what the "danger" might be.

If all you are to do is comprehend the literal meaning of the words, then you are left scratching your head. So the cognitive elite is isolated? Why is that dangerous? What apocalypse awaits? The most important message of this book is broadly hinted at, but left entirely unspoken. Nevertheless, with a little detective work, the message is clear.

The authors are very careful to lay out the social pathologies that accompany low IQ, including increased crime, poverty and illegitimacy. They pointedly assert, over and over, that the intelligent are being removed from most working class neighborhoods. At the turn of the century, the intelligent formed most of the neighborhood leaders in churches, PTAs and local clubs. As these people are removed from working class neighborhoods, these neighborhoods are crippled, unable to organize, and vulnerable to social decay.

For the first 266 pages, the authors confine their discussion of the effects of low IQ to whites only, and limit the statistics on social pathology to whites (a very important clue about the real message of this book). They place particular emphasis on the advent of high levels of white illegitimacy, implying that white neighborhoods will soon become as dangerous and crime ridden as black neighborhoods.

The authors do not want readers with short attention spans to miss the graphic descriptions of white, working class neighborhoods full of illegitimacy and sullen angry skin-heads.

The next clue is a graphic on page 46, which clearly shows that while American Universities have been doing a much better job at rounding up intelligent people and getting them college degrees, only slightly more than half those with IQs above 115 get college degrees, and a clear majority of those above 130 do not attend college, remaining scattered in the those decaying neighborhoods.

Now why do you suppose the authors would print such an important graphic that tends to undermine their thesis? The graphic shows that while there may be fewer intelligent people back in those decaying neighborhoods, nevertheless, a clear majority of those with IQs at the truly gifted and genius levels remain back there with the decay!

People with IQs above 130 process information differently from the rest of society. They care a lot less about status. They are self-taught. They will act upon ideas, regardless of what others think. They have far less patience with propaganda than people with IQs below 130. People with IQs between 110 and 120 are far more conscious of status, manners and place. They tend to be a powerful force for social stability.

Now I will ask you; could this graphic have something to do with the real message of this book?

Might this vision of decaying white neighborhoods with too few 115 IQ people for stability but with more than half of our geniuses be disquieting to anyone out there?

Is the real message that there are more than enough very smart people left in those decaying white neighborhoods to cause lots of trouble?

Is the "code" becoming clearer?

So who, exactly is this "elite" that the authors are warning of impending danger? The book never says, although there are hints.

The book carefully notes that Asians have IQs that are 5 points, on average, ahead of whites. Jews have IQs that are 12 points above whites.

The authors spend 500 pages demonstrating that those people in our society with the highest IQs get all the best jobs, make all the money, and end up with all the power.

So let us go ahead and break the code! Here is the authors' real message:

How is it going to look to the European-American majority when most of the good jobs, most of the wealth and most of the power are held by Jews, Asians and other high IQ imports?

Worse yet, how is this concentration of wealth and power in minority hands going to look when these minorities impose racial quotas, attack majority religions and culture, and do everything in their power to weaken the majority, and to accelerate the pace of social decay?

The authors think that this is a prescription for disaster. But of course, they must say it in code. The bald indented statements above are very dangerous. Such statements can never be made in public.

Their warning is directed at this new culturally non-white elite. The authors are neo-

conservatives. What the authors are saying, in code, is that in order to be a secure elite, you must actively seek to foster and protect the culture of the majority. You cannot tear it down. You cannot, on one hand preach the virtues of equality, opportunity and diversity, while at the same time attacking the culture of the majority and hobbling them with quotas.

The problem that all neo-conservatives are addressing is a simple one. These new minority elites must overcome their suspicions and hostilities toward the majority or there will be real trouble. In particular, the newly conspicuous Jewish elite must learn to foster and protect traditional Christianity and stop viewing it as an "enemy". The Jews must shed their paranoia about pogroms and vigilantly protect the culture of the white majority.

Holding prosperous positions carries with it the responsibility for protecting others. For minorities in these positions, the responsibility is a stretch. According to these two neo-conservative authors, it is a responsibility that our new minority elites are handling very badly.

Multi-racial empires have a unique flaw that homogenous nations do not.

In a homogenous nation, ethnic unity tends to discipline elites to take responsibility for their political positions. If their policy prescriptions are destructive, they are destroying their own people. Ethnic unity tends to add a dimension of control to the appetites of elites. They are expected to protect the health safety and happiness of their own kind.

In a multiracial empire, elites become cosmopolitan. They lose the sense of unity between race and nation, and are free to advocate all sorts of bad policies, because the ill consequence of this policy will be inflicted upon cultural and racial strangers - people for whom these elites no longer have a sense of responsibility. It is only when a policy affects them personally that they react.

For minority elites, the problem is even worse. Because the evil policy could not have been adopted without some majority support, the minority elites never feel responsible for the consequences. In addition, minority elites will believe that the policy would have worked out fine if only the majority had not screwed up the administration of it.

That is why we still have Marxists in 1995. Being a Jewish ideological construct, the descendants of the Jews who invented it still believe it, despite its failure everywhere it has been tried, because it has "never been administered correctly." There is nothing wrong with Marxism; the problem is with the goyim who keep messing it up.

Not only are they free to disclaim responsibility, but they are free to indulge veiled hatreds toward the majority, with very little risk of discovery. All they need do is to speak in code, so that members of their own kind understand but the broader society does not.

Out of spleen and spite for some ancient outrage or slight, these minority elites are free to advocate racial quotas, confiscatory taxes, destroy traditional religions and promote alternative life styles that plunge millions into poverty and crime without the slightest remorse for the consequences. Why? Because they feel no bond of kinship with these people who are harmed. More often than not, they are overtly hostile to those harmed.

Neo-conservatives do not think that this will work.

But they also must speak in code. For indeed, the intended audience is expected to understand the real message without having it spelled out in black and white. Spelling it out runs the risk of informing the unorganized and unsuspecting majority. And that is not their purpose.

What you, the average European-American, must understand is that minority elites will always speak to each other of truly important and dangerous things in code.

After all, when they debate among themselves just exactly how they must deal with us, it may be very dangerous if we hear and understand.

Speaking in code is the sign of a strong culture, a culture with a will to survive. To remain ignorant of the truly important discussions going on around us dealing with our fate is a sign of a weak culture, one that is easily destroyed.

We must change.

We must learn how to think like minorities. We must develop powerful "code-speak" antenna.

We must understand the real agendas behind the words and images placed before us so that we can defend our own culture.

Neo-conservatism is a Jewish thing. It was invented by Norman Podhoretz and Midge Dechter at Commentary magazine. Its leading lights are George Gilder, Irving Kristol, and his son, Bud Kristol, Ronald Reagan's speech writer. They are good people, devoid of ethnic hostility towards us. They are engaged in a passionate and sincere debate with the "socialist" and profoundly anti-white members of their own tribe over the issue of fitness for leadership of this American empire.

If I thought the neoconservatives had a chance of winning this argument I would not be alarming you in this manner. But it is our job to be realists and defend ourselves. The neoconservatives are good people, but they constitute a mere 10% of their tribe.

The neoconservatives are faced with a daunting task. They must convince their co-religionists

to protect and foster Christian belief and Christian values among Christians, at a time when establishment judaism and the Holocaust lobby constantly fan their fears to raise funds for Jewish charities and the State of Israel.

The Ole Ygg believes that the neo-conservatives will lose the argument and that the problem will get worse.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Culture Wars - Speaking in Code (Part II)

The ascent of visible minorities into our elites exacerbates a problem that has existed for a long time in the U.S. An earlier elite that has all but disappeared from public view used to speak in code as well.

The sons of wealthy Euro-Americans of an earlier generation were sent to prep schools of Groton, Choate, Andover and St. Paul's to learn the manners of empire.

The assumption was that all the peoples of the world would want the benefits of the industrial revolution, and that only the sons of these well-to-do could bring it to them.

These young men were taught the virtues of compassion, pluralism and the understanding of other cultures. The rough hewn edges of their acquisitive fathers were polished into a mannered egalitarianism intended to facilitate the opening of new markets under the jurisdiction of native regimes.

The graduates of these schools filled the State Department and the Diplomatic Corps. But the rest of the world turned out much harder to manage than these imperialists had imagined. Third world countries adopted vicious anti-American tyrannies despite the good intentions of our polished diplomats.

In a word, good intentions and liberality towards other races did not seem to work. The rest of the world stubbornly refused to reciprocate. To mask these failures and to shore up belief in the "brotherhood of man" and the efficacy of good intentions and liberality of mind toward other races, this earlier generation of liberals also spoke in code.

Myths had to be invented and propagated to prevent a simpler and more logical explanation from taking hold. Heaven forbid that the children of these corporals of industry should come to believe that the rest of the world hates us for no other reason than the color of our skins.

This simple idea had serious domestic implications. There were plenty of non-Europeans here in America. Were they destined to hate us too? Were they going to hate us no matter how generous and well intentioned we were?

Myths were needed to hold our multi-racial empire together.

The famous British historian, Arnold Toynbee, wrote two classics, "Civilization on Trial" and "The World and the West" in which he danced all around the subject, spoke in code, and created a new "Mythos" to keep integrationism alive. Toynbee said in essence that Second and Third world hostility was not based on race, but rather on the shock and shame occasioned by the encounter with the prosperous and powerful West. Whether we were fighting or not we were "aggressors", and these non-western nations were merely "defending" themselves:

"In the encounter between the World and the West that has been going on by now for four or five hundred years, the world, not the West, is the party that, up to now, has had the significant experience. It has not been the West that has been hit by the world; it is the world that has been hit- and hit hard - by the West; and that is why, in the title of this book, the world has been put first.

"Different though the non-western peoples of the world may be from one another in race, language, civilization, and religion, if any Western inquirer asks them their opinion of the West, he will hear all of them giving the same answer: Russians, Muslims, Hindus, Chinese, Japanese, and all the rest. The West, they will tell him, has been the arch aggressor of modern times, and each will have their own experience of Western aggression to bring up against him."

In other words, in using our aid to build hospitals in the rest of the world, we should have allowed the goats and chickens to run through the wards as did Albert Schweitzer. In that manner, our aid would not have been viewed as so aggressive and so humiliating.

The mythos that concealed race from our idealistic elites was "sensitivity training." Hatred would disappear if we would just bend over backward a little more to avoid giving offense.

As voters became more and more appalled at ungrateful aid recipients, the old WASP establishment created the myth of the "Ugly American" to keep the genie of race firmly in the bottle.

You see, the good work of our sensitive elites at the State Department was being mucked up by loud, obnoxious tourists with bad manners. If it were not for the shock of the encounter with these crass tourists, these other lands would not be so intensely anti-American.

Indeed the myth so infected our culture that it shows up in some of the most hilarious places, like the stereotyped Louisiana Sheriff in the James Bond classic "Live and Let Die" who shows up as a tourist with a loud Hawaiian shirt in Bangkok Thailand in "Man with the Golden Gun," the next movie of the series. The myth was so widely disseminated that audiences would suspend disbelief and accept the image of relatively impoverished southern sheriffs vacationing in Thailand.

But times change and the myths of the 1950's are now dead.

You never hear about the "Ugly American" any more. Toynbee has been banished from our universities for his politically incorrect characterizations of sub-saharan African culture.

These WASP elites that once propounded myths of their own to cover the failures of the integrationist view are still around. They have just fallen silent.

Their silence now speaks volumes. If you ask them to answer an opinion poll, you will get the socially acceptable responses. However, they are no longer willing to invest effort in the integrationist enterprise.

As new global elites emerge in Japan, China and India to challenge the bureaucracies of American big business, this former elite wants to hold its options open. For the truth is that every one of these new WASPs in the information elite knows full well that the Chinese, Japanese and Indian business elites could give a fig about "integration" or "pluralism".

In their heart of hearts, these new WASP elites have become aware that exclusion and discrimination at the hands of these emerging Asian elites of international commerce is a virtual certainty. There is a mild sense of alarm at the large "fifth columns" of these new Asian elites already within our borders.

These new WASPs might someday be confined to working among and organizing the economic activities of their own kind. A "global tribe" might be the best defense, and the continued good will of the average middle class Euro-American might become critical in some unknown future. It is an asset these gentile elites do not wish to destroy. Silence seems prudent. The increasingly untenable integrationist myths are no longer to be defended.

Nobody from among the newer WASP elites tries to craft myths to conceal the failure of "integrationism." Liberalism and integrationism are out there alone, twisting in the wind, with their only defenders the shrill and obviously self-interested minority elites.

Ironically, the last WASP defenders of integration and pluralism are the conservatives, with their neo-conservative allies. The desperation of the editors of the Wall Street Journal to keep the old flame alive is touching. While faithfully reporting the shocking decay of our institutions and the intimate details of the racial preferences burdening Euro-Americans, they have formed an ideological "Camp of the Saints" with their tiny band of principled neo-conservative Jews and neoconservative Blacks bent on defending the older inclusive version of Western Civilization on behalf of us all in an even-handed manner.

To my brothers and sisters in the movement seeking to understand the world I can say only this:



The United States is entering a time of flux and danger. The minority elites defending integrationism are becoming more desperate and more dangerous.

Understand the following:

1. In culture and public policy debates, what is left unsaid is almost always more important than what is stated.
2. In public policy debates within a multi-racial empire, the truly important messages cannot be spoken without risk of provoking conflict. These messages are communicated in a complex "code." You must develop your own "code-speak" antenna and indeed learn to speak in your own "code."
3. When used by alienated minority elites, words will almost always mean the opposite of the dictionary definition. In a multiracial empire words are used as often to confuse and mislead as to enlighten.
4. The only purpose of commercial print or broadcast media is to induce an irrational purchase based on status or "brand" familiarity rather than on price or quality. The advertising of commercial print or broadcast media exploits status insecurities, sexual insecurities, and encourages unplanned impulsive decisions.
5. Commercial print and broadcast media will always encourage alternative life styles like homosexuality in which the consumer spends all of his income on impulse purchases for himself. The media dislike consumers who must make price-conscious purchase decisions for family dependents. Families reduce the effectiveness of advertising. Hedonistic lifestyles increase it and will always be encouraged.
6. Traditional religions are always anti-materialist and tend to enforce the virtue of deferred gratification. Thus, traditional religions reduce the effectiveness of advertising messages. Commercial print and broadcast media will always be hostile to traditional religions or any other cultural artifact that lessens the effect of its product, advertising.
7. Because of the inherent economic bias against the effects of traditional religions and cultures, the print and broadcast media will always become a haven for members of minority elites, who are comfortable carrying out the veiled attack, not only for economic reasons, but for reasons of racial and religious aggression as well.
8. Schools, governments and public institutions have come to view "tolerance" and "diversity" as weapons with which to control the majority, narrow its options, and extract additional tax dollars. Discount their propaganda accordingly.

Part of becoming a strong culture, with a will to survive, is learning to understand the hidden agendas and having the will to unmask them in public.

By unmasking the agendas, you weaken your enemies.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Hate Crimes and Rules of Evidence

Advice for young white males from Yggdrasil:

If you live in an area where you are likely to come into contact with aggressive minorities, and if you might have to defend yourself against them, you should never express white separatist - nationalist - or supremacist views except through the most confidential media, such as subscription bulletin boards.

Once your views become known, you have no option other than to flee minority aggression.

The attached news article from the Los Angeles Times describes a murder case from Huntington Beach, California in which the prosecutor is attempting to add a "hate crime" charge to murder charges arising out of an altercation between a black man and two white youths.

Now, you might sensibly ask, - Why would a prosecutor bother? If he must win the murder conviction before the murder becomes a hate crime, and if he does win the murder conviction, then the hate crime charge becomes trivial.

Welcome to the inner workings of American Justice system!

You see, when a person is charged with murder, his racial or economic views, whether he voted Socialist in the last election, and even prior criminal convictions are excluded from evidence. (Repeated assaults on the same victim, as in the Simpson case, will generally be allowed into evidence on the theory that the motive for the present assault might be the same as in the earlier cases).

The reason we exclude this stuff is that its prejudicial effect far outweighs its probative value (the probability that the political views or prior unrelated offenses could have motivated or caused the specific violence in the present case).

Now one problem with assaults by whites against blacks is that most white jurors are instinctively aware of what the statistics show. Blacks commit 7 times the number of assaults on whites as whites do on blacks. Per capita, an individual black is 49 times as likely to assault a white as any white is to assault a black.

Thus, claims of self-defense will have a clear plausibility to suburban juries.

And here is where "hate crime laws" come in. Their only real effect is to prejudice the jury against the defendant on the underlying charge (whether it is vandalism, assault, or murder). You see, once the prosecutor is allowed to charge a hate crime, then all the crap about the defendant's political views, his prior arrests and convictions, and his tatoos and hair styles are admitted into evidence in the trial on the underlying (real) murder charge.

That is why, in the article below, the prosecutor and the public defender spent 5 days in hearings on the issue of whether to allow the "hate crime" charge. If the judge allows the hate crime, conviction on the underlying murder charge becomes far more probable.

In real life, once a fight starts, ideology and politics go out the window, and much more basic human emotions take over. Our rules of evidence have recognized this fact for many centuries. Thus, absent testimony of a friend that the defendants went out looking for a black to shoot, the hate crime charge becomes a simple means of applying different rules of evidence to white defendants with dissident political views.

The case below is particularly egregious. Note that the defendant's high school teachers saved school essays and drawings that are now being used to place them in jail for life. Note also that their body tatoos have become "evidence".

This kind of stuff has very little to do with the issue of whether the deceased black provoked the attack. What it is designed to do is to shock a middle-class suburban jury and to prejudice them against the self-defense claims - to reverse the normal (and reasonable) assumption that blacks are much more aggressive than whites.

Just one more example of how our liberal elites in the legal system view the average European-American as "property" to be disposed of at their whim. Toe the line, act like a sheep, and you retain the ancient rights of your culture. Get uppity and rebel, and you will find that a whole new set of rules apply.

Yggdrasil-

-----

[Feb 4, 1995 Los Angeles Times p B1]

Two Murder Defendants Also Face Charge of Hate Crime Courts: Prosecutors say the pair embraced white supremacist beliefs. They are accused of shooting an African American man outside a restaurant.

By CHING-CHING NI TIMES STAFF WRITER

WESTMINSTER--Two men said to have embraced white supremacist beliefs must stand trial on charges of murder and commission of a hate crime in connection with the shooting death of an African American man in Huntington Beach last September, a municipal court judge ruled Friday. Jonathan Kinsey, 19, who also uses the last name Kennedy, and Robert Wofford, 18, face the charges in the fatal shooting of 44-year-old Vernon Flournoy during a confrontation outside a fast-food restaurant Sept. 15.

After a five-day preliminary hearing, Judge Thomas J. Borris of the Municipal Court in Westminster also charged Kinsey with attempted murder, assault with a deadly weapon and commission of a hate crime in the shooting of two Latino men. The victims, Angel Campos and Juan Vergara, both 22, were attacked in Huntington Beach last August.

Kinsey's public defender, Sharon Petrosino, said Flournoy's slaying was an act of self-defense without racial motivation. Pat McNeal, Wofford's attorney, said his client barely knew Kinsey and had no intention of taking part in the attack on Flournoy. Kinsey, of Huntington Beach, and Wofford, a Laguna Niguel resident, would face 25 years to life in prison if convicted. During the last day of the preliminary hearings Friday, the prosecution tried to prove that both Kinsey and Wofford were influenced by skinhead ideologies that propelled them to violence against minorities in the name of white supremacy.

An expert on skinhead culture testified that a review of Wofford's school essays and drawings showed that "this person is very committed to the racist skinhead movement philosophy . . . probably a hard core."

Sgt. R.K. Miller of the Huntington Beach Police Department, who has specialized in skinhead investigations, also told the court that ornate tattoos covering Kinsey's body show "his personal affirmation to the racist skinhead philosophy."

He noted the white supremacist tattoos on Kinsey's arms, back and abdomen, which include "SWP" (Supreme White Power), and head nailed to a cross. Miller also read from an essay "Skins," and a picture of a skin-prosecutors said was written by Wofford.

"I am willing to die for my race," Wofford allegedly wrote in the essay, titled, "Me, Myself and I," which he composed as a student at Valley Vista High School in Fountain Valley.

"I believe in white power. My race is better. I don't care what others think. I don't like minorities. They complain about equal rights.... I think white is better no matter who says what." McNeal said that, even if Wofford wrote the essay, it is only the words of a minor, "which may or may not be what he believes in and what he's willing to act on."

But Petrosino claimed that no skinhead paraphernalia was found at Kinsey's home to indicate he is still affiliated with racist skinheads. Under questioning from Petrosino, Miller acknowledged that some youths adopt the trappings of a skinhead lifestyle without espousing racist views.

Arrestment for both men is scheduled for Feb. 14 in Santa Ana Superior Court.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Statistics on Interracial Marriage

In response to a recent thread in which one poster alleged that the white race was disappearing because of intermarriage, I offer some analysis of hard numbers by Census bureau statisticians, and a history lesson from a Nobel prize winner, Robert Fogel.

The pattern that clearly appears from the numbers is that White males have an overwhelming preference for white females.

Blacks and whites have lived together on this American continent for approximately 400 years. That is a long time. If white males were attracted to black females, then the races would have blended long ago. In the Words of Fogel and Engerman in "Time on the Cross" (p 132):

"The fact that during the twenty three decades of contact between slaves and whites which elapsed between 1620 and 1850, only 7.7 percent of slaves were mulattoes suggests that on average only a very small percentage of the slaves born in any given year were fathered by white men."

And more telling (p 134):

"Nor should one underestimate the effect of racism on the demand of white males for black sexual partners. While some white men might have been tempted by the myth of black sexuality, a myth that may be stronger today than it was in the antebellum South, it is likely that far larger numbers were put off by racist aversions. Data on prostitution supports this conjecture. Nashville is the only southern city for which a count of prostitutes is available. The 1860 census showed that just 4.3 percent of the prostitutes in that city were Negroes, although a fifth of the population of Nashville was Negro. Moreover, all of the Negro prostitutes were free and light-skinned. There were no pure blacks who were prostitutes; nor were any slaves prostitutes. The substantial underrepresentation of Negroes, as well as the complete absence of dark-skinned Negroes, indicates that white men who desired illicit sex had a strong preference for white women."

This pattern of aesthetic preference of white males is about as durable as any trend can be. As long as white males continue to restrict their mates in this manner, the race is bound to exist at least until the next Ice Age.

The 1990 census data discussed below demonstrates that the more things change, the more they stay the same.

Yggdrasil

---

May 9, 1991 Wall Street Journal p B1

### Interracial Marriages Increase, but Still Rare

INTERRACIAL marriages increase, though they still aren't that common. Census Bureau specialists Roderick J. Harrison and Claudette Bennett report that the 1990 census showed about 1.1 million interracial couples, up slightly from not quite one million in 1980 and more than triple the 321,000 in 1970. When marriages between Hispanics and members of other minority groups or non-Hispanic whites are added in, there were 2.3 million interracial and intergroup marriages in 1990, compared with 1.6 million in 1980.

Nonetheless, interracial couples represented only about 2% of married couples in 1990, and interracial and intergroup marriages only 4%. Non-Hispanic whites and non-Hispanic blacks were proportionately the least likely to marry outside their group, the analysis reveals, with more than 95% of these whites and 92% of these blacks marrying within their own group. Only 68% of Asians or Hispanics and only 25% of American Indians had married within their groups.

When members of a minority marry outside their group, the spouses are most likely to be non-Hispanic whites, according to the researchers; marriages involving members of two minority groups are less frequent. Most "out-marrying" whites tend to have married Hispanics; only 0.01% of white married men and only 0.03% of white married women have married blacks.

"If persons married without regard to race or Hispanic origin, and simply in proportion to each group's percentage of the married population, about 5.5% of [non-Hispanic] white males and females should have Hispanic spouses, and another 5.5% have black spouses," the authors observe. "This is about five times as many marriages as actually occur between whites and Hispanics, about 20 times the percentage observed between white women and black men and 50 times that realized between white men and black women."

---

[Back to Main Page](#)



(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Remain Calm

Liberals everywhere are going to make hay out of the Oklahoma City bombing. That is to be expected. Expect the smears directed toward all of us on the right based on guilt by association. "Because these deranged bombers share your political views, you are guilty too."

This tactic is normal. Expressions of moral outrage and guilt by association are reflex actions among the dominant elites of our liberal culture. It flows according to script.

But when the dust of Oklahoma City settles, we will still have:

- race quotas burdening Whites;
- relentless anti-Western propaganda taught in the schools and universities;
- welfare driven urban decay and unrestrained illegal immigration forcing White flight;
- large advertisers purchasing cultural fare that portrays white males as wimps and white businessmen as criminals; and,
- a democracy in which elected officials never pay attention to citizens.

Our liberal elites will not even consider measures that might reduce the anger. In truth, they wish to provoke it. White violence gives them an excuse for grabbing more power and more control. It gives them cover under which to step up their anti- white propaganda efforts.

White male anger is another "problem" for the therapeutic state to "solve."

The liberal elites will continue to do everything in their power to enrage white males. The only difference will be that more police will be watching. Instead of accommodation we will get more repression.

We will still have angry white males and the anger will still be justified.

As the liberal, multi-cultural elites impose ever greater demands on young white males, it is inevitable that some angry loners will resort to violence. Sadly, this may be the beginning of a

process of decay predicted in Yggdrasil's lesson 4, entitled "Demographics and Revolt".

However, to all of you who lead or have access to White Nationalist groups, (and I know all of you monitor this NG!) I will remind you once again -- We have a one very simple task to perform over the next 20 years.

We must persuade the average European-American that they will be better off and safer governed by us than by the liberals.

So the message to the troops is really very simple, isn't it:

Killing a mixed crowd of 75 Euro-Americans (and 75 others) schlepping ATF paperwork for a living in Oklahoma City hardly seems like a sound strategy for convincing them that they are better off governed by us, now, does it!

And so we will have no more of these incidents! - right?

Good!!!

Now further to our defense.

We must remind everyone that there is no connection whatever between the "militia" types and white nationalists. These militia types are into sightings of "foreign troops" and "black helicopters." They are mad as hell at the government but never seem to be able to articulate exactly why.

What you hear are abstract concepts like "freedom" and the "right to bear arms." We haven't a clue what lies beneath these abstractions. We White Nationalists really do not know exactly what the militiamens' world would look like!

They never articulate exactly what they want changed, they just seem to be spoiling for a fight.

In truth, militiamen are primarily rural types. They have very little contact with or understanding of multiculturalism. They appear (at least by their silence) to accept the integrationist myth. They appear to be of an extreme libertarian bent, a provisional wing of the Republican Party, if you will.

If I had to guess, I would say that they have become alienated because the cultural images beamed to them over the television have become so alien to their world, that they no longer connect with the larger society and have become intensely suspicious of it. They are, in short, what Herrnstein and Murray wanted to warn us about in "The Bell Curve", but could only

describe in "code."

In contrast, White Nationalists are urban and suburban. Our goals are to defend European-Americans against the organized racial aggression of the non-European-Americans. Frankly, we're just not into sightings of "black helicopters" and "foreign troops on American soil".

We are definitely not into provoking civil war with our fellow Euro-Americans the liberal elites hire to police us. Provoking the ATF, FBI and (ultimately) the Marine Corps to fratricide is a stillborn loser. The province of paranoids who do not understand the issue of race.

But to my fellow White Nationalists out there I say: - Don't let this incident bother you. Continue the march. Like you, I am angered at how easy it is for the media to create in the public mind a connection between us and the bomber when none exists.

But I spot opportunity here. It is absolutely clear that the liberals will respond in inappropriate and provocative ways. Our message of truth will be needed more than ever.

Further, the alienation of tens of millions of rural and small town European-Americans creates an opportunity for us to establish new movie and tv production companies to produce fare that they can recognize. Entrepreneurial opportunities abound here. But more important, this is a niche market that the liberals will never be able to fill. The field is wide open. There will be no competition!

In larger cities we need clubs where disaffected Euro-Americans can go, speak their minds, enjoy themselves and be protected from legal trouble. We need more music stores that carry white nationalist music, and more bands to produce it. We need small theaters and experimental film companies and a sense of excitement in supporting their work.

We need to begin building institutions that protect and help Euro-Americans. We need legal foundations to defend Euro- Americans against the "hate-crime" show trials and other infringements of free speech and civil liberties.

The list goes on and on, and will be expanded in future posts.

Fear not for the future!

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

## YGGDRASIL

### **Read a copy of the Turner Diaries - Wow!**

I hope Dr. Pierce doesn't think his profoundly pessimistic work as a good "first read" for the awakening middle class Euro-Americans.

It is a powerful book for motivating malcontents and unhappy people, but the millions of middle class European-Americans respond more to messages of hope and relief rather than to apocalyptic messages of mass death and destruction.

Nevertheless, the book is brilliant and thought provoking.

First, it is one man's vision (and a coherent one, at that) of just exactly how the "leadership principle" might work in operation. It is helpful to know what its advocates have in mind before one accepts, rejects or modifies it.

Second, I was struck by Dr. Pierce's pessimistic estimate of the numbers of his own support. Much too low! His "Order" only had about 1000 members and including the "legals" (above ground members) totalled only 5000. I hope Dr. Pierce realizes that things have changed mightily since 1978.

In a recent survey by the Census Bureau of population preferences for racial descriptors, 3% of the U.S. Population suggested that they would prefer to be called European-American. That is about 6 million sympathizers, not six thousand. In the last congressional election, tens of millions of "angry White males" voted to cast the integrationists out of Congress. Although the Republicans have not really represented their new constituency, the electorate has come a long way since 1978.

I am much more optimistic than Dr. Pierce was in 1978 about our numbers 20 years from now (Ygg Jr. argues that it will only take 10 years.) I believe that we will have a majority of the Euro-American population, or approximately 80 to 100 million sympathizers. These numbers will allow for the creation of new institutions to communicate and organize. The "revolution" can start as a purely political and economic phenomenon. Once 50 million European-Americans recognize their own self interest and reject the integrationist myths, it will be impossible for liberals to run our American Empire as they do now. The anti-white minority coalition will either split, attempting to work out deals with the Euro-American minority, or the partially masked racial conflict will escalate and become much more open and direct. Change is inevitable in either event.

In the minds of movement old-timers, large numbers of opportunists will jump on the band wagon. Get used to the idea and accept it as a complement - a validation of your efforts. A Western renaissance will not be born out of a bloody purge of White opportunists and "johnny come lately's".

Third, once you convince 10 million Euro-Americans that Western Civilization is worth dying for, the liberal game is over. The movement cannot be stopped by 100,000 FBI agents (most of whom are nice, boring Euro-American types with accounting backgrounds.) They will back lateral the mission to the Marines. The only realistic chance the liberal establishment will have of stopping it with domestic military force is for them to get comfortable with and actually move toward an all black and brown military. There is no evidence that our zionist masters are at all comfortable with such a military. All indications are that they are much more comfortable with racially unaware Euro- American "sheep." That is why they are so desperate to keep us in the dark and censor the internet. They need us, but they need us dumb. The recent drive to purge racially aware enlisted men from the army merely confirms this. The liberal establishment will find out that as the numbers of racially unaware Euro-Americans dwindle, the price of "sheep" will escalate to the point of impracticality. If present trends continue, there is no way the liberals can maintain control.

Fourth, the critical issue in predicting the outcome of any such struggle is whether any Euro-Americans will be willing to sacrifice their lives to stop Euro-American self-determination and preserve the rights of minorities to hector us for eternity. Let me suggest that there is a marked contrast between 1996 and 1860, when hundreds of thousands of Northern Whites marched to their deaths to stop the South from seceding.

The question is whether any such resistance to White self determination (among Whites) could be mounted today. I would suggest not.

Most of you are aware of the reasons why the wealthy industrialists wanted war. In 1860, the federal government was financed almost entirely by tariffs on European imports which were paid overwhelmingly by Southern planters. Secession meant much higher taxes in the North and a contraction of the range of their railroads and commerce.

But the plutocrats were not willing to march to their deaths. Young men of the middle class were, and their motivations are far more important.

Back in 1860, virtually the entire middle class was employed in the retail trade. The North had tens of thousands of small, general stores. They made their living selling goods to millions of small farmers and free laborers. The problem was that large plantations bypassed the small retail stores entirely and purchased food and fabrics in bulk from a few wholesalers. Consequently, the middle class was much smaller in the South, and the middle class in the North viewed the spread of the slave system as a threat to their livelihoods and their middle class identity. With such and

economic threat, it is little wonder that the religious anti-slavery fervor caught on with the Euro-American middle class in the North despite countless neutral scriptural references to slavery in the Bible.

For the life of me, I cannot imagine any similar reaction to White self-determination today - particularly if it happens partly by default from efforts by blacks and browns to segregate themselves.

Under the circumstances, the most important thing we must do is be smart, and avoid repulsive fantasies about annihilating all non-whites the world over in a nuclear holocaust, as does the conclusion of the Turner Diaries. There is mounting evidence that large chunks of the liberal-minority coalition are losing interest in controlling us. Once a large block of us start voting our racial interests, we will be troublesome enough to them that they may well want to cede us the countryside and suburbs, if we agree to no trade barriers and no attacks.

It is simple, really. Real wage rates among Euro- Americans have been falling for 15 years. The reason for this is the wholesale export of jobs and uncontrolled immigration encouraged by minority racial coalitions. The Euro-American middle class is going to recognize the need for a racially conscious solution and will vote for someone to reverse this trend and improve their living standard. In contrast, a world- wide nuclear war would cut the living standards and life expectancies of the survivors in half (in addition to resulting in 200 million White casualties). Honestly, I cannot think of a stupider political vision to pitch to the middle class. It is a vision that could only motivate psychopaths bent on wreaking revenge on their own kind for not protecting them from the thousand insults inflicted by minorities.

In fairness to Dr. Pierce, we must recognize that the book is a novel, a work of fiction, and not necessarily his vision of the optimal outcome of our present conflict. Further, as a work of fiction it is an appropriate vehicle for shocking the reader into rethinking his comfortable vision of America. On balance, I am glad he wrote it. It will greatly increase our understanding of the alternatives for structuring our struggle. Also, as I read the book, I cannot help but think about the fact that the illegitimacy rate among Whites has risen to 24% of all births. I cannot help but think about all the angry White males in their early 20s who hang out in Huntington Beach and harass both middle class Whites and minorities (but not quite equally).

It is a class that will grow exponentially over the next 20 years. Its members have already been born. The liberal establishment will not be able to afford jails to house them all.

We are faced with a mighty task of bringing hope and civilization to this group. Dr. Pierce can relax. The liberal establishment and the minorities don't have a prayer of controlling this group. It is up to us. Their challenge must be answered in a constructive way or else. They will not let us wait another 20 years in our comfortable suburbs. These will not be sheep.



I can understand the anger and the frustration, but we must exercise restraint and make ourselves fit to lead. Herewith, a few suggestions from that Nordic tree of wisdom and life.

1. Every book by White nationalists argues for the preservation of the White race and Western Civilization.

The problem is that a large portion of middle class Euro- America raised in the suburbs and in rural areas without minorities just doesn't buy it. They see lots of Whites every day and do not believe that the White race is fundamentally threatened.

When you speak with and write to the typical suburbanite, forget about the survival of the White race. Rather, simply point out that everywhere else on earth where multiple races are gathered within a single country there is escalating conflict. The conflict usually resolves itself in secession or massacre.

Why do our middle class Euro-Americans believe that America will be any different?

Our racially isolated middle class will pay attention to facts and logical associations. Once they recognize the universality of racial conflict, they will be forced to admit that racial integration produces conflict and misery. Their charitable impulses will take over and force them to conclude that integrationism and liberalism are, themselves, self-interested lies and tools of racial conflict.

Remember, among our middle class suburbanites, it is declassé in the extreme to admit that you are threatened by minorities. The middle class needs a way to agree that integrationism is an ugly tool to promote racial conflict without having to admit that they are directly impacted by it.

The beauty of talking about the world wide failure of multi- racial empires is that the argument carries our message and mandates our conclusion, but carries no personal status threat to the listener or reader.

In contrast, any of the millions of Euro-Americans who have attended integrated schools at the margins of our ghettos already understand how profoundly blacks and browns hate us. For them, survival of the White race means their own personal survival and safety. Two different audiences with two entirely different needs.

2. Our primary long-term mission among the Euro-American middle class is to wean them away from their status conscious reactions to their own self interests and their own survival.

The minority-liberal political coalition plays these middle class status fears like a violin. Our middle class Euro-America is so desperate to distance itself from the feared "White

trash" that it is willing to vote for the continuation of the minority attack on itself.

Status consciousness is the sole vehicle of minority control over the majority in America. You can counter-attack easily. The way to do it is to mention the obvious.

"Our tax system is very carefully and artfully designed to extract the maximum amount from the middle class. After all, that is where the money is! Further, with corporate downsizing, our middle class is being pushed to work much longer hours. Our welfare system then guarantees that each member of the middle class who still has a job must support more and more non-workers. The liberal elites have rigged the game so that abstract generalities such as fairness and equality are understood by racial minorities as a promise of specific group favors for them at your expense, while working class Whites understand them as an excuse for economic jealousy. Why be a sucker. Make an alliance with the working class Whites!"

"Let's face it, the liberals have you boxed in. Why not play the race card just like they do? Why not get over your status fears and start voting with working class Whites. Its just smart politics!"

There are all kinds of methods you can use to belittle middle class status fears. I say - Go for it!

As for Dr. Pierce's little novel, I say that we have a lot of work to do within the Euro-American middle class before they are ready for self-determination. We will not be able (nor should we want) to bludgeon them into self-determination and racial consciousness prematurely.

White self-determination will only survive when the majority of the Euro-American middle class understands its self-interest and becomes willing to defend those interests. Until then, we must concentrate on strengthening Euro-American culture from within - not on provoking violence towards our enemies from without.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Welfare as a Racial Transfer

Welfare is a disproportionate transfer of money from one race to another. The following excerpt from an article concerning the issue of welfare reform makes that exact point and cites the relative statistics on recipients by race.

The percentage of Black welfare recipients is three times as large as their percentage of the total population.

Yggdrasil-

-----

Nov. 16, 1994 Wall Street Journal p. A36

CAPITAL JOURNAL BY GERALD F. SEIB

Welfare Reform: Hot-Button Issue Of New Order \* \* \*

TWO YEARS AGO, Bill Clinton pledged to seize this bull by the horns when he proposed pushing welfare recipients off the rolls and into jobs after two years. Nineteen months after the 1992 election, he proposed a plan. But nothing has happened. Today, there is no doubt that a Republican Congress will move, fast. And it is now beyond debate that a radical fix is in order. But there's also no doubt that next year's debate will be tinged with potentially explosive racial tensions. Welfare reform is by definition a racial issue; though blacks make up just 12.1% of the nation's population, they constitute 37.2%, of the recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children. By contrast, of the 283 Republicans who are expected to sit in the new Congress, just two are black, and two are Hispanics. Only 20 are women. That means 90% are white males. It happens that the one new black Republican elected to Congress this year, T.C. Watts of Oklahoma, is an articulate spokesman for radically changing a welfare system that is suppressing the very people it is supposed to help. That will help. but it hardly assures that the coming debate will be rational rather than hysterical. \* \* \*

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## The Cultural Chasm

Immediately following the November 1994 election, the Wall Street Journal had several brilliant editorial page features on the unbridgeable cultural chasm that separates conservative and liberal world views. The articles are an absolute scream.

So here are two, for those of you who may not subscribe to the Journal (and, hence, really do not understand our world!).

A particular kick is the mention of "trailer parks" from the memo of a liberal news editor when describing conservatives.

There is vengeance too, in the Journal's crowing about the decline in influence suffered by the New York Times.

But of far greater importance to White Nationalists is the passage about the older generation of Republicans "obsessing about and exaggerating the power of institutions that were unfriendly to them."

Integrationism is a self-interested moral code. If we White Nationalists "tend our own garden" with vigor and a little bit of joy, that moral code will collapse of its own weight.

Yggdrasil says - enjoy!

-----  
Nov. 17, 1994 Wall Street Journal p A20

Meet the New Establishment

By DAVID BROOKS

On Wednesday, Nov. 9, the day after the election, the New York Times surveyed a team of experts to explain the Republican tide. These commentators included liberal historians David Halberstam, Doris Kearns Goodwin and Alan Brinkley; civil-rights leader Julian Bond; George McGovern; and a token Republican Howard Baker. Now, it may be possible to draw up a list of

people who would be likely to know less about the anti-government message that was delivered Nov. 8, but it would take a lot of effort. One of the revelations of the past two weeks has been the incompetence on the part of so many liberals in understanding and describing the GOP takeover. Conservatives basically know about liberalism; anyone who goes to the movies, listens to popular music or reads the major newspapers finds himself traveling on liberal terrain. But many liberals, it transpires, have only the haziest phantasms about conservatism, having only read each other's descriptions of it.

The New York Times Magazine (whose slogan is "What Sunday Was Created For") recently did a story on evangelical Christians using a tone one might adopt in the contemplation of Martians.

\* \* \*

### A 1950s Horror Movie

While liberals such as John Judis and E.J. Dionne have actually read the conservative sources, many other liberals, especially in my neighborhood on the Upper West Side of Manhattan, have reacted to the election like gaping victims of a 1950s horror movie: They don't know what this monster is; they don't know where it came from, or how it got so powerful; they only wish it would go away.

All of this goes to show how distant the two political cultures have become. On the one side there is the Doonesbury cohort: the smart liberal Boomers who have had their lives traced by the lives of Garry Trudeau characters-Mark on public radio, Joanie the lawyer and Hill staffer, Rick the Washington reporter. On the other side are a quite different set of cultural references associated with former professors Gingrich, Armev and Gramm- Sunbelt suburbs, John Wayne movies, grace before dinner and high- tech entrepreneurs.

The 1990s culture war isn't a conflict between country rubes and urban sophisticates. It is increasingly fought between elites, often with similar academic credentials but radically different world views. It's no longer outsider conservative bombthrowers railing against the East Coast establishment. The new paradigm is the assault on Robert Bork, with well-educated activists and journalists going up against well-educated theoreticians. Last Tuesday's election was not simply a political shake-up; it was another step in a long cultural revolution, the rise and maturity of what Sidney Blumenthal has called the Conservative Counter-establishment. We now have two rival establishments in this country.

\* \* \*

This conservative establishment is of course radically different in shape, size and tone from the

liberal one, but also from previous Republican leaderships. The Republicans who were formed before the Reagan administration practiced a limited form of politics. With their interest in getting policies right, the George Bushes and James Bakers were either satisfied with, or uninterested in, the cultural landscape.

The new generation of Republicans practice social politics. In his first postelection interviews, Mr. Gingrich spoke about the counterculture and the McGovernites. Mr. Gingrich set himself up for some snickering ripostes by bringing back McGovern-liberals have come a way since then and in fact liberalism is now too ethereal a thing to make an effective bogeyman. But in bringing up the 1960s, he was referring to the moment when liberals and conservatives first split into separate cultures.

Mr. Gingrich's best moment came during the final weeks of the campaign when he stood against a withering assault by an entire world of people who declared the "Contract With America" a disastrous mistake. He insisted that no, it was actually a key to victory. That correct stand echoed another key moment, last year, when GOP strategist William Kristol stood against a similar public barrage and said that no, there is no health care crisis and the Republicans should oppose the Clinton plan, rather than merely compromise with it.

These brasher conservatives were displaying an intellectual self-confidence and Washington-savvy that has not always characterized Republican political players. Feeling beleaguered, many older conservatives ended up obsessing about and exaggerating the power of institutions that were unfriendly to them. That temper is obsolete. The emergence of rival establishments means that the institutions of the old single establishment have lost importance. For example, the New York Times was once the paper of record, the voice of the governing New Deal Democrats and liberal Republicans. But that group is gone, and there is no longer a role for a single paramount institution. The Times reasonably enough oriented itself toward the upper-middle-class core of Manhattan, the Upper West Side/Greenwich Village liberals. It is still one of the great papers of the world, but it is now one player among others. The more it serves its core audience in Manhattan, the less authority it will have over the rest of the nation.

\* \* \*

### Happier Than Renegades

Conservatives will have trouble acting like an establishment in part because so many conservatives love feeling persecuted and resentful, but also because conservatives are acutely aware of the dangers of establishmentarianism: insularity and snobbery. But there's no getting around it; if you want to run a country for a long period of time, you have to form an establishment. And establishments have one advantage: They are happier than renegade movements that feel history is going away from them. The best advice on how to win conservative allies still comes from a happy establishmentarian of the 19th century, Walter

Bagehot. It is this:

"The essence of Toryism is enjoyment. Talk of the ways of spreading wholesome Conservatism through the country: give painful lectures, distribute weary tracts . . . but as far as communicating and establishing your creed are concerned--try a little pleasure. The way to keep up old customs is to enjoy old customs, the way to be satisfied with the present state of things is to enjoy the state of things. Over the 'Cavalier' mind this world passes with a thrill of delight; there is an exultation in a daily event, zest in the 'regular thing,' joy at an old feast."

Let liberals wail and whine for the next decades; maybe it's the conservatives' turn to be happy warriors. Mr. Brooks is the Journal's editorial features editor. [The above quote consists of excerpts, the complete article may be downloaded from Dow Jones News Retrieval]

-----

Those Who Don't Get It

The following memo has been passed along by Andrew Ferguson, a senior writer at Washingtonian magazine. Any relation to any actual memo circulating in Washington newsrooms is purely coincidental.

From: \_\_\_\_\_, Managing Editor, The \_\_\_\_\_.

To: Political reporters

Re: Covering the new Congress

I know the last several days have been difficult for you. Soon you will bid adieu to many good friends on the Hill--men and women who were always there with that pointed quote, that special document to round out our stories and bring our readers the fairest, most informed congressional coverage possible. But now is no time for tears, frankly. Literally thousands of new Republicans will be moving here to take positions on the Hill, and we have a big task ahead as we transition to this much less familiar environment.

The purpose of this memo is to make your transition as painless as possible.

What are congressional Republicans? In a nutshell, that's the question I've heard from many of you over the last week. It's a fair one. All across Washington, from Georgetown on one side to Cleveland Park on the other, neighbors have been asking the same thing. Our librarians have been very helpful (see profile of Everett Dirksen attached). And I have done some research of my own.



My information is admittedly sketchy. I have a call in to Elliot Richardson, an old tennis partner who is himself a Republican, and hopefully he'll be able to flesh out some details. What follows is the information I've gleaned from several casual conversations, including my lunch earlier this week with Dave Gergen.

(Incidentally, Dave indicated in the strongest possible terms that contrary to erroneous reports last year, he has always been a Republican and is "damn proud of it." Some of these erroneous reports appeared in our own paper. We have got to be more careful, people.)

Here, then, are the results of my reporting.

The days when moderates like George Mitchell controlled the Hill are gone, at least for now. Most of the new Republican congresspersons and staffers are adherents of the right-wing philosophy of "conservatism." Conservatism can be traced to such right-wing thinkers as Franco, Pinochet, and William F. Buckley Jr. Conservatism, in brief, calls for dismantling the entire government while simultaneously controlling the most intimate decisions of a person's life. Contradictory? Sure: like cutting taxes, increasing defense, and balancing the budget, all at the same time! Let's make sure our readers understand the impossibility of doing this.

Several sources emphasized that in reporting our stories, we should take care not to call staffers or congresspersons on Sunday morning, when the vast majority of Americans stay home to watch Brinkley. But apparently many Republicans "go to church." Some of you will be familiar with churches in Cleveland Park for their marvelous chamber music concerts. Our new Republican friends, however, go to church for "services" -patriarchal rituals that date back to the early 1900s or even earlier. This also has something to do with "turning back the clock," another right-wing tenet of conservatism.

Over the years you have been able to develop relations with congressional sources through your kids' schools-at soccer games, Earth Day ceremonies, Condom Fairs, and the like. But beware! I'm told that many of the new Republicans will be sending their kids to "public schools" in the suburbs, where they don't even charge tuition. As one waggish Source put it to me, "half these clowns have never heard of Sidwell Friends or Georgetown Day!" Good news for you as parents bad news for you as reporters, who will have to create new avenues of informal communication.

Again, not easy: Many of the Republicans will be living in Virginia, the state across the Potomac from Bethesda (see map attached). These suburbs are usually 1980s-style wastelands of tract houses - "one step up from the trailer park," another source quips - that have destroyed irreplaceable historic landscapes. If there's sufficient interest, the paper will be happy to arrange a bus tour. They must be seen to be believed.

This won't be news to some of you. It's been my pleasure to entertain members of our staff at my farm in the Shenandoah Valley, which is also in Virginia. As you drove out you may have noticed that instead of Volvos and Camrys many of the natives drove old cars, "pickup" trucks, and vans. The men wear their baseball caps oddly-with the bill turned forward, instead of backward in the more conventional manner. Often the women look as if their fitness-center memberships were canceled years ago. Oblivious to the population crisis, these people sometimes parent more than two children (and then complain about condoms in the schools!). All of them own guns.

I mention this because you've heard Gingrich talk of the "ordinary Americans" that he and his congresspersons supposedly represent. My sources indicate that this is a ruse. Historically, Republicans have been controlled by the "haves" in the war against minorities, women, gays and other "have-nots." There is a great deal of documentation for this.

I suggest you consult books by Sidney Blumenthal and Haynes Johnson. Their understanding of Republicans sets a lofty goal all of us should aspire to.

So let's get to work. In this new era our job remains the same: to comfort the afflicted and afflict the comfortable. When it comes to choosing between a self-satisfied, out-of-touch elite and ordinary Americans, I think we all know where we stand. [The above article, because of its admittedly uncertain parentage, is reprinted in full.]

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## 'Have Less' Whites

Following is an excerpt from the Wall Street Journal concerning the causes of discontent among middle class whites (as well as a few dissidents in the information elite who are tired of being beat up and losing all the political battles).

Once again, the excerpt makes an important point about the growing alienation of the liberal elite from the middle class when it says:

"the same upper-middle-class elites 'who control the international flow of money and information . . . and thus set the terms of public debate' have paradoxically 'lost faith in the values, or what remains of them, of the West.'"

You see, Yggdrasil is not the only one who is concerned with the character of our liberal elites. Living and working among our information elites every day is a scarier experience than merely reading about them. In truth, the problem is worse than you may think.

And, of course, it is White Nationalists who gather and browse here who, by spreading the word, will do the most to reinvigorate Western Civilization.

Yggdrasil-

-----

[Dec. 14, 1994 Wall Street Journal p A1]

Elite Theory

Have Liberals Ignored 'Have-Less' Whites At Their Own Peril?

Anger in a Tennessee Town Unmasks Deep Divisions, Trouble for Democrats

Mud on the Glass-Tower Set

BY DENNIS FARNEY Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

## GREAT DIVIDES

### Scenes From the Politics of American Culture

#### LAST OF A SERIES

MUNFORD, Tenn. - Listen to the angry, anxious voices of white voters here and you can hear the splintering sound of something even bigger than last month's Republican landslide. It is the sound of the American middle class-rending apart and lashing out. The middle class, long the balance wheel of American society, is beginning to fissure along fault lines of income, values and lifestyle. It is cleaving into the havemores--"the glass-tower people," Labor Secretary Robert Reich calls them - and the have- lesses. The glass-tower people are generally college-educated, economically ascendant and comfortable with cultural diversity and change; indeed, they prosper precisely because of their ability to manage and adapt to these forces. But the have-lesses are generally undereducated, trapped in unrewarding and sometimes dead-end jobs, economically and socially vulnerable. They constitute a beleaguered subculture: un-chic, un-minority and, in their opinion, unheard. Liberals, they believe, seem able to muster sympathy for every group - feminists, gays, welfare mothers-except theirs. In fact, they have a great deal to say - and their message signals class warfare with the glass-tower people and the whole complex of values the glass-tower people hold. Listen: "The working man, he ain't got a chance," bursts out a bitter Sidney Tracy, walking his dog on the main street of this little town north of Memphis. After 25 years in the food-processing business, the 49-year-old Mr. Tracy has just lost his job as a lab technician. He lays much of the blame on President Clinton. "Clinton said he was for the working man. But he went up there and did everything for blacks and gays.

Carl Biggs, 33, a telephone-service technician, recently lost his job, too. That forced him to plunge into the brave new world of entrepreneurship: He is now the proprietor of a doughnut and snack shop here. Go out on Highway 51 during morning rush hour, he says with a pained smile. Half the vehicles have a woman driver, headed for work in Memphis. "You just know that has got to emasculate a diehard, big-ego, male chauvinist. Men have got to have a scapegoat . . . and Clinton is just perfect for everybody's ailment." That's pretty much how he sees things himself; he voted Republican for every office but one this time, and doubts he will be voting much for Democrats from now on.

"Everything [Democratic liberals] do, everything they want to do, is against us," maintains David Elston, a 49-year-old maintenance man for an electric cooperative. "Work and pay taxes - that's all they want from us."

#### Blue-Collar Rage

White males like these, each of whom voted Republican last month, were the single most

decisive factor in the national Democratic rout. Here in Tennessee, they blew away three-term Democratic incumbent Jim Sasser as well as Jim Cooper, the Democratic candidate for an unexpired Senate term. For good measure, they elected a Republican governor and provided swing votes that helped Republicans capture two Democratic House seats. "The big story of the election is the hostility among blue-collar men who haven't gone to college," concludes Democratic pollster Geoffrey Garin.

White men weren't the only factor. Almost as striking, says Mr. Garin, was a 10-percentage-point drop nationally in support for Democrats among white women, who have customarily been more sympathetic to Democratic causes. Like men, "they feel the world is changing on them and that nobody in high places seems to care," he says.

Similarly, Republican pollster Neil Newhouse couched his post-election analysis in terms of "angry" white men and "ambivalent" white women. White women as a group remain more sympathetic than white men toward the president and what he is trying to do; indeed, they split 47% to 47% in a Newhouse post-election poll when asked whether Washington should change direction or continue the president's policies. (White men wanted change by a decisive 66%-to-32% margin.)

### Gulf of Mistrust

White homemakers, however, differed sharply from career women. They also emphatically wanted change, by a 54%-to-34% margin. Many women, like men, feel "forgotten," says Mr. Newhouse. As they see it, "affirmative action is helping minorities and the rich are getting richer," but nobody is looking out for them. But something beyond politics happened last month - and something beyond economics, too, although economic anxiety was its catalyst. What happened was cultural backlash against a professional and managerial "knowledge class," cosmopolitan in outlook, that claims to speak for places like Munford but, as Munford sees it, speaks mostly to itself and for itself. Politicians are only the most visible symbol of this class - and one of the few members of it that ordinary people can reach out and topple. But the same gulf estranges Middle America from lobbyists and bankers, from consultants and artists, from journalists and academicians - from a whole class that has come to dominate the nation's internal dialogue.

It is unlikely the backlash is over - a point of great glee to Republican conservatives now brimming with ideas on how to dismantle much of what they consider to be the failed notions of American liberalism. There is a sense, shared by some of the most acute social observers of our time that an era-political, cultural and historical-may be coming to an end.

Author Gore Vidal, for example, was asked at a National Press Club appearance days before the election who would be a leading character if he wrote a book about this period in American history. He replied, only halfjokingly: "Rush Limbaugh, I suppose." Then, taking a broader

historical view, he added: "This is a twilight time, you know.... There's a smell of the Weimar Republic in the air now; something is going to happen."

Something did. Reading the election results, Labor Secretary Reich concluded that the nation had just witnessed "the revolt of the anxious class." He explained in a post-election address: "We are on the way to becoming a two-tiered [middle class] composed of a few winners and a larger group left behind, whose anger and disillusionment is easily manipulated. Today the targets of rage are immigrants welfare mothers, government officials gays and an ill-defined 'counter-culture. As the middle class continues to erode, who will be the targets tomorrow?"

### Liberal Myopia?

Christopher Lasch, author and social critic, ventures a suggestion in a book to be published posthumously next month. The target, he writes, will be "upper-middle-class liberals" and the whole complex of values they hold. The great liberal blind spot, he suggests, is "their inability to grasp the importance of class differences in shaping attitudes toward life."

In "The Revolt of the Elites," Mr. Lasch sets forth a provocative thesis. He argues that the same upper-middle-class elites "who control the international flow of money and information . . . and thus set the terms of public debate" have paradoxically "lost faith in the values, or what remains of them, of the West." In a reversal of historical roles, Middle Americans now perform the social function once assumed by elites: They are society's conservative force, clinging to tradition and serving as a brake on potentially destabilizing social experiments.

To the upper-middle class, Mr. Lasch continues, Middle Americans "are at once absurd and vaguely menacing - not because they wish to overthrow the old order but precisely because their defense of it appears so deeply irrational that it expresses itself, at the higher reaches of its intensity, in fanatical religiosity, in a repressive sexuality that occasionally erupts into violence against women and gays, and in a patriotism that supports imperialist wars and a national ethic of aggressive masculinity."

But the upper-middle class ignores Middle America at its peril. Whatever its faults, "middle-class nationalism [provides] a common ground, common standards, a common frame of reference without which society dissolves into nothing more than contending factions . . . a war of all against all."

\* \* \*

[The above quote is from a much longer article which you may retrieve from Dow Jones News Retrieval]

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Polarizing Election

Posted below is an excerpt from a Wall Street Journal editorial that notes some of the racial voting patterns in the November 1994 elections.

For the first time in modern history, white males in several Southern states voted 85% Republican. Blacks have long voted 80% to 90% Democratic, levels that indicate block voting of racial interests. The article notes the few exceptions to the polarized black norm.

The key point is that Southern white males are beginning to vote their racial interests as well. The balkanization of America proceeds apace. Non-white quotas and preferences will merely accelerate the pace.

Yggdrasil.

-----

[Nov. 11, 1994 Wall Street Journal p A14]

## Voters Throw a Party

The claim is being made in some precincts that Tuesday's Democratic debacle represents a short-term set back for the party but not a realigning election. The weight of the evidence, however, is that the results spell the end of the party's New Deal coalition.

Historically, a party loses as many seats in Congress as Democrats did in two kinds of mid-term elections: after a party has been in power for six or more years and voters have grown tired of it or two years after a party has captured a large number of new seats and must defend many marginal Members. Neither of those conditions apply to this election, which leads some analysts to think a political realignment toward the GOP is in progress.

That is certainly true of the South and Border states. The Civil War finally ended this week as Republicans won a majority of the region's House and Senate seats. The percentage of white men who vote Democratic fell below 15% in several Southern states.

Minorities largely voted for Democrats in the South and elsewhere, :but there were striking exceptions. In Ohio, Governor George Voinovich won 40% of blacks, and Republican Ken



Blackwell was elected as the state's first black treasurer. In California, Governor Pete Wilson received 21% of the black vote, and both he and Senate nominee Michael Huffington won among Asian voters. In Texas, a third of Hispanics plumped for George W. Bush for governor.

\* \* \*

[The quote above is from a much longer article which you may retrieve from Dow Jones News Retrieval.]

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## "California Dreamin," - A Low Wage America

In 1981, when Yggdrasil first drove down Interstate 15 through the Cajon Pass into Southern California, he knew he was in trouble.

4000 feet below, in the San Bernardino - Riverside area, a valley they call the Inland Empire, there were dense packed houses and condos thrown up 'favela' style in tiny areas, surrounded by vast tracts of absolutely empty land.

No 160 acre quarter sections, so visible throughout the rest of the country, exist in Southern California.

It was clear that the Ygg had suddenly entered Latin-America, with its notorious concentration of land in the hands of a few wealthy owners. In truth, the system of land distribution in Southern California is a cowardly copy of the genuine article to be found South of our borders. In fact, the assignees of the 7 original land grant owners of Southern California have successfully lobbied the government to purchase most of the land to restrict available supply. In the genuine article to the South, a few of the wealthy land owners proudly own it all without government as a senior partner.

As a consequence, the middle class in Southern California exhausts its entire life savings on bric-a-brack housing that would be laughed out of town in any other part of the country. They commute endless miles to and from work on packed freeways, often past the vast open tracts of land still held by our modern day 'patrones', the landholders, with their special agricultural property tax exemptions.

It has created a hyper-crowded tinder-box in which residential neighborhoods decay quickly and white flight accelerates to record speeds.

As the excerpt reprinted below demonstrates, the economic backbone of the Southern California economy consists of thousands of mobile sweat-shops, paying minimum wages and dependent upon a labor force willing to pack themselves 12 to a house, and 4 to 6 to a bedroom. After lobbying by civil rights groups, most city health codes allow for it. It is the only way in which immigrants from Mexico can afford the astronomic rents charged in Southern California:

"Cheap labor and ready capital are making the region as commercially fertile as the Far East. While high technology, aerospace industry and movie studios give Los Angeles its

sheen, sweatshops provide much of its industrial muscle. Quickly established and fiercely competitive, tiny factories making everything from women's clothes to nuts and bolts may be crucial to the city's future."

Developers love it.

They have found a way to transform middle class neighborhoods into slums, produce white flight that drives demand for new suburbs, new suburban shopping centers and office towers, while keeping rents and property values high. No other region of the country has duplicated the formula with such success.

But as the excerpt reprinted below suggests, there is nothing to stop the developers and their allies in the "civil rights" and "free immigration" movements from duplicating that formula all across the United States. After all, California is the trend setter for the Nation.

But as you will also see from the article below, this trend does not bode well for integrationism:

"Seers suggest that Los Angeles will not be an assimilationist 'melting pot' but will remain a mix of cultures and economies that are discrete and retain strong ties to other countries. LA 2000, a committee appointed by Mayor Tom Bradley to look at the city's future, recently concluded that Los Angeles in the next century will be "not just a bigger world center, but a kind of international city of cities . . . "

So it should be no surprise that this newsgroup was created out of the subscriber base of Netcom, with its original concentration in Southern California.

Readers of this newsgroup are going to be very surprised to find out that "White Nationalism" is more "descriptive" than "revolutionary." That is to say that White Nationalists want, for the most part, to recognize and guide existing trends in American Society rather than reversing them. They are not advocates of large scale resettlement, ethnic cleansing, or any other large scale movement or change.

As you can see from the article excerpts below, there is no need for White Nationalists to do anything to force change. The American multi-racial empire is balkanizing at a rapid rate without any impetus from us. White Nationalism is an effect and not the cause of this balkanization. This revolution is going to be easy, because others are doing our work for us.

Rather, it is imperative that European-Americans recognize that integrationism is a self-interested moral ideology invented following the industrial revolution to rationalize the destruction of European culture that resulted from the importation of diverse races to assure continuous supplies of cheap labor.

In its many modern incarnations, that self-interested moral ideology rationalizes the imposition of burdens upon the most numerous and productive (but least politically organized) racial group. It is against this self-interested moral paradigm and against the burdens it imposes that White Nationalists must fight.

Yggdrasil-

-----

June 12, 1989 Wall Street Journal P1 C1

California Babel

The City of the Future Is a Troubling Prospect If It's to Be Los Angeles

To Cultural Stew Add Slums, Crime, Pollution, Traffic, - Film Fantasies and Tofu

Economic Base: Cheap Labor

By FREDERICK ROSE Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

LOS ANGELES--At night, the cityscape seen from the police helicopter is a dream.

In the distance, lights of futuristic office towers shine across a sea of street lamps and houses. Through a man-made canyon of buildings, a ribbon of commuters' taillights winds northward into mountains festooned with luxury housing.

But suddenly, the chopper drops and the beam of its spotlight pierces the darkness of a slum. A dozen gang members scurry to escape the glare like ants fleeing an approaching footstep. The youths leave behind a corpse.

A mecca of culture and economic energy, a wilderness of crime and poverty: Los Angeles is an urban vision in two parts, bigger and more powerful, yet darker, than its reputation. It has been the city of the future for so long that clues to the actual prospects of Los Angeles, and perhaps of urban America, are hard to separate from the myth.

Los Angeles is the invention of engineers who brought water, bankers who brought money and Immigrants who brought dreams. Local movie makers have interpreted America to itself. The suburb was created here after World War II. The Watts riots of 1965 set off an era of urban violence.

Still, Los Angeles often is taken no more seriously than surfing and skateboards, and there's little sense in Southern California of the wider world. Showbiz and unreality are as pervasive as the California sunshine. Mystery writer Raymond Chandler once grumped that the place had "no more personality than a paper cup." But the cup is overflowing in the nation's second-largest city. The home of Beach Boys idylls is a center of economic and political might-with problems as big as its promise.

More than any other urban area--practically speaking, it's a region 100 miles in diameter--Los Angeles is today a laboratory of the American metropolis. But if Los Angeles continues to set the pace for the nation, other cities may be in for a shock.

New tides of immigration, trade and capital link the city to Asia and to Central and South America. Its U.S. identity is being stirred into a cultural stew, an extraordinary example of which is a Korean owned lunch counter that specializes in (supposedly) kosher burritos.

Cheap labor and ready capital are making the region as commercially fertile as the Far East. While high technology, aerospace industry and movie studios give Los Angeles its sheen, sweatshops provide much of its industrial muscle. Quickly established and fiercely competitive, tiny factories making everything from women's clothes to nuts and bolts may be crucial to the city's future.

The region's current population of about 13.5 million will grow to challenge metropolitan New York City's sometime around the year 2010. "The sheer power of the population explosion will be more than anyone can imagine," says John C. Cushman III, a developer of commercial real estate. Highways, clogged even today, will have to carry still more people. Water must be found to slake the thirst of additional millions. And the air, barely breathable at times, will have to be improved.

### Removing Mountains

Already, mountains more than 60 miles from the city's center are being leveled to build thousands of new houses to make greater Los Angeles even bigger. And futurists expect that Los Angeles, the symbol of urban sprawl, will become denser, stacked atop itself.

Bungalows built in sleepier days of single-family homes are being demolished to make way for apartment blocks packed with new Americans--Hispanics, Asians, Armenians--who are contributing to the city's economic strength and remaking its culture.

\* \* \*

The pink-walled confines of Hollywood High School haven't changed much since that day Lana Turner sneaked out of typing class and was "discovered." The rest is movie history. Kids still

hang out on Sunset Boulevard in front of school. Lockers still clang in tiled halls. And in the English class that Judith Campbell teaches, 12th graders are pondering Moliere's 17th-century play "Tartuffe," in which a character is menaced with an arranged marriage.

"That doesn't happen any more," objects Latanya Miller. But Ludwig Jingoian, the son of Armenian immigrants, disagrees. "Get real," he urges. Most classmates take his side. And nearly half the students raise their hands when the teacher asks if they know someone whose marriage was arranged.

"There is a swirl of cultures here," Mrs. Campbell later observes. Students in this class alone speak nearly a dozen mother tongues-Spanish, Korean, Armenian, Romanian, Arabic and Tagalog among them.

### More Hispanic Schoolchildren

By 2010, the student population in Los Angeles-area schools will swell to 3.2 million, up a third from 1980, according to the Southern California Association of Governments. The proportion of non-Hispanic white children will tumble to 29% from 50%, practically a mirror image of the change in the number of Hispanic youngsters.

Anglos will soon be displaced as the city's majority, dropping to 41% of the population by 2010 from 61% in 1980. The proportion of Hispanics will jump to 40% from 24%, with the black and Asian populations inching up.

Seers suggest that Los Angeles will not be an assimilationist "melting pot" but will remain a mix of cultures and economies that are discrete and retain strong ties to other countries. LA 2000, a committee appointed by Mayor Tom Bradley to look at the city's future, recently concluded that Los Angeles in the next century will be "not just a bigger world center, but a kind of international city of cities . . . "

Foreign investment in the city is soaring. More than half of downtown commercial space is foreign-owned. "Los Angeles," predicts Richard Weinstein, the dean of architecture and urban studies at the University of California at Los Angeles, "will be the first American metropolis of the Third World."

\* \* \*

South Normandy Street, like a hundred others in Los Angeles, runs in a straight line between dusty, garage-like buildings of concrete and steel. Every block or so, there's a doughnut or taco shop. A few trucks linger. Grunting men push goods about. You might not guess that this is the heart of industrial Los Angeles- and potentially a central part of a new industrial revolution.

Ducking inside buildings, a visitor sees figures bent over any of a number of production devices--sewing machines, welding torches, electric circuits, furniture sanders. At Brek Manufacturing Co., a big green machine towers above Salvadore Castenada as its whirring tool, guided by computer, carves an intricate airliner part from aluminum.

### One Shop, Hundreds Like It

Mr. Castenada, who is from Guadalajara, Mexico, is one of nine men on an all Hispanic shop crew at tiny Brek, one of hundreds of such companies serving the aerospace industry. Northrop Corp. is one of Brek's biggest customers.

There are no committees here at Brek, no middle managers to direct production. And no labor union. When Arthur Gene Price, Brek's beefy owner and president, figures a job needs doing, he walks out of his office and orders it. It's simple, and it works. Last year, Brek, with barely a dozen employees, had sales of about \$2.5 million.

Multiply that thousands of times and you have the foundation of the city's future: a tapestry of Lilliputian factories that upends 20th-century industrial practice. If the new theories hold true, giant factories won't be needed to produce goods from scratch. Instead, dozens of separate facilities will build parts for assembly by a final contractor.

Northrop, for example, estimates that about 75% of its production costs now represent work done outside the company by concerns such as Brek. Indeed, while basic industries--steel and rubber--were being shuttered in traditional industrial states, manufacturing employment increased in California, climbing 24% between 1970 and 1985. Los Angeles County--rarely thought of as an industrial stronghold--leads the nation in manufacturing shipments.

But in this small industrial revolution lies the risk of a larger upheaval, given the wages and working conditions that prevail in the many little nonunion factories. That pressures might someday explode in violence of the sort once seen in Watts worries people like Lewis H. Butler, the president of California Tomorrow, a think tank specializing in immigration and ethnicity. "Los Angeles could be so fragmented that it could be a very unpleasant place to live," he says.

\* \* \*

But, increasingly, the sociological skyline of Los Angeles looks like the vista from the police helicopter: a glow of wealth on the horizon and ugliness below. The dream that came for many Californians is dying now, as well-paid union jobs disappear, housing costs multiply and public aid to education falls behind inflation.

People drawn for decades to Southern California are starting to leave. Some 860,000 will depart the Los Angeles area in the next 20 years, projections suggest. (Despite that, the region's

population is expected to rise by 4.9 million, to 18.4 million because of immigration and high birth rates.)

## Reasons to Complain

As Los Angeles grows, its citizens grow more inclined to grouse. Nearly two thirds of those polled recently by the Los Angeles Times said the city is a worse place to live than 15 years ago. Nearly half said they had considered moving out within the past year, citing crime, traffic and high living costs.

Gang violence is widespread. Teen-age killings are a staple of local television news. One junior high school decided recently to build a wall to protect its playground from gunfire.

The solid, semiskilled manual jobs that for years supported the city's blue-collar middle class--black and white--are declining. A study by Goetz Wolff, an economist with the county of Los Angeles, finds that the number of skilled manufacturing jobs climbed 9% in the past decade; so did the number of unskilled jobs. But in the middle, in the sorts of positions once filled by semiskilled auto assemblers and steelmill workers employment declined 12%. "Manufacturing jobs were the ladder for social progress; now, several rungs are missing," says Mr. Wolff. Like 19th-century London, where dark factories dependent on sweatshop wages supported a worldly city at its peak of wealth and power, Los Angeles may face an era of economic disparity. Allen J. Scott, a UCLA geographer who has written extensively about the city's industry and studied its growth, speculates that "it could be a Dickensian hell."

\* \* \*

## Melange of Styles

\* \* \*

Even Tinseltown, once strikingly parochial, has acquired a new worldliness. "This is not the Hollywood of old," says producer Norman Lear. Though sunshine created filming conditions that once drew movie crews to Los Angeles, the city has become far more than a brightly lighted stage. It is an international bazaar, where movies and TV productions from around the world are packaged, financed and distributed.

With Japan providing some of the technology, new opportunities are being created for Hollywood. High-definition television, surround-sound systems, giant wall screens, even three-dimensional laser imaging--these technologies may one day make true home theaters more than just a futurist's dream. And whatever the medium, Hollywood is likely to provide the message. "This will be the control booth for world-wide entertainment," Mr. Lear predicts.



Hollywood thinks the rest of the world is as interested in Los Angeles as people here are. Hence, the world's screens resonate with images of Southern California--from a police station on Hill Street to car chases along the city's freeway overpasses.

A stark look at the motion picture industry's hometown, the 1982 film "Blade Runner," finds the city of the future not a dream but a Polyglot nightmare. A Third World horror where the poor live in dingy streets beneath soaring skyscrapers for the wealthy. Cars clutter the streets. Even the climate has changed: The air seeps rain under a cloud of pollution.

So frighteningly real was Hollywood's vision of a future Los Angeles that "the Blade Runner scenario" has become shorthand for planners and economists describing unbridled development.

\* \* \*

The city's love affair with the car is rusting. Without major changes in travel patterns, rush-hour traffic in the year 2010 may be nearly at a standstill on nearly a third of the region's highways. Average freeway speeds throughout the day may drop to 19 miles per hour from the 35 mph that is pretty standard today. Air pollution - by far the nation's worst-is expected to become even more of a problem after the turn of the century as population and economic activity grow. Drastic steps to cut smog have been proposed by a regional agency. But important parts of the plan will require legislation, technological advances and public support. Altogether, a tall order.

\* \* \*

[The above quotes are excerpts from a longer article that you may retrieve on Dow Jones News Retrieval.]

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Immigration and Conflict

In my previous post concerning business lobbying to gut any serious immigration reform, I spoke of the welfare and other costs of immigration to the taxpayer.

A bigger problem (at least from the moderate-liberal perspective) should be the obvious potential for conflict that these changes create.

The excerpt below shows that the political battle-lines have already been drawn for the next 30 years.

We have a minority member of Clinnocio's cabinet, Fernando Torres-Gil, assistant secretary for aging in the Department of Health and Human Services issuing what amounts to a thinly veiled threat - knuckle under and pay for us brown people, or we will take away your Social Security!

"The nation will be heavily dependent on workers from minority groups 'for the productivity and labor skills and the political willingness to pay taxes to support an aging population that will be largely white,' said Fernando Torres-Gil, assistant secretary for aging in the Department of Health and Human Services. "We have to be willing to invest in these groups, as we invested in people after World War II with education, training and good roads," he said. 'Maybe we need a new GI bill for this segment of the population.'

"But the spending will not be possible, he said, without the approval of the aging white population. 'It will be up to senior citizens, with their tremendous political clout, to protect their benefits like Medicare and Social Security and also invest in a new diverse, younger population,' he said.

"Education 'will be the really important flash point,' predicted Robert Manning, assistant professor of sociology at American University in Washington."

Brazen, isn't it!

The attack by blacks and browns will intensify as European-Americans become a smaller and smaller group. They already know what they want and what to threaten.

The attack will intensify until it becomes intolerable and conflict breaks out.

As long as European-Americans insist on playing "let's pretend" and refuse to admit that these people hate us, we will continue to lose the battle that we refuse to recognize.

It is really quite simple:

Which groups are displacing others and gaining territory?

Which group is fleeing (and paying exorbitant housing costs in the process)?

Which groups are able to extract tribute in the form of welfare from the other?

Which groups are able to win racial preferences from our legislatures?

Which groups are allowed to identify and advocate their interests in public?

To find out who has political power, you must ask who is winning and who is losing.

As you can see from the excerpt below, Euro-America is losing. The reason they are losing is that they refuse to recognize the uncomfortable truth about black and brown hatred. They prefer to delay the inevitable costs of self-defense until they can be imposed on someone else's children!

What you can also see is an arrogant hubris on the part of the minority coalition. They think that Euro-Americans will sit by passively and be willing to lose these battles indefinitely.

They ignore the lessons from the rest of the world. Multi-racial empires generate conflict. Races do not remain passive in the face of attack indefinitely.

Yggdrasil-

-----

[Mar. 14, 1996 Los Angeles Times p A4]

POPULATION: Latino, Asian Growth

\* \* \*

Continued from A1

The nation's total population 262.8 million last July 1, will increase to 393.9 million by the year 2050, according to the Census Bureau's forecast. Current growth is modest, less than 1% a year, the lowest rate since the Great Depression of the 1930s. It is projected to slow even more at the turn of the century and, after 2025, is expected to drop to the lowest rates ever.

The basic expansion of the U.S. population will be in the Latino and Asian populations, which already are leading the way in changing the ethnic makeup of California.

\* \* \*

The U.S. population now is 73.6% white, 12% black, 10.2% Latino, 3.3% Asian, and 0.7% Native American. The official forecast issued on Wednesday is that in 2050, the nation will be 52.8% white, 24.5% Latino, 13.6% black, 8.2% Asian and 0.95% Native American.

"I would be willing to bet that is a conservative estimate-the white population could be less than a majority a lot sooner," said Peter Francese, president of American Demographics magazine.

The government forecasts, revised every two years, depend on estimates of future birthrates and immigration trends. The Census Bureau expects immigration of 820,000 a year, including about 225,000 illegal immigrants.

The Latino population is growing at a rate of 900,000 a year, including net immigration of 350,000. The category of Asian and Pacific Islanders is increasing at 380,000 a year, including 235,000 immigrants.

Even without immigration, the Latino population would be growing faster than the white non-Latino population because it is younger and has a higher fertility rate. Latinos will become the nation's largest minority group in 2009, the Census Bureau predicts, surpassing the number of blacks.

New entrants into the U.S. work force will increasingly be members of minority groups. The median age - half the members are older and half younger - is 35.3 for whites, 30.6 for Asians, 29.2 for blacks, and 26.3 for Latinos.

The nation will be heavily dependent on workers from minority groups "for the productivity and labor skills and the political willingness to pay taxes to support an aging population that will be largely white," said Fernando Torres-Gil, assistant secretary for aging in the Department of Health and Human Services. "We have to be willing to invest in these groups, as we invested in people after World War II with education, training and good roads," he said. "Maybe we need a new GI bill for this segment of the population."

But the spending will not be possible, he said, without the approval of the aging white population. "It will be up to senior citizens, with their tremendous political clout, to protect their benefits like Medicare and Social Security and also invest in a new diverse, younger population," he said.

Education "will be the really important flash point," predicted Robert Manning, assistant professor of sociology at American University in Washington.

The retired population, those 65 and over, will grow very slowly for the next 15 years because there was a baby bust in the 1930's the decade of economic depression and very low birthrates. An enormous surge will start in the year 2010, when the first of the hordes of baby-boomers - the 76 million persons born in the years 1946 through 1965 - reach 65.

The "Florida-zation" of the United States will be fully complete by 2030, Torres-Gil said. About 20% of Americans will be over 65 then, compared with 13% now.

The biggest expansion of Latino and Asian populations will take place in states that draw the most immigrants California, Texas, New York, Florida, Illinois and New Jersey. But there is now a spillover with communities growing rapidly in such places as Atlanta, Minneapolis and Washington state, said Jeffrey Passel, director of the Urban Institute's program for research on immigration policy. California's population is currently 52.5% white, 29.8% Latino, 10.7% Asian and 6.9% black according to the Finance Department. The most recent state forecast, issued in 1993, goes to 2040 and estimates a California population that will be 49.7% Latino 32.4% white, 11.8% Asian and 5.9% black.

Los Angeles County is now 43.5% Latino, 35.1% white, 9.9% black and 11.4% Asian, according to state figures. The 2040 forecast expects a population of 69.1% Latino, 13.8% white, 6% black and 10.9% Asian.

Orange County is 61.8% white 26.1% Latino, 1.6% black and 10.5% Asian. Projections are for a 2040 population of 47.4% Latino 40.6% white, 10.4% Asian and 1.5% black.

\* \* \*

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Immigration Reform Gutted

Here we go again!

Another classic example of how the wishes of the majority are thwarted in the halls of Congress by business lobbies with their back-room deals.

Business wants wide-open immigration and lower wage rates. They object to any legislation that will allow business to query an electronic database to check on an immigrant's credentials.

Last week I posted an article by Professor Borjas of Harvard arguing that immigrants (legal and illegal) collect 33% more welfare than the native born.

"During the mid-1980s, the probability that an immigrant household received some type of assistance was 17.7 per cent v. 14.6 per cent for natives, a gap of 3.1 percentage points. By the early 1990s, recipient immigrant households had risen to 20.7 per cent, v. 14.1 per cent for natives. The immigrant-native "welfare gap," therefore, more than doubled in less than a decade.

"Thus immigrants are not only more likely to have some exposure to the welfare system; they are also more likely to be "permanent" recipients. And the trend is getting worse. Unless eligibility requirements are made much more stringent, much of the welfare use that we see now in the immigrant population may remain with us for some time. This raises troubling questions about the impact of this long-term dependency on the immigrants-and on their U.S.-born children."

So what we have are business groups lobbying for a little extra profit, while the taxpayer gets stuck with the welfare tab.

The problem is that illegal immigration is a negative sum game. The profits of businesses hiring immigrants (willing to work) are less than the costs to the taxpayer.

It would be cheaper for us to close the border and pay each of the business owners joining in the lobbying effort \$200,000 per year just to leave us alone!

The same is true with profits from "white flight" in parts of California. In Orange County, high density development has produced a highway infrastructure deficit of \$27 billion. That is just

the cost of new roads to bring traffic to acceptable levels. It does not include the costs to the great herds of middle-class working sheep of having to spend an extra hour or so a day commuting to work.

Once again, it would have been cheaper to pay the developers a few hundred thousand each in direct subsidies (ie. bribe them to leave us alone) rather than to accede (as local government invariably does) to their requests for variances from planned density levels to much higher and more profitable densities (with its tripwires for rapid neighborhood decline).

The middle class taxpayer simply is not represented when these kinds of issues are decided in the back-rooms.

One Republican sponsor in the House had an interesting reaction:

"Business is losing by winning," said Rep. Elton Gallegly (R-Simi Valley), a strong proponent of worker verification. "What has happened is that there is a tremendous amount of misinformation out there among business people."

"Under current law, Gallegly argues, business owners cannot determine whether they are hiring illegal immigrants because of authentic-looking fraudulent documents. It is in their interest, he said, to rely on a better system to check new hires."

Gallegly misses the point (as most Republicans do). The point is that business wants illegal immigration and low wage rates. They oppose electronic verification because it is cheap and effective and will end the profitable game of hiring illegals.

Our problem is that Republicans are always assuming "good faith" and "good intentions" even where evidence of its absence is overwhelming.

The Democrats, of course, represent our minority attackers.

As you can see from the excerpt below, immigration reform has been gutted.

And of course, the entire legislative course that has allowed immigration on such a vast scale has been illegal, anti-democratic, and illegitimate. We reserve the right to reverse its effects at any time.

Until the middle class demands real representation in the political process, our interests will never be protected.

To most business lobbyists, a few thousand in profits is more important than the survival of

Western Civilization.

Yggdrasil-

-----  
Mar. 14, 1996 Los Angeles Times p A4 Panel Rejects Bigger Illegal Hiring Fines

By MARC LACEY TIMES STAFF WRITER

WASHINGTON-Business interests won a key concession on immigration reform Wednesday as the Senate Judiciary Committee rejected an effort to significantly raise fines for employers who knowingly hire illegal immigrants.

The panel's vote to strike the stiffer penalties from the Senate's immigration bill adds to a string of legislative victories for business that critics say are taking some of the teeth out of immigration reform.

"I don't think we have to fine them in an exorbitant way," said Judiciary Committee Chairman Orrin G. Hatch (R-Utah), an opponent of any employer sanctions at all. "What happens is that small business gets slapped and they just turn away people with foreign-sounding names and appearances."

The fines would have more than doubled from current levels, which now range from \$250 to \$10,000 for each illegal immigrant hired.

Since the 1986 immigration law made it illegal for employers to hire undocumented workers, businesses have complained that they are effectively being turned into federal agents because of the government's inability to enforce the law.

Using their lobbying clout, business groups have joined forces with an odd mix of allies, from the Christian Coalition to the National Council of La Raza, in opposing various aspects of immigration reform. In fine-tuning its bill for a vote by the full Senate next month, the Judiciary Committee Wednesday also struck provisions from the bill that would have allowed the federal government to seize the property of employers who violate immigration law.

Another section that did not survive would have sent employer fines directly to the Immigration and Naturalization Service budget, creating a sort of "bounty" for each violator the agency caught.

Last week, in another business victory, Sen. Alan K. Simpson (R-Wyo.), the bill's sponsor,



agreed to drop reductions in the number of foreign workers allowed into the country, a key sticking point with business.

Both the House and Senate have bowed to widespread opposition to a worker-verification program that would force employers to tap into a government database to check on the immigration status of prospective workers.

The last-minute changes, especially the toned-down worker-verification measures, infuriate those pushing for the toughest crackdown possible.

Business is losing by winning," said Rep. Elton Gallegly (R-Simi Valley), a strong proponent of worker verification. "What has happened is that there is a tremendous amount of misinformation out there among business people."

Under current law, Gallegly argues, business owners cannot determine whether they are hiring illegal immigrants because of authentic-looking fraudulent documents. It is in their interest, he said, to rely on a better system to check new hires.

\* \* \*

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Republican Immigration Fantasies

In my previous post concerning immigration, entitled "Immigration and Conflict," I quoted the thinly veiled threat of Fernando Torres-Gil, assistant secretary for aging in the Department of Health and Human Services:

"The nation will be heavily dependent on workers from minority groups 'for the productivity and labor skills and the political willingness to pay taxes to support an aging population that will be largely white,..." \* \* \* "Maybe we need a new GI bill for this segment (minority groups) of the population.

"But the spending will not be possible, he said, without the approval of the aging white population. 'It will be up to senior citizens, with their tremendous political clout, to protect their benefits like Medicare and Social Security and also invest in a new diverse, younger population,' he said."

Thirty years from now, the black and brown coalition plans to pit its new brown majority against aging whites, threatening to cut off Social Security benefits (ie, make it a means tested benefit) unless the retired white baby boomers vote for exorbitant taxes on their minority, middle-class offspring.

The black and brown coalition is going to pit the older generation of whites against the younger generation of whites to pay the future bills for welfare and education for America's new Third-World majority.

So the ongoing struggle within the Republican Party over immigration becomes critical. Realistically, the Democratic party is the party of black and brown. If we are to protect ourselves through the political process, the Republican Party will have to be the vehicle.

It is going to be tough and ugly road ahead.

As the editors of National Review state in their March 25, 1996 issue (page 18) concerning the fate of the immigration reform bills:

"And there is a danger of defeat-posed, curiously, by Washington's conservative establishment. It mounts two sets of arguments against the reforms: first, that immigration is a clear continuing benefit to American society; second, that reduced

immigration would damage GOP and conservative political prospects. To which we reply: if you believe that, you'll believe anything."

As NR points out, the Republican establishment is bent on offending its own natural constituency:

"The socio-economic case was put in a "Manifesto for Immigration," written by Malcolm Wallop (Steve Forbes's campaign manager), Spencer Abraham, William Bennett, and Jack Kemp, and published (where else?) on the Wall Street Journal editorial page." \* \* \* "They claim, quoting Julian Simon, that "the studies uniformly show that immigrants do not increase the rate of native unemployment." Not so. For example, David Jaeger at the Bureau of Labor Statistics has published a study demonstrating that roughly half the decline in real wages of native dropouts is caused by immigration.

"They argue, quoting Bill Gates, that limits on skilled immigration will damage American companies and U.S. inventiveness generally. But Norman Matloff of the University of California at Davis shows in a new report that a) almost all the major technical advances in computers have been made by U.S. natives; b) U.S. universities are turning out more domestic graduates each year than the computer industry needs; and c) skilled foreigners are hired simply because they are cheaper. \* \* \*"

But the real problem is that so many in the Republican Party are driven to political fantasies about all these new immigrants voting Republican. As the editors of National Review point out, this will be politically fatal:

"And in most elections Hispanics vote Democratic over Republican by 70 to 30.

"Population projections, moreover, suggest that continued high levels of immigration pose a real threat to the GOP's fragile national majority. The Census Bureau estimates that, if immigration continues at present levels, Hispanics will account for between 20.2 and 24.6 per cent of the U.S. population in 2050. If their political loyalties remain unchanged, that would give the Democrats a clear national majority. Hispanics would need to shift massively into the GOP column before that demographic shift was even negated, let alone reversed."

But the worst problem is that Republican leaders are so ready to alienate whites by refusing to represent them. The Democrats blatantly appeal to the racial interests of blacks and browns, but somehow it is "unclean" for Republicans to appeal to the racial interests of Euro-Americans.

The Republican leadership would rather lose elections that give up its vision of integrationism.

The ability to deny racial consciousness among minorities is very important for many Republican leaders because they find defending the racial interests of Euro-Americans socially repellent.

In truth, they are so threatened by the prospect of being perceived as "white trash", that they cannot bring themselves to represent whites politically. Thus, they can only be leaders of a de-racinated fantasy land that exists nowhere except in their own minds.

It is more important for them to uphold patrician rituals of manners than it is to recognize reality and save Western Civilization in North America.

And it is this powerful Republican status fear that produces such ridiculous ideological inconsistencies. For what these "free market conservatives" are forced to insist, by stubbornly clinging to their integrationist vision, is that each immigrant is "new socialist man" who loses any racial consciousness upon crossing our borders. It is a vision of blacks and browns as raceless automatons, conveniently stripped of racial aggression and instantly remade into the bolshevik ideal of creatures motivated solely by economic calculations.

Now what exactly is it about American capitalism that makes it able to precipitate Marxist cultural results with such dispatch? The truth is that such a transformation occurs not in the real world, but only in the minds of Republicans with status insecurities that render them unfit to lead.

The truth is that integrationism is a failure. The minority coalition will settle for nothing less than victory and dominance. It promises nothing but conflict.

The Republican Party has two choices.

1. Preserve the Euro-American majority in a peaceful political process now, or
2. Allow Euro-Americans to slip into a permanent minority status in which their interests can only be defended through violence and secession.

That is it.

There are no other choices!

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Immigrant Welfare Gap

Reprinted below is a short article from National Review Magazine by George Borjas, a professor at Harvard.

He makes the case that immigrants to America collect more means- tested welfare benefits than native-born Americans.

For those of you who have a tendency to make politically incorrect statements in class, this article is a must - packed full of numbers- for backing up your assertions.

Yggdrasil-

-----

March 11, 1996 National Review p.48

### The Welfare Magnet

For more and more immigrants, America is becoming the land of welfare opportunities.

GEORGE BORJAS Mr. Borjas is a professor of public policy at the John F Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. This article is adapted from his Immigration and the Welfare State: Immigrant Participation in Means-Tested Entitlement Programs, written jointly with Lynette Hilton and to be published by the Quarterly Journal of Economics in its May 1996 issue.

THE evidence has become overwhelming: immigrant participation in welfare programs is on the rise. In 1970, immigrant households were slightly less likely than native households to receive cash benefits like AFDC. (Aid to Families with dependent Children) or SSI (Supplementary Security Income). By 1990, immigrant households were more likely to receive such cash benefits (9.1 per cent v. 7.4 per cent). Pro-immigration lobbyists are increasingly falling back on the excuse that this immigrant-native "welfare gap" is attributable solely to refugees and/or elderly immigrants; or that the gap is not numerically large. (Proportionately, it's "only" 23 per cent).

But the Census does not provide any information about the use of noncash transfers. These are

programs like Food Stamps, Medicaid, housing subsidies, and the myriad of other subsidies that make up the modern welfare state. And noncash transfers comprise over three quarters of the cost of all means-tested entitlement programs. In 1991, the value of these noncash transfers totaled about \$140 billion.

Recently available data help provide a more complete picture. The Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) samples randomly selected households about their involvement in virtually all means-tested programs. From this, the proportion of immigrant households that receive benefits from any particular program can be calculated.

The results are striking. The "welfare gap" between immigrants and natives is much larger when noncash transfers are included [see table]. Taking all types of welfare together, immigrant participation is 20.7 per cent. For native-born households, it's only 14.1 per cent—a gap of 6.6 percentage points (proportionately, 47 per cent).

And the SIPP data also indicate that immigrants spend a relatively large fraction of their time participating in some means-tested program. In other words, the "welfare gap" does not occur because many immigrant households receive assistance for a short time, but because a significant proportion—more than the native-born—receive assistance for the long haul.

Finally, the SIPP data show that the types of welfare benefits received by particular immigrant groups influence the type of welfare benefits received by later immigrants from the same group. Implication: there appear to be networks operating within ethnic communities which transmit information about the availability of particular types of welfare to new arrivals.

The results are even more striking in detail. Immigrants are more likely to participate in practically every one of the major means-tested programs. In the early 1990s, the typical immigrant family household had a 4.4 per cent probability of receiving AFDC, v. 2.9 per cent of native-born families. [Further details in Table 1].

And that overall "welfare gap" becomes even wider if immigrant families are compared to non-Hispanic white native-born households. Immigrants are almost twice as likely to receive some type of assistance—20.7 per cent v. 10.5 per cent.

The SIPP data also allow us to calculate the dollar value of the benefits disbursed to immigrant households, as compared to the native-born. In the early 1990s, 8 per cent of households were foreign-born. These immigrant households accounted for 13.8 per cent of the cost of the programs. They cost almost 75 per cent more than their representation in the population.

The disproportionate disbursement of benefits to immigrant households is particularly acute in California, a state which has both a lot of immigrants and very generous welfare programs.

Immigrants make up only 21 per cent of the households in California. But these households consume 39.5 per cent of all the benefit dollars distributed in the state. It is not too much of an exaggeration to say that the welfare problem in California is on the verge of becoming an immigrant problem.

The pattern holds for other states. In Texas, where 8.9 per cent of households are immigrant but which has less generous welfare, immigrants receive 22 per cent of benefits distributed. In New York State, 16 per cent of the households are immigrants. They receive 22.2 per cent of benefits.

The SIPP data track households over a 32-month period. This allows us to determine if immigrant welfare participation is temporary-perhaps the result of dislocation and adjustment-or long-term and possibly permanent.

The evidence is disturbing. During the early 1990s, nearly a third (31.3 per cent) of immigrant households participated in welfare programs at some point in the tracking period. Only just over a fifth (22.7 per cent) of native-born households did so. And 10.3 per cent of immigrant households received benefits through the entire period, v. 7.3 per cent of native-born households.

Because the Bureau of the Census began to collect the SIPP data in 1984, we can use it to assess if there have been any noticeable changes in Immigrant welfare use. It turns out there has been a very rapid rise.

During the mid-1980s, the probability that an immigrant household received some type of assistance was 17.7 per cent v. 14.6 percent for natives, a gap of 3.1 percentage points. By the early 1990s, recipient immigrant households had risen to 20.7 per cent, v. 14.1 per cent for natives. The immigrant-native "welfare gap," therefore, more than doubled in less than a decade.

Thus immigrants are not only more likely to have some exposure to the welfare system; they are also more likely to be "permanent" recipients. And the trend is getting worse. Unless eligibility requirements are made much more stringent, much of the welfare use that we see now in the immigrant population may remain with us for some time. This raises troubling questions about the impact of this long-term dependency on the immigrants-and on their U.S.-born children.

There is huge variation in welfare participation among immigrant groups. For example, about 4.3 per cent of households originating in Germany, 26.8 per cent of households originating in Mexico, and 40.6 per cent of households originating in the former Soviet Union are covered by Medicaid. Similarly, about 17.2 per cent of households originating in Italy, 36 per cent from Mexico and over 50 per cent in the Dominican Republic received some sort of welfare benefit.



A more careful look at these national-origin differentials reveals an interesting pattern: national-origin groups tend to "major" in particular types of benefit. For example, Mexican immigrants are 50 per cent more likely to receive energy assistance than Cuban immigrants. But Cubans are more likely to receive housing benefits than Mexicans.

The SIPP data reveal a very strong positive correlation between the probability that new arrivals belonging to a particular immigrant group receive a particular type of benefit, and the probability that earlier arrivals from the same group received that type of assistance. This correlation remains strong even after we control for the household's demographic background, state of residence, and other factors. And the effect is not small. A 10 percentage point increase in the fraction of the existing immigrant stock who receive benefits from a particular program implies about a 10 per cent increase in the probability that a newly arrived immigrant will receive those benefits.

This confirms anecdotal evidence. Writing in the New Democrat-the mouthpiece of the Democratic Leadership Council-Norman Matloff reports that "a popular Chinese-language book sold in Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Chinese bookstores in the United States includes a 36-page guide to SSI and other welfare benefits" and that the "World Journal, the largest Chinese-language newspaper in the United States, runs a 'dear Abby'-style column on immigration matters, with welfare dominating the discussion."

And the argument that the immigrant-native "welfare gap" is caused by refugees and/or elderly immigrants? We can check its validity by removing from the calculations all immigrant households that either originate in countries from which refugees come or that contain any elderly persons.

Result: 17.3 per cent of this narrowly defined immigrant population receives benefits, v. 13 per cent of native households that do not contain any elderly persons. Welfare gap: 4.3 percentage points (proportionately, 33 per cent).

The argument that the immigrant welfare problem is caused by refugees and the elderly is factually incorrect. Conservatives typically stress the costs of maintaining the welfare state. But we must not delude ourselves into thinking that nothing is gained from the provision of antibiotics to sick children or from giving food to poor families. At the same time, however, these welfare programs introduce a cost which current calculations of the fiscal costs and benefits of immigration do not acknowledge and which might well dwarf the current fiscal expenditures. That cost can be expressed as follows: To what extent does a generous welfare state reduce the work incentives of current immigrants, and change the nature of the immigrant flow by influencing potential immigrants' decisions to come-and to stay?

AVERAGE MONTHLY PROBABILITY OF RECEIVING BENEFITS IN EARLY 1990s

TYPE OF BENEFIT	Immigrant household	Native Household
Cash Programs:		
Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC)	4.4	2.9
Supplemental Security Income (SSI)	6.5	3.7
General Assistance	.8	.6
Noncash Programs:		
Medicaid	15.4	9.4
Food Stamps	9.2	6.5
Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)	3.0	2.0
Energy Assistance	2.1	2.3
Housing Assistance (public housing or low-rent subsidies)	5.6	4.4
School Breakfasts and Lunches (free or reduced price)	12.5	6.2
Summary: Receive Cash Benefits, Medicaid, Food Stamps, WIC, Energy Assistance, or Housing Assistance	20.7	14.1

[Back to Main Page](#)

---

# YGGDRASIL

## George Bush - And The NRA

Poor, dumb George never did get it!

Below is an excerpt from the L.A. Times on George Bush's latest moral posturing. He joined the National Rifle Association years ago for reasons of political expediency. He never really did believe in the cause. Poor old George never could understand the fears of the Founding Fathers that our government might turn into tyranny.

So once the NRA published an ad portraying ATF agents as jackbooted invaders, he resigns to display his patrician, East Coast "moral superiority".

You see George is one of those WW-2 vet Republicans who believes that government is the sainted defender of all things good, and that all government employees are well meaning people doing a wonderful job. So lost in the fog of the "Good War" is George, that he ignores reality.

Ask George how one of his sainted FBI snipers could see Vickie Weaver come to the doorway carrying her baby, place the crosshairs of his scope over her temple and squeeze the trigger. Just another day in the life of a well meaning government employee rescuing the world from tyranny, right George?

George still can't figure out why those of us born after the War are so angry at his tax increases. During Reagan's term, the Ole Ygg's top marginal rate was 28%. George's tax hikes applied the infamous phase-outs of deductions, dependent credits and the base tax rate, raising the Ole Ygg's top marginal rate to 42%. Clinoccio then hiked it to about 45%.

Bush's taxes were unique in their public deception. The middle class was left believing that the top marginal rate was a "fair" 32% when they would be hit with 42% should any of them be so unfortunate as to succeed. Not only did Bush raise the rates, but he concealed them from public view.

And what have America's productive citizens received for their money? To George, it's 50 year old memories of "good intentions" that count, not the actual results. But the problem is that those of us born after the "Good War" have eyes and were never issued rose colored glasses.

What we are buying with our taxes is a rapid slide into Third World status with runaway immigration, racial quotas, an entrenched welfare culture, dramatically rising illegitimacy rates,

falling SAT scores and finally, a Treasury department that purchases attack helicopters, armored personnel carriers and battle tanks for domestic use on those who might be offended enough by these results to actually do something about it. These purchases were made on George's watch, not Clinoccio's.

Then George has the gall to say that all Government workers are well-meaning and that it is unfair for the national Rifle Association to criticize BATF.

The BATF was created years ago to destroy whiskey stills and shoot ridge-running Southern moonshiners during prohibition. They have been chasing and shooting rural white boys for at least 2 generations. The BATF has always had a clearly understood mission as an extension of the Eastern Seaboard's post-civil war program of Reconstruction in the South. The agency has always done the bidding of our East Coast elites, controlling the hillbillies and other white undesirables running around the rural countryside.

Only now, it has branched out into the rural Midwest and West, and apparently these new objects of BATF attention are not as patient as Southerners who have experienced the brunt of New England liberalism before.

The Wall Street Journal ran a full page editorial ("Faddish Justice?", May 2, 1995 p A24) contrasting the treatment meted out to police handling the Ruby Ridge and Waco affairs with the treatment meted out to the police who handled Rodney King. In the Journal's words:

"Allowing for the dilemmas of the real world, we seem to have a double standard today: It says that law enforcement officials can do what they want with unpopular defendants like religious fanatics and white supremacists. But in dealing with suspects who might charge racial prejudice, they have to be careful indeed. Even in the wake of Oklahoma City, we are about to have the release of a Mario Van Peebles film making the Black Panthers into entertainment, guns and all."

So what are we to think when these agencies begin arming themselves against the civilian population with attack helicopters, armored personnel carriers and tanks?

Indeed there is a double standard. It was on George Bush's watch that the U.S. Marshals purchased the silencers that they carried up on Ruby Ridge.

What possible reason could George Bush's beloved and sweet spirited Federal police forces have for wanting to use a silencer when serving an arrest warrant if not to kill people without alarming the folks who live down the road?

Did George Bush sign the requisition order for these silencers?

Was he any more aware of what was going on in his administration than Reagan?

Did the GSA sign the order under Bush's authority? If so, then why isn't George Bush in the deepest and most profound sense a Washington Criminal?

At some point, those of us paying George Bush's exorbitant taxes have to take responsibility for what we are financing! At some point we have to connect motives with deeds. And with the Federal Government performing so many evil deeds, at some point we must conclude that those directing all this activity have evil motives.

Shooting someone by mistake is understandable. But requisitioning silencers for use in making rural arrests bespeaks premeditation and a view of law enforcement that is hard to square with any notion of liberty.

All things being equal, the Ole Ygg prefers to finance Federal police that, when they choose to kill, must do so loudly so that the public knows what is happening. George Bush and his BATF and GSA obviously had different ideas.

The sad truth is that the "Good War" has blinded an entire generation to reality.

The U.S. Government lied then about its involvement in that war just as it lies now about Waco and Ruby Ridge.

The Ole Ygg's father still believes that Jews were killed in gas chambers at Dachau, Buchenwald and Dora. He also believes that Nazis made soap and lampshades out of Jews at Dachau.

While these particulars are acknowledged by Vad Y'shem in Israel to be false, The U.S. military concocted the story upon liberating the camps and broadcast pictures of emaciated corpses as supposed gas chamber victims to the entire world. They did this despite a forensic examination by a U.S. Army surgeon of hundreds of these corpses, and a finding that all had died of typhus or similar diseases and malnutrition.

The Government did not tell the World about how, after the German guards surrendered, they lined them up and then machine gunned them to death in violation of the Geneva conventions. But some troops enjoyed the event so much they took pictures that survive to this day.

Despite the findings of Army doctors, the U.S. built a "gas chamber" for tourists at Dachau after the War, where none ever existed before.

Oddly, they undertook this needless and false propaganda onslaught \_after\_ the Germans were

beaten. Why? Blood lust?

The U.S Government and its allies then imposed a constitution on West Germany that prevented any German guard who served at one of the camps from coming forward and denying that there were gas chambers at his camp on pain of a 5 year jail term for "Holocaust Denial."

In truth, George Bush's generation lied to itself to justify its own savagery. They still do. Whether it is the wholesale and sly destruction of African-Americans with abortion and liberal welfare schemes in our ghettos, or the unbridled physical aggression against rural whites by Federal police, George Bush and his World War II generation have learned to ignore Government's deeds and pretend away the results of its actions.

To them, the ritual of manners and the posturing of high minded motives are all that count.

In truth, for those of us born after the War, George Bush's reappearance on the stage for one last patrician morality play is electrifying. The Ole Ygg finds himself scurrying around to find the misplaced reply envelope from NRA-ILA. Time for another 200 bucks to the boys in DC with a pair of eyes who can shoot straight!

Time for 'Ole Ygg to fax his Congressman yet again about the future mission of OSI once all the German prison guards that U.S. troops did not murder finally die off. If you think that BATF is dangerous, just wait till OSI finds a new mission!

Time for 'Ole Ygg to send a cool thou to IHR so that there will be at least one non-liberal institution that can be trusted to preserve the story of Western Civilization.

Time for 'Ole Ygg to find that misplaced reply envelope for the Buchanan campaign. Dole has a bad dose of George Bush's disease.

Its the vision thing - World War II destroyed it!

Yggdrasil-

-----  
May 11, 1995 Los Angeles Times p. A8

Bush Resigns NRA Membership in Protest

Lobbyists: Ex-President says he is 'outraged' by group's fund-raising letter labeling federal agents as 'jackbooted thugs.'

By ROBERT SHOGAN  
TIMES POLITICAL WRITER

WASHINGTON--Former President George Bush has quit the National Rifle Assn. to protest a fund-raising letter sent out by the organization that labeled federal agents as "jackbooted thugs" and could roil the waters of the Republican presidential race. Bush described himself as "outraged" by the organization's failure to repudiate the letter, which points up the NRA's vulnerability in the wake of the bombing of the Oklahoma City federal building. In a letter to NRA President Thomas Washington dated May 3 and made available by his office in Houston, the former GOP chief executive added: "To attack Secret Service agents or ATF [Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms] people or any government law enforcement people as 'wearing Nazi bucket helmets and black storm trooper uniforms' wanting to 'attack law-abiding citizens' is a vicious slander on good people."

Bush was particularly irate because Wayne LaPierre, the NRA's chief lobbyist, defended the attack contained in the letter even after the Oklahoma City bombing. Asked if his language was excessive in view of the tragedy, LaPierre said "That's like saying the weather report in Florida on the hurricane caused the damage rather than the hurricane." In response to Bush's protest, the NRA released a letter from its president, Washington, to Bush, urging the former President to reconsider his resignation.

The letter claimed that the gist of the NRA's attacks would be supported by further inquiry and complained that Bush had not sought a private explanation before making his resignation letter public. "Such a course of action, I believe, would have better served the country than what now will become a public disagreement that can only lead to more polarization in these troubled times," the NRA said.

\* \* \*

In his letter to the NRA, Bush pointed out that Al Whicher, who served on his Secret Service detail when he was in the White House, was killed in Oklahoma City.

"He was no Nazi," Bush wrote. "He was a kind man, a loving parent, a man dedicated to serving his country."

Bush also recalled that he had attended the wake for ATF Agent Steve Willis, who was slain in the Feb. 23, 1993, shootout with members of the Branch Davidian cult near Waco, Tex. "I can assure you that this honorable man, killed by weird cultists, was no Nazi," Bush wrote.

For his part, Washington wrote Bush that the "NRA never intended for its words to offend your

sense of decency and honor or your concept of service to country." He added "I firmly believe that after a thorough congressional examination of BATF, you will agree that our words have been more truth than slander. I believe you will judge, too, much of what BATF had done to be inexcusable and deserving of your personal repudiation."

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

# YGGDRASIL

## Those Hopeless Republicans

Now let's see.

What are the big issues that stir the public imagination?

We have California's prop 187, with its restrictions on welfare for illegal immigrants.

We have the California Civil Rights Initiative outlawing race preferences in affirmative action.

Prop 187 passed by an overwhelming margin in the state with the highest percentage of immigrants. The CCR will pass by an overwhelming margin too.

So, what do our Congressional Republicans worry about?

They obsess about the deficit. Whether deficits are good or bad depends on what you spend the money on and what return you get. If you borrow to invest in ports, highways and facilities that produce a high rate of return, then deficits are not necessarily bad. On the other hand, if you borrow to pay welfare benefits and entitlements, then deficit spending clearly becomes part of the racially motivated attack on the majority.

The problem with the Republicans is that they refuse to talk about the real issue. If they are worried about the share of the federal budget used to fund the minority attack, they should say so!

After all, Whites comprise 73.5% of the population. Why pussy-foot around?

You have Steve Forbes running around advocating unrestricted immigration to drive down wages. He wants low taxes on capital fleeing the country to create jobs in the third world. You have to concede points to Forbes for brazenness. Never has a politician whacked his constituents on the snout harder and expected them to enjoy it.

Then you have Dole and Alexander forever hoping that the minority racial attack on the majority can be stilled with a sufficient amount of economic growth. Apparently Republicans over the age of 50 are congenitally incapable of figuring out that the minority drive for equality can never be satisfied, because the real objective is superiority and dominance. They will never

be bought off by mere equality nor economic growth.

Let's clear the air:

The Republicans are dealing with an absolute numerical majority. They can sacrifice about 25 to 30% of that majority and still win without any help from minorities. There is absolutely zero chance that significant numbers of minority voters will ever split away from the minority coalition and vote Republican.

No matter how polite the Republicans are to the minorities, and no matter what they promise, the minorities will never abandon their deep seated racial animus and vote Republican. Given this reality, why do Republicans allow worries about minority reactions to slow down their drive to represent the majority?

Why do Republicans always seem to believe that minority votes are better than majority votes?

Why can't Republicans count?

Given the numbers, you can readily see that we are dealing with deep seated irrational behavior here.

We are dealing once again with status fears.

The ugly truth is that the Euro-American upper middle class is frightened to death of being identified with the working class White. The typical Republican politician simply cannot comprehend how he could save face among his friends if he were ever caught appealing to and identifying with the interests of working class Whites. The problem is that if you forcefully and emotionally advocate their interests, the upper middle class is going to assume that you are one of them. It involves a personal cost that most Republican politicians are unwilling to pay.

The consequence is that Republicans would rather lose elections.

These status fears are the true source of black and brown minority power in the U.S.

A sensible question is "Where do these powerful status fears come from?"

The answer is simple. They come from that oldest of multi-racial empires - Great Britain.

Britain is an amalgamation of racially similar tribes, the Celts, the Angles and Saxons, the Picts (danish invaders) and the Normans each of whom arrived at different times and struggled for dominance.

These tribes fought extensively until approximately the 1600's .

Since then, the explicit ethnic dimension of the conflict has dissipated and has been replaced by a very explicit and crippling class and status consciousness.

If Britain's example is the best that can be hoped for over the long term from ethnic and racial integration, then integrationism must be judged a failure. The status conscious behavior of the upper classes and their middle class wannabes have produced a nation that cannot even honestly discuss its problems, much less unite to defend its own interests. It is a nation that cannot allow itself to be successful for fear that the "wrong people" might benefit.

And indeed, even if racial defense requires that the upper class elites rally the working class majority, it won't happen because of the status costs to the upper class as individuals if they participate. To reaffirm their status rankings, the upper classes must visibly defend black and brown immigration and generally sacrifice the interests of their own kind.

Fortunately, this status consciousness is unique to Britain and its former dominions, the U.S., Canada and Australia.

The social phenomenon does not exist in the same way in Continental Europe. As a girlfriend said 30 years ago to me in Berlin, "The one good thing about the Third Reich was that all Germans were equal!"

The bad thing about the Third Reich was that so many Germans ended up dead.

But in any event, we have Dole, Forbes and Alexander, Anglo- Saxons all, suffering from the English disease of status insecurity. Somehow, down deep, they feel that they cannot vigorously represent the average working class Euro-American without being mistaken for one. Such an indignity! And indeed, for this type of Republican, minority votes are much more comfortable and comforting than majority votes.

It is only Mr. Buchanan, of Irish extraction, who seems largely free of the disease.

For my comrades on this newsgroup, let me suggest an extended campaign of therapy. When you spot a Republican politician nervously skirting his natural constituency and fleeing the real issues for neutral sounding abstractions like the "flat tax" and the "deficit," scold him with a fax.

Be sure to get explicit. Ask whether he is just a "country club Republican who would rather lose elections that be identified with the interests and destiny of the average Euro-American".

Tell him to get real! After all, these are the Nineties!

Gradually, their behavior will change.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## The Cult of Economics

Curious that in this 1996 primary election campaign the Republicans are all frantically talking up the elixir of economic growth, as if it could keep all of our problems tucked safely under the rug.

Truth is, America's most severe problems have little or nothing to do with economic growth.

We have white illegitimacy rates that have grown from 1.5% in 1950 to 22% in 1992. In the same time period, black illegitimacy rates have climbed from 6% to 60%.

The United States is well on its way to third world status with unrestrained illegal immigration and the creation of small, culturally isolated nations within our borders.

We have a society in which different races see events so differently that communication has become difficult. Indeed, it is impossible for police to pacify our urban ghettos because ghetto juries acquit 75% of the defendants charged with carrying a concealed weapon. The criminal justice system has effectively ceased to function in the black and brown areas of this country because of race-based jury nullification. Police no longer bother to make arrests for many types of criminal behavior. Indeed, the black, brown and talmudic populations of this country have become so hostile toward Euro-Americans that they suspect racism at every turn. Their perception of the degree of racism among the Euro-American majority is so plainly at odds with what Euro-Americans actually see and hear among their own kind in everyday life, that the reservoir of good will that has kept this country together is rapidly being depleted.

Another 1% per year increase in GDP will not put Humpty-Dumpty back together again.

Ironically, the stubborn resistance of Republican candidates (with the partial exception of Buchanan) to address these problems confirms their seriousness. The Republicans know that to discuss these problems in public is to risk wholesale shifts in existing political power relationships. Ideas that might produce such shifts are labeled "extreme" and "divisive".

Most would rather bury their heads in the sand and hope that an additional 1% annual GDP growth will heal this multi-racial empire's wounds. It won't!

While we get lots of libertarian prescriptions such as a "flat tax" "deficit reduction" and "less government," each such palliative is premised on the notion that blacks and browns lose the

hatreds that they embraced so wholeheartedly in their countries of origin upon contact with American soil and became "new socialist man" motivated only by economic concerns and utterly devoid of racial consciousness.

And that is the problem with the entire Republican campaign. The fundamental and unspoken premise of their "free market" prescriptions is that Americans have already been transformed by socialism and bolshevism into creatures that have never before existed on this planet.

In short, their prescriptions are insincere and they know it.

Capitalism, private ownership of property, and free markets are the sacred tools by which Western Civilization has attained preeminence. The entire world can adopt Western Capitalism (as Jack Kemp suggests it is doing) but racial conflict will escalate, not subside, as more of the world's peoples acquire the means to strike at their racial enemies. Just because the peoples of the world have discovered capitalism does not mean that they have discovered restraint and respect.

In the United States the most strident racists are the angry minorities within our wealthy elites, not among the rural poor.

As Don Black once said: "Limited government is a 'white' thing." Even if cutting back on government can produce an additional 1% per year GDP growth, it will not stop the relentless attack by blacks and browns on Western Civilization in America.

To halt the attack, we need to insist publicly that all manifestations of it stop. If we do it now, the task can be accomplished without violence.

If we wait 20 years, all bets are off.

I fear the Republicans aren't up to the task. They would rather fiddle with the deficit and play "let's pretend".

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Fear of "Divisiveness"

In many posts on this newsgroup, the white nationalist participants voice dismay at the tendency of the European- American middle class to bury its head and play "lets pretend" on racial issues.

As a method of social and political organization, the Multi- racial empire has been found wanting. Placing different races or ethnic groups under a single government provokes conflict.

Search as you may throughout the world, you cannot find a single example that works.

As for our integrationist myths, we speak constantly of the racial oppression in America of black and brown, and yet people of color are clamoring by the millions to gain entry into this land where they will be "oppressed." We speak constantly of "exploitation" of black and brown, but when you trace the money flows, it becomes clear and obvious that the name of the "integrationist game" is extorting money from the Euro-American middle class in exchange for racial peace.

After all, that is where the money is!

So then, why can't the Euro-American middle class see the truth?

Why the intense need to believe lies?

To find the clues, we must take another of Yggdrasil's lessons in careful reading.

Here is a quote from Ben Wattenberg, a "new-Democrat" political analyst speaking about the poll results on American attitudes. In the article (Nov. 13, 1995 WSJ p A14), he is arguing that the American voter is more concerned about moral decay than about economic policies. He says:

"Thinking about the Reagan presidency also calls attention to the fact that a call to restore virtues can be achieved only so long as the national father figure is not a divisive and abrasive one...The great majority of Americans who sense a moral crisis includes millions who are moderate, centrist people; millions who are sometimes religious, but not strongly so; and millions who fear divisiveness and polarization."

Just so!

Much of our Euro-American middle class fears divisiveness and polarization.

They fear it because it has the potential to interfere with their creature comforts and their security. They fear divisiveness because they fear its latent potential for open conflict.

On other levels, they fear divisiveness because conflict places a premium on skills seldom valued in a civil society. Conflict has the potential to rearrange existing status rankings within society as salesmanship skills, the passive-aggressive skills of corporate staffers, and the manipulative skills of top managers take a back seat to the skills of the hunter and the watchful guard.

At the top corporate level, there is a significant (but fading) fear that divisiveness might narrow markets and cripple the political institutions that pass out subsidies and insulate big businesses from competition.

Having to deal with several new and uncertain governments will, at a minimum, increase costs, and in the worst case (from the corporate perspective) eliminate existing barriers to entry and competition.

All threatening prospects indeed!

But as with most powerfully irrational social responses, fear of divisiveness among the Euro-American middle class has a second face. There is reverse side to this coin.

If the fear of divisiveness is so great as to prompt the middle class to ignore the obvious and readily observable realities of our everyday lives, then that fear is also powerful enough to motivate the Euro-American middle class to repel the actual threat.

The Euro-American middle class has its comfortable enclaves in suburbia that are (or were, until recently) untouched by the raw inter-racial contact that occurs at the edges of our urban ghettos. As long as the Euro-American middle class has the income to escape these combat zones, they are men of "good will" and "compassion" comfortable with the notion that it is only the "white trash" who are having the hell beat out of them at the peripheries of our urban ghettos, and quite content with ineffective government experiments to foster "understanding" and "tolerance."

The first fear that the Euro-American middle class feels is the threat that "divisiveness" might cause the urban combat zones to expand and spread to suburbia (as they are now in Southern California) and that they might suddenly have to share the "costs" of the beatings and crime they were heretofore able to escape.

But the second and more fundamental fear is that "divisiveness" might call forth "demagogues"



willing to awaken the Euro-American underclass to the simple notion that as citizens of the American nation, they have the right to demand from their more prosperous racial brothers some minimal commitment to a vision of unity and national purpose that includes them and protects them as equals from racial attack.

The point for all white nationalists to ponder is this: - Once you understand the fears of the Euro-American middle class, you have the tools to change their attitudes. And that change can be swift and powerful.

The fear of divisiveness is unstable. It depends for its continued existence on a calculation that escape from the racial maelstrom is possible. As that calculation begins to wither under accumulating contrary evidence from our everyday lives, attitudes among this Euro-American middle class will change.

Once it becomes clear to the Euro-American middle class that there is no escape, then feelings of racial unity and racial defense against the onslaught will be natural. The consequence and the changes it will bring about will be powerful and enduring.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## STATUS YEARNINGS

In a recent post entitled "fear of divisiveness", I argued that the Euro-American middle class is unwilling to confront race issues because of the existence of suburbs and the easy avenue of escape suburbs afford from the brutality at the edges of our urban ghettos.

But the embarrassing truth is that the Euro-American middle class is enslaved not so much by fear of violence as by its concerns about status and social class. As long as most middle class Euro-Americans feel that they are a majority and that members of their race control our society, they fear more for their status within the majority group than for their security from attack from outside it.

The distinction between blacks and browns and our Euro-American middle class is obvious. You can easily see the difference. There is no reason for a middle class European-American to strain to differentiate himself from African-Americans or Mexican-Americans. That differentiation is easy. He looks different.

In truth, the typical member of the Euro-American middle class is far more fearful of being mistaken for a low status Euro-American. After all, they look the same. Therefore, it takes a great deal more effort to maintain one's social distance from poor Euro-Americans than from blacks or browns. And because it takes more effort, the Euro-American middle class is very insecure about behavior or ideas that might cause others to mistake them for poor Euro-Americans.

In multi-racial empires, there is a natural tendency for majority elites to distance themselves from notions of racial solidarity. To distance yourself from your own majority race shows that you do not compete with racial minorities, and that you have more status than those within your own racial group who do.

And in all societies fortunate enough to have a middle class, it is natural for that middle class to ape the attitudes and mores of the elite.

Since compassion and magnanimity toward minorities are the hallmarks of noble breeding, those of high education but low economic status will feel pressure to ape the sentiments of the elites to compensate for their lack of economic success.

Racial minorities instantly understand these status yearnings within the majority. After all, their

survival in an alien land demands that they read these signals correctly.

Minorities need only encourage these impulses. They need not invent or artificially induce them. And, of course, racial minorities will exploit these impulses for their own benefit.

In a democracy, once the idea of racial solidarity is identified with low socio-economic status, the majority is rendered helpless. Its status-conscious elite, dependent upon the minorities for votes, will never protect the interests of its own race as long as they are in a clear and dominant majority.

And there, of course, is the rub!

European Americans are fast slipping from their majority status in the United States. As that happens, certain social and political dynamics will inevitably take hold to force the European-American elites to change.

With non-European groups growing as a percent of the total, the political pressure for favors and preferences will grow as well. At some point, these demands begin to directly impact a significant fraction of the Euro-American middle class. The Euro-American elites simply cannot satisfy these demands without losing the support of that middle class.

It is only because minorities (by definition) need the votes of a portion of the Euro-American middle class that minorities support white elite politicians. When the white elites no longer command the respect of a large fraction of their own kind, they become worthless to the non-European races. Minorities would as soon install their fellow blacks and browns in positions of power.

Our white integrationist elites suffer from the delusion that the blacks and browns will need their brain power long after European-Americans become a minority. But as the absolute numbers of blacks and browns increase, their demand for power and control will go far beyond mere quotas and preferences to direct replacement of the white elites themselves. Ultimately, the myth of "American exceptionalism" will collapse as those elites discover that the Americans of color could give a fig about their intelligence or their ability to keep the trains running. Competing ethnic groups the world over have demonstrated time and again that they would rather be ruled by butchers and incompetents of their own race than by effective administrators of another. It will be no different here in America.

In practice, clear self-interest will cause the scales to fall from the eyes of many in our white elites. However, the conversion will be slowed by the status yearnings of this class and its deep revulsion toward the culture and mores of poor European-Americans, whom they most fear.

Bad attitudes about the middle class ("white bread"), and the poor ("trailer parks", "racist bigots" and "fundamentalist fanatics") will not be conducive to attaining leadership positions once the white elites are expelled by their favored blacks and browns from their integrated dreamlands back into the separatist homelands of reality. So it is predictable that many will flee rather than admit to equality or any identity of interest with the European-Americans they detest. Among some, the revulsion toward poor and middle class Euro-America is so great that they would prefer to "make a statement" and submit to the butchery and tyranny of another race rather than return to the centuries-old freedoms nurtured by their racial kinsmen.

Long after the European-American poor and middle classes understand what needs to be done, a large fraction of our elites will resist. This is the exclusive factor which is likely to make the de-jure splitting of a de-facto balkanized America very messy.

In any event, the important lesson in all this for you in the Movement is that once you understand the status concerns of middle class, it becomes easy to address those concerns.

One unintended tactical benefit of the dumbing-down of our educational system and culture is that few in the middle class associate low status with abstract concepts. Rather, they associate low status only with specific words and slogans.

It takes billions of dollars of investment and years of propaganda before the mass-media can associate a new set of words and phrases with low status European-Americans. It is relatively easy for you to maneuver within this slow strategic cycle created by our mass media and the dumbed-down culture it has produced.

Use it to your advantage! Avoid those stereotyped phrases and words, and the status threat to the middle class audience is removed. They will listen intently to your concepts as long as they are unaccompanied by ignorant sounding slogans.

The establishment will be left with its feeble efforts to silence you. They dare not debate the merits. They dare not argue openly that multi-racial empires are conducive to peace. They dare not begin a debate over the proposition, inherent in all integrationist mythology, that blacks and browns lose that predisposition toward racial hatred and aggression that they exhibit everywhere else in the world once on North American or European soil.

They cannot afford to address publicly that ultimate question of how much European-Americans must give up to buy racial peace.

So exploit their weaknesses! Explain reality but avoid the words and phrases that provoke status fears.

Stop talking about "loving your own race" when accused of hating other races. Talk instead about the inevitability of conflict within multi-racial empires irrespective of the races involved, and talk about the obvious economic motives for their creation - the manipulation of the most numerous and productive.

Stop talking about the achievements of the white race, and focus on the demands of blacks and browns.

Stop talking about genetic differences and focus instead on practical ways of preventing conflict and reducing costs.

And for god's sake, stop using the "n" word.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Colin Powell - Subsidy Sucker!

Ever wonder whether the Republican Party has any integrity?

According to the excerpt from the Wall Street Journal article quoted below, Colin Powell is a well-to-do black man who takes advantage of race-based tax preferences.

Now just exactly how does his conduct reflect Conservative or Republican principles?

How is the White portion of the population supposed to react to this blatant profiteering off skin color?

Is this the mark of a man who understands "fairness"? Is this the mark of a man who believes in a "color blind" laws for a "color blind" society?

Or is Powell just another establishment Pol who's function is to preserve the status quo by shaming Whites into accepting the disadvantages of affirmative action programs, contract set-asides, governmental race preferences?

Is Bob Dole a whore for even considering this man?

Yggdrasil-

-----  
Nov. 8, 1995 Wall Street Journal p A18

Tax Breaks for Being Black

BY GREG FORSTER

Other than name recognition, O.J. Simpson and Colin Powell don't appear, at first glance, to have much in common. But in the eyes of the federal government, both of them are "economically disadvantaged" and in need of special government help, which is exactly what they got.

According to CNN, in 1985 a group of black investors that included Mr. Simpson and Mr. Powell bought a television station in Buffalo, N.Y., and benefitted from a federal minority preference program that gave them a tax break to buy the station. They sold it in April of this year at a healthy profit. A man who can afford to hire a small army of the nation's elite defense attorneys and a national war hero millions of Americans would like to elect president were the federal government's idea of "economically disadvantaged." The investors also included basketball stars Patrick Ewing and Julius Erving, actor Mr. T, and several members of Michael Jackson's family. All of them got a tax break for being black. It shouldn't come as a surprise. Many of the federal government's racial preference programs assume that all minority owned businesses are underfinanced and disadvantaged, although that's clearly not the case. The track record of the Federal Communications Commission on racial preference programs is a virtual textbook on how such programs primarily benefit people and companies that don't need the help. In one case, then-mayor of Charlotte, N.C., Harvey Gantt, who is black, and his partners bought a television license from the FCC under a minority- Preference bidding system. They then sold the license to whites four months later, and Mr. Gantt pocketed a \$3 million profit. More largesse for the "economically disadvantaged.

\* \* \*

Preference programs Currently provide special treatment and give away truckloads of tax dollars to countless "disadvantaged" celebrities, millionaires and businesses that are perfectly capable of competing with other companies--and most of these minority millionaire bonanza programs aren't being re-evaluated. Since the Clinton administration is determined to protect the status quo, it may well take a lawsuit for each and every program to force any real change.

\* \* \*

Mr. Forster is a policy analyst at the Center for Equal Opportunity in Washington.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Powell, O.J. & the Middle Class**

An article from the Nov. 8, 1995 Wall Street Journal, p A18, entitled "Tax Breaks for Being Black," states that:

"Other than name recognition, O.J. Simpson and Colin Powell don't appear, at first glance, to have much in common. But in the eyes of the federal government, both of them are "economically disadvantaged" and in need of special government help, which is exactly what they got.

"According to CNN, in 1985 a group of black investors that included Mr. Simpson and Mr. Powell bought a television station in Buffalo, N.Y., and benefitted from a federal minority preference program that gave them a tax break to buy the station."

The truth is that Colin Powell and O.J. have much more in common than just name recognition and race preferred investments.

Both have actively and successfully projected and exploited the image of the "friendly negro." It is an image that the White middle class desperately wants to believe.

That is why the March 19, 1996 edition of the Los Angeles Times, p 1, states:

"Despite his rising popularity and early advantage over Dole, however, Clinton is not the most popular political figure to Californians. That honor goes, here as elsewhere, to retired Gen. Colin Powell, who remains the object of unrequited political lust. Two thirds of the voters here have a favorable impression of the retired military man..."

The truth is that the White middle class is frightened to death of blacks and the "race problem." They want their gentle black hero, Colin Powell, to use his image and influence with blacks to make the problem go away.

More than anything else, the White middle class wants to be comforted that the "race problem" is manageable. To the White Middle class, the Colin Powells, O.J.s and Magic Johnson's hold out hope. Hope for an escape from their intense fears.

The White middle class is aware of the black family breakdown, illegitimacy rates of 60%, horrendous crime rates in our urban centers, and (thanks to O.J.) widespread, race-based jury



nullification that makes it impossible for our present legal system to ensure safety. The White middle class is also aware of the "war" being waged against it.

The Sydney Morning Herald (Australia) "THE RACE WAR OF BLACK AGAINST WHITE"  
by Paul Sheehan. Saturday, 20 May 1995:

"The longest war America has ever fought is the Dirty War, and it is not over. It has lasted 30 years so far and claimed more than 25 million victims. It has cost almost as many lives as the Vietnam War. "It determined the result of last year's congressional election. Yet the American news media do not want to talk about the Dirty War, which remains between the lines and unreported. In fact, to even suggest that the war exists is to be discredited. So let's start suggesting, immediately.

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

"Nearly all the following figures, which speak for themselves, have not been reported in America:

\* \* \*

"\* Almost 1 million white Americans were murdered, robbed, assaulted or raped by black Americans in 1992, compared with about 132,000 blacks who were murdered, robbed, assaulted or raped by whites, according to the same survey.

"\* Blacks thus committed 7.5 times more violent inter-racial crimes than whites even though the black population is only one-seventh the size of the white population. When these figures are adjusted on a per capita basis, they reveal an extraordinary disparity: blacks are committing more than 50 times the number of violent racial crimes of whites.

"\* According to the latest annual report on murder by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, most inter-racial murders involve black assailants and white victims, with blacks murdering whites at 18 times the rate that whites murder blacks.

"These breathtaking disparities began to emerge in the mid-1960's, when there was a sharp increase in black crime against whites, an upsurge which, not coincidentally, corresponds exactly with the beginning of the modern civil rights movement.

"Over time, the cumulative effect has been staggering. Justice Department and FBI

statistics indicate that between 1964 and 1994 more than 25 million violent inter-racial crimes were committed, overwhelmingly involving black offenders and white victims, and more than 45,000 people were killed in inter-racial murders. By comparisons 58,000 Americans died in Vietnam, and 34,000 were killed in the Korean war.

"When non-violent crimes (burglary, larceny, car theft and personal theft) are included, the cumulative totals become prodigious. The Bureau of Justice Statistics says 27 million non-violent crimes were committed in the US in 1992, and the survey found that 31 per cent of the robberies involved black offenders and white victims (while only 2 per cent in the reverse).

"When all the crime figures are calculated, it appears that black Americans have committed at least 170 million crimes against white Americans in the past 30 years. It is the great defining disaster of American life and American ideals since World War II.

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

The problem is that your degree of exposure to the above carnage depends on the quality of your real estate. With few exceptions, the above assaults take place in a narrow band in and around our urban combat zones.

Middle class whites who can afford homes in distant suburbs escape most of the impact, but still experience the fear. Those who live at the margins of our urban centers bear the brunt.

Thus, much of middle class white America is content to let the problem continue.

What the suburban middle class wants is a quick fix to the problem. They are not into difficult solutions, like pulling the plug on aid to dependent children and then forcibly containing the riots.

Nor are they into expensive solutions. They do not want to increase the tribute they must pay to blacks in the form of welfare to keep them quiet.

What they want is a quick fix through image and advertising. Like the infamous "Dare" and "project self esteem" campaigns, they hope that a "role model" like Colin Powell can somehow transform the dangerous and fearsome black population into something more like themselves.

But most of all, they want to keep the problem and their fears under wraps and out of the public view.

They think that if they can just find enough non-threatening "gentle negroes" among our sports stars and politicians, the black population will mimic their public behavior and become passive.

But the black masses are not fooled by the "gentle negro" figures so comforting to Whites. There are limits to the power of "image" and advertising.

In truth, the situation is quite unstable. If the race problem degenerates further, White middle class fears can quickly turn to anger and aggression.

Hollywood allows only two images of aggressive masculinity. One is the black male. The second, curiously, is the blond SS Officer.

The images of our popular culture cut two ways. If pressed, the White middle class has been well schooled by Hollywood in the behavior and manners that spell quick relief from this crisis.

But a sudden change would be uncomfortable for our middle class. First, their consumption patterns have been dictated by their flight from the race problem for the past thirty years. If the urban combat zones are pacified, the suburban housing they own becomes relatively less attractive. Second, because the talents required to pacify our urban combat zones are not found in profusion among our high-status occupations, such a solution implies an enormous shift of power in our society from one class of Whites to another.

But by clinging to its dream of the clever "quick fix" by manipulating popular images, White middle-class America is ensuring that a measured and peaceful political response to the problem is much less likely.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## **Brown Hatred in 'Aztlan'**

Here is another example of brown hatred for Whites reported by "American Renaissance" magazine.

Note that it is the minority elites - the college educated and the college students - that are the most hate-filled. (No surprise to regular readers of this newsgroup!)

The greater the quota preferences, the more intense the resentment!

The greater the subsidy and the greater the Euro-American obedience to speech and harassment codes, the more Euro-Americans are reviled!

Whites cannot bend over backward far enough to save their mythic integrationist religion and their tottering multi-racial empire.

Yggdrasil-

\* \* \* \* \*

American Renaissance Vol.6, No.9 - September 1995

What They Are Saying Now

Voz Fronteriza is one of several irredentist, anti-white publications supported by California taxpayers. On its masthead, it calls itself "a quarterly Chicano Mexicano student publication founded in 1975 . . . recognized as an official campus print media [sic] by the Associated Student Media Board of U.C. San Diego." This is the lead of a typical article:

"In August of 1996, a large gathering of the most racist/fascist European settlers will take place in San Diego, Ca. The objective of this gathering is to consolidate and develop a program which will further erode the democratic rights of the majority of the people in occupied America (United States) and hold steady the present U.S. socio-political policy leading to the genocide and deportation of the Mexicano, African, and other oppressed people."

The anticipated "gathering" is the Republican National Convention. The article goes on to

explain that "the right-wing plans of GOP pigs such as [Pete] Wilson, Gingrich, Helms, Buchannon [sic], etc. are genocidal, pure and simple."

Articles routinely refer either to "the 'so-called' border between Aztlan and Mexico" or use the Spanish expression 'la Frontera Falsa'. They call Mexicans la raza, "the race," or our gente, "our people." The Mex-American nation of Aztlan is to be won through "armed struggle."

The centerfold of each issue is to something called "Definitions and Descriptions of Oppression," a kind of catechism of anti-white nationalism, which includes definitions like this: "Race is an arbitrary sociobiological category created by Europeans (white men) in the 15th century and used to assign human worth and social status with themselves as the model of humanity, with the purpose of establishing white skin access to sources of power."

Likewise, "A racist is one who is both privileged and socialized on the basis of race by a white supremacist (racist) system. The term applies to all white people (i.e., people of European descent) living in the United States ...." Naturally, "people of color cannot be racists."

On the back page is a Poesia section, in which young Chicanos vent righteous rage in blank verse. A recent issue offered two works, one called "Stupid American" and the other, "What the hell are you looking at, old white man?" both every bit as bad as they sound.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Lying by the Numbers

In a series of posts on this newsgroup, I have argued that the essence of "White Nationalism" is defense against an establishment seeking not only to destroy our racial identity, but to extract the most money from middle class Euro-America.

After all, that is where the money is!

If your objective is wealth and power, you are going to screw the 75% who earn 80% of this nation's income. You are not going to content yourself with a mere 25% of the population which earns a lesser percentage of national income. Wealth and power can be attained only by looting the most productive.

Of course, screwing the majority is a delicate art requiring a thousand deceptions. After all, you can't exploit them without keeping them in the dark. They must remain (to use Bowery's term) "slave populations."

In earlier posts, we have examined this empire's myths - bland generalities such as "majorities always exploit minorities" - which end up being tools to achieve the opposite effect.

But in all of these posts, I have been more concerned with facts than abstract ideologies of race. Just exactly how does the government screw the White majority? How does it conceal the effects of its policies? Once you have examples, then Euro- Americans can construct their own ideologies, each of which will be broadly acceptable. Hopefully, they will vote (or, ultimately, secede) to protect themselves.

And this week I found another gem from Barron's Magazine.

Below is a short quotation from Jim Rogers, a famous investor from the April 22 edition of Barron's magazine, page 29.

Q: Well, when are we going to see any of this in the inflation statistics?

A: The government lies to us about prices. They said the price of heating oil is up 2.2% in the most recent report. I don't know if you heat your house with oil, but I do - and my prices were up a whole lot more than 2.2%. I called my oil man and said, "The Government says the prices are up 2.2%, how come you charged me so much?" He said,

"Buy your oil from the government then, if you really think prices are only up 2.2%." The government lies to us because they want to screw COLA recipients - keep the cost-of-living adjustments down. That helps the government in lots of ways on the expense side. And on the income side, since all the tax brackets are indexed, if you keep them from moving up, everybody has to pay higher taxes. So the government has a lot of reasons for doing it. I happen to be old enough to know that the government lies. Every government. But they do have a rationale, they say, for claiming that the price of gasoline, or cars, or whatever, hasn't gone up much. It's better, safer, cleaner, less-polluting - because of government-mandated improvements. So it must be good for us. And if its good for us, it shouldn't count as a price increase in the CPI or PPI."

In the "Roundtable" discussion in January, Jim Rogers made the same point about the CPI numbers being a lie. He noted that the government claims the cost of an automobile has increased by 187% (or a factor of 1.87 times) since 1967. However the price of a Camaro has risen 8 fold (800%) in that time frame, not 1.87 times.

In 1980 a box of cereal cost about \$1.50. Now they cost \$5 and \$6.

So why would the bureaucrats at Census and Commerce lie to you?

The immediate answer is that they are under a great deal of pressure from their political bosses to lie. As Jim Rogers notes, the political bosses want to hold down payments to the aged (who are disproportionately more White than the younger population), and to increase the tax take to enhance their ability to buy votes.

But a much more important reason for lying is shared by both the government and by Wall Street. It is the screwing of the White baby boomers.

In 1972, housing prices began to rise as the lead edge of the baby boom hit their mid-20s (1972-1945 = 27). Housing prices peaked in 1986-1987 in most parts of the country (but not until 1989 in California).

In 1982, as the baby boom hit their mid-30s and started saving for retirement, the stock and bond markets embarked on historic rallies. If housing is any guide, these markets will peak sometime between 1996 and 1999.

Beginning in the year 2005, the lead edge of the baby boom will hit age 60 and begin withdrawing the moneys they have saved. We will enter a 30 year bear market in stocks and bonds (unless the Chinese become enamored of our markets).

But no politicians or investment professionals on Wall Street care about the year 2005. The

government has \$200 billion in bonds to sell every year, and Wall Street earns a hefty 1% of the trillions in financial assets that the baby boom has blissfully accumulated over the last 14 years.

As we speak, the boomers are pouring \$5 billion per week into mutual funds.

And both Wall Street and the Government desperately want the baby boomers to continue investing. They want them feeling secure about the economy. Rosie Scenario rules!

With the dividend yield on the S&P 500 at 2.2% and the long treasury bond yielding a mere 6.8%, it is comforting to know that "inflation" is running only 2.7%.

If the public were to realize that real consumer inflation is now running at more like 6 or 7%, they would not be so likely to invest in financial assets.

This is the first runaway bull market in history that has been so heavily dependent on propaganda.

The smart money on Wall Street is feeding off the baby boom - selling them pieces of paper at record highs and collecting hefty management fees on the financial asset inflation the boomers have created. To keep the con going, they are feeding them propaganda about low inflation.

The government goes along with the gag and gins up the phony numbers because they have to sell \$200 billion of new bonds every year.

Here is what will happen.

Millions of older boomers have large 401(k) accounts of up to \$500,000. But to make money for retirement you ultimately have to convert those mutual funds to cash. Only a small number of early birds will succeed.

The vast majority will see their accounts melt away in that 30 year long bear market.

The value of all American stocks is about 6 trillion. But this does not mean that you could sell all the stocks and collect 6 trillion. Once even modest levels of net selling begin, prices drop dramatically so that stocks will not have a value of anything like 6 trillion. The amount of cash the baby boom can withdraw from the markets is considerably less than 6 trillion.

Our stock market has such a value only for the early birds who get out in time. Wall street knows this, the actuarial firms know this, and so do the government statisticians.

Once the retirements start, our stocks will have to fall in price to a point where dividend yield



compensates new buyers for the fact that prices will be dead in the water during the decades of retirement selling. "Dead money" is the bane of all investors.

The significance of the inflation lie is that dividend yields need only rise to 5.7% to provide a "real yield" of 3% if inflation is only 2.7%.

But if inflation is actually 7%, then the yield on the S&P will have to go to 10% or 12% for stocks to find willing holders.

Take the Dow or the S&P and divide by 5 folks. That is how far stocks must fall to get us to 12% dividends.

Most of the baby boom is going to have their retirement taken away from them.

At this point, the trailer parks will proliferate and a large sector of the glass tower elite is going to become dependent on Social Security and will rub elbows with the real America. Social Security, itself imperiled by these same demographics, will become much more important.

The politicians will claim that new immigration is needed to pay Social Security taxes. However, there is no way the new immigrants are going to pay for aging whites. Blacks and browns have been sensitized by "multiculturalism." They have quotas, preferences and subsidies. They don't pay! They collect!

The blacks and browns we will be asking to support us are racially aware. There is no way they are going to volunteer to take the place of the Whites now on ZOG's treadmill.

In fact, the lack of racial awareness of most American Whites is a resource for the exploiters that is unlikely to be duplicated anywhere in the World ever again. It will prove to be unique in history.

For you lurkers on this group, much of the demographic information is what Wall Street calls "background." It does not tell you when our markets will peak.

However, there are two trends in the foreground that make it prudent for me to mention this to you now.

First, commodities have been rising for about three years now. As is typical of a new trend, in these early years the rise was fitful and it was difficult to make money. That is changing. Since the January 1993 low, you would have earned about 8% compounded in silver. This yield is about to increase.

Second, interest rates have started to rise. Ultimately, stocks buckle under the pressure of rising rates and rising commodity prices.

The point is that you now have alternative investments in commodities, hard assets (but not trade-up housing) and short term debt. Look for the rare coins of Canada and Australia (both commodity producing countries) to perform spectacularly over the long run.

It is critical that you White Nationalists protect yourselves and your 401(k) balances. Don't be the last out the door.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## The Running of The Tide

From time to time I get into debates with young White Nationalists about the proper role of anger in our movement. Often, I argue that White Nationalism is inevitable and anger irrelevant.

Its exact shape is far from inevitable, but movement toward explicit race-conscious political organization of America is well underway. It just isn't that visible yet to young White males.

As I was cleaning up from a recent move, I stumbled upon a classic 1979 Wall Street Journal Article written by Ray Vicker.

For years following 1972 (the year I first subscribed to the Journal) column 3 on page 1 had daily short summaries of the armed conflicts de jour from around the World. Always, one party would be described as "leftist guerrillas" and the other party as "rightists."

Back then, the news was always interpreted in light of the struggle between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

But around the time the article below appeared, something began to change, much as Don Quixote's perception of his love, Dulcinea, evolves from "doncella" (lady) into "puti-doncella" (whore-lady). Dulcinea was, of course, a prostitute by profession from the beginning.

To my young hot-head friends, I would suggest that the article below is extraordinarily important for assessing the probability of a geographic and political expression of White Nationalism here in the soon-to-be former U.S.

In 1979, Vicker was confronted with ambiguity that prevents him from characterizing the Ayatollah and his followers as leftists.

"There is pride in a victory which is seen as a definite Islamic coup (even though left-wingers in Iran may be in the background ready to seize control should Islamic leaders falter)."

But then, if these Shiites were not fighting for ideological reasons (leftism) then why were they fighting?

A Shiite businessman tells the author exactly what sentiments are behind the Shiite revolution in Iran with an analogy that an American of that period could not possibly fail to grasp.

"Don't misinterpret developments here, though. Right now the demonstrations you have been watching are more a sign of pride in Islam rather than an expression of newly aroused religious feeling. Maybe the arousal will come later. Now it is the same pride American blacks had when they realized they didn't have to hang their heads in shame for some imagined weakness in their character."

In other words, it is a racial-nationalist thing.

But notice Vicker's sensitivity to the middle class sensibilities of his readers. He does not come right out and say that this rebellion was motivated by racial feeling. Rather, he just quotes the Shiite businessman to suggest this as a hypothesis.

The principle point of the story is that Shiites stir anxieties in the capitals of each Arab country into which they immigrate. Now Mr. Vicker is certainly aware that Iranians are Indo-Europeans and that Arabs are semitics. Thus, not only is there a sectarian or doctrinal religious difference, but also a significant racial difference between the Shiites and the Arab populations in the countries of their diaspora.

Vickers ignored this racial history in 1979.

The reason is simple. Socialism de-racinates conflict!

Socialism provided intellectuals and elites of the West a faith that explained conflict as arising out of economic inequality, a condition that their new "industrial revolution" could make go away. According to the socialist faith, conflict would disappear with rising prosperity.

This aspect of socialism was invented not by Jews but by the English. Every thirty years a new generation of Celts would storm out of the hills of Scotland and fight a new war with the germanic tribes to the south. Occasionally, as in the case of Cromwell's roundheads, descendants of the Danish invaders of Northern and Eastern England would rise up and fight as well. According to Palmer & Colton's "A History of the Modern World" in 1600, only about four million people in England and lowland Scotland spoke English.

In response to these horrific tribal conflicts among whites, there developed in England not so much an ideology, but a set of manners to prevent conflict. The etiquette demanded that tribal differences be ignored by all in the hopes that the wars would stop.

Similar systems of etiquette evolved in Continental Europe in response to the Hundred Years

war and the Thirty Years War. While the history books describe these wars as fights over religious dogma, the combatants were in fact different tribes of European Whites.

Indeed, blaming conflict on religious doctrine became, perhaps, the earliest universally accepted propaganda device of Western Civilization. Religions are mutable and voluntary. It is much more convenient to blame conflict on a mutable characteristic than the immutable one of ethnic origin.

Besides, ethnic or tribal identity was often expressed by religion. It is at least possible, following an ugly and destructive war, to shame people into taking their religion less seriously as a means of making them take their ethnic origins less seriously. Attacking their feelings of ethnic identity directly leads only to more bloodbaths.

Religion has been under attack in the West for 300 years as a means of weakening White tribal identities (See "No Offense: Civil Religion and Protestant Taste", by John Murray Cuddihy).

But the attacks on religion are a side-issue. Much more important is the enforced silence about ethnic identity. Our own Civil War was fought between Celtic Scots who migrated to the American South, and the newly arrived Germanic British in the industrial towns of the northeast. Yet you will look in vain for any mention of this ethnic difference in any of the newspapers, books or even private letters from soldiers of that day.

It is only the "Southrons" laboring at American Renaissance Magazine 130 years later who feel comfortable addressing this issue.

In large part, it was a breach of manners that made Hitler blunder into an unwanted fight with Britain and America in World War II. He committed the unforgivable sin of dredging up German ethnic identity (as opposed to European or White racial identity) as the organizing principle for the Third Reich. The middle classes in Britain and the U.S. were horrified. They needed no convincing.

While Hitler and his staff read Clausewitz and thought in terms of economic "national interests," they blundered into a breach of manners that offended sensibilities forged over centuries to prevent the very sort of European ethnic slaughters that Hitler was (in the minds of middle class British and American citizens) inevitably provoking.

Thus, when the British and American publics decided to fight "The Good War" they were absolutely sincere. It was inevitable not only that Hess's peace overture to Britain and similar entreaties to the U.S. to join Germany's crusade against Soviet communism would fail, but that Germany's loss of the war would plunge the West into a long winter of moralistic propaganda with constant reminders about "Holocausts" and "ultimate evils."

Give them an "A+" for engineering, but an "F" for marketing.

With Hitler out of the way, the Western press could then fall back into its comfortable pattern of seeing all conflicts as arising out of belief systems and ideologies of the "left" and "right."

Thus, in the transition piece below, the author, while coming perilously close to declaring openly what we all know to be true, reaffirms the common faith when he talks about afghanistan:

"In Afghanistan, where leftists recently scored a resounding political victory for communism, Islamic rebels are challenging that leftward swing."

Indeed, I can just picture thousands of barefoot Afghan tribesmen debating the "leftism" they learned while on their frequent summer vacations to City College of New York and Harvard!

During these same years, the Wall Street Journal faithfully described the conflict in Angola as a struggle between Savimbi's UNITA rightists and the communist MPLA. Finally, on April 14, 1993, the editor told the truth, and in a most ungentle way. The "leftists" in control were Kimbundu, while the "rightist" rebels were Ovimbundu. May not mean much to you and I, but apparently it is a matter of life and death to them.

"Mr. Savimbi spoke the values of his American supporters, while the MPLA called itself the Leninist vanguard. For the people of Angola, though, the battle was palpably one of race, ethnicity and the perquisites of control. Angola is a vast territory, and ranks near the bottom of the scale ethnologists use to measure ethnic homogeneity. Mr. Savimbi's followers, the Ovimbundu, inhabit the remote and forested provinces of south and central Angola. The Soviet sponsored MPLA was the party of Luanda's Portuguese-educated intellectuals. Though largely white or mestizo, they had their populist allies, the Kimbundu people, whose ethnic hinterland lies to the north and east of the capital. The triumph of American values abroad wasn't likely to turn these contestants into Republicans and Democrats."

So then the question becomes "what happened between 1979 and 1993?"

The answer is that Europeans the world over dropped the socialist pretense that Western prosperity would prevent conflict. The Russians got tired of supporting the ethnic republics and set them free to pay their own bills.

The liberal multiculturalists in the United States and Europe abandoned the socialist pretense of assimilation and began to encourage their non-white immigrant groups toward separation and White hating.

What happened is simply this. In the first half of the 20th Century, Europeans took the habit of refusing to recognize European ethnic and tribal differences and applied it broadly to all races on earth. They tried to be "color blind."

In the second half of the 20th Century, they abandoned that conceit for some unknown reason.

Only one conclusion is certain. Euro-Americans are no longer afraid of slaughters between and among Europeans. For the social convention to disappear, the driver behind it must have disappeared. But that is all we know for sure.

Manners are a far more important and effective means of social control than police power. Arrests, fines, penalties, licenses and permits only enrage. If police and the bureaucracy are assigned responsibility for social control of a majority they have an impossible task. The majority must control itself through manners and social conventions. The bureaucracy and the police must avoid contact with those who display those manners and follow those conventions. Otherwise there will be nothing but militias and rebellions.

If the elite manages to define certain behaviors as badges of poverty and ignorance, avoidance of those behaviors will be reinforced vigorously through private action throughout all social strata.

Gentlemen, I would suggest that when a code of behavior built and followed by Europeans for 300 years is suddenly abandoned, something very important is going on.

It is not only the Wall Street Journal that openly describes combatants as being of different races, but the L.A. Times and the New York Times as well.

Let us be clear.

The liberals in charge of these papers know perfectly well that once you publicly label "race" as the prime motive behind conflict, you have just told Euro-America that race and racial defense are critical to survival.

You do not need to speak explicitly of White interests to get the point across. Any liberal who openly encourages Mecha's Aztlan and black separatism argues, by default, for a new White Nation. In their minds the new White Nation may be a slave nation, but it is a separate racial state nonetheless. As to why liberals are willing to bring race back into public awareness, I can only hazard a guess. (While I have gone to school with liberals and worked with them all my life, I have never really understood them.)

First, the information elite is lost physical and cultural contact with ordinary folks and no longer has the capacity to influence manners and social conventions through direct interaction.

Second, the elite now is half Asian and Jewish, with smaller quota-protected Black and Hispanic contingents. White gentiles are a minority within our elite, and the younger ones have lost any sense of history. Modern liberals probably no longer believe that the behavioral demands of their group will be respected by majority Whites.

Third, while the news shows make a valiant effort to instruct us on how to feel about things, television has ceased to be an effective conduit for instruction on manners.

Fourth, I suspect that the ascendancy of Japan, and its elephantine neighbor China, have rendered fear of intra- European conflicts obsolete.

Finally, just as Stalin turned on the Jews who created the Russian revolution and drove them from public life in Russia, the liberals have developed a newer, meaner form of liberalism that is rendering the blacks and browns incapable of racial competition, as a prelude to our transition into a Society based on the Latin-American model of a small White elite ruling large brown masses. Through the welfare state, the libs have found a way to render races dumb and docile without alarming them. To keep the game going, all they need is to buy off the small number of intelligent blacks and browns with quotas, and silence the "white trash" who get insecure about their unspoken place in this transition.

As we speak, the Euro-American Nation is slipping into separatism by default and not by design. We are surrounded by the chaotic consequences of a confused and weakened elite which no longer understands its most sternly obligatory behaviors. Absent effective political organization, we are slipping into an atmosphere fraught with the danger of violence and extreme repression.

If I am right about the new, meaner form of liberalism, then it is obvious that White Nationalism offers a more humane and far less expensive alternative for preventing ethnic conflict. We should follow Russia's example by giving the blacks and browns their own small nations, thereby relieving the pressure on the average White to submerge himself into that brown servile mass of the liberals' dreams.

In any event, we do not have the option of turning a blind eye to race any longer. Devolution has already begun. The liberals have started this process and they leave us no alternative but active participation to fix upon satisfactory details of implementation.



Yggdrasil-

-----

[Feb. 21, 1979 Wall Street Journal P16 C4]

## The Middle East's Shi'ites Hail Khomeini

By RAY VICKER

BEIRUT, Lebanon-On Rue Hamra and adjacent streets here nearly every shop and wall carries photographs of the Ayatollah Rouhallah Khomeini, leader of the Islamic revolution in Iran.

On a recent day, several thousand demonstrators march on a street in the southern part of this city. They carry banners praising the Islamic Republic which may soon be established in Iran. The Ayatollah Khomeini's photograph is hoisted aloft by dozens of marchers as if the religious leader were the new prophet for all Islam.

It is about 850 miles from this Lebanese capital to the capital city of Tehran in Iran, but developments here show that already, with Iran's revolution not yet complete, its repercussions are already being felt elsewhere in the Middle East.

Yasser Arafat, leader of the Palestine Liberation Organization was in Iran over the past weekend cementing newly opened relations with the Islamic movement there. Here in Beirut, Palestinians speak of Iran as if it may be fighting beside Palestinians against Israel in the future. Shi'ite Moslems in this city show a new cockiness, as if they are riding the crest of victory.

Elsewhere in the Mideast there are mixed feelings about the Iranian revolution. There is pride in a victory which is seen as a definite islamic coup ( even though left-wingers in Iran may be in the background ready to seize control should Islamic leaders falter). There is also anxiety that the trouble from Iran might spill into Shi'ite minorities in other countries.

In Iraq, the ruling Baathist party wonders uneasily if its large Shi'ite population will be stimulated into troublesome political expression. The Baath leadership is currently composed largely of Sunni Moslems.

In Kuwait and other sheikhdoms of the Persian Gulf, governments are keeping a closer watch upon Shi'ite minorities. For decades, Iranians have been settling in the sheikhdoms as jobs appeared. They brought there religion with them and kept separate from Sunni Moslems, always remaining outsiders.

Even Saudi Arabia has small pockets of Shi'ite Moslems in its eastern province. That happens to be where the Saudis' oil is

"The Shia have always been clannish wherever they settle," says one diplomat here. "And they have a long History of dissidence, of being opposed to whatever government happens to be in power, of being fanatical once aroused."

Here in Lebanon, Shiite Moslems are numerous. Of the country's three million or so people including Palestinians, perhaps a half million are Shias. They are outnumbered by both Christians and by Sunni Moslems. Shi'ites, however, often act as a body. They are well organized and disciplined, pressed together by a persecution complex which sometimes has had more than mere paranoia behind it.

One Shi'ite Moslem who attended the American University of Beirut bristles when told what the diplomat had to say about Shi'ite fanaticism. A businessman with a thriving fruit warehousing operation, he says: "Certainly we take our religion seriously. But we are not fanatic. We merely believe in speaking out when we encounter oppression. And we believe in defending our religion whenever it seems threatened.

He avers that the biggest threat today comes from Israel, not from brother Arab countries. He adds: "Don't misinterpret developments here, though. Right now the demonstrations you have been watching are more a sign of pride in Islam rather than an expression of newly aroused religious feeling. Maybe the arousal will come later. Now it is the same pride American blacks had when they realized they didn't have to hang their heads in shame for some imagined weakness in their character."

That may be so. However, one historian at Beirut's American University points out that Shi'ites in the past have been ready to follow those religious leaders they believe to be divinely inspired.

Iran is likely to have its hands full trying to reestablish its economy, and thus won't be knocking on Israel's door for awhile. The Ayatollah Khomeini said a few days ago that "we will turn to the issue of victory over Israel" when local problems are solved. One needs only to travel a few miles through Iran to sense that these problems are not going to be solved quickly.

Still, the Islamic upsurge being noted in different ways across the whole Moslem world does promise to create new problems, fresh opportunities and different attitudes. In Afghanistan, where leftists recently scored a resounding political victory for communism, Islamic rebels are challenging that leftward swing.

In Egypt, religion remains a powerful force despite decades of trending steadily toward secular Western ways. President Anwar Sadat had to warn Islamic leaders recently that their efforts

should be kept within religious channels, not switched to political themes. Any upsurge of religious feeling in Egypt certainly could have unforeseeable consequences in that country.

Here in Lebanon, the growing political awareness of Shi'ite Moslems could have repercussions of its own. In recent years, Christians and Moslems sometimes seemed to be pulling ever further apart in this war-torn nation. Yet Shias always seemed to evade taking sides and plunging into the Lebanese blood baths.

Now they are growing more anti-Zionist, much more oriented toward the PLO and they are listening closely to the Ayatollah Khomeini in Iran.

Mr. Vicker is the Journal's senior international correspondent.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Our Elites Decompose

The L.A. Times is a delight, - really!

Like its counterpart on the opposite coast, the L.A. Times is a wonderful and unabashed barometer of the attitudes of our elites.

Now you may recall that a persistent theme on this newsgroup is the alienation of our elites from the mass of ordinary working folks.

Herrenstein and Murray discuss this theme in their seminal work "The Bell Curve." Our elites in the media claim that the book is about racial differences in average IQs. The authors claim it is about the distance, and hence, the unfitness of our elites to lead.

In many cases, the distance of our elites from the ordinary folk is explained by ethnic difference. The dreamy nostalgia for the power of communism to hammer us into "new socialist man" - and the siren song of its siamese twin - "liberal democracy" - with its power to destroy races and cultures while promising them compassion, equality and welfare are both ethnically based.

The only essential difference between the two is the marketing. Both are byproducts of secularized Judaism, the slag left over when belief in the chosen race survives long after the death of faith in G\*d.

Policies that cripple and destroy others are the natural byproduct of aggressive feelings of ethnic minorities.

A more serious problem, because of the lack of any obvious motive, is the anger of Euro-American elites toward their own culture and their own kind.

And for an object lesson about this more serious problem, we are indebted once again to the Times and another of its front page editorials masquerading as news.

The story was entitled "Women of Influence Feel Estranged From the GOP" and appeared on Sunday June 2, 1996. It was a puff piece about the "gender gap" intended to frighten already confused conservatives into even greater political paralysis.

A liberal consultant who frequently works for clients in the real estate development (white - flight) industry gathered four of her alienated female executive friends and the L.A. Times reporter in a fancy restaurant and talked. The talk was revealing. All of their political complaints revolved around their own frustrations and their own need for political validation of their personal choices.

Some typical comments:

"... women are the heart and soul of this party... There is a definition of family that is exclusionary..."

" Republicans are still stuck in the patriarchal male model of the family ..."

" We have become the men our mothers wanted us to marry."

" Republicans are getting too scary, too mean spirited."

Not a single statement about a public morality that might ease the burdens of those who are less fortunate economically. Not a glimmer of recognition that welfare mechanisms of "liberal democracy" slyly destroyed Afro-America, and are fast destroying Euro-America as well.

Not a hint of recognition that in our rural areas the "custodial state" - employer of last resort - has hired so many soil conservation police, pesticide police, fish and game police, wetlands police, tax collection police, child abuse police, gun police and drug police that half the population is watching the other half.

Naturally, the half being watched is rebelling and joining militias.

While America crumbles, we get total self-absorption from our business elites.

The only thing that these wealthy and successful career women are capable of articulating is the politics of their own personal frustration. What they want from politics is validation of their own personal choices - loud public approval of their childless and, ultimately, self-centered existences.

In order for a culture to survive, its elite must focus not on its own needs but on the needs of the less affluent and more numerous citizens.

So the Republican Party is getting mean. No duh!

If you are trying to raise a family on \$35,000 you are always having to say "no." No to the

pushers of credit cards; no to the overpriced designer jeans. You have to resist the effects of advertising that makes your daughter hate her body. (Remarks about how "ordinaire" the supermodels look before the make-up artists arrive don't seem to help much!)

We live in a society in which the advertisers are exploiting the insecurities of youth to provoke impulse purchases - impulses that represent real economic threats to average working people.

The average working class couple trying to raise kids has a great deal to contend with. They are pissed-off. So it is no surprise that as these ordinary working people join the Republican party, the party begins to take on a much harsher edge.

If our elites had not been so self-absorbed and had worked to prevent the worst excesses of the purveyors of cultural decline, perhaps the harsh edge would not be necessary.

Ironically the Jewish neo-conservatives who work at Commentary magazine and contribute articles to the Wall Street Journal are calling for the "remoralization of America". They want to reinvigorate traditional religions and bring morality back into public places. They decry the enforced "feminization" of family life brought on by a welfare state that renders men and husbands irrelevant.

The Neocons at least are concerning themselves with the needs of the broader society. In this respect they are behaving like more traditional elites of the 17th and 18th centuries. (One is free to wonder, of course, whether Gertrude Himmelfarb, Bud Kristol and George Gilder are motivated by true concern for the survival of Christian culture and religion, or whether this is the same old control being sold under a new marketing plan!)

Nevertheless, our successful goyim business executives care nothing about what happens to others. They want to whine, and they want a political party to tell them that their whining is all right. They want a politics that will reinforce extreme individualism and will fight to protect the elite from any demands of the broader society that they behave as role models.

The truth is that large business organizations are not terribly effective at selecting and rewarding an elite capable of sustaining the broader culture. Rather, large organizations tend to select and reward the compulsive workaholics.

At the highest levels, they reward those who are good at withholding information from potential competitors for power within the organization. Top managers are invariably those who, with a straight face, can talk about creating a "family friendly workplace" but at the same time put intense pressure on employees to work 12 hour days.

Psychological testers will tell you that the most sought after in today's economy are those who

lack a "co-worldly value system." Translated, that means people with no interests or ambitions other than career success.

What you get, in surprising numbers, are men who lead incredibly boring personal lives obsessed with privacy issues, fearing that government is "peeking into their bedrooms." You get women who have never been asked or approached railing about sexual exploitation. What these Republican elites want is tax cuts, low- wage immigration and massive white-flight wrapped in the politics of sexual frustration and sexual jealousy.

Believe it or not, our business elites are caught in the sixties. What our business elites really crave is a new politics of sexual liberation and fulfillment. That is why you hear so much about abortion rights, alternative life-styles, non-traditional "families", women's "empowerment", aids research, privacy and "freedom of porn". They will vote for and contribute to any politician who holds out hope of delivering the practical benefits promised by the sixties sexual revolution.

So we are saddled with a goy elite (not one of the 5 women executives interviewed by the L.A. Times was Jewish) that looks to government for yet another entitlement. Not an economic entitlement, but a far more improbable personal one that government cannot attempt to deliver without considerable damage to the Euro- American family.

I fear that the political decay of the United States is complete and irreversible. The neocons will fail at moral rearmament.

Inevitably, the physicist William Pierce has a clearer and more accurate view of exactly what the endgame of saving European civilization will look like.

Elites can protect a civilization with trivial personal sacrifice. All they need do is reinforce the values that protect the common man in public while keeping their personal frustrations private.

For a remnant of leaderless working men to preserve a civilization without access to the levers of power and against the will of their own elites will require far more burdensome and mortal sacrifice.

I predict that millions will ultimately volunteer.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

# YGGDRASIL

## Modern Weapons and the Multi-Racial Empire

The Los Angeles Times of March 19, 1996 had a fascinating front page article on the new military technology that is changing the face of warfare.

The thrust is that real-time satellite technology can observe troop concentrations so that our commanders can see them, know exactly where they are at all times, and fire artillery at them from great distances with guidance from global positioning satellite systems.

The focus of the story was primarily on foot soldiers and how vulnerable they were to this new technology.

Actually, unsupported foot soldiers have been helpless in the face of tanks and aircraft for almost one hundred years now. Yes, modern technology increases that vulnerability but it does not fundamentally change the situation of the individual infantryman.

But it was a message that the typical Times reader in West Los Angeles wants to hear.- - Don't worry about these racists and right-wing militias armed with rifles - modern technology puts US firmly in control.

We should rejoice that the Los Angeles Times feels comforted by the rapid evolution of weapons systems.

But I think they may have it wrong.

I was paging through Clausewitz "On War" a few days later and came upon a famous passage:

"Now, being convinced that the superiority of the defensive (rightly understood) is very great, and much greater than may appear at first sight, we conceive that the greater number of those periods of inaction which occur in war are thus explained without involving any contradiction."

Indeed standard doctrine 30 years ago at the Infantry School at Fort Benning Georgia was that the attacker needs three times the number of troops to prevail over a force defending a fixed position.

The defense has always been superior to the offense.

But inexpensive global positioning satellites and inexpensive conventional cruise missiles can decapitate a government very easily with very little collateral damage to civilians. Unlike nuclear weapons that kill millions of ordinary people, these small, exceptionally accurate weapons do very little collateral damage, killing only the leaders. The average citizen has little or nothing to fear.

Presidents and cabinet members can be killed in their bedrooms from a thousand miles away. The parliaments of democratic countries are easy targets. You can kill all the leaders, cut off electric power, knock out computers and communications and cut off water supplies in a single day.

A sudden attack also might interrupt command and control of the military (although this would be more difficult than getting rid of the civilian government).

In any event, it is hard to argue that a nation possessed of this technology benefits from waiting and being hit with it first.

It is vital that you decapitate your enemy first, before he decapitates you. Modern technology grants an extreme advantage to the attacker.

But the extent of the advantage is going to depend on whether the target is a homogeneous nation like Japan or Sweden, in which case the advantage will be limited to its military effects, or a multi-ethnic empire like India, Sri-Lanka, Somalia, Rwanda, Malaysia, South Africa, or the United States, in which case destroying government leaders could lead to a disintegration of the empire and an end to hostilities.

As Clausewitz says:

"Thus, therefore, the political object, as the original motive of the War, will be the standard for determining both the aim of the military force and also the amount of effort to be made."

In multi-racial or multi-ethnic empires the original motive for War is seldom understood or agreed upon by the competing population groups within that empire. Further, the original motive affects the interests of only a very small group of the elite and is hidden from public view. The "original motive of the War" may not survive the loss of the elite's political leaders.

For example, does anyone pretend to know why the U.S. is patrolling Bosnia? Any clue as to why we sent expeditionary forces to Somalia? Any hints as to why we publicly sail carrier groups to shadow Chinese naval exercises?

For 50 years, the United States has launched wars under lofty sounding slogans like "making the world safe for democracy," and establishing a "New World Order." Whatever the real reasons might be for these wars, the American Peoples (to use the multicultural term) have been left in the dark. Further, there is no country on earth in which the military is more profoundly isolated from the liberal elites who make the real decisions than the U.S. Thus, although the U.S. military command might survive a decapitating attack more or less intact, our generals simply would not have a clue how the real establishment thinks or what its real objectives are. It certainly would not instinctively duplicate ZOG's propaganda.

While the military's instincts would be to retaliate, there is an overwhelming probability that the original political aim of the conflict would be lost, particularly if the attacker threatens no further harm. The generals are not likely to continue a war that has no perceptible purpose.

The one critical piece of information for an attacker to understand about the U.S. that may be different from the other multi-racial and multi-ethnic empires of the World is the importance of shutting down our mass media.

In the U.S. the TV broadcasters and the press set the agenda, whip up support within the Euro-American middle class, and ultimately force the politicians to act and behave in certain pre-determined ways. In the U.S., the real decision maker is the media and the press.

So the critical strategy for the attacker would be eliminate the political leaders and to shut down the television stations, newspapers and other media so that nobody will have the capacity to whip up the Middle Class with pictures of dead children killed by a stray missile or two.

With the media shut down, there will be no quick answers. Without the media, the Euro-American middle class and the military are not going to know how to "feel" about the situation or how to respond. The empire would be headless.

The basic problem confronting our elites is simply this: With Congress, the President and the Supreme Court gone, the IRS computers shut down, and the TV off, Euro-America will uncork the champagne.

In truth, the United States is at least 3 nations. The effective absence of a central government and its controlling private media would trigger a fierce competition between Black America, Mexican America and Euro-America to establish a new government and to redefine their relationships with one another. Elections for a new Congress and the grappling for power (or for self-determination) would be far more important than retaliation against a foreign power that is the source of their sudden opportunity and liberty.

While new weapons pose problems for all multi-racial empires, it seems clear that the

vulnerabilities, at least for the U.S., will increase over time as a result of two forces, both of which are firmly in place and cannot be reversed.

First, U.S. vulnerability increases as the decreasing cost and increasing sophistication of new weapons systems lead more countries to acquire them.

While the U.S. and other nations scramble to develop defensive systems against their own technologies, the falling cost of computers drives the cost of the original offensive weapon down to a point where the less wealthy nation has two offensive options: buy the latest (stealth) system to evade the defenses, or buy thousands of the older and cheaper models, to overwhelm the defenses.

As the new offensive technologies get cheaper and proliferate, the defensive technologies become more expensive and threaten domestic spending agendas needed to keep the multi-racial empires together.

The offensive technology development cycle is shorter and less costly than the defensive development cycle.

Second, the gradual decline of the Euro-American majority over the next 50 years will exacerbate the tensions and make retaliation for a decapitating attack on the U.S. government far less likely.

Right now, much of the Euro-American population lives in communities that are 90%+ Euro-American. To them, America is a White nation. But as the effects of unrestrained immigration spread to the hinterland, it will be harder and harder to confuse the declining Euro-American majority about its place in this society and the interests our government really represents.

Most Americans know that their government exists to protect someone else, and not them. Further, most Americans are very isolated from the real thinking and motivation of our elites. The military has no lines of communication with these elites at all.

That is why we see such a massive effort for non-proliferation by the U.S. The more nations that acquire this technology, the more likely it will be used against the large, multi-racial empires. Over very long periods of time, with ZOG's penchant for military adventures, it is a near certainty that such an attack on the U.S. will take place. That is why the U.S. government puts so much effort into the "New World Order" and the U.N.

An international response to restore our Federal Government following such an attack is far more predictable and certain in the minds of our liberal elites than a domestic response.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## A drive through the Empire

Last week the Ygg and Mrs. Ygg drove from southern California to Texas and back. The kids stayed home.

The purpose of the trip was to look at housing in Texas, just in case we might want to join the great White migration out of Southern California. The trip had nothing to do with politics.

The Ole Ygg hasn't gone for a long drive in about 15 years. You see, yuppies in the information elite fly everywhere. We don't drive. In fact, on the few occasions when I have told my partners that I am driving the short haul from LA to San Fran, they look at me like I am crazy. The elites would rather stroll West Los Angeles naked than drive in the open country.

Like most who earn a living in the information industry, I get my impressions of cities and of regions of the country by what I see in airports and the glass towers I visit.

Well, it didn't take too many hours on the road in the Southwest to realize that my view of America from inside Airports and the glass towers was less than a total picture of reality.

Once on the road, I was judging America by the people I saw at gas stations rather than by the people I saw in its airport lobbies.

What a contrast!

The first impression is that the interstate highways are the exclusive province of factory workers, farmers and service workers. Some have money for nice cars and trucks. Many do not.

However, none of our elites are out there on these highways.

This pattern is actually a sharp contrast with the 1950's and the 1960's. Then, the elites vacationed by driving. That was a period of rapid freeway construction. The new roads were as smooth as glass.

The interstates are much bumpier now. The inescapable impression is that the United States is no longer willing to invest money in its automotive highway network. Repairs are spotty. The "wrong" people use them.

A second inescapable impression is that there are large tracts of the United States in which Euro-Americans are foreigners.

We all know that Euro-Americans cannot wander the streets of Newark, Camden, South-Central Los Angeles, most of Detroit, most of Manhattan Island, and similar venues after dark without a near certainty of death or mayhem. Euro-Americans cannot enter these venues in daytime without a visibly obvious reason.

In these urban combat zones of America, Euro-Americans yield the sidewalks in a classic reversal of roles from the old South.

Driving Interstate 10 from San Diego to El Paso leaves one not so much with a sense of danger as with a sense of alienation.

There is a large swath of real estate in which you rarely see Euro-Americans. It runs North from the Mexican border about 100 miles, beginning about 20 miles inland from the Pacific and extending through Southern Arizona, New Mexico, to San Antonio, Texas. You will see Euro-Americans in the airport at El Paso, but you will not see any on the streets or roads, nor any working at any of the motels or fast food outlets.

Mendelssohn's Violin Concerto booming up through the sunroof of a white Porsche had a dramatic effect on locals who had never heard anything like it before. They stared in amazement. The culture from which that auto and its music came were so profoundly alien, there wasn't a hint of recognition.

In El Paso, like San Diego, the U.S. Government has abandoned control of the border. Instead, there is an INS checkpoint about one hundred miles East of the border. It is the same in California, where the real border begins about 40 miles north of San Diego at the inspection station at Camp Pendleton, and in Fallbrook on Interstate 15.

That is where the INS begins to apprehend and chase undocumented aliens. But within most of that 100 mile strip of land along the border the policy is "don't ask, don't tell."

Within this nation of Aztlan, Euro-American culture has disappeared. Its residents will not attack (as in Detroit) but will watch Euro-Americans with wary suspicion. It is obvious to them that we are "outsiders" who do not "belong" there.

However, once you hit Austin, Texas a remarkable transformation occurs. Euro-Americans are everywhere.

You have arrived at the border of the Euro-American nation.

When you say that you are from California, the Texas real estate agents explain that there are thousands like you who move there every year in a mass exodus. Neighborhoods in Texas aren't like California. "People go to Church here. You won't find drugs all over the schools." But if you aren't comfortable with the overt religiosity of the people, you will not be comfortable living there.

We took the northern route back, along interstate 40 from Amarillo in the Panhandle, through Northern New Mexico and Arizona.

We stopped for a bite to eat in Gallup, New Mexico, just off the Interstate, on old Route 66. There were 60 restaurants and most looked like mom and pop operations, so just to be safe, we picked a Pizza Hut franchise and went in. The physical layout of the place was strictly Pizza Hut, down to the seats, salad bar and sign that said " please wait to be seated".

But this wasn't any ordinary Pizza Hut. For the service was extraordinarily different.

A young lady came over, fumbled and hesitated, and led us to a table without making eye contact. We waited 15 minutes and began to notice that the waiters and waitresses seemed to avoid eye contact with us. All of the workers and all of the patrons were Indians. We were the only Euro-Americans in the place.

After we had been there about 10 minutes, a man with blonde hair and a pony tail came in, was seated, waited for about 5 minutes to be served, and then quietly left. Finally, after 15 minutes, a young man came over to take our order. The body language was bad. He was stiff and uncomfortable. 40 minutes later, and our pizza still had not arrived. Valuable road time was lost.

While we waited, the counter was doing a land-office business in carry-out pizza orders. All of the carry-out patrons were also Indians. Not a single one was White.

Mrs. Ygg was getting angry. Now Mrs. Ygg is not really a white nationalist. She is non-ideological, something of a racial "liberal," a fairly typical National Charity League "society mom" instinctively respectful of society's manners and conventions for preventing ill feeling and conflict.

And it was the breach of public manners that threw her into a rage. She sensed that the Navajo did not want Whites in their restaurant and asked why they just didn't post a sign to that effect so that she could take her business elsewhere. She demanded that I go ask where our pizza was.

I went to the counter, waited two minutes for the waitress to make eye contact, and then finally blurted out to her back "how is our pizza coming along?" The visibly agitated and uncomfortable waitress said "I will check" and ran into the back room where the pizzas were



being cooked.

The waitress came out and said she didn't know what happened to our pizza, but that they would prepare a new one, it would be ready in 12 minutes and we did not have to pay. 15 minutes later the waitress came over with the pizza said nothing and did not make eye contact. The silent message was "eat this and get the hell out of here!"

By this time, Mrs. Ygg was ready to re-fight the battle of Little Big Horn.

I tried to calm her. I said that "we are now in the Navajo Nation just like the sign next door says. They don't mis-label anything. It is our culture that claims race and nation do not exist. They can be as uncomfortable with us as they want in their nation. We should do what they say, keep quiet, avoid eye contact and then leave."

Mrs. Ygg said "Bullshit, This is a retail establishment on a major interstate highway. They see thousands of whites. How could they be in business here and be so uncomfortable with us. They are seething with hostility and suspicion."

"Further, all the indian men in this place are wearing "gang pants" and high tops. They listen to rap music in the back. They sure as hell understand American symbols of anger!"

I then said, "you know, it is quite strange that the kids who run this place are so suspicious and uncomfortable. They have had at least 4 generations of contact with us along this highway - and two generations of television - and they have not learned to put up a friendly front during business hours. Maybe acting friendly when they don't feel friendly would be cowardly in their culture. Who knows!"

"But this is what I mean when I talk to Ygg Jr. about the failure of multi-racial empires. If you had paid attention, you would know to expect this sort of thing. You would not now be surprised or offended. It is our presence here with them that is unnatural, not their breach of the manners that you expect them to learn from us."

Mrs. Ygg then angrily said "I don't care about that. I don't need their free pizza or their charity! I am going to pay for the pizza!"

The Ole' Ygg replied. "No you are not! They have told us the rules. We are to eat and get out with no more contact. Insist on paying and you risk serious conflict. Much as you might like to see me kick these pudgy little people through the window (as the Koreans taught me to do many years ago) you know I can't do that, even in self-defense, without my political views being uncovered and becoming an issue."

As we finished our pizza and walked toward the door, several young female patrons at the carry-out counter looked at us with alarm, as if we were men from Mars. They saw the Ole' Ygg first, and became uncomfortable, but became much more agitated at the sight of Mrs. Ygg. It was as if she were George Armstrong Custer.

Curious!

As we drove away, I could not help thinking back to Yggdrasil's Lesson One, and the thoughts of Professor Barro from Harvard, who observed that if the "constituent characteristics" of ethnic groups within a single country differ by too much, it might be wise to split the country into separate nations.

A handy guide occurred to me. Any population that needs a quota or explicit preference has "constituent characteristics" that differ enough to justify separation. All you need do is keep the current questionnaires and administrative apparatus in place.

And in the meantime, we were only a few miles from the White Nation beginning in Flagstaff, extending through Kingman and winding across the desert to Bakersfield, California. It is a different White Nation from the traditional one in Texas.

It is a nation that knows it is under attack. Like America's pioneers, they know that the eastern elites will send the cavalry to protect the black and brown attackers if they defend too visibly.

They know yuppies when they see them and they have learned to keep their true feelings and ideas to themselves. While sitting in a diner in Kingman, I spotted a copy of "The Arizona Republic" reporting the arrest of 30 Aryan Brotherhood members in Arizona. McPaper had reports of a debate between Mcvey's lawyer and the prosecutor, as well as an article to the effect that Mcvey might want to testify at his trial and claim he never touched a bomb.

It occurred to me that our Euro-American elites are going to be exceptionally angry and fearful as it becomes more and more apparent that their integrationist dream is failing. They are likely to blame these poor working class Whites and pursue them with a vengeance as the only remaining group within our Multi-racial empire upon whom they can enforce their will.

Look for the jails to fill with offenders who cross the line of manners and belief into the proliferating categories of "hate crimes" applied selectively on the basis of race and social class. Look for sporadic mass prosecutions for child molestation in these small towns, as social workers isolate children from their parents and interrogate them for weeks at a time behind closed doors to "recover" their memories.

Look for the clever among these working class Whites to learn the diaspora art of concealing their true feelings lest they become targets.

Marranos of the desert and the trailer park!

Herrenstein and Murray were right in their seminal work "The Bell Curve." The information elites have become so profoundly isolated from working class Whites that they have come to believe that whites truly are the passive, emasculated creatures portrayed by Hollywood. Treatment of poor Whites by our elites and their legal system will not know any of the usual boundaries of "civil rights" and "civil liberties" that apply to blacks or browns. Our elites see no reason for caution. "Justice" (tzedek?) meted out by our custodial state to poor Whites uppity enough to think for themselves is "likely to be brusque."

Our information elites see America only from the air.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Mainstream Science on Intelligence

50 professors at Universities throughout the U.S., Canada, and Britain have signed the following statement concerning the generally accepted science of intelligence and inter-race differences in intelligence.

You will be surprised at many of the conclusions and at the number and identity of the signers, all of whom are listed at the end of the article.

Yggdrasil-

Dec. 13, 1994 Wall Street Journal p A18

## Mainstream Science on Intelligence

Since the publication of "The Bell Curve," many commentators have offered opinions about human intelligence that misstate current scientific evidence. Some conclusions dismissed in the media as discredited are actually firmly supported.

This statement outlines conclusions regarded as mainstream among researchers on intelligence, in particular, on the nature, origins, and practical consequences of individual and group differences in intelligence. Its aim is to promote more reasoned discussion of the vexing phenomenon that the research has revealed in recent decades. The following conclusions are fully described in the major textbooks, professional journals and encyclopedias in intelligence.

## The Meaning and Measurement of Intelligence

1. Intelligence is a very general mental capability that, among other things, involves the ability to reason, plan, solve problems, think abstractly, comprehend complex ideas, learn quickly and learn from experience. It is not merely book learning, a narrow academic skill, or test-taking smarts. Rather, it reflects a broader and deeper capability for comprehending our surroundings-- "catching on," "making sense" of things, or "figuring out" what to do.

2. Intelligence, so defined, can be measured, and intelligence tests measure it well. They are among the most accurate (in technical terms, reliable and valid) of all psychological tests and assessments. They do not measure creativity, character personality, or other important differences among individuals, nor are they intended to.

3. While there are different types of intelligence tests, they all measure the same intelligence. Some use words or numbers and require specific cultural knowledge (like vocabulary). Others do not, and instead use shapes or designs and require knowledge of only simple, universal concepts (many/few, open/closed, up/down).

4. The spread of people along the IQ continuum, from low to high, can be represented well by the bell curve (in statistical jargon, the "normal curve"). Most people cluster around the average (IQ 100). Few are either very bright or very dull: About 3% of Americans score above IQ 130 (often considered the threshold for "giftedness"), with about the same percentage below IQ 70 (IQ 70-75 often being considered the threshold for mental retardation).

5. Intelligence tests are not culturally biased against American blacks or other native-born, English-speaking peoples in the U.S. Rather, IQ scores predict equally accurately for all such Americans, regardless of race and social class. Individuals who do not understand English well can be given either a nonverbal test or one in their native language.

6. The brain processes underlying intelligence are still little understood. Current research looks, for example, at speed of neural transmission, glucose (energy) uptake, and electrical activity of the brain, uptake, and electrical activity of the brain.

### Group Differences

7. Members of all racial-ethnic groups can be found at every IQ level. The bell curves of different groups overlap considerably, but groups often differ in where their members tend to cluster along the IQ line. The bell curves for some groups (Jews and East Asians) are centered somewhat higher than for whites in general. Other groups (blacks and Hispanics) are centered somewhat lower than non-Hispanic whites.

8. The bell curve for whites is centered roughly around IQ 100; the bell curve for American blacks roughly around 85; and those for different subgroups of Hispanics roughly midway between those for whites and blacks. The evidence is less definitive for exactly where above IQ 100 the bell curves for Jews and Asians are centered.

### Practical Importance

9. IQ is strongly related, probably more so than any other single measurable human trait, to many important educational, occupational, economic, and social outcomes. Its relation to the welfare and performance of individuals is very strong in some arenas in life (education, military training), moderate but robust in others (social competence), and modest but consistent in others (law-abidingness). Whatever IQ tests measure, it is of great practical and social importance.

10. A high IQ is an advantage in life because virtually all activities require some reasoning and decision-making. Conversely, a low IQ is often a disadvantage, especially in disorganized environments. Of course, a high IQ no more guarantees success than a low IQ guarantees failure in life. There are many exceptions, but the odds for success in our society greatly favor individuals with higher IQs.

11. The practical advantages of having a higher IQ increase as life settings become more complex (novel, ambiguous, changing, unpredictable, or multifaceted). For example, a high IQ is generally necessary to perform well in highly complex or fluid jobs (the professions, management); it is a considerable advantage in moderately complex jobs (crafts, clerical and police work); but it provides less advantage in settings that require only routine decision making or simple problem solving (unskilled work).

12. Differences in intelligence certainly are not the only factor affecting performance in education, training, and highly complex jobs (no one claims they are), but intelligence is often the most important. When individuals have already been selected for high (or low) intelligence and so do not differ as much in IQ, as in graduate school (or special education), other influences on performance loom larger in comparison.

13. Certain personality traits, special talents, aptitudes, physical capabilities, experience, and the like are important (sometimes essential) for successful performance in many jobs, but they have narrower (or unknown) applicability or "transferability" across tasks and settings compared with general intelligence. Some scholars choose to refer to these other human traits as other "intelligences." Source and Stability of Within-Group Differences

14. Individuals differ in intelligence due to differences in both their environments and genetic heritage. Heritability estimates range from 0.4 to 0.8 (on a scale from 0 to 1), most thereby indicating that genetics plays a bigger role than does environment in creating IQ differences among individuals. (Heritability is the squared correlation of phenotype with genotype.) If all environments were to become equal for everyone, heritability would rise to 100% because all remaining differences in IQ would necessarily be genetic in origin.

15. Members of the same family also tend to differ substantially in intelligence (by an average of about 12 IQ points) for both genetic and environmental reasons. They differ genetically because biological brothers and sisters share exactly half their genes with each parent and, on the average, only half with each other. They also differ in IQ because they experience different environments within the same family.

16. That IQ may be highly heritable does not mean that it is not affected by the environment. Individuals are not born with fixed, unchangeable levels of intelligence (no one claims they are). IQs do gradually stabilize during childhood, however, and generally change little

thereafter.

17. Although the environment is important in creating IQ differences, we do not know yet how to manipulate it to raise low IQs permanently. Whether recent attempts show promise is still a matter of considerable scientific debate.

18. Genetically caused differences are not necessarily irremediable (consider diabetes, poor vision, and phenal keton uria), nor are environmentally caused ones necessarily remediable (consider injuries, poisons, severe neglect, and some diseases). Both may be preventable to some extent. Source and Stability of Between-Group Differences

19. There is no persuasive evidence that the IQ bell curves for different racial-ethnic groups are converging. Surveys in some years show that gaps in academic achievement have narrowed a bit for some races, ages, school subjects and skill levels, but this picture seems too mixed to reflect a general shift in IQ levels themselves.

20. Racial-ethnic differences in IQ bell curves are essentially the same when youngsters leave high school as when they enter first grade. However, because bright youngsters learn faster than slow learners, these same IQ differences lead to growing disparities in amount learned as youngsters progress from grades one to 12. As large national surveys continue to show, black 17- year-olds perform, on the average, more like white 13-year-olds in reading, math, and science, with Hispanics in between.

21. The reasons that blacks differ among themselves in intelligence appear to be basically the same as those for why whites (or Asians or Hispanics) differ among themselves. Both environment and genetic heredity are involved.

22. There is no definitive answer to why IQ bell curves differ across racial-ethnic groups. The reasons for these IQ differences between groups may be markedly different from the reasons for why individuals differ among themselves within any particular group (whites or blacks or Asians). In fact, it is wrong to assume, as many do, that the reason why some individuals in a population have high IQs but others have low IQs must be the same reason why some populations contain more such high (or low) IQ individuals than others. Most experts believe that environment is important in pushing the bell curves apart, but that genetics could be involved too.

23. Racial-ethnic differences are somewhat smaller but still substantial for individuals from the same socioeconomic backgrounds. To illustrate, black students from prosperous families tend to score higher in IQ than blacks from poor families, but they score no higher, on average, than whites from poor families.

24. Almost all Americans who identify themselves as black have white ancestors--the white admixture is about 20%, on average--and many self-designated whites, Hispanics, and others likewise have mixed ancestry. Because research on intelligence relies on self- classification into distinct racial categories, as does most other social-science research, its findings likewise relate to some unclear mixture of social and biological distinctions among groups (no one claims otherwise).

### Implications for Social Policy

25. The research findings neither dictate nor preclude any particular social policy, because they can never determine our goals. They can, however, help us estimate the likely success and side-effects of pursuing those goals via different means.

\* \* \* \* \*

The following professors--all experts in intelligence and allied fields--have signed this statement:

Richard D. Arvey, University of Minnesota

Thomas J. Bouchard, Jr., University of Minnesota

John B. Carroll, U.N.C. at Chapel Hill

Raymond B. Cattell, University of Hawaii

David B. Cohen, U.T. at Austin

Rene W. Dawis, University of Minnesota

Douglas K. Detterman, Case Western Reserve U.

Marvin Dunnette, University of Minnesota

Hans Eysenck, University of London

Jack Feldman, Georgia Institute of Technology

Edwin A. Fleishman, George Mason University

Grover C. Gilmore, Case Western Reserve U.



Robert A. Gordon, Johns Hopkins University

Linda S. Gottfredsen, University of Delaware

Richard J. Haier, U.C. Irvine

Garrett Hardin, U.C. Berkeley

Robert Hogan, University of Tulsa

Joseph M. Horn, U.T. at Austin

Lloyd G. Humphreys, U.Ill. at Champaign-Urbana

John E. Hunter, Michigan State University

Seymour W. Itzkoff, Smith College

Douglas N. Jackson, U. of Western Ontario

James J. Jenkins, U. of South Florida

Arthur R. Jensen, U.C. Berkeley

Alan S. Kaufman, University of Alabama

Nadeen L. Kaufman, Cal. School of Prof. Pshch., S.D.

Timothy Z. Keith, Alfred University

Nadine Lambert, U.C. Berkeley

John C. Loehlin, U.T. at Austin

David Lubinski, Iowa State University

David T. Lykken, University of Minnesota

Richard Lynn, University of Ulster at Coleraine

Paul E. Meehl, University of Minnesota

R. Travis Osborne, University of Georgia

Robert Perloff, University of Pittsburg

Robert Plomin, Institute of Psychiatry, London

Cecil R. Reynolds Texas A&M University

David C. Rowe University of Arizona

J. Philippe Rushton U. of Western Ontario

Vincent Sarich, U.C. Berkeley

Sandra Scarr, University of Virginia

Frank L. Schmidt University of Iowa

Lyle F. Schoenfeldt, Texas A&M University

James C. Sharf, George Washington University

Julian C. Stanley, Johns Hopkins University

Del Theissen, U.T. at Austin

Lee A. Thompson, Case Western Reserve U.

Robert M. Thorndike, Western Washington University

Philip Anthony Vernon, U. of Western Ontario

Lee Willerman, U.T. at Austin

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Discrimination in the Name of Diversity

Because U.S. Government has abandoned the notion of a "color-blind" society, many Americans may feel compelled to abandon their allegiance to the U.S and cast about for a new political and, perhaps, physical homeland.

By abandoning the "color-blind" society, the liberals have raised the stakes in future political battles from civilized levels, in which the defeated still feel like they are a part of the broader society, to "third world" levels in which the defeated fear for their property, jobs, and their personal safety.

Liberals sure know how to provoke conflict!

Yggdrasil-

\* \* \* \* \*

Nov. 11, 1991 Wall Street Journal p. A12

Tales From an Oppressed Class

By Frederick R. Lynch

How many white men have been affected by affirmative action -- and how have they reacted? Few experts in the press or academe wanted to probe this most politically incorrect topic until Louisiana's David Duke seized the issue and became a political force.

General population polls conducted by Gordon Black Associates in 1984 and by the National Opinion Research Center in 1990 suggest that 1-in-10 white men has been injured by affirmative action. This figure alone adds up to millions. Circumstantial evidence suggests even much larger numbers.

Preferential policies were instituted during an intensely competitive era when huge cohorts of baby boomers crowded job markets increasingly constrained by international competition, lean-and-mean downsizing movements, and tax revolts. Thus, affirmative action often occurred in zero-sum contexts; someone was quota-ed in at another's expense.

My research indicates that reverse discrimination's bite has varied by age, geography, occupation, and private or public sector. Most vulnerable have been public-sector white men under the age of 45 with people-oriented skills. Their phone calls flood radio talk-show programs on this topic.

Many more white men may not have been fully aware that they were being injured by behind-the-scenes tactics such as "race-norming" of employment tests by public testing agencies, and many private ones. (The EEOC only recently stopped pressuring corporations to use such procedures.) Nor have they been told of the drive to tie managers' bonuses to affirmative action hiring and promotion records.

I became curious about the impact of affirmative action while working in the increasingly quota-crazy higher education systems of California -- where policies moved far beyond the Supreme Court's 1978 Bakke dictum that race could be considered as one of several factors in selection processes.

During the 1980s, a state mandate for the community college system (AB1725) ordered a 30% minority-faculty hiring "goal" until the year 2005 -- when faculty must mirror the ethnic diversity of the entire state; the University of California began advertising "targets of diversity" faculty positions and substantially boosted minority-female representation in administrative staff positions to 72%; and the California State University system implemented set-aside faculty positions, set-aside grant and fellowship programs for graduate students -- while the politically correct faculty union lobbied (successfully) for higher pay for "underrepresented" junior faculty. And "parity goals" for the entire state work force were monitored in annual reports by the State Personnel Board.

As my quiet interest in affirmative action leaked out -- a professionally dangerous development -- students, colleagues, friends and relative strangers began to report encounters with reverse discrimination. In 1984-85, two graduate assistants and I supplemented this rising tide of informal data -- and scattered press reports -- with 32 in-depth interviews with California-based, mostly middle-class white men who reported that preferential policies prevented them from obtaining jobs or disrupted or ended extant careers.

Some findings:

-- A community college instructor repeatedly lost tenure-track appointments to less qualified minorities after he moved to California from Michigan. "At first, you think it's you," he said. "You blame yourself." (He finally obtained an appointment at another college.)

-- A mid-management bank administrator -- and an ardent liberal -- began to have second thoughts as he watched women he'd hired the year before move by him on the affirmative-action fast-track. (Rapid increases in female mid-management employees in his bank and at others lent

credence to his account.)

-- Public-sector workers reported that affirmative action barriers eventually became obvious and quietly acknowledged by most employees. After 13 years of being bypassed by minorities or women, one upper-middle-management California state official reported being offered a promotion -- with some public fanfare -- only to have the appointment rescinded because, as an agency head told him, "Let's face it, you're not the right color."

Most of these men avoided open complaints or protests out of fear they wouldn't be believed or would be labeled racist. (No one said he feared being thought sexist.)

Six resigned from the organizations that discriminated against them. Three circumvented reverse discrimination problems through various organizational means. Three filed suits, none of which was successful. No government agency offered redress. (EEOC guidelines effectively insulate employers from reverse discrimination complaints if the employer has taken "reasonable" voluntary affirmative action to remedy "deficiencies" in minority representation.)

The majority of our subjects simply acquiesced in their treatment with varying degrees of bewilderment, resignation or anger. Most subjects voiced temporary, if not long-term, frustration and cynicism about social institutions. "A lot of us were sold a bill of goods," complained a California state middle-management worker. "We were told if you went to college you could write your own ticket. But . . . affirmative action has lowered standards to the point where education counts against you."

No subject expressed hostility toward minorities per se, but many felt alienated from a society that refused to acknowledge whites' victimization. A teacher, transferred to a distant school in a racial balancing plan, commented: "My friends couldn't handle this. They experienced cognitive dissonance. They didn't want to be seen as racists." Another teacher noted: "I found out what it was like to be a victim. Nobody likes a victim."

Research sponsored and then suppressed by the Democratic Party in 1985 and 1987 suggests a possible class split in white reactions to affirmative action. Political analyst Stanley Greenberg's "Report on Democratic Defections" by blue-collar white "Reagan Democrats" in Michigan found fury over quotas for blacks and immigrants. (This anger, Mr. Greenberg concluded, undercut Democratic campaign themes of "fairness" and "justice.") These data, in combination with the record of lawsuits filed by blue-collar groups (overtly or covertly aided by unions), indicate a more militant, angry working-class response. This is perhaps because of more intense zero-sum problems wrought by a shrinking blue-collar jobs market.

Until Pete Wilson, Jesse Helms and David Duke began to attack quotas in statewide election campaigns last year, a curious bipartisan paralysis thwarted any open political response to rank-and-file whites.

Radicals and liberals have neutralized whites' complaints with swift, categorical denials, such as "white males can't be victims." Indeed, much liberal and multicultural theory today embodies a colorized version of Marx's class struggle. White men (regardless of individual backgrounds) are regarded as a privileged modern-day "bourgeoisie," while women and people of color (again, regardless of individual or subgroup circumstances) are the oppressed "proletariat." Any mention of a white working class -- once prominently represented in labor histories -- is simply met with more rationalizations or with awkward silence.

\* \* \*

The stereotype of "racist" working-class white men has made most journalists, academics and politicians fearful of acquiring a "racist" label themselves if they even raise the white-male problem. Thus, most of the recent debate over affirmative action has focused on the safer topics of costs to employers and the stigmatization of officially favored groups.

Unwanted, inadvertent findings about whites and affirmative action have been buried. Just as the Greenberg studies were suppressed in the mid-1980s, a 1990 study by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, designed to provide impetus for the 1991 civil rights bill, was bottled up. News leaks indicated the study uncovered substantial white anger toward affirmative action preferences.

\* \* \*

Mr. Lynch is visiting associate professor of government at Claremont McKenna College in California, and author of "Invisible Victims: White Males and the Crisis of Affirmative Action" (Praeger Paperbacks, 1991).

[The above quotes are part of a longer article that can be retrieved on Dow Jones News Retrieval]

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Diversity is not a Virtue

Reprinted below is an article by a neo-conservative bemoaning the loss of the "color-blind" ideal in America at the hands of liberal multiculturalists.

Most White Nationalists would view the demise of the "color-blind" integrationist ideal as the inevitable consequence of integration itself, and the opportunities that integration creates for channeling racial hostility for political advantage.

An invisible hand operates in politics as well as economics, and few white liberals are going to restrain themselves for the sake of preserving Western civilization's inclusionary and individualistic values when confronted with the opportunity to reap short term political gain from organizing and exploiting the natural racial and ethnic animus of non-whites.

As long as European-Americans remain a majority, this process of arousing non-white demands is likely to produce primarily political struggles for advantage and preferences in our legislatures and bureaucracies.

When European-Americans cease to be a majority, there is no reason to believe that the struggles will not blossom into more direct and satisfying expressions of racial animus of the kind that occurred in Haiti in 1798-1803, or in so many other parts of the World since.

The grim message of multi-culturalism, and the shock to the very souls of the neo-conservatives, is that democratic capitalism is no guarantee of tolerance. If tolerance cannot be defended even in the prosperous circumstances of the United States, then what hope is there that democratic capitalism will spread notions of tolerance through the rest of the World's multi-racial empires?

The author, Mark Helprin, despairs of a personal by-product of this process; - that of becoming a European-American.

For becoming a European-American implies a new identity for him and millions like him compelled by the need for self-defense.

YGGDRASIL SAYS behold the anguish of a neo-conservative being mugged by reality:

Nov. 25, 1994 Wall Street Journal p A8



## Diversity Is Not a Virtue

BY MARK HELPRIN

Of all the divisions in the politics of the Western world the clearest and most consequential are those between corporate or communal rights and the rights of the individual. Though other questions may be all consuming, they are often restatements of this fundamental issue.

Socialists steadfastly champion central planning despite its monotonous failures because they cannot abide individual liberty even if it accomplishes their goals of material advancement. And proponents of the free market who rest their case upon its performance forget that ultimately they are its advocates not because of its operational superiorities but because it is a necessary precondition of free society.

\* \* \*

Though the Soviet apparatus disintegrated, the communalist ideal escaped. It is still with us, harbored by the old guard in the East and the intellectual elites of the West, who, now that their enthusiasms seem no longer a matter of national betrayal, are more fervent than ever. A Dangerous Principle

At the founding of the nation, in the Civil War, and in the authentic struggle for civil rights, the corporatist idea was found wanting and the rights of the individual affirmed. Once again we are faced with the same choice, but today the churches, the president, the universities and the press endorse rather than condemn the idea that we are most importantly representatives of a class, a tribe, or a race and that we treat others and expect to be treated as such.

They do so to make amends and to "celebrate diversity," without concern that the recipients of their largesse may not themselves have been wronged. As they see it, they need only find people of the same type, and the deed is done. And what amends! To atone for having wrongly judged people by race, they will now rightly judge people by race. To atone for segregated accommodations, they offer separate dormitories. To atone for having said "colored people," they say "people of color." What they do now is as wrong as it once was-not merely because of the effect, but because of the dangerous principle that individuals do not transcend the accidents of birth.

Almost every scholastic body in the country now considers itself a kind of Congress of Vienna with the special mission of making its students aware of race and ethnicity. Though they are forced to dwell on half a dozen categories, told that this is diversity, the reduction of 250 million individuals to a handful of racial and ethnic classifications is not a recognition of

differences but their brutal suppression.

\* \* \*

A long way from equal justice under law are the debit or credit now furiously assigned to membership in various communities; the federal laws that in requiring complex racial assessments embarrassingly parallel Hitler's Aryan Decree; the virtual numerus clausus in the American university, this time directed against Asians; the regrowth of racial segregation; and the computerized homelands of Congressional redistricting.

Many well-meaning liberals now deal carelessly with the stock and trade of Nazism and apartheid, and what they advocate is racism plain and stupid, no different from the laziness of mind and deficiency of spirit of the old-time segregationist--' There goes a white one, there goes a black one, that one's an octoroon.'

They are comfortable with what they once abhorred, because it is part of the good work of promoting communal rights, and in the past few years they have expanded their purview with the voraciousness they attribute to corporate raiders. Accelerating far beyond the relatively simple matter of race, they have included absolutely everyone in their systems of grievance, publicity, manipulation, and reward.

\* \* \*

This damage having been done, the next step is the promotion of diversity as a political value, and the institutional proclamation of ethnic differences ("We're so proud to have Melanie in our class, because she's an Eskimo"). Even were this somehow to further diversity neither diversity nor unity are virtues, and should be left to find their own balance without stilted prodding. Freezing acculturation to keep each contributing element pristine would have been impossible even in the age of steam, much less now, when things change faster than we can register. Why then the useless, shallow and patronizing acclaim for the great tributaries of this new stream that goes its own way and will not be made to back up? Why the interminable school programs in which parents are forced to listen as their hostage children sing Indonesian Christmas carols? Am I really a European-American? The hell I am.

All the hyphenation and saccharine praise of differences (in which any politically useful subdivision becomes a "culture") is to organize and divide the otherwise unmanageable, unplannable chaos of a society of individuals, and thus augment the power of the state. When you want to control a complex social situation the first thing you do is make categories and award privileges. But, as in any statist system, for every entitlement there is an equal and opposite obligation. When, in the flush of class action, entitlements are compassionately granted to groups, obligations are cruelly drawn from individuals. Over all, the state is the decisive arbiter, its power increasing as it manufactures new rights and new relations, shifting

them in an ever changing shell game in which the players have the illusion that they are winning but it is the dealer who goes home with the money.

\* \* \*

### A portent of Fascism

They always mean well- Communalists, multiculturalists, the politically correct always want to do good, but they always, always require power to do so, and as their appetite for doing good is limitless, so is their capacity for acquiring power. Intent, as history shows, is a poor bulwark against despotism, and as a nation we have never failed to understand this, rightly refusing to accept either a benign despotism or one that is pernicious, for at heart they are the same.

If I have not done so already, let me make myself absolutely clear. The contemporary passion to classify and divide the American people is a portent of fascism both red and black. Where the communal approach rules (Yugoslavia, the Middle East, Northern Ireland, Soviet Central Asia, Hitler's Germany, Stalin's Russia) blood flows and no one is treated fairly. We, on the other hand, have fought many times for the sake of being apprehended not as classes of people but as individual souls.

Six generations ago, my forebears left Russia after the Kishinev Pogrom, left behind the weight of a thousand years, for a future that they thought sparkled and shone like a diamond, because it was fair, because the great, euphoric gift of America -- its essential condition, its clarity, its purity, and its decency-- was that it took them for what they were, just as God would, looking past the accidents of birth and the complications of history. I cannot imagine that we would willingly leave this behind, and I, for one, will not.

Mr. Helprin, a novelist, is a contributing editor of the Journal. This is adapted from a speech he delivered Monday at the Ethics and Public Policy Center in Washington.

[The quotes above are a part of a longer article that you can obtain through Dow Jones News Retrieval.]

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Diversity's Losers - Part 1

In numerous posts to this newsgroup, I have seen liberals make the statement that "nobody loses from diversity."

It seems intuitively obvious to most Euro-Americans that racial quotas reserving a fixed percentage of positions to black and brown persons means fewer opportunities for Euro-Americans.

To counter that common sense impression, our young liberals give us marketing slogans. What the hell, if advertising confuses people about the value of soft drinks, why not confuse them about race preferences?

What a country!

Diversity benefits us all!

But does it?

Here is a short quote from the Wall Street Journal of Nov. 11, 1996 p A14, entitled "Race Still Matters to California Companies."

"Thus California corporations will continue to hire and promote based on race and sex. San Francisco-based Levi-Strauss, for example, hires employees based on their ability to fill a specific demographic gap in its work force. The company's drive for proportional representation has one exception: Only 13% of Levi-Strauss's employees are white males, but the company has yet to undertake a campaign to redress this demographic imbalance."

Everyone seems to do well under diversity programs except white males.

The problem is that once an institution hires EEO police and puts in place performance reviews that reward promotion of minorities, an inexorable process begins. The ranks fill up with Blacks, Browns and women. The new hires become more angry about the few middle-aged white males in top management, and the only way for top management to cope with the anger from these new hires is to intensify the "diversity" efforts.

Ultimately, you get institutions like Levi-Strauss which stop hiring young white (heterosexual) males altogether. The workforce ceases to reflect the percentage of white males in the general population, or the percentage of white males within the MMSA. (The measuring unit used for EEO compliance).

The only way a young white male can get a job is if no other applicant shows up to claim it.

The fact that the average white is beginning to perceive "diversity" as a threat can hardly be surprising. Look at Harvard. Its entering freshman class is 45% "white." But 27% of the entering class is Jewish. This means that white gentiles comprising 73% of our population get only 18% of the seats in this elite institution. Further, if you look for students at Harvard who come from Baptist, Pentecostal and similar backgrounds comprising about 30% of our population, you will find that there are none!

Whatever else Harvard's undergraduate student body may be, it is not diverse.

As I mentioned in Yggdrasil's lesson 4, governments and utilities (insulated from the costs of such behavior) are the most energetic about driving white males from their ranks. That covers about 25% of the work force. But we are now beginning to see the same pattern across a broad spectrum of private employers and universities as well.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Diversity's Losers - Part II - The Universities

A slogan oft seen on this newsgroup is that "no group loses as a result of diversity." Is the slogan truth or advertising?

This series entitled "diversity's losers" is intended to answer that question.

In this second installment of the series on diversity's losers, we are going to ask two questions:

Who is the under-represented minority?

What does "diversity" really mean?

Let's put some numbers around these terms.

Below is a spreadsheet of the top 15 National Universities from the U.S. News rankings, in order of their ranking.

The Ole Ygg attended one of these universities about 30 years ago, and learned, among other things, that when someone asks for the number of "whites" attending such a university, you must ask "which whites?" The term "white" conjures images of rich wasps who attend exclusive prep schools.

So let's examine the numbers!

How many white gentiles actually attend these elite universities? Are they over-represented or under-represented?

As gatekeepers for access to the most desirable graduate schools and jobs, what definition of "diversity" is being applied? What concept of "Justice" underlies their actions?

When used by these elite institutions, does the term "diversity" mean that all groups are represented in rough proportion to their share in the general population?

Or does "diversity" mean excluding as many white gentiles as is politically possible?

The answer to this question varies by institution.

Courtesy of the Princeton Review, and its publication "Hillel Guide To Jewish Life on Campus," I have listed the enrollments at each university, including undergraduate and graduate schools.

In the next column, you will find the percent of "white" students from The Princeton Review's 1997 "The Best 310 Colleges." These percents were checked against those published in Barron's 1997 "Profiles of American Colleges."

Again, courtesy of the Hillel Guide, we have the number of Jews attending each institution. Through the miracle of simple subtraction, we then get the number and percentage of white gentiles attending each of these institutions.

#### TOP 15 NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES

SCHOOL	ENROLLMENT	% WHITE	#WHITE	#JEWS	J-%	#W-GEN	W-GEN%
YALE	10000	67	6700	3000	30	3700	37
PRINCETON	5700	70	3990	800	14	3190	56
HARVARD	16700	45	7515	4500	27	3015	18
DUKE	9500	72	6840	1500	16	5340	56
MIT	9800	48	4704	875	09	3829	39
STANFORD	14000	50	7000	2000	14	5000	36
DARTMOUTH	5270	57	3004	500	09	2504	47
BROWN	7100	67	4757	1600	23	3157	44
CALTECH	2050	56	1148	100	05	1048	51
NORTHWESTERN	10000	68	6800	2000	20	4800	48
COLUMBIA	19000	58	11020	6000	32	5020	26
CHICAGO	8500	60	5100	1350	16	3750	44
PENN	22800	60	13680	7000	31	6680	29
CORNELL	18500	67	12395	3000	16	9395	51
HOPKINS	4400	65	2860	800	18	2060	47
TOTALS	163320		97513	35025	21	62488	38

Nationally, blacks constitute 12% of our population, hispanics 9% and asians 3%. Whites are 75% of the population. Jews comprise 2.4% of the population, so non-hispanic white gentiles make up 73% of the total.

If we are really going to have "quotas" and "affirmative action" to correct for statistical imbalances in our institutions, you would expect that black and brown minorities would be preferred until the number of "whites" has fallen to 75%. At that point, we have a "diverse" student body.

But setting aside the question of "which whites" for the time being, not one of the above institutions match the percentage of whites in the population, and only 7 out of 15 on the above list (Yale, Princeton, Duke, Brown, Northwestern, Cornell and Hopkins) have enrollments that are within 10% of the population total of 75% white.

Whites are clearly under-represented at Harvard, MIT, Stanford Dartmouth, CalTech, Columbia, Chicago and Penn, but the numbers do not appear alarming on the surface, given a reasonable margin for group differences in IQ (Jews) and educational effort (Asians).

But are the student bodies at these universities really diverse?

White gentiles, comprising 73% of the general population get only 18% of the seats at Harvard. They are under-represented by a factor of 4 times. If blacks were similarly under-represented at Harvard, they would have only 3% of the seats. In fact, they have 8%.

At Harvard, white gentiles are 3 times more under-represented, relative to their share of the population, than blacks.

When you look at the totals for all 15 schools, you see that white gentiles comprise only 38% of the student population, approximately half their share in the general population.

Jews have an average IQ that is .84 standard deviations above that of white gentiles. The average for white gentiles is 100. For Jews it is 112. Based on this higher average, we would expect them to be represented at a rate of 4 to 5 times their share of the population at the IQ range of 140, which populates Harvard. That means 10 to 12% of the seats, not 27%.

Indeed, CalTech, the school with the highest SAT scores (both verbal and math) and the smartest students, has only 5% Jews.

Thus, it becomes clear that the dramatic differences in percents of white gentiles between CalTech and Princeton at one end of the scale, and Harvard and Columbia, at the other, are based on policy preferences of the institution, and not on the size of the talent pool.



The variation in the numbers of white gentiles between schools demonstrates that these variances are the result of deliberate policy choices made by the particular university.

Below is a spreadsheet setting forth the undergraduate enrollment of each of the above institutions, along with the combined SAT cutoff for the bottom 25%, the average or 50th percentile, and the SAT cutoff for the top 25%.

U-G SAT Scores

SCHOOL	U.G.ENROLLMENT	75%	50%	25%
YALE	5236	1350	1410	1550
PRINCETON	5609	1340	1370	1550
HARVARD	7098	1370	1460	1560
DUKE	6380	1290	1390	1470
MIT	4495	1380	1440	1540
STANFORD	6577	1330	1370	1530
DARTMOUTH	4286	1330	1370	1520
BROWN	5730	1290	1350	1470
CALTECH	923	1400	1470	1580
NORTHWESTERN	7570	1260	1310	1440
COLUMBIA	3573	1341	1330	1438
CHICAGO	3431	1270	1340	1470
PENN	9454	1270	1285	1440
CORNELL	13262	1250	1340	1440
HOPKINS	3427	1280	1310	1460
TOTAL	86051			

Indeed, each one of the above institutions has at least a 200 point spread between the 25th percentile and the 75th percentile. In every case except Duke, the average is closer to the cut-off for the bottom 25% than to the top 25%.

This means that, other than Duke, none of the schools maintains a statistically "normal" shaped distribution curve based on talent. Rather, at most of the institutions, you get a group of super-

bright kids in the top 25%, with a 100 to 150 point "air pocket" between them and the group that is willing to pay full tuition for prestige. It is a group that tends to cluster around the cutoff for the bottom 25%.

Indeed, this is precisely what an economist would predict. Only those at the bottom of the class accrue benefits from the name on the diploma that equal the value of the tuition payment.

Those in the top 25% at these schools can get full scholarships, if not with the institution they attend, at least with a competing institution or at a leading state institution with a top honors program. There is no reason for any of them to pay tuition.

Every one of these institutions has ample room within their odd distributions of talent to attain their own mix of financial and social objectives. With two exceptions, enrolling a representative number of white gentiles is obviously no longer one of those objectives.

The above numbers give you clear evidence that the clamor for "diversity" is really, in the minds of more than half of our elite institutions, a call for exclusion of as many white gentiles as is politically possible.

Now you might reasonably assume that the elite schools are small, and it does not really matter what they do as long as talented white gentiles are free to attend state schools.

A reasonable position.

However, I have bad news.

"Affirmative Action" is a very important tool in the government's arsenal of force and fraud. The average white thinks that government reserves only 20% of the slots for blacks and browns and that their kids are free to compete for the remainder.

But here is a typical story, from the September 2, 1996 edition of National Review Magazine, page 24:

IN the summer of 1994 Ward Connerly, a new regent of the University of California, was visited by Jerry and Ellen Cook. The Cooks' son, a Phi Beta Kappa undergrad, had been accepted to the combined Harvard/ MIT health sciences program, and was one of two California students admitted to Johns Hopkins Medical School. But he was turned away from the medical school at UC San Diego, just around the block from his home, which he hoped to attend to be near his ailing grandparents. The Cooks couldn't believe it.

It is a story you hear over and over in Newport Beach and other predominantly white gentile suburbs. "My kid had grades and scores well above average for Berkeley/UCLA but was rejected."

Indeed!

Below is a listing of the U.C. System Universities in order of their U.S. News ranking, starting with Berkeley, number 26, and extending through U.C. Santa Barbara, number 46, and then including the two "second tier" Universities, U.C. Riverside and U.C. Santa Cruz.

### UC SYSTEM UNIVERSITIES

SCHOOL	ENROLLMENT	% WHITE	#WHITE	#JEWS	%JESS	#W-GEN	% W-GEN
BERKELEY	30000	32	9600	4000	13	5600	19
UCLA	32000	42	13440	6000	19	7440	23
SAN DIEGO	18000	47	8460	2000	11	6460	36
IRVINE	15000	32	4800	1500	10	3300	22
DAVIS	22000	47	10340	2200	10	8140	37
SANTA BARBARA	18000	66	11880	2000	11	9880	55
RIVERSIDE	8500	36	3060	750	09	2310	27
SANTA CRUZ	10000	58	5800	2000	20	3800	38
TOTAL	153500		67380	20450	13	46930	31

Non-hispanic whites make up approximately 57% of the population of California. Approximately 53% are non-hispanic white gentiles. Asians are 9.6% of the California population; hispanics, 26% and blacks 7.4%

By statute, the top 12% of all high school students in the state are eligible for admission. The administration in Berkeley reports that 20% of all whites qualify, and 40% of all Asians. Thus, we would expect that whites would be over-represented, on all campuses. But instead we find that they are under-represented throughout the U.C. system, but most conspicuously at Berkeley and UCLA.

The question then becomes: where did these whites go? And why aren't there more at Berkeley and UCLA?

To follow the social engineering that is going on, you will need another spreadsheet.

### U.C.SYSTEM U-G SAT Scores

SCHOOL	U.G.ENROLLMENT	75%	50%	25%	#>25%
BERKELEY	21138	1180	1290	1430	5285
UCLA	23619	1100	1200	1340	5905
UCSD	11248	1110	1190	1330	2812
UCI	13541	980	1110	1230	3385
DAVIS	17596	1039	1150	1281	4399
UCSB	15525	1010	1090	1220	3881
RIVERSIDE	7103	910	1090	1194	1776
UCSC	8876	1010	1130	1250	2219
TOTAL	118646				29662

The table above is the same as for the top 15 rated "national" universities, except that I have added a column to indicate the number of students in the top 25%, all of whom would be above the 75th percentile at most of the top 15 national universities. The point of the final column is that the state universities have tens of thousands of students who are academically indistinguishable from the top 75% of students at the top 15 national universities.

You will notice that there is a 250 point spread between the 25th percentile and the 75th percentile at Berkeley. The spread is comparable at each of the other campuses.

But you can also see an enormous overlap between institutions. The top 25% at Davis and Santa Barbara are well above the cut off for the bottom 25% at Berkeley.

There are two critical differences between the University of California and the top 15 national universities. First, there is no economic need for the 200 point spread. U.C. Tuition is only \$4000 per year, and not \$20,000. Thus, there is no need to lower the standards at Berkeley in order to attract paying students. Many more students can afford to pay \$4000 than can afford \$20,000.

The second difference is that these campuses are not economic competitors. They are all administered and directed by a single bureaucracy in Berkeley.

If that is so, then why the enormous spreads between the top 25% and the large number of

relatively stupid kids in the bottom 25% at Berkeley? Why doesn't Berkeley just admit all the smart kids? Why are there so many relatively stupid ones as well?

The answer is that, unlike the Ivy League schools, where some of the spread is attributable to economic objectives, the huge spread in abilities at Berkeley and UCLA is entirely attributable to social engineering in the U.C. system.

And that should raise alarm bells.

White Californians are incredibly naive if they think that social engineering in the U.C. system will end with the demise of "affirmative action." The degree of social engineering that is going on is massively in excess of what the administration could accomplish with a mere 20% of the slots.

All the demise of "affirmative action" has done is to make the UC Administration scramble for a new explanation of why the numbers are so terribly skewed to the disadvantage of whites.

And indeed, the massive under-representation of white gentiles in the system, and particularly at Berkeley and UCLA, indicates that the administration is arbitrarily rejecting thousands of whites with above average scores for Berkeley and UCLA in the hopes that they will attend one of the other institutions.

Every year Asian students of mixed ancestry, who are aware of the under-representation of whites at Berkeley and UCLA, ask me if they would have a better chance of admission if they claimed to be "white." My answer is always in the form of a question - "What makes you think that they aren't deliberately excluding whites by applying higher standards to whites than asians?" After all, that is the numeric result they are achieving! Who is to say it is not intended?

Do all states behave like California?

Compare the California system results with the University of Texas, the University of Michigan, the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, and Ohio State!

#### SELECTED STATE UNIVERSITIES

SCHOOL	ENROLLMENT	% WHITE	#WHITE	#JEWS	%JEWS	#W-GEN	% W-GEN
TEXAS	48500	65	31525	4000	08	27525	57
MICHIGAN	35000	72	25200	6000	17	19200	55

ILL-URBANA	36000	72	25920	3000	08	22920	64
OHIO ST	53000	82	43460	3300	06	40160	76
TOTAL	172500		126105	16300	09	109805	64

You will notice that the percent of white gentiles at each of these universities is roughly proportionate to the their number in the general population. Michigan and Texas are virtually indistinguishable from Berkeley academically, and the tens of thousands of students in the top 25% at these schools all meet or exceed the qualifications for the top 75% at the top 15 national universities.

### U-G SAT Scores

School	U.G.Enrollment	75%	50%	25%	#>25%
TEXAS	30100	1100	1290	1330	7525
MICHIGAN	21971	1200	1240	1420	5493
ILLINOIS	25839	1170	1240	1350	6460
OHIO ST	30499	990	1090	1200	7625
TOTALS	108409				27103

The significant difference between these four schools and the California system is that they practice "affirmative action" in the sense that it is understood by white gentiles -- that under-represented groups will be preferred until the percentage of white gentiles is in line with their share of the total population.

But this is not what Jews, Blacks, Mexicans and Asians mean when they use the term "diversity."

Indeed old stereotypes die hard. The Princeton Review's guide to the best 310 colleges has this to say about the student body at Harvard:

"'Brilliant' is the word most often used by Harvard students to describe each other; 'preppy' is the second most common description. Still many students indicated surprise at how heterogeneous the student body here is."

"Preppy" is a term applied to rich WASPs. If there are any at Harvard, it is a tiny minority of less than 18%. The above quote is important because it indicates that in a school dominated by Jews, Asians, Blacks and Browns, no matter how few white gentiles attend, it is still too many.

About the student body at Columbia, the Princeton Review Guide had this to say:

"Students give themselves high marks in ethnic diversity/interaction, and openness/acceptance of alternative lifestyles, all hallmarks of a liberal student body."

Why would students at an institution in which white gentiles are only a third their share of the general population pride themselves on their diversity? If that is true, then the term "diversity" can only be a code word for the absence of white gentiles.

Here is a quote from Princeton Review's discussion of UC Santa Barbara, a school which is 55% white gentile:

"'Warning: Everyone here is blond,' is how a UCSB student characterizes his classmates...Adds an Asian Student, 'This school is not ethnically diverse at all, but I'm getting used to it.'"

At best, one out of 10 UCSB students will be blonde.

But in the eyes of a typical Asian student, a school with 55% white gentiles is "not ethnically diverse at all."

This means that Asian (Jewish, Black, Mexican) students are uniformly uncomfortable on a campus with more than a token number of whites. Any more than 10% whites and the school is not "diverse."

This meaning of the term "diversity" is very important.

Whenever minorities lobby for diversity efforts in college admissions or in employment, whites imagine that they mean "proportionate to their share of the population." But the minorities themselves mean that the proportion of whites must be driven down to something like 10%.

Once the EEO police hired by Harvard, Columbia, Stanford or the University of California understand what it takes to make the Asian, Jewish, Black, and Mecha members of their community "comfortable," white gentiles are on their way out.

That is what we hear if we listen.

That is what we see in the numbers.

The portents for White America once their numbers fall to less than 50% are grim indeed.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.





---

## The Way We Were - Part I

I am purchasing tires for daughter's car.

Seeking to maximize the utility of my time spent improving someone else's productivity in what passes for a store lobby, my eye drifts to a copy of the local rag, lying on a vacant seat.

What ho?!!

What is this I see? A headline which says "Civilians tried to get custody of atomic arms" and "Declassified history shows behind-scenes fight in late 1940s for control of weapons."

My code antennae are on max alert. I can tell from the headline that this article will say very little about the motives behind this conflict, but will speak volumes to its small intended audience. But the by line contains another surprise. It is an AP piece written by one Robert Burns. It might be a misdirect, but most probably one of my own tribesmen.

My curiosity is much aroused. Now understand that before I even start the article, I am expecting a masterpiece of concealment, deception and code-speak. After all, if this piece is about who and what I suspect it is, then deep encryption of the message will be necessary for this article to survive past the AP editor's desk. Expectations are high indeed!

And the very first paragraph does not disappoint:

"WASHINGTON - In the early years of America's monopoly on atomic weapons, civilian and military leaders fought behind the scenes over who should have custody of the small but growing arsenal, according to a newly declassified Pentagon history of the period."

Now what normal person would expect that anyone other than the military would have custody over a weapon. Indeed, the only reason not to give them custody is if you distrust them. But then the U.S. military has never disobeyed orders. It has a 200 year record. So I have not gone past the first paragraph, and it is already clear that we are dealing with powerful and fundamentally irrational emotions on the part of people with sufficient political connections to obtain sub-cabinet and commission level political appointments.

Ok, so let's try paragraph two:

"With 'suspicion and distrust on both sides,' the quiet struggle reached crisis proportions in 1948. Civilian leaders deemed the military unfit to maintain the new weapons, the military argued that it must have possession and control in order to be prepared to use the weapons on short notice."

Now this is really curious, the U.S. military has just won "The Good War." What percentage of the population in 1948 could possibly think the military "unfit" and untrustworthy to keep nuclear weapons?

And like a good journalist, Mr. Burns gives us the heavily encrypted answer in paragraph 3.

"In the summer of 1948, President Truman, citing the approaching elections, chose to let the tempest continue, according to the once secret Pentagon document, 'History of the Custody and Deployment of Nuclear Weapons,' written in 1978."

Folks, I'll give you one guess. You only get one strike in the great game of American Cultural Decryption. Here is the quiz. Name the one political constituency which a) would mistrust the American military despite having fought the Good War, b) would be feared by Truman, and c) would attach political significance to an arcane issue like custody of nuclear weapons.

Of course all of you recognize instantly that this can be none other than the inner party (as I have previously defined it).

Now the next question is whether the author will break crude and identify a player or two in a way that discloses the ethnic identity of the "civilians" for the "encryption challenged."

So let us continue our read:

"The first atomic bombs were built during World War II by the super-secret Manhattan Engineer District, run by Army Gen. Leslie Groves."

Groves. Ok, no surprises here and not points deducted. Let's continue:

"In late 1946, the small existing stockpile of nuclear weapons was transferred to control of the Atomic Energy Commission, a civilian agency whose first chairman was David Lilienthal."

Lilienthal?

Seriously, was that really necessary? Couldn't Burns, the author, have picked a non-inner party secretary or spokesperson or something less conspicuous?

The only thing that remains is to see how this Burns guy handles the emotion behind the issue. How can one possibly explain it? From the viewpoint of the military it is easy. Anger at universalized "civilians" mistrusting them and interfering with the performance of their jobs will be all that it takes. But how can one possibly describe the fears of the inner party without causing himself no end of trouble?

The suspense builds! It's like the triple axle in figure skating. Can this Burns fellow redeem himself? Can he pull it off?

Here is part one:

"Norris, who is writing a biography of Groves, said the Army general was offended at the civilians' position.

"'He was wounded by all of this,' Norris said. 'From his point of view, 'You gave me the responsibility of building the bomb during the war, and now you don't trust me with it?' Norris said."

Nice graceful lead in to the final jump.

And now the tough part. How does one encrypt the emotions and delusions on the other side? Here it comes:

"The military pressed Defense Secretary James Forrestal to get Truman on their side. Truman said no."

"According to Secretary Forrestal, the president had informed him that it might be possible to re-examine this issue at a later date, perhaps after the fall elections," the Pentagon history says. In the months leading up to the November election, Truman said custody should remain with civilian authorities."

James Forrestal!

Magnificent! I never would have thought of it!

After all, Forrestal - the son of an Irish immigrant, a Princeton graduate, chairman of Dillon Read, America's first Secretary of Defense under Roosevelt, and Truman cabinet appointee -

was subjected to vicious personal media attacks by Drew Pearson and Walter Winchell following his opposition to the formation of the state of Israel and the expulsion of Palestinians from their lands. The public personal attacks caused him to suffer a nervous breakdown and resign.

The very mention of James Forrestal would, of course, remind inner party readers that this was their emotional issue, without having to describe the feelings explicitly. Through this ingenious encryption, the author avoids implanting awkward questions in the minds of outer party readers that would be triggered by any candid discussion of inner party feelings on the matter. The powerful symbolism of Forrestal allows the emotion of the story to be lightly encrypted for the audience possessed of a public "group key", while leaving the outer party with a comforting image of a universalist sounding "civilians" opposed to military control of nuclear weapons.

Brilliant. - I give it a 9.8 out of 10 possible. How about you!

All of which begs the ultimate question, which is how on earth we of the outer party ever reached such a state of debility that we failed to react collectively to this outrage. After all, this notion that nuclear weapons were the exclusive national property of the inner party - not to be shared with us - means that this group of American citizens had a powerful shared vision of the proper condition in which we should be maintained, namely, a role in which we are defenseless drones, producing and consuming, but bereft of meaningful sovereignty and self-determination, and ruled by a hostile elite. How could we fail to see that our common group interests were threatened, and that these interests should be defended?

How did we come to such a pass?

As some of you may know from e-mails and direct correspondence, I am working on a larger project involving this very issue. But I think that Forrestal was typical of his generation of outer party Wasp (Irish, Wasp? - It makes no difference because we all look the same to them!). Forrestal provides us with one rather spectacular example of our collective debility - the incapacity to recognize hostile purposes and to defend against groups acting in accordance with those hostile purposes.

To the inner party, Forrestal's public campaign to "take the Palestine issue out of partisan politics" and for a "federated state in Palestine in which the inner party and Arabs would share power" made him an anti-semite.

But for us, Forrestal is a very special symbol of universalist naivete - and the first and most prominent sacrificial lamb upon the alter of inner party group interests.

In his book, *The Samson Option*, Seymour Hersh describes in detail the early AEC, in which the driving force was not its chairman, Alfred Lilienthal, but Lewis Strauss, an inner party member

that Hersh describes as "the strongman of the Commission." (Page 84)

At the same time, Abe Feinberg, the man who turned around Truman's losing presidential campaign with a donation of the then unheard of sum of \$2 million, was raising funds for the development of Israel's nuclear weapons program. (Page 93). So the communication lines were crystal clear. Any outer-party liberal Democrat serving in Truman's cabinet had ready access to the relevant political facts if he wanted to know them.

The nuclear custody issue was clearly and obviously a particularist issue of group interests as the inner party saw those interests. More telling, of course was the reaction of Forrestal, who, following the pattern of his folk at the time, ignored what his intellect must have plainly recognized, choosing instead to transform these particular group interests into the universalized interests of "civilians," thereby permitting him to deal with the issue in universalized terms and to avoid the socially unacceptable consequences of confronting the group interests and opposing them in a direct way through exposure and through rallying his own group for support.

In this respect, Forrestal and virtually all of his outer party contemporaries were modern day Don Quixotes, transforming a fairly obvious objective reality into something more psychologically manageable.

Most telling, of course, is that Burns, the author of the story under discussion, must believe the disease still widespread, or he would not have written the article reprinted below based on the assumption that the outer party readers would react exactly as Forrestal did 50 years ago. Indeed, this is my most powerful evidence that Forrestal's individual reaction was shaped by powerful group norms shared by most outer party newspaper readers, certainly in his own time, and even to this day.

But the times have changed for us.

Try and imagine any outer party member politically connected enough to land a cabinet appointment in the year 2000 who would oppose the interests of Israel and then be surprised when he is attacked in the media on some unrelated issue.

Try and imagine further, that he would be so surprised and upset by the attack that he would have a nervous breakdown and be unable to continue to serve.

After what happened to Charles Percy, William Fulbright, and numerous others who have tried to maintain their personal dignity and independence on issues of foreign policy, it is hard to imagine a modern politician of any party failing to anticipate the payback for opposing inner party group interests, or if opposed, allowing the inevitable public attacks to upset one's fundamental view of one's self.

In some respects, outer party politicians have come a long way since 1948. John Kennedy would vent in private about the inner party and its power (Hersh, pp 96-97, 117). And we all know that Richard Nixon vented his frustrations with the inner party privately in the infamous tapes. Try to imagine Pat Buchanan being surprised by public attacks.

Indeed, in order for Forrestal to have had a nervous breakdown in response to the public attacks, he would have to believe that he and the inner party were members of a single universalized humanity sharing common bonds of trust and respect such as would prevent a personal attack unless he were guilty of some sort of breach that caused it.

And this is critical to understanding our present predicament. For it can only be a deep instinctive feeling that all who live in geographic proximity with us automatically share tribal bonds of trust and respect that could render us unable to confront obvious group behavior when we see it.

For some reason, it has become more important to our identities to preserve this odd notion of geographic brotherhood, or brotherhood based on land, than to protect our own interests or to ensure our collective survival against the encroachments of those who share the land with us.

It is a failing ultimately reinforced by the fear that confrontation would diminish us in the eyes of those who are undeniably part of our wider "kinship" or national grouping, even if, for most of us who suffer under the heavy universalist disability, that kinship is recognized only to the extent it is forced upon us by our dissimilar neighbors who persist in displaying group behavior despite our polite refusal to acknowledge its existence.

To see the extent of the change, all one need do is compare the roster of names in Truman's first cabinet (Byrnes, Vinson, Patterson, Forrestal, Biddle, Hannegan, Krug, Anderson, Harriman, Schellenbach) with Clinton's cabinet roster.

The inescapable conclusion: - It is becoming more and more difficult to find outer party members willing to serve on their knees.

While the attitudes of the American descendants of European Christendom change with glacial slowness, they do change. Ultimately, ideas follow action. And our actions show clearly that it is becoming more and more difficult for us to maintain the universalist delusion. We may still be willing to work tirelessly for universalism, but when the inner party forces its agenda upon us, we stop volunteering. And so, the universalist elite is rapidly falling apart under the weight of the crassness of the inner party agenda.

A quick tour through *The Forrestal Diaries*, (Viking Press, 1951) is instructive.

Here we have a collection of Forrestal's private notes. In Forrestal's private notes this notion of a federated state of inner party and Arabs sharing power in Palestine simply pops up ex cathedra. There is no discussion of whether the concept was consistent with the behavior of Irgun on the ground at the time, and no expression of doubts about whether such an arrangement could be used effectively to transform the conflict from inner party terrorist violence to the more civilized form of conflict carried on in legislative debates. It is merely assumed - "a truth universally acknowledged" so to speak.

Indeed, Forrestal embodies this notion that there is a universal American interest that is universally understood by all Americans and to which lesser considerations of residual old-world tribal and national loyalties will naturally subserve. See especially his notes on page 344 of a luncheon conversation with Senator McGrath in which he analogizes removing Palestine from domestic politics to "the Eire-Irish question of forty years ago and that neither should be permitted to have any substantial influence on American Policy."

Oh my!

It was a basic failure to understand the nature of the multi-cultural society that was in the early stages of being forced upon this country at that time!

Indeed to understand just how out of step and ultimately self-destructive Forrestal's thinking is, one need only read his Diaries along side "The Fatal Embrace", by Benjamin Ginsberg (University of Chicago, 1993).

In The Fatal Embrace, Ginzberg rather boldly and explicitly relates every liberal policy to its specific impact on the group interests of the inner party. It is a perfect illustration of how winners and survivors think in a multi-cultural society.

Human equality is our central delusion.

And when I say human equality, I mean group equality, for everyone recognizes that individuals are wildly unequal. But there can be no differences among groups despite the evidence of our eyes and our experience.

Our survival depends primarily upon our ability to understand ourselves and why we cling so tenaciously to this delusion. No one else on Earth believes it. Only the descendants of European Christendom.

Before understanding where this delusion comes from, and the strategies for its expulsion from our collective consciousness, it is first necessary to recognize that, unlike the inner party, we as a people are prone to delusions that are contrary to our self interest. That is why I regard Charles McKay's 1841 masterpiece "Memoirs of Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of

Crowds" to be one of the seven Nationalist Classics.

It is a classic for investors because of his description of the great speculative manias we fall victim to including the Mississippi Scheme, The South Sea Bubble and Tulipomania. But to stop at the end of these early chapters is to deprive yourself of a deeper understanding of the inherent weakness of European peoples. You must read the remaining chapters, especially the chapters on the Crusades and the Witch trials (which spread all over Europe and only touched the Puritan colonies in Massachusetts for a very brief period).

When one reads McKay, one is struck with a profound irony, for these delusions are not "popular" nor are they embraced by our stereotype of the "crowd", but rather they are the peculiar province of our upper classes - our elites. After all, investment manias are restricted to those with capital to invest. Similarly, there were many crusades, but only one minor peasants' crusade. The remainder were staffed and financed, much to their own personal disadvantage, by Knights, Barons and Kings.

And in every one, our elites embrace with wild enthusiasm a course of action profoundly contrary to their own long term interests based on a vision of reality that even the lowliest peasant would reject out of hand.

Only a member of the outer party elite could read McKay and not see the irony of the title, or fail to see that the memoirs are about him. Only an outer party elite could read Cervantes masterpiece Don Quixote, and not realize that he is reading about himself.

Only our outer party elite could watch this campaign to deprive us of control of our own nuclear weapons - driven by an impulse from deep within the inner party and requiring no visible communication or coordination among themselves - and refuse to acknowledge the mortal danger to his own people - his own descendants.

More coming in "The Way we Were - Part II"

-----

Austin American-Statesman Oct. 21, 1999 pA17 Civilians tried to get custody of atomic arms

Declassified history shows behind-scenes fight in late 1940s for control of weapons

BY ROBERT BURNS Associated Press

WASHINGTON-In the early years of America's monopoly on atomic weapons, civilian and military leaders fought behind the scenes over who should have custody of the small but



growing arsenal, according to a newly declassified Pentagon history of the period.

With "suspicion and distrust on both sides," the quiet struggle reached crisis proportions in 1948. Civilian leaders deemed the military unfit to maintain the new weapons, the military argued that it must have possession and control in order to be prepared to use the weapons on short notice.

In the summer of 1948, President Truman, citing the approaching elections, chose to let the tempest continue, according to the once secret Pentagon document, "History of the Custody and Deployment of Nuclear Weapons," written in 1978. The history was partially declassified this year and released in response to a Freedom of Information Act request by Robert Norris, a military historian.

U.S. military leaders grew increasingly concerned about the custody dispute as world tensions increased with the Soviet blockade of Berlin in June 1948, although the Soviets did not yet have their own nuclear arms.

In the spring of 1949, a few months before the first Soviet nuclear test, a resolution began to emerge, allowing the military initially to control nuclear weapon assemblies positioned at bases overseas. Internal tensions eased, although more than a decade passed before the Defense Department gained full custody.

Then, as now, the president retained final say over ordering the actual use of such weapons.

"To say that the issue of civilian versus military control of atomic energy had been a burning, acrimonious issue for years would be an understatement of classic proportions," the Pentagon history said.

Even today, arguments persist over responsibility for U.S. nuclear weapons and the vast network of laboratories and other installations associated with them. The Energy Department has control over research, development, manufacturing and testing of nuclear weapons, but after reports of Chinese stealing U.S. nuclear laboratory secrets, some in Congress called for the Pentagon to take those responsibilities.

The first atomic bombs were built during World War II by the super-secret Manhattan Engineer District, run by Army Gen. Leslie Groves. Two were dropped on Japan in August 1945, ending the war. In late 1946, the small existing stockpile of nuclear weapons was transferred to control of the Atomic Energy Commission, a civilian agency whose first chairman was David Lilienthal.

Groves led the charge to win military custody of the weapons. Lilienthal was his chief antagonist. At a White House meeting in March 1948, one month after Groves retired, Truman

cautioned the two sides that in view of troubling signs of aggressive intentions by communists in Europe they had better find a solution.

Norris, who is writing a biography of Groves, said the Army general was offended at the civilians' position.

"He was wounded by all of this," Norris said. "From his point of view, 'You gave me the responsibility of building the bomb during the war, and now you don't trust me with it?' " Norris said.

The military pressed Defense Secretary James Forrestal to get Truman on their side. Truman said no.

"According to Secretary Forrestal, the president had informed him that it might be possible to re-examine this issue at a later date, perhaps after the fall elections," the Pentagon history says. In the months leading up to the November election, Truman said custody should remain with civilian authorities.

A few months later, however, agreements were reached on giving the military a limited custodial role, and as of June 1949, military personnel of the Armed Forces Special Weapons Project were involved in inspection of weapons and their routine maintenance at storage sites in the United States.

[1949 AP file photo Before his re-election and this inaugural address, President Truman backed giving custody of the atomic arsenal to a civilian authority, but by summer 1949, the military had regained a limited inspection-and-maintenance role, newly released documents say.]

The outbreak of war on the Korean peninsula in June 1950 gave rise to more controversy over custody. Concerned about Soviet intentions in Europe, Truman authorized the first transfer of nuclear weapon components minus their nuclear explosive capsules - to storage sites in the United Kingdom, Guam and aboard the U.S. Navy aircraft carrier Coral Sea in the Mediterranean Sea.

The military wanted control at overseas bases not just for the nuclear bomb components but also the U.S.-based nuclear capsules under Atomic Energy Commission control that would have to be flown in during a crisis. Truman approved the first such transfer of nuclear capsules to military control abroad in June 1953.

(c) 1999 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

## The Way We Were - Part II

A correspondent was kind enough to drop me a note calling my attention to a passage in the Forrestal Diaries that I previously glossed over. Upon a close re-read, it illustrates the workings of the universalist, de-racinated mind better than any other example I have found.

The passage is from page 121 of The Forrestal Diaries - the entry for Dec. 27, 1945. It is especially timely because it reflects upon Patrick Buchanan's thesis in his new book to the effect that if the U.S. had remained out of the Good War, Hitler would have attacked Russia and left us alone.

However, the purpose of this posting is not to vindicate a particular historical point of view, but rather to examine the thought process of a middle of the road, moderate pro-business Democrat 50 years ago to see if we can find any clues as to our present dilemma. We are focusing on the vulnerability of the Euro-American mind at a critical crossroads, and attempting to ascertain the degree to which he limits the range of his intellect to socially accepted norms. Because of the way in which socially accepted norms work, we can infer from Forrestal's example the limits of socially acceptable thought and speech internalized by a huge majority of Forrestal's outer part elite contemporaries.

Let's start with the first paragraph:

"Played golf today with Joe Kennedy [Joseph P. Kennedy, who was Roosevelt's Ambassador to Great Britain in the years immediately before the war]. I asked him about his conversations with Roosevelt and Neville Chamberlain from 1938 on. He said Chamberlain's position in 1938 was that England had nothing with which to fight and that she could not risk going to war with Hitler. Kennedy's view: That Hitler would have fought Russia without any later conflict with England if it had not been for Bullitt's [William C. Bullitt, then Ambassador to France] urging on Roosevelt in the summer of 1939 that the Germans must be faced down about Poland; neither the French nor the British would have made Poland a cause of war if it had not been for the constant needling from Washington. Bullitt, he said, kept telling Roosevelt that the Germans wouldn't fight, Kennedy that they would, and that they would overrun Europe. Chamberlain, he says, stated that America and the world Jews had forced England into the war. In his telephone conversation with Roosevelt in the summer of 1939 the

President kept telling him to put some iron up Chamberlain's backside. Kennedy's response always was that putting iron up his backside did no good unless the British had some iron with which to fight, and they did not...."

This passage is fascinating and important for two reasons. First, it suggests something that I have never heard from any other source, namely, that "neither the French nor the British would have made Poland a cause of war if it had not been for the constant needling from Washington." We have become accustomed to thinking that nations make decisions based on their interests, and not the personality quirks or emotions of their leaders. This passage shows clearly that Joe Kennedy had a distinctly non-determinist view of history.

Second, note that the remarks of Kennedy are elicited by a question from Forrestal about "his conversations with Roosevelt and Neville Chamberlain from 1938 on." In other words, Forrestal credits this very same non-determinist view of history enough to be curious about the answer. In an oblique sort of way, the question and the answer both credit the view of history held by the other side in the Good War, namely that the course of human events is greatly determined by "the leadership principle," a resolutely anti-marxist view.

In other words, Forrestal was willing to at least ponder the possibility that the personal needling from Roosevelt could inflame the pride of Chamberlain enough to influence his decision about Britain's national interests. It also demonstrates that the calumny directed at Chamberlain to the effect that he was an appeaser and a coward, as opposed to a statesman willing to grant Germany control over its irredent ethnic German populations, was part of a pre-planned campaign of defamation.

Hmm!

Now clearly, the question posed by Forrestal demonstrates that he was far too much of a free thinker for the comfort of the inner party. There is no way they would allow such a person to continue to hold a cabinet position in a presidential administration that they financed and controlled once this degree of free thinking was uncovered.

The next paragraph is even more interesting:

"What Kennedy told me in this conversation jibes substantially with the remarks Clarence Dillon had made to me already, to the general effect that Roosevelt had asked him in some manner to communicate privately with the British to the end that Chamberlain should have greater firmness in his dealings with Germany. Dillon told me that at Roosevelt's request he had talked with Lord Lothian in the same general sense as Kennedy reported Roosevelt having urged him to do with Chamberlain. Lothian presumably was to communicate to Chamberlain the gist of his conversation with Dillon."

Clarence Dillon was the Forrestal's boss at Dillon Read, and purchaser of the World renowned Chateau Haut Brion in retirement (a much better wine in my view than that produced by the vineyard bearing the best known inner party name in the World. The name of his son, C. Douglas Dillon, Treasurer under Eisenhower, appeared on every dollar bill I earned as a kid at the caddy shack. Only years later would I understand the political and social significance of the battle fought by the old men at that club to keep the caddy shack open and outlaw self propelled golf carts, and only after several bottles of Haut Brion ten years later (clearly vindicating the view of those old men) would I notice that the "Dillon" on all those dollar bills had a connection with Clarence, as in "domaine Clarence Dillon". But I digress!)

This passage is even more revealing than the first, because it shows that Forrestal was indeed a political animal. First, he is very careful to conceal what his investment banking partner, Clarence Dillon really thought of the war. Forrestal is clearly more reluctant to document Dillon's views than those of the combative and notorious Kennedy. This passage tells us that he was very well aware that the social boundaries of acceptable opinion were considerably narrower than those expressed by Kennedy and intimidated by his boss and partner, Clarence Dillon. The passage also cleverly reveals that this pressure on Chamberlain was indeed part of an extensive campaign, particularly if it reached to Republicans like Dillon.

Now the third paragraph is the most interesting:

"Looking backward there is undoubtedly foundation for Kennedy's belief that Hitler's attack could have been deflected to Russia, but I think he fails to take into account what would have happened after Hitler had conquered Russia. Would he have been content to stop? Nothing in his record indicates that that would have been the case, but rather that having removed the threat to his eastern frontiers he would then have exercised the options open to him to construct a European German-dominated system to which he later gave expression after overrunning France."

After a very promising intro full of free and remarkably perceptive inquiry, we get the cliché; "Would he have been content to stop?" as moral justification for prolonging and intensifying an immensely destructive European war in which over 30 million died. First, up until 1940, all of Germany's aggressive acts were assertions of control over irredent German populations in the multi-ethnic states surrounding it. What if Germany's racial ideology really did inform its actions? If so, then the chance of an unprovoked attack on France or England was nil.

Second, Forrestal was certainly aware that Germany was a short distance from a huge and incredibly aggressive neighbor openly espousing an ideology of World conquest, killing millions upon millions of Christians within its own borders, and decapitating all of its domestic racial and ethnic groups save the inner party by killing or deporting their most intelligent members. What characteristic might France have shared with this aggressive

neighbor that would provoke a similar response from Germany?

These facts were well known to Kennedy and to Forrestal. Again, the social censor is on the march. Clearly, socially imposed norms will not permit Forrestal to consider the possibility that Hitler might have had much more narrowly circumscribed ambitions.

Finally, while this would have been a bit of a stretch back in 1945 for anyone other than Sir Arthur Keith, when one examines the tribal or mono-ethnic states of Europe, they are the most peaceful. Finland, for example, would fight fiercely to retain its independence, but never attempted to conquer anyone else. The same is true of Denmark, Sweden, Norway and half a dozen others.

Indeed, in the 1500 years during which Scotland fought to maintain its independence from England, it never attacked anyone with the intention of taking their land or subjugating their people. Same is true of Ireland and Wales. Rather, it was the multi-ethnic empire England that was the perennial aggressor, as was France, and Austria-Hungary.

If Forrestal's justification for the war is to be taken literally, one must believe that Germany would have subdued Russia first to eliminate an obvious threat (and to gain access to oil) and then would have attacked France and Britain just because they were there.

A stretch to be sure.

And a stretch that would have been immediately obvious to Forrestal had he allowed himself to think about it and not short circuit his obvious intellectual gifts with a socially acceptable cliché.

Indeed, the third paragraph quoted above is premised upon a truth universally acknowledged - namely, that international stability requires a "balance of power". A "balance of power" must at all times be maintained, for apparently any European nation, if given the opportunity, will inevitably and always conquer its neighbors and incorporate them into a larger nation.

Now it is true, as Sir Arthur Keith has pointed out, that the History of Europe is one of tribal and national amalgamation. Strong kings would subdue weak Kings by force and incorporate the conquered people and land into a larger nation, forcing them to assimilate, to learn the language and to redirect their loyalty and patriotic feelings toward a much broader kinship group - the multi-ethnic empire. What remains notably absent from our history texts is the fact that the Kings and their administrators were betraying their own kinship group in the process while promising benefits to a few, based on enlarged markets, an enlarged tax base, and an enlarged population pool from which to draw infantry for future conquests. Tribes, including one's own, became a universalized commodity to be absorbed, manipulated, lied to and blended.

Ironically, the notion of a "balance of power" became necessary to slow this universalizing process. It was sought by diplomats for two distinct reasons - first and primarily, as a means of protecting one universalizing empire from conquest by another - both sides accepting the premise that small nations were obsolete, and disputing only whether theirs should be the absorber or the absorbee.

Then, second, in order to maintain independence and control over their own genetic destinies, the smaller ethno states would either form alliances with the larger universalizers or declare "neutrality," depending upon their perception of where the least danger lay.

Hitler had no cultural or other connection with the universalizers, and everyone knew it. Rather, he was a street kid, growing up in whatever the equivalent of the American caddy shack might have been in small town Austria. His world view was dominated by his contact with the inner party as a youth, which clearly and obviously formed his racial view of reality. While the aristocrats in the military and the civil service might have been universalists and imperialists, it is quite clear that Hitler was not and never could be. While he would fight fiercely for the Safety and self-determination of Germans everywhere, it was equally clear that he would not sacrifice German lives merely for the commercial gain of a few German aristocrats and industrialists. Recall that most of his political contributions came from ordinary working and middle class people.

Oddly, the standard bromide, "Would he have been content to stop?" could only seriously entertained if Forrestal believed that Hitler adopted his racial theories solely for reasons of political opportunism, and that he really had the same essential world view as Forrestal's classmates at Princeton, all of whom would, if given the power, instantly and reflexively overrun the entire planet and force the races to mix at the point of the bayonet, all in the name of commerce, efficiency, and social justice.

After all, for the true universalist, it is only a small leap from the multi-ethnic European empire of the preceding five centuries to the multi-racial empire of Twentieth Century.

That is why I reach two very important conclusions from the above three passages.

First, passages one and two show that Forrestal was either unaware of the boundaries of thought and discourse acceptable to the inner party, or he grossly underestimated their power to enforce those boundaries. Hence his later downfall.

Second, his carelessness of boundaries of speech and thought imposed on us by the inner party sets in clear and stark relief a different and obviously much more powerful native social censor that shows its grip over Forrestal very clearly in the third paragraph.



And it is this second social censor that is more interesting. Where does it come from? Why do we carry it around? Is this social censor even more dangerous to our long run survival than the alien version imposed by the inner party?

A second correspondent wrote the following e-mail in response to "The Way We Were - Part I" which broadly hints at the conclusion of this series coming up in "The Way We Were - Part III":

"I just read your latest. What was that saying about the fish always rotting at the head first? Our elites have their peculiar delusions and the will and ability to enforce them on the rest of us. The notion that anyone living in our common homeland must be a fellow tribesman with similar outlooks and interests, however, is a very deeply ingrained notion in Western Civilization, and one not easily put aside. We have our work cut out for us.

"Have you read Lawrence Brown's "The Might of the West"? It is an anglo-Americanized version of Spengler, in which he explains, among other things, how the West (basically the descendants of pre-1500 Catholic Europe) has always been organized around territorial sovereignty unlike the Levantine Civilization which is composed of sect-nations (Islam, Jews, various factions of Christians, Zoroastrians, Manicheans, Mandeans, etc.) whose nations are based on blood descent and adherence to the same laws and sacred books, and whose existence is independent of whether the sect-nation holds territorial power or not, and whose territorial extent is identical with the location of its membership, regardless of geographical dispersion.

"Given the 1,000 year history of our Western perception of territorial nationality, it will not be easy to break free from this and base our understanding of our own identity purely on racial and cultural grounds. Historically, the more Western portions of "Latin Christian" Europe have been more closely tied to this territorial model, given the early consolidation of the national monarchies in the West (England, France, Spain, Portugal, Denmark, Sweden, etc.), and their ability to create centralized, territorial states where over time, the ethnic self-identity of the population and its territorial sovereignty became identical.

"In the east, in Germany, Poland, Hungary, Italy, etc., where nationhood came late and where national groups were intermingled, the notion of nationality as not just territorial but racial/cultural as well, was much stronger. You might say that the 20th century involved our elites, now the "outer party", forcing their notions of nationality at gunpoint on the populations of central and eastern Europe, regardless of cost in life, treasure, or corruption of their own "outer party" cultural norms and values.

"How do we get our elites to see reality for what it is, rather than for what they wish it to be? And to act on this reality? We are fighting against some deeply rooted Western

cultural norms."

More coming!

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to the White Awakenings Page](#)

(c) 1999 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

## The Way We Were - Part III

Politics is generally a forbidden topic around our house. If I launch around the kids, their eyes roll in one of those teen-aged "not another lecture from dad" looks. My wife generally doesn't want to hear it either, and has ways of making her preferences felt.

But she rises earlier than I, grabs the Wall Street Journal, and devours it before I wander down the stairs. By the time I reach the kitchen, after checking the globex quotes in the morning, I will often find the table empty, except that occasionally the Journal will repose passively with its pages bent back and open, invariably to the best that the day has to offer.

The article below is a particular gem, stumbled upon according to the above described pattern. It was buried in "The Weekend" section of the Journal. Left to my own devices, I never would have found it and would have missed its message of "once in one hundred year" importance.

This article should shake you to your core.

It begins with a simple statement of fact:

"'They all laughed at Christopher Columbus when he said the world was round.' Ira Gershwin didn't have to explain his words when his song became a huge hit in 1936, since everyone knew them to be true.

"The problem is, they weren't--as we might do well to remember on Monday as we observe Columbus Day.

" Christopher Columbus's contemporaries didn't laugh because they knew very well--had never doubted--the earth's sphericity. Medieval science had been built on the precise studies of classical scholars, much of whose work had survived through the centuries.

" Not only had the ancient Greeks understood the earth's sphericity--and handed down the knowledge--but the philosopher Eratostenes had accurately calculated the earth's circumference in the third century B.C. While subsequent scholars debated many details--the earth's size, the extent of its oceans--no serious scholar believed the earth to be flat."

So the most basic lesson of American History that we learned as children was a lie.

The European world knew full well that the World was round in 1492.

Having established that our history is false, the article then asks the question, "why?"

" How is it then that many Americans, aided by their grade-school textbooks, continue to believe that Christopher Columbus's big achievement was to prove the earth's roundness to ignorant contemporaries who feared he would sail off the edge of the earth into eternal damnation?"

Now the "why" question is quite unusual. Here we have an author in a neoconservative newspaper asking "who benefits?" and "what is the hidden agenda behind this universally accepted myth?" A dangerous tendency in this media saturated world.

At this point, my code antennae are triangulating on the neoconservative wing of the inner party. After all, outer party members rarely ask "who benefits?". We believe what we read and almost always accept the surface message as true. And since the neocon wing of the inner party knows this about us, the article does not tease or conceal, but delivers up the answer straight away with no coding at all. It is obvious that the "encryption impaired" outer party is the intended audience:

" The myth was popularized by scientists in the late 19th century, says Harvard paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould in his recent book, "Rock of Ages: Science and Religion in the Fullness of Life." Their purpose was to fell religion in its war with science. What better strategy than to attribute clearly wrong-headed ideas to a wrong-headed enemy? The beauty of the flat-earth myth was its preposterousness. Every third-grader could see how foolish it was."

Indeed, Stephen Jay Gould is a rather well known Marxist with oddly neocon ideas. But this idea that our history is a lie and a myth is not the sort of thing that the Reform Marxist or Frankfurt School wing of the inner party would normally wish to publicize. After all, they control the media and it is not in their interests to be giving the outer party alarming examples of the lies and propaganda that litter our history books.

To what earthly end might Mr. Gould be telling us this now?

"According to the historian J.B. Russell, writing in 1991, the promulgation of the myth can be directly traced to two 19th-century Americans: John William Draper, a physician, and Andrew Dickson White, a scientist who became the first president of Cornell University. Each published an immensely influential book--Draper's "History of the Conflict Between Religion and Science" appeared in 1874 and White's "History of the

Warfare of Science With Theology in Christendom" in 1896."

But of course! The authors of this lie were outer party members! Notice that the entire name - first, middle and last - is spelled out just so you won't miss the message.

Take that, Kevin MacDonald! The attack upon Christianity, and the entire "Culture of Critique" started among your own. Don't blame the inner party as a group, for the Marxist wing of the inner party is merely apeing your own kind! You have met the enemy and he is you!

Touche, Mr. Gould, point taken!

Indeed, the great migration of the inner party from Eastern Europe did not commence until 1880. They were not involved in this one!

But as with all Neo-conservative arguments, this leaves us possessed of information that can truly liberate us and allow us to reclaim our own destiny.

The most important passage in the article follows:

" Both men seized on the flat-earth myth to help make their larger case against religion. It spread quickly. Russell found that while few textbooks mentioned the flat-earth myth before 1870, nearly all texts had it after 1880."

Once again, we have an example of a falsehood that spreads very quickly through virtually the entire upper middle class ranks of the post civil-war outer party in the Northern States - the very people who controlled education and text book distribution.

They believed this lie because they wanted to believe it.

Up until this point in the series I have focused on James Forrestal. It should be quite obvious that unlike Draper and White, Forrestal was one of us. I dealt at length with Forrestal because he is very typical of that segment of the outer party elite devoid of any animus toward the rest of his kind. He means us well, and certainly would defend us against any attack he is capable of recognizing. However, he cannot allow himself to see obvious group behaviors nor the serious threats to our collective survival that result from these behaviors.

And in this sense, Forrestal is typical of so many well meaning outer party members. They are simply not equipped to defend us. And, quite frankly, our cause is truly hopeless until we reach a sufficient number of contemporary James Forrestals and purge them of the social blinders that cripple the normal and natural defensive response to which they quite clearly would be predisposed if they could throw off their self- imposed shackles.

Forrestal is very important to us a symbol of "close, but no cigar".

On the other hand, Draper and White, along with the tens of thousands of their outer party contemporaries who so desperately wanted to believe Draper and White's falsification of history fall into an entirely different category.

Ultimately, it is a category that is far more threatening to our survival than the inner party.

Let's think about this falsification for a moment.

Ironically, 1870 was a period of unparalleled scientific and economic progress in Western Civilization. In the late 1700's, as the population of Britain outstripped the supply of wood for winter fuel, they switched to coal. The steam engine and the mining industry were invented. As a natural extension of this, the steam locomotive and iron rails used in the mines were lifted up out of the ground and transformed into railroads, thus lowering the cost of transporting coal. At the time Draper wrote, the railroads had so lowered the costs of transportation, that vast tracts of agricultural land were opened up in America, Australia and Argentina, thus allowing the mass migration of rural populations to cities to be fed at reasonable cost.

It was a time of unparalleled progress in medicine and science. The telegraph had been invented thirty years earlier, vastly decreasing the cost of communication - making possible for the first time in human history the instant transmission of messages across thousands of miles.

In 1877 Edison invented the phonograph, and by 1879, the incandescent light bulb. In 1891 it was the movie camera.

There is not one scintilla of evidence anywhere that Churchmen opposed Newtonian mechanics, nor advances in chemistry, medicine or mathematics or astronomy. The only thing Churchmen objected to was the notion that somehow the obvious genetic changes that accumulate over time in races and species negated the spiritual act of "creation" sacred to their faith.

In short, there was no evidence anywhere that Churchmen opposed any science other than parts of the social sciences, to which the more strident articulations of the theory of evolution more properly belong. Churchmen did not want science to be used to tear apart the web of belief that enforces the acts of mutual obligation and self sacrifice which hold human societies together and allow them to reproduce.

So why the concerted attack on religion? Why the attempt to belittle it and stigmatize it by associating it with ignorance and low socio- economic status?

Indeed, what could Draper and White possibly expect to gain by attacking religious belief? After

all, religion had coexisted with huge strides in scientific progress for centuries. Why the sudden perception of religion as an enemy of progress?

Further, would not the loss of faith pose significant risks for Draper, White and their followers? After all, what would replace religious faith? Wouldn't the millions of peasants migrating to the cities from the countryside become dangerous without religious belief to restrain them? Indeed, Marx wrote his most popular works in 1848 and argued that religion was the opiate of the masses, standing between them and the bloody revolution he sought.

Could this have been what Draper and White were after?

What new bonds were Draper, White and their followers prepared to put forward that might hold society together and restrain all of those intensely religious peasants moving to the cities from indulging in the bloody revolutions that Marx and Engels sought? Did the new theory of evolution supply a better source of social stability?

Indeed, the activities of Draper, White, and their followers powerfully suggest that Marx was not an agent of social change, but rather, that he and his followers merely recognized the inevitable consequence of a social trend set in motion by the outer party and sought to position their own people to capitalize on that trend.

From the perspective of Draper, White and Co. none of this was planned, nor were the consequences clearly thought out. The entire program was pure delusion.

Indeed, the explanation is surprisingly and pathetically simple. The new arrivals from the countryside were intensely religious, and, to make matters worse, they were utterly indistinguishable from Draper and White in appearance. The only sure way for Draper, White and their followers to maintain social distance from these new arrivals was to reject religion. Of course, a mere intellectual or academic rejection quietly entertained by the upper classes would not have accomplished the objective of creating a widely recognized marker of higher status and social distance.

In order to accomplish the real objective of maintaining their superior social status, it was necessary to propagate in the public mind this image of the religious as weak minded fools. Hence the need to create the public myth of belief in a flat earth and to propagate that myth throughout our culture.

So desperate and intense was this need to distance themselves from these newly arriving and intensely religious peasants, that the practical risks of destabilizing the social order were completely ignored, as were the obvious warnings emanating from the small band of inner party intellectuals who had been drawing up plans to exploit that destabilization for the preceding 30 years.

It is powerfully ironic that Draper and White should pick Darwin and his theory of evolution to forward their crusade for status by attacking religion.

The most ardent disciple of Darwin, Sir Arthur Keith, came to the conclusion in 1914 that religious belief was absolutely essential to the cohesion and survival of human groups. According to Sir Arthur, it was not physical traits but rather group psychology, including the web of belief in the supernatural, that gave the group internal cohesion and helped to set it apart from physically similar appearing groups nearby. These differences in group psychology created the huge differences in group fitness that dictated the winners and losers in the group selection process. More recent mathematical proofs that group selection did not occur rely, of course, on the assumption that differences in psychological fitness varied no more from tribe to tribe than the minor measurable differences in physical fitness.

The modern fossil record bears out Sir Arthur, as we find more and more examples of hominid forms and homo sapiens forms which disappeared without leaving any recognizable progeny nor any trace of genetic influence upon surviving groups.

Life and survival is serious business. It is not a sport, and there are no second place winners.

Of course, the lie about Columbus is just the beginning.

Despite the huge torrent of inexpensive labor flooding into the cities at the time, Draper, White and followers had Congress open up our borders to massive immigration to let in more. This had the twin effect of lowering the wage rates of the new arrivals from the countryside, thus reinforcing their low status, while the new immigrants also provided political allies to dilute the vote of this despised and feared group.

To further set themselves apart socially, Draper, White and followers whole heartedly adopted ideologies of group equality, with the result that the new and intensely religious arrivals from rural America were no better than African Blacks, Latin American Indians, or any other similar low wage imports.

Never mind that these ideologies left Draper, White and followers defenseless against the Marxist attack. Immediate social differentiation from their distant kinsman was much more urgent.

In the Words of Sir Arthur Keith:

"Huxley condemned Universalism; it was an illusion. More than a century earlier J. J. Rousseau gave an equally unsparing verdict; 'it was a veritable chimera.' But the reasons they gave for their condemnation were not the same. Huxley's judgment was founded on



the belief that no sooner would Universalism be established than evolution would again raise her hoary head, pitting local group against local group, and that soon mankind would reassume its evil evolutionary ways."

Isn't this exactly what Draper, White and their followers are doing? Are they not engaging in clear race forming behaviors?

Now the question arises whether this response to the Industrial Revolution by Draper and White was sui generis, an isolated incident unlikely to be repeated, or part of a longer term pattern.

I would suggest that Draper and White represent a dramatic escalation of a trend that began nearly 1000 years earlier.

If we return to our roots as described in the ballads of Roland and Beowulf, we see that kings or tribal chieftains were elected by the tribal council. The dominant males would select one from among their number and grant him life tenure based on several qualities including the ability to inspire the group in battle, and the ability to resolve disputes within the group to the satisfaction of all. In other words, a king was selected based on his talents in administering the dual code, amity among his kinsmen and enmity toward its attackers. A chieftain's son had a large lead in the contest to become the new king, but the custom recognized that the broader kinship group would certainly produce the required talent, even as the king's eldest son would often deviate back toward the population mean in such qualities.

The Germanic invasions of Western Europe during the latter stages of the Roman Empire (AD 200 to AD 400) and the Norse invasions beginning in 700 to 900 AD produced a territorial scrambling of tribes throughout Europe. Beginning around 800 AD in France and 1066 in England, tribal chieftains began the process of tribal amalgamation and Nation building that Sir Arthur Keith describes. As one tribe subdued neighboring tribes and created the multi-tribal kingdom, the code of tribal amity that permitted election of kings became untenable, and primogeniture and divine right took hold. As the territorial reach of these kingdoms increased it became necessary for kings to dissociate themselves from their particular tribe in order to maintain peace. Marriage to a non-royal would not only diminish the King's social distance and his claim to divine right, but it would also be seen as a preference for and a reversion to the tribe from which the young lady came - an utter impossibility. Thus, to prevail in the nation building process, and to avoid being conquered and absorbed by a more successful neighbor, European royalty was forced to isolate itself genetically from their countrymen.

A series of royal behaviors and attitudes arose as a result of this process of genetic isolation (a race forming behavior) and all of these behaviors and attitudes came to be associated with high social status. Young royals shunned their own kinship group and traveled to foreign capitals and learned foreign languages in order to meet eligible mates.

As the size of kingdoms grew, this emerging royal race would employ ever larger numbers of talented lesser nobles and commoners to administer their realms. Naturally, Kings confined this patronage to those who aped the cosmopolitan social attitudes which reinforced royal genetic isolation, including the glamor of travel to foreign capitals and the learning of foreign languages. As the size of the kingdoms grew, and the number of these retainers increased, this disdain for local tribal loyalty extended to ever greater numbers of commoners with social aspirations.

Thus, the quest for status and position by individual commoners throughout Europe over the last 1000 years became increasingly associated with the adoption of attitudes that put social distance between them and their racial or ethnic fellows. At the same time, these attitudes would ingratiate them to those who possessed the power to hire and promote.

Thus, we have been conditioned for over 1000 years to seek social status by distancing ourselves from our own kinship groups.

With the advent of colonial empires and worldwide commercial empires, these attitudes found an ever wider field of application, moving from encouraging the destruction of ties with local and national European kinship groups, to facilitating the establishment of distance from the entire European racial group. Favoring of non-Europeans became the new marker of social status.

These attitudes that accompany status yearnings manifest themselves on a number of different levels. We see in Forrestal, and in paleoconservatives generally, bravery of opinion up to a carefully drawn and well understood internal boundary. And it is the observance of this boundary that accounts for their incessant political defeats, both individually as in the case of Forrestal, and collectively as in the case of the Buckley, YAF, and Reagan's conservative movement in the U.S. They dare not define or identify "who benefits," and thus the movement inevitably lacks motive political force.

Further, they cannot allow themselves to identify group threats and rally their own to combat those threats. It is life and survival as sport rather than in earnest. Only economic growth and selective individual prosperity allows us to keep fooling ourselves.

With the demise of royal power and the ascent of liberal democracy in 19th Century Europe, the 50 years surrounding the invention of the flat earth lie by Draper and White saw these markers of superior social status work a massive change on the rules of engagement for conflict among Europeans.

In the Napoleonic wars, casualty rates escalated from the 10% maximum tolerated by competing kings to 60% and 70% levels tolerated by modern democrats. In the Napoleonic wars, casualties were limited to military personnel. Fifty years later, the U.S. civil war not only accelerated the high casualty rates of military personnel, but shifted the focus of combat to the civilian

population, as General Sherman earned his place in the history books by being the first to wage economic war on a civilian population.

Shortly after Draper and White invented the flat earth story, the final version of the rules of engagement for conflicts between Euros seeking to maintain their national identity and the Euro status seekers were clearly announced for all to see in the Boer War of 1899-1902.

In that war, the British shot captured Boer prisoners of war. Boer Women and children were rounded up and placed in concentration camps where they died of disease and starved to death. Boer farms were burned to the ground.

It was a war of firsts that would establish a clear pattern for the next century. It was the first war in which civilian deaths far outnumbered deaths of soldiers. It was the first war instigated largely by the inner party and then prosecuted lustily by that segment of the outer party which shared the attitudes of Draper and White.

Although World War One reverted back towards the Napoleonic model, the Russian Revolution vastly expanded the Boer model, as did its continuation in World War II. Indeed, the rules of engagement have been consistent from the Boer war through Waco and Ruby Ridge. Whites seeking self-determination for their group against the wishes of the followers of Draper and White are to be shot on sight. No exceptions.

Indeed, the modern day followers of Draper and White have a delusional dream based on the Latin American model. They are morally certain that they can prosper and succeed through eternity by lording over a world full of blacks and browns and winning their consent for this arrangement by parading around in drag as the "party of permanent revolution against European colonialism and imperialism" just as the European elites in Latin America do today.

The potential claims of their fellow Whites for independence and self determination are a wildly destabilizing hindrance to this vision, as is their most unfortunate geographic concentration in Europe, North America and Australia.

The geographic concentration is being cured by mass non-European immigration. The troublesome concentration of Whites in Eastern Europe will be overcome by conquest by the EU, and the opening up of their borders as well. Indeed the excellent adventure in the skies over Serbia followed exactly the same rules of engagement. Three thousand Serb civilians died, but only 683 Serb soldiers, more than half of whom were killed in old fashioned combat with the KLA.

Several questions naturally arise about the followers of Draper and White. Will their race forming behavior succeed? Will they survive over the long run? And is there any chance that their imperial dreams will be fulfilled?

As Sir Arthur Keith pointed out, these isolating status seekers form a cast or social class with no capacity for defense other than that provided by their overlord, the universalist state which they no longer control. They are doomed without the protection of their racial fellows.

First, as our society and economy has become more complex it has developed an overarching need for high IQ people to organize economic activity and to solve problems. In response to this complexity, our society has adopted the standardized test and now applies it society wide. Those with the requisite test scores no longer need to curry favor by adopting social attitudes favored by employers. The demand for high IQ is so great that our institutions can no longer afford to disqualify individuals based on social attitudes.

The consequence is that the attitudes which motivated Draper and White can no longer be induced by the carrot of patronage, but now must be enforced with a system of punishments that include public vilification and employment loss.

To counteract this newfound autonomy of high IQ individuals, the followers of Draper and White have adopted wholesale the censorship and punishments advocated by the inner party as a way of ensuring the silence of the talented dissenters.

But in the long run, the incentives to join the race forming liberal pack are diminishing. Thus, the followers of Draper and White are faced with the prospect of dissent, competition and ridicule from within their own outer party ranks.

Second, the inner party has no intention of relying upon the outer party followers of Draper and White over the long run. The inner party does not trust the outer party followers of Draper and White, and if one credits the inner party's actions as opposed to their words, it is clear that they believe that racial cohesion is instinctive, and that the outer party will change their stripes and ally with their lesser kinsmen as soon as it is in their interest to do so.

Would that such a result were so clear!

In fact, the inner party is busy importing hundreds of thousands of high IQ Asians at a record clip to help organize and manage the United States. But for their status seeking illusions, the outer party would clearly see that they are scheduled for displacement.

Third, as immigration accelerates, the outer party followers of Draper and White will occupy an increasingly tenuous economic position as they bear the increasing cost of rewards that the inner party distributes to its affirmative action elites in its political coalition.

In the 1970's the Federal Government decided to perform a massive tracking survey of the U.S. population. They carefully interviewed over 100,000 families to identify a truly non-biased

statistical sample of 12,000 youngsters ranging in age from 14 to 22 to participate in this study.

Every one of those young people was administered an IQ test. And all have been interviewed every two years thereafter in a tracking study which keeps current such data as fertility, educational attainment and income.

It is called the National Longitudinal Study of Youth 1979 ("NLSY" 1979). The data is freely available on CD rom from Ohio state. Its data has been tapped tens of thousands of times by social scientists over the past 20 years, but never once to see how the outer party followers of Draper and White compare, in such items as income and educational attainment, to the inner party and its coalition partners when ranked by IQ.

Here are the results for individual income by IQ.

**Median Individual Income by IQ by Race  
NLSY 1979 Sample, 1996 Update - MALES**

IQ Bracket	Inner Party	Black	Hispanic	Outer Party
Top 2%	69,000	54,200	46,000	46,000
Next 8%	44,000	50,000	43,000	43,315
Next 15%	48,200	46,000	42,000	38,000
Second Quartile	36,500	31,000	35,000	35,000
Third Quartile	44,000	25,000	30,000	28,000
Bottom Quartile	24,000	19,000	22,000	21,000

**Median Individual Income by IQ by Race  
NLSY 1979 Sample, 1996 Update - FEMALES**

IQ Bracket	Inner Party	Black	Hispanic	Outer Party
Top 2%	45,350	None	50,000	28,000
Next 8%	57,550	61,500	48,750	28,000
Next 15%	20,000	38,000	30,000	24,300

Second Quartile	24,000	27,685	26,000	21,000
Third Quartile	26,550	22,000	21,000	15,500
Bottom Quartile	11,000	13,500	13,000	10,200

Please note that "median" means that 50% earn more than the dollar figure and 50% earn less. The income averages for the high IQ brackets are much higher than the median, because of the effects of a few million dollar earners in each category. Although the within-group patterns are similar, the median figure provides more meaningful information concerning between group comparisons. Out of 1483 black females included in the sample, none scored in the top 2% by IQ. Out of 1462 black males included in the sample, 4 scored in the top 2% by IQ, and of those, 3 came from the supplemental sample of poor blacks. Regrettably, Asians were classed as "white" by the government back in 1979, and while there are 120 Asians who can be isolated in the data by ethnic origin self identification, the sample has far too many low IQ individuals than is reasonable for this group. In contrast the 117 inner party members included in the sample are, as Herrnstein notes in "The Bell Curve" an excellent sample with an average IQ exactly equal to the known group average, and a distribution of IQs that, somewhat miraculously for such a small group, mirrors a normal distribution around that average. More will be available in a forthcoming book.

As you can see, the members of the outer party earn far less than the members of the inner party and their affirmative action coalition partners at the same level of IQ. The disparity is shocking among females. Because of the structure of the employment preferences used by public employers and local monopolies, as well as the impact of affirmative action laws on employers operating in the competitive private sphere, it is absolutely clear that the followers of Draper and White will be disproportionately and severely impacted by any economic slowdown.

Indeed, they already look like fools when the comparative data are examined.

Obviously, having allowed the inner party to take control of our political process and the media, has been a huge mistake.

Having alienated themselves from the mass of their racial fellows, they are now utterly defenseless and easy prey to those who are already in the process of displacing them.

The only question is how intense the pain must become before these outer party status seekers begin to realize that they will share the same fate as those from whom they seek to distance themselves.

Sir Arthur Keith theorizes that evolutionary psychology and group behavior are instinctive. If he is right, then the conversion to the dual code should be rapid among a majority of these alienated elites, just as the inner party clearly fears. The challenge for those of us in the real opposition will be to allow these instant conversions without recrimination, while at the same time being quite firm in the treatment of the committed enemies from among our own kind.

This will not be easy.

And in this regard, I must return to the history of the Boer War as a means of illustrating a spectacular collective failure on the part of us in the outer party to understand the potential threats that surround us.

The Boers first settled the cape area of South Africa in 1652. The British conquered the Cape area in 1814. Ten thousand Boers trekked inland from the Cape Colony and established the Orange Free State and the South African Republic. The discovery of gold in 1886 (shortly after Draper and White were concocting their lies) ended the isolation of the Boers. Of 100,000 inhabitants of their capitol, Johannesburg, in 1896, 50,000 were Euros, and only 6205 of these were Boers.

They had been overrun by immigration, and by that time were the rulers of a classic multi-racial empire.

In 1895 a band of 500 British adventurers attempted an armed takeover of the Boer republics which was orchestrated by Cecil Rhodes, then British governor of the Cape Colony, and by inner party members Barney Barnato (Barnett Isaacs) owner with Rhodes of Debeers, Alfred Beit, owner of Wernher, Beit & Co., and Lionel Phillips, owner of H. Eckstein & Co., the largest South African mining syndicate.

The Boers were fatally slow to recognize the nature of the threat. They easily defeated the 500 armed invaders, but then tried and gave very lenient sentences to Phillips and Leander Starr Jameson, leaders of the armed insurrection.

Given this tepid response, the British were encouraged to gather their forces and prepare for a full scale war to capture the Boer lands for the British empire.

The Boers could not have foreseen the intensity of the coming conflict. Indeed, the vast majority of the English living in the Boer republics could have cared less about whether those Republics remained independent of Britain. The Boers knew they were doing little to interfere with the prosperity and commerce of the English and inner party "uitlanders". Rational historical determinists that they must have been, they could see no objective reason for an attack.

They never had any reason to suspect that their people would be herded into concentration

camps and that their captured soldiers would all be shot. They imagined that the British, their fellow Europeans, would base their actions on their self-interests and reject war, and even if they chose wrongly, would abide by the codes of civilized conduct that they talked so much about.

Had the Boers seen the movie in advance, they would have known that they had to find a way to short circuit the war.

They would have looked at the tiny number of individuals lobbying London in favor of war and realized that the pro-war movement was entirely "personnel dependent".

The Boers could have avoided 7000 battlefield deaths and 28,000 Boer deaths in concentration camps (26,000 of those deaths being women and children), as well as the loss of their independence to Britain by forming an "intelligence service" with no more than a few dozen operatives trained to identify accurately those creating the pressure in favor of war and then ensuring that the tiny group so identified simply disappeared. The successors in interest of this small group would quickly deduce that there is more personal profit in dealing with independent Boer Republics than in lobbying Britain to subdue them through what Lloyd George called a "war of extermination". The profiteers would quickly learn to avoid such activity.

By that course of action, the Boers could have demonstrated that they were deadly serious about their independence and survival, and anyone lobbying for their slaughter would pay the ultimate price.

The only difficult question for the Boers would have been whether this program should reach back to Britain itself to include Lord Milner, who would have to fall victim to what appeared to be an unfortunate accident.

Indeed, as long as small elites are allowed to hide behind someone else's infantry and police without any personal consequence or hardship, they have every incentive to stir up continued slaughters, and the rules of engagement developed in 1899 will remain in place for the vast armies they set in motion.

The only way to change those rules of engagement is to adopt rules on our side to preempt their application. Tiny elites must be made to understand that they personally and individually are the combatants, and that they personally and individually will suffer the consequences of their aggression.

In the face of a small but determined nation, these hostile elites will scatter like so many mice.

Thus, even after the war, the Boers should have organized an intelligence service and reached out and touched Kitchener, in retaliation for his war crimes, as well as each of the original band of conspirators. The demonstrative effect on future generations, who as we discovered in 1939



were apparently incapable of extracting the proper lessons from the Boer experience, would have been invaluable.

Our current predicament in the year 2000 would not be possible absent the attitudes and race forming behaviors of the followers of Draper and White.

I suspect that the reasonable strategy will be to identify and then convert as many of these alienated outer party members as possible in the coming years as the arrival of competing elites accelerates, and as their displacement and disadvantages become easier for them to recognize during economic downturns.

We must make a good faith effort to convert them and welcome them back into the group.

At the same time we are going to have to confront many habits of mind in ourselves that leave us so vulnerable to displacement and extinction.

We must ask ourselves why we refuse to recognize hostile group behavior. Does this refusal really benefit us? Is it really moral? If it results in our displacement and destruction, how can it be moral?

Are we serious about our group survival, or do we look upon survival as a mere sport which we will be free to walk away from following a loss?

Do we really believe, contrary to the evidence of the final quarter of the twentieth century, that we can trust the rest of humanity to shed their group instincts and treat us fairly as individuals in a New World Order?

Indeed, none of these groups sharing our land in the U.S. now treat us fairly. So why do we persist in believing they will in the future when we are reduced to a minority? All but one of these groups are quite candid in admitting that they have no such intention. Why do we not believe them?

We know what we must do to survive, but we recoil at the prospect. Why? How many hardships and humiliations must we suffer before we learn that we must resist?

And finally, when will our baseball players acquire the street smarts to say, when interviewed by the press, that like any real man they constantly think thoughts that would get them fired from their jobs, but that the reader will have to imagine exactly what those thoughts might be?

When will we begin to make the simple and obvious adaptations that are so necessary to our survival?

Yggdrasil-

-----

October 8, 1999

Columbus's Circle

By Julia Vitullo-Martin, who edited "Breaking Away: The Future of Cities" (1996).

"They all laughed at Christopher Columbus when he said the world was round." Ira Gershwin didn't have to explain his words when his song became a huge hit in 1936, since everyone knew them to be true.

The problem is, they weren't--as we might do well to remember on Monday as we observe Columbus Day.

Christopher Columbus's contemporaries didn't laugh because they knew very well--had never doubted--the earth's sphericity. Medieval science had been built on the precise studies of classical scholars, much of whose work had survived through the centuries.

Not only had the ancient Greeks understood the earth's sphericity--and handed down the knowledge--but the philosopher Eratostenes had accurately calculated the earth's circumference in the third century B.C. While subsequent scholars debated many details--the earth's size, the extent of its oceans--no serious scholar believed the earth to be flat. And the great medieval religious scholars--the Venerable Bede, Roger Bacon, Thomas Aquinas--accepted and deepened classical knowledge with their own analyses and calculations.

How is it then that many Americans, aided by their grade-school textbooks, continue to believe that Christopher Columbus's big achievement was to prove the earth's roundness to ignorant contemporaries who feared he would sail off the edge of the earth into eternal damnation?

The myth was popularized by scientists in the late 19th century, says Harvard paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould in his recent book, "Rock of Ages: Science and Religion in the Fullness of Life." Their purpose was to fell religion in its war with science. What better strategy than to attribute clearly wrong-headed ideas to a wrong-headed enemy? The beauty of the flat-earth myth was its preposterousness. Every third-grader could see how foolish it was.

According to the historian J.B. Russell, writing in 1991, the promulgation of the myth can be directly traced to two 19th-century Americans: John William Draper, a physician, and Andrew Dickson White, a scientist who became the first president of Cornell University. Each published

an immensely influential book--Draper's "History of the Conflict Between Religion and Science" appeared in 1874 and White's "History of the Warfare of Science With Theology in Christendom" in 1896.

For Draper, the history of Science (always capitalized) was "a narrative of the conflict of two contending powers, the expansive force of the human intellect on one side, and the compressing arising from traditional faith" on the other. "Christianity and Science," he argued, are "absolutely incompatible." For White, the enemy was his fellow Protestants. It was they, in their evangelical fervor, who not only kept mankind in darkness but tried to prevent him from establishing Cornell as a secular university.

Both men seized on the flat-earth myth to help make their larger case against religion. It spread quickly. Russell found that while few textbooks mentioned the flat-earth myth before 1870, nearly all texts had it after 1880.

Those years, notes Russell, also marked the construction of the model of warfare between science and religion as a guiding theme of Western history. According to this model, religious darkness destroyed Greek knowledge and wove mankind into a web of fears based on dogma and opposed to rationality. Science became the only legitimate source of truth--witness its ancient understanding of the earth's sphericity and its triumph over ignorant theologians.

Mr. Gould calls the war between science and religion a fallacy and believes that much evil has come from it. This includes today's Darwinist-creationist battle, which can trace its bitter heritage directly to Draper and White. Draper wrapped himself fully in a Darwinian mantle, notes Mr. Gould, and regarded the struggle for Darwinism as the last phase in the long history of science's battle with religion. Is it any wonder that creationists regarded Darwinism in the same militaristic light?

The 19th-century attempt to make Columbus into an antireligious hero of rationalism is deeply ironic. As historian Delno C. West notes in his translation of Columbus's "Books of Prophecies," biblical truths held a place equal with scientific knowledge in Columbus's mind. Draper's idea that the progress of the human race demanded that science reign over religion would have been as bizarre to Columbus as the idea that the earth was flat.

---

[Back to the White Awakenings Page](#)

(c) 1999 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

## Harvard Comes Knocking

April 29, 2001

My daughter has done well enough in the PSAT to trigger the National Merit process, and is receiving a deluge of mail from colleges.

As you know, the brochures are marketing pieces, and so I examine them with a keen eye towards the images that our best universities present to prospective students and parents, as opposed to real picture that lies behind the cold, hard numbers in the standard college catalogues.

The brochures illuminate the difference between what the institutions would have you believe, and what is actually true.

In the competition for student eyeballs, the state universities must be ever on the alert that a copy of any brochure they send out will inevitably end up in the hands of state legislators to whom they report. Thus, I have come to expect institutions that are in fact mostly minority to be essentially truthful in their self-portraits, and picture almost nothing but blacks or Hispanics in their brochures.

I should note parenthetically that my daughter hasn't received a single piece of mail from any of these institutions. I know this only from pictorial guides I have seen and purchased at bookstores.

Likewise, those public institutions that have very few non-whites will also picture mostly blacks and Hispanics in their brochures. For public institutions, whites are simply too controversial to picture in anything approaching proportionate numbers.

Based on the marketing materials, you would think that our nation's colleges and universities were majority black and Hispanic, as opposed to overwhelmingly white and Asian.

About 10 years ago, the contrived look was de-rigueur, with the notorious "one-of-each" shots - visibly improbable random groupings - dominating the literature produced by colleges and

universities.

Today, most admissions departments hire marketing consultants and ad agencies, and the "one-of-each" shots are definitely out.

But the true diversity of image comes from the private universities, although curiously, many of the private universities do the same thing as the public universities by presenting an image of a student body that is wildly at odds with the reality. In the majority of cases, what you see in the brochure is precisely the opposite of what you are likely to encounter on campus.

Just one more example of how life in the multi-racial/ethnic state is based on lies.

So it was with particular interest that I started reading a brochure sent by Harvard inviting my daughter to attend a summer school session. On a purely personal level, that is a strange way to market to my daughter. After all, as Harvard knows, she attends an intensely competitive high school, and is taking five AP courses as a junior. She has worked her tail off all year and Harvard thinks she is going to want more during this summer?? Good plan, Harvard!

Frankly, she is better off getting a job and taking a break from the pressures of study.

And, of course, from a parent's perspective, I can't help but notice that Harvard wants to get into my shorts to the tune of about \$7,000 for this summer session.

Now this raises all sorts of interesting questions. How many students do you suppose can afford to forgo summer employment and pay Harvard seven thou? Here we have the very citadel of our secular religion of equality, the very epicenter of liberal whining and kvetching against "the rich" and against "the privileged" with a clear message that only the very very rich and very privileged need apply. Nice message, Harvard!

Now it is possible that Harvard matched my daughter's address on the PSAT results tape they purchased from ETS down to the census tract level (about 100 homes) and determined, based on housing values, that her parents were unlikely to take offense at the piece. However, if this brochure was mailed to everyone with comparable test scores, more than half are likely to be offended at the blatant hypocrisy of it.

Further, it is an invitation to students and parents to begin connecting the dots. It is apparent from the other brochures we get that my daughter has an excellent chance of getting academic aid from a number of outstanding schools.

Yet Harvard's pitch is quite different. They want us to pay through the nose. Now the neocons at the Wall Street Journal complain from time to time about the fact that Harvard has no

economic reason to be charging tuition at all. It would require only about 5% of just the interest income (and none of the capital gains) from their massive endowment to make tuition free for all students.

Now one of my biggest complaints about my fellow descendants of European Christendom is that they seem instinctively incapable of making what appear to me to be fairly obvious logical connections.

So let's begin the process of connecting the dots!

If Harvard doesn't have an economic reason for their money grubbing ways, then perhaps there is a compelling non-economic reason.

There are approximately 45,000  $((270m/60)*.5)*.02$  students each year with scores that would place them in the top half of Harvard's freshman class. Of these, Harvard gets only 800 per year (total class size 1600). Substitute .01 for the final multiplier above and you are very nearly down to the group receiving national merit awards, of whom Harvard gets about 450 per year. Obviously, eliminating tuition would increase the percentage of top students accepting Harvard's admissions offer, and thus allow Harvard to upgrade the academic quality of its student body, if that were its objective. So scratch academic achievement. That objective isn't on the table.

But then an obvious side effect of eliminating tuition would be intensified competition for the available seats at Harvard from bright middle class students who now flock to the honors programs at state universities because of price. Free tuition would invite intense parental scrutiny of exactly what criteria Harvard does use for its admissions. Now that isn't to say that my fellow American descendants of European Christendom would necessarily learn to connect the dots, but it would present a distinct risk by increasing the motivation to do so.

So what is the real objective?

For clues let's analyze the published numbers concerning Harvard's racial and ethnic composition as set forth in [Diversity's Losers - Part II](#), updated to the present time.

Harvard claims that its undergraduate student body is 45% "white". Hillel's guide to campus life states that Harvard's undergraduate student body is 25% inner party. That leaves about 20% for the children of American Descendants of European Christendom. It is unclear what percentage of that residue of "white" is taken by offspring of inner party mixed marriages, which ran at a rate in excess of 50% 20 years ago, and how much is taken by children of non-citizens, including wealthy Turkish, Arabic, and Latin American elites.

In the U.S., the American descendants of European Christendom are 70% of the population and have about 55% of the children described in the test categories above. Based on population, we are under-represented by a factor of 3.5 times, and based on our numbers at the relevant IQ and test score levels, by a factor of 2.7 times. Good show, Harvard!

Couple the above statistical information about Harvard's undergraduate student body with data from the National Longitudinal Study of Youth which shows that the median income of American Descendants of European Christendom is far less at each level of IQ than the median incomes of Inner party, blacks and Hispanics of the same IQ, and you have a clear reason why Harvard may wish to be a stickler about money.

For the truth is that the American Descendants of European Christendom simply do not have the incomes and assets to send their children to Harvard. High tuition guarantees that uniform admissions standards will result in disproportionate rates of acceptance by inner party kids with parents who can afford the tuition. In addition, high tuition gives Harvard the flexibility to use financial aid to engineer the complexion of the remainder of its student body in the manner that they prefer, even as Harvard diligently propagates the myth that it is the American Descendants of European Christendom who are disproportionately and unjustly "rich" and "privileged".

The critical point here is that a loan is not really financial aid.

Borrowing money to go to a college means that you are paying full freight plus interest. A loan is no financial aid at all.

Like most schools, Harvard deceptively lumps its lending activity as well as campus work programs together with real financial aid in its public disclosures in the Barron's guide, making it appear that over 65% of the students receive financial aid. Absent this deceptive form of disclosure, they would get far fewer applications and their competitiveness rating would suffer. However, Harvard does not disclose the percentage that get real financial aid - tuition discounts commonly known as "scholarships".

The proof of demographic engineering is in the final results.

Indeed, Harvard has been doing this for a long time, as two of my wife's brothers were offered admission to Harvard, but were denied need-based tuition discounts or "scholarships" despite the most compelling of need-based circumstances. One actually borrowed the money and attended, while the other accepted a "full ride" at my alma mater instead.

Interestingly, while the Harvard grad and I do not discuss politics, it is nevertheless clear that the real education he picked up at Harvard wasn't quite what Harvard intended, as I recall distinctly some very pointed remarks he made to his inner party fiancée while my wife and I

were visiting at her Park Avenue apartment. In response to one of her fairly standard observations about economic inequality and injustice in our society, he countered that all the rich people he had ever met were, like her, from West Judea.

She seemed strangely excited by this abuse, as perhaps it made her rebellious attempt to hop on the Aryanizing train all the more authentic and daring. As I have mentioned in previous essays, much of the inner party has imprinted upon a sexual aesthetic that makes them modern day "sondercommando" in their own disappearance or transformation, however you may prefer to view it. But I digress again.

In any event, extensive political discussion with this brother-in-law simply isn't needed, as it is clear that he and I view our World through similar lenses.

Whatever else may be true about Harvard, they are remarkably adroit about creating the smokescreen that enables them to indulge their passion for demographic engineering to the disadvantage of the American Descendants of European Christendom. Sadly, it is a deception that seems to work, except of course on those who have had some actual contact with the place.

Now a curious thing appears to be happening within our empire's higher education system.

For the past four years, I have attended all four of the academic awards ceremonies at my daughter's high school. It is clearly one of the best non-magnet public schools in the country as it produces about 20 or so National Merits each year.

Now, wonder of wonders, the printed awards program lists all of these top students individually along with the colleges they are applying to. A treasure trove of valuable data.

And I cannot help but notice that the four Ivies with the highest concentrations of inner party students - Harvard, Columbia, Penn and Yale - have never appeared on the list. Equally curious, students from this high school have applied to and attended Princeton, Cornell and Dartmouth. Wow!

An alumna from Harvard dutifully schleps her Harvard book award to a student at that school every spring, all to no avail.

Equally curious, most of these kids have techie parents who have moved here from other states, so the parents are a geographically diverse group of well-paid engineers and middle managers broadly representative of corporate America. Among these students there is a fairly large contingent of Asians but very few inner party kids. Notably absent is any hint of political leftism among the student body, certainly nothing like what I encountered at the inner party dominated magnet school I attended nearly 40 years ago.



From my observations at the local high school, and from the published data, it has become clear that the advent of co-education has produced unintended consequences, as have so many other items on the universalist-egalitarian agenda.

Nowadays, kids actually visit campuses and see what the students look like. While your kid will never admit it, and indeed may not even be conscious of it, they almost invariably pick a school with large and visible concentrations of kids from the opposite sex whom they would want to date.

The mating mind is rapidly segregating our institutions of higher learning along fairly narrow aesthetic lines.

Overwhelmingly, the American Descendants of European Christendom at this suburban high school select sun belt schools with very high concentrations of students just like themselves. Most of the outstanding students get full rides in highly regarded honors programs maintained by state universities, or at highly regarded private institutions that compete with Harvard and make no secret of the availability of merit based tuition discounts.

A happy marriage of social preference for the kids and economics for the parents. This looks like an unstoppable trend!

It reminds me of one of my late father-in-law's favorite jokes - to the effect that a successful university president need understand only two things - that undergraduates want sex and the faculty wants close-in reserved parking!

The innate and universal preference among all life forms for genetic self-similarity is taking hold with a vengeance on our nation's campuses. While most university administrators are universalist-egalitarians who would very much like to fight that trend, we have too many universities competing for a limited pool of students. Thus, there are practical limitations on the ability of any one university to combat it effectively.

Only a very few have that "luxury".

So, with that background in mind, lets take a look at the Harvard brochure!

The front cover pictures a blond girl and a blond white guy conversing with a second white girl! Not even the slightest nod to our standard image of diversity on the cover.

Not much diversity in the rest of the 22 pages of color photos of what purports to be life at Harvard either. A few scattered Asians and a Brooklyn nebbish with a Brandeis sweatshirt, but that is about it.

Most outlandish is the full page shot of students changing class, which might just as easily have been shot at Miami of Ohio or the University of Edinburg across the pond, for that matter.

Indeed, I search in vain through 22 pages of color photos of life at Harvard for a picture of a black. Wait! On page 3 there is a very small picture of what might be a very light skinned black. Hard to tell for sure as a hat covers much of his face.

There is also a full page shot of a statue of a dead white guy who is very obviously from my very own tribe!

Finally, even the campus radical passing out communist literature has a distinct northern European look that would pass for a typical college Republican on any midwestern campus.

Stunning! And strange, very strange!

When you visit the Harvard campus, you get the distinct feeling that it is a school maintained for United Nations staff along with a sizable yeshiva thrown in for good measure - which is precisely what you would expect given the published numbers.

Now there is no way in hell that I am going to pay Harvard seven grand to present a two month long sales pitch to my daughter! But I would easily pay 500 bucks to be a fly on the wall of the committee which produced that brochure, and maybe a grand to read the mind of the decisionmaker who ultimately approved it for distribution.

Now that would have been a real education!

My first thought was that this must be a targeted mailer attempting to portray the Harvard student body in a way that might appeal to my daughter - sent to selected students based on last name and the demographics of the zip code and census tract in which they live.

But that explanation makes no sense. If Harvard wanted more American Descendants of European Christendom, it would simply give more tuition discounts to those admitted or admit more! It gets plenty of applications!

The next step is to test the simple explanation that any consultant hired by Harvard would proffer as an explanation for the pictures selected for this brochure, namely, that nobody is going to sign up for the summer session if you show ugly kids in your brochure. The hair on girls legs and the funny little caps won't pass!

Of course, since Hollywood is in control of the transmission belt for such images in our culture,

and those images are well understood by all on the committee, no further explanation of the suggested photographs would be required.

But the problem with the simple explanation is that it assumes the students who actually attend Harvard, unlike the rest of the biological world, and contrary to the trend throughout the rest of the country, are not attracted by genetic self-similarity and are not repelled to some degree by genetic dissimilarity.

Further, it fails to account for the conspicuous omission of the standard images of diversity that everyone has come to expect in a college mailer - especially from such an impassioned advocate of diversity.

What might they gain by displaying themselves as a non-diverse place?

For clues, we turn to the complaint of Alan Dershowitz, a member of the faculty at Harvard who observes, on page 62 of his tome "The Vanishing American Jew":

"Even in my thirty-plus years of teaching at Harvard, I have seen a significant change: Jewish students are simply not as outstanding as they once seemed to be. As they have become more "normalized" - more accepted, less discriminated against - they have also become less driven, less creative, less obsessed with proving themselves. They are also less compassionate, less willing to identify with the downtrodden than they once seemed to be; although still apparently more than the average person is."

I offer only a hypothesis:

Perhaps Harvard is seeking the kind of student who feels a need to crash through the gates of "white privilege", and will be motivated by a brochure that keeps alive the myth that Harvard is just such a place.

Perhaps Harvard doesn't want the kind of inner party student who is motivated by genetic self-similarity - the complacent and satisfied types that flock to the comfortable social terrain they will find at Penn, for example.

Perhaps Harvard realizes, in its deepest collective soul, that the leftist ideological commitment it seeks is utterly dependent on the identification of a racial and ethnic enemy.

Perhaps Harvard realizes that if its target audience discovers that there are no rich wasps at Harvard, (or more accurately, that wasps from any economic strata are so rare at Harvard as to be virtually invisible) they might cease to attend - reasoning like Groucho Marx "that any club that would admit me isn't worth joining."

The hypothesis is consistent also with the summary of student opinion at Harvard published in Princeton Review's guide to the 310 best colleges:

"'Brilliant' is the word most often used by Harvard students to describe each other, 'preppy' is the second most common description. Still, many students indicated surprise at how heterogeneous the student body here is."

Indeed, it is time for professor Dershowitz to despair.

Not only have Harvard's inner party recruits lost their competitive edge, they have lost the ability to read a simple college catalogue and understand the numbers!

Harvard is now admitting retards! How on earth could they be surprised at the heterogeneity of Harvard when the most recent three presidents of Harvard have all been inner party members? Where on earth does Harvard find these kids who sound like they just fell off the turnip truck?

What rock have they all been living under?

Tomorrows leaders??

Are we to be led by kids who fantasize that battalions of young Republican wasps will be waiting assembled on the quad ready to defend their turf when the published numbers indicate the impossibility of that fantasy?

Most excellent foolishness! Such excellent comic diversion!

Dear reader, like many things in life, the brochure my daughter received in the mail from Harvard will forever remain a mystery.

But the trends I see quite clearly in the admissions data indicate that Harvard has lost its grip over a very wide and important population group in this American Empire - both parents and children.

The sweep of history is bypassing them.

I see the brochure as confirmation of weakness - either an expensive but half-hearted and ineffectual attempt to lure back some of what they have lost over the past 30 years; or more likely, a rear guard action to continue to attract students from a shrinking pool of the deluded and paranoid.

And in any event, the stuff you see on this web page is a hell of a lot more original and interesting than anything that has come out of Harvard's Poly Sci department in the past 30 years!

So there it is!!

Any way you slice it, it looks like good news to me.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to the White Awakenings Page](#)

(c) 1999 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

## Harvard Comes Knocking Again

July 10, 2001

My daughter just received a second big brochure from Harvard.

This time it is 54 pages of glossy multi-color promotional material wrapped around a remarkably long and tendentious application for admission.

I should mention that my daughter didn't request it. Its arrival is purely gratuitous.

Lo and behold, I open the brochure and I am instantly transported to the real Harvard, the Harvard that we all know so well.

In my last writing about this subject - [Harvard Comes Knocking](#), - I claimed that the student body at Harvard looks like a U.N. School. On further reflection, that characterization misses the mark.

When I picture the classic "U.N. School" look, I think of UCLA after 5:00 PM, when the commuters have all left, and there isn't a white face anywhere to be seen. You see teeming masses of people from the Asian and Latin American continents, along with a sprinkling of blacks dressed up like German tourists in sandals, all wandering around aimlessly looking like they are lost, as if they all suddenly had been deposited there by alien spacecraft.

Harvard has a considerably narrower complexion, and the students exhibit an intense focus. They know exactly where they are and where they are headed.

The images from the brochure are accurate and instructive.

The first large picture of students appears on Page 6. Two black girls and an Asian girl are talking to a blond White guy in the dining hall. The body language is telling. The three females are leaning forward. The White guy is listening politely but leaning backwards and away from the girls, as if to break away from the conversation.

On the facing page in bold type offset by a red background is a remarkably candid statement that sums up the Harvard mission: "The freshman Dean's office **carefully crafts** first-year rooming groups of two or more students, who live together in suites." The irony is that given the student demographics (a mere 20% descendants of European Christendom, well over 30% inner party if we include half-breeds, and the remainder asian, hispanic and black), selecting roommates at random would very seldom place two of a kind in the same room or "suite" as Harvard likes to call it.

But accidental mixing is not enough at Harvard. Multi-culturalism is strictly enforced or "carefully crafted" in Harvard's words; the cardinal sin of having two of the same kind sharing a room being *streng verboten*.

Harvard is not Noah's ark.

So having made crystal clear that all freshmen, without exception, will be force fed into the ethnic and racial blender, Harvard proceeds with our instruction by showing us a picture of an actual class on page 12.

It is an Afro-American studies class taught by an inner party professor. Now at most universities, the Afro-American studies are delivered by Afro-American professors. But Harvard pays big bucks for its black students, and has a very specific mission in mind for them, as this picture makes clear. They are there at Harvard to learn how to deliver the votes of their fellow blacks for the inner-party dominated racial extortion coalition, upon whose existence their continuing good fortune depends. Harvard doesn't want them wandering too far off the Frankfurt School plantation, hence the inner party Afro-American studies faculty.

Indeed, the authors of this brochure were kind enough to include along with the photo, a caption pointing out that this particular Afro-American studies class was about "Afro-American literature of the 1920's", the golden age when the inner party kept W.E.B. DuBois and the NAACP on a very short leash indeed.

The message encoded into this brochure will be immediately apparent to inner party applicants - Harvard is their place and their agenda - and utterly lost on the rest of the applicant pool, to whom the various short leashes so carefully crafted by Harvard will remain invisible.

Indeed, for clues as to what sort of Whites might actually attend this multi-cultural training academy, I looked first to page 49 and I see that there is no merit based financial aid. So I know that the children of middle managers and professionals looking for educational bargains need not apply. That narrows the field considerably to the needy and very wealthy.

For further clues, I look to page 23 and Harvard football's offensive line - all big White guys! I

am assuming that these guys aren't paying \$35,000 a year to play football for Harvard, but I could be wrong in some cases.

Under the "religious groups" list on page 36, I couldn't help but notice a Latter Day Saints Students Association. And here we get a little closer to the truth. Harvard especially likes Whites from remote, all White communities who have no exposure whatever to the racial extortion coalition - those who just fell off the turnip truck from the perspective of multi-cultural exposure and don't have the foggiest idea what they are getting themselves into.

It is apparent that Harvard doesn't want (and isn't going to get) battle-hardened goy veterans from big city yeshivas-in-drag that we call magnet schools.

And the idea that the children of connected, wealthy WASPs go to Harvard is utterly absurd. The tiny remnant of that once large herd will send their children to Princeton, if truly exceptional, and to Wake Forrest, Vanderbilt, UNC, or U. Va., if they are merely gifted. The connected aren't about to sacrifice four years of their lives in the temple of multi-culturalism!

Life is too short!

I also notice that for such a small group of Whites at Harvard, there is a very long list of white ethnic organizations - a Celtic society, German society, Hellenic Society, Persian Society, Polish Society, Romanian Society, Serbian Society, Russian Society and Cuban American Association - leaving the inescapable impression that Harvard admits one or two of each kind, as petri dish specimens for study by the inner party kids.

After all, the most essential skill to be acquired at Harvard is to master the limits of political cluelessness and gullibility of the Descendants of European Christendom in an environment where miscalculations have very limited consequences, so that serious errors can be avoided later in life.

For the students that count at Harvard, such exposure provides an elemental survival skill.

Sir Arthur Keith would hold that this entire Harvard enterprise - forming relationships with the elites of the racial extortion coalition, while learning to deceive the supposed elite of your racial enemy - is utterly futile. Indeed, when you force races through the blender, the half-breeds that emerge are not raceless, but rather form new races, which will be no more tractable than the old ones that you spent so much time and effort trying to eradicate.

I could not help but notice that there is an organized "Half Asian Persons Association" recognized as an ethnic group at Harvard.



Half-breeds are acutely aware of their need to organize and jostle for advantage.

But the broader question is why parents who are Descendants of European Christendom would allow their children to attend Harvard, much less pay for the "privilege".

Setting aside for the moment your child's role as a laboratory rat for study by the racial extortion coalition which comprises 80% of the Harvard student body, there is a much subtler and more insidious personal issue that will immediately confront that child.

Harken to the message of Michael Kinsley, inner party editor of Slate Magazine and graduate of Harvard, as rendered in the Washington Post of July 6, 2001:

"At the Harvard admissions office they used to have an alleged philosophy they called "the happy bottom quarter." The idea was that Harvard could fill each class, if it wanted to, with nothing but the very top high school students, but that this might be traumatic to those who didn't make it to the top at Harvard. So the admissions office supposedly reserved about 25 percent of each class for those who could handle the notion of not being a star student.

"In practice, this did not mean searching for young folks with a zen-like acceptance of life's fate, or a profound sense of universal human equality, or enough mathematical wit to appreciate the joke that even at Harvard - unlike Lake Wobegon - everyone cannot be above average. No, " the happy bottom quarter" was a fancy way to make room for alumni sons and athletes and rich kids whose families might give money. These were people who didn't need top grades in order to feel above average. They would be happy with a "Gentleman's C" - meaning both that gentlemen were entitled to no less and that gentlemen strove for no more.

"Nicholas Lemann's book "The Big Test" describes how the cozy elite of the Gentleman's C was replaced, in universities and society, by a more rigorous meritocracy of grades and test scores. By the time George W. was in college, that transformation was almost over. "The happy bottom quarter" was just a way to preserve some room for the old America in the new one."

It's official, folks!

When an inner party member uses the word "meritocracy," it is a code word for members of his own "chosen" tribe. It being understood - notwithstanding the statistics - that all members of the lesser nations are stupid and inferior.

Why on earth would a parent pay to subject their child to this kind of abusive stereotype? One

look at my daughter's hair color, or the reading of her name will announce to all of the various and sundry haters pictured in the Harvard application brochure that she is one of those dummies in "the happy bottom quarter." Never mind her SAT scores, and never mind that her dad was a street fighter who grew up on the wrong side of the tracks and hung out at the caddy shack.

And what about all those professors who harbor that same stereotype? Will they grade her work accordingly?

Would anyone bother looking up her SAT scores? Would she have to wear a sweatshirt all the time announcing them?

Tattoo them on her forearm maybe??

Who needs it?

If I were inclined to spend \$35,000 a year on college for her (which I am not), I would send her to Princeton, which has a very different sort of student body than Harvard.

But in the real world - her world - what I think doesn't matter.

For whatever reason, Harvard didn't make her list.

And the real world of how normal 16 year-old girls make these kinds of decisions is an intuitive and irrational place. For example, when she sees in the catalog that the male-female ratio at the Air Force Academy is 8 to 1, she wants to go there. "Boot camp would be fun." But then she reads that they would cut her hair, so the Air Force is out!

You get the picture.

But I do worry about the Descendants of European Christendom growing up in all-White flyover areas of the country with parents who don't have a clue about Harvard and its agenda, and whose clergymen haven't a clue what the word "pharisee" means.

All the chatty college guides, those which purport to give you the inside view, are written by pharisees. If the parents don't understand the code and know how to read between the lines, their kids could end up spending a very miserable four years as lab rats in a multicultural reeducation camp.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to the White Awakenings Page](#)

(c) 2001 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

## The End Game

September 14, 2001

That collector from Northern Virginia who introduced me to Sir Arthur Keith has admonished me to outline for you the debate going on in the halls of government between various factions of the inner party.

Op Ed pieces are beginning to appear in our national newspapers which reflect that debate. Numerous articles are floating the trial balloon of "ending states" which harbor terrorists. In addition, several other press organs are breathing life back into a notion born of our most excellent imperial adventure over the skies of Serbia. In the words of an op-ed piece in the Wall Street Journal of 9-14-01, "any state that harbors or abets terrorists - or abuses its own citizens - forfeits its sovereign rights."

In order to examine exactly what such a statement might mean in actual practice we must understand that the attack on the twin towers in Manhattan occurs within the context of a clearly defined imperial structure of rewards and punishments.

The multi-racial empire of the old Soviet Union fragmented into its ethnic and racial components (collapsed to a lower order of complexity) because its centrally planned economy could not provide enough tangible benefits to all the constituent groups within that empire to purchase their continued allegiance. The young turks of the KGB decided that they would be better off and have more power with a smaller, ethnically cohesive Russian nation state.

See Pillar 7, "The Collapse of Complex Societies" by Joseph Tainter.

The same exact thing will happen to the United States if the empire can no longer provide tangible benefits to its citizens that justify the expense of the imperial adventure. And the expense of maintaining that empire has just increased dramatically - at least \$20 billions in lost real estate, a \$40 billion anti-terrorism appropriation, plus untold costs associated with shutting down air travel and the financial markets for a week.

Until now, the empire has been ruled by a financial system of rewards and punishments.

The American consumer benefits from imports manufactured with cheap foreign labor. In addition, American consumers benefit from the availability of cheap credit to purchase those goods - cheap credit made possible by the recycling of the dollars we pay for those imported goods back into U.S. securities by the exporting countries. Because of this basic circular money flow, Americans have been allowed to consume far beyond their means for decades, and it feels good. It is one hell of a seductive arrangement.

In addition, our intellectual property laws (patent and copyright) guarantee a stream of payments from our trading partners in perpetuity that resemble tribute, and guarantee that our trading partners within the empire can never compete with the U.S. on an equal economic footing. Indeed, we cripple their ability to innovate and obtain patents of their own by hiring away their best and brightest at our overseas subsidiaries (thereby gaining ownership of their innovations) and by removing talented innovators from their native lands through H1-B visas and immigration.

Our trading partners are, in effect, permanent vassal states.

Now you might reasonably ask, "why do they put up with this unbalanced system?"

First, they are reasonably comfortable for the time being, largely because the United States debt balloon provides them with a large export market which allows them to provide employment for their people.

Second, because the dollar is used to settle so many trade transactions between nations other than the United States, non-U.S. participants in the empire are forced to hold very large dollar reserves - meaning that they have no choice but to buy our debt - so that they can trade with other nations (buy oil).

Third and last are the financial punishments.

A number of countries possess cheap labor and compete for the U.S. export market. Thus, we have the power to reduce access or close our markets to one country and open them to another and invest in that other country simultaneously so as to shift production from the country being punished.

Next, our Asian trading partners have much higher savings rates than we do, meaning that the capital structures of their companies must have much higher ratios of debt to equity than ours in order to absorb and utilize that pool of savings. Thus, they become vulnerable to sudden withdrawals of foreign capital and attacks on their currencies despite their high domestic savings rates because of the leverage that those high savings rates create in their domestic financial structures. The inner party has demonstrated on many occasions that they know how

to pull the rug out from under any country that allows in large amounts of alien investment capital. In Latin American economies heavily dependent on foreign capital, the rug pulling exercise is simpler than in Asia. After each rug pull, our imperial financiers buy up bankrupt companies at distress prices just as the IMF and the other emergency lending agencies (staffed by their brethren) make loans to the victim country thereby assuring that the distress purchases make huge profits for their new imperial owners.

And we accuse others of crony capitalism! What a country!!

Now it is true that Japan and China have large enough dollar reserves that they can pull the rug out from under us.

However, deliberately selling all our debt and producing a massive depression in the U.S. would cut demand for their exports (an economic consequence) and would be perceived by the inner party as a belligerent act, subjecting them to the risk of bombs falling from the sky.

In the words of the inner party financial consultant Peter Drucker, "never in history has the world's largest debtor had such an enormously powerful military."

Beyond our undeniable military power is a second unique risk factor which makes us extremely dangerous in the eyes of many of our trading partners. We have an elite that has no particular interest in the survival of the American majority - an elite that openly advertises its view that the present majority is expendable and openly advertises its willingness to import a replacement population. And quite inexplicably, instead of feeling threatened by that attitude on the part of our elites, the majority population is quite comfortable, and quite easily persuaded to immolate themselves in hideously destructive wars to vindicate self-righteous slogans and conceptual abstractions that have absolutely nothing to do with their interests or long run survival - making the world safe for democracy - protecting freedom - fighting tyranny - securing human rights - defeating terrorism - each of which is applied quite unevenly in actual practice and none of which have any predictive value whatsoever until you discover the short term and shifting interests of the inner party. It is this unique combustible mix that makes our military behavior quite unpredictable and dangerous, particularly from the viewpoint of Asian nations.

Thus, as long as the trade flows are stable, Japan and China have no desire to upset the empire's apple cart.

In sharp contrast to the above structure, the sources of terrorism lie mostly outside the imperial orbit of financial rewards and punishments. Thus, the normal financial rewards and punishments have no effect on Serbia, Syria, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Somalia, Lybia, Aden, North Korea, and a few others. These are poor countries with relatively little foreign trade. They have mostly autarchic economies.

For these countries, the only method of control up to this point has been aerial bombardment.

During our recent excellent adventure over the skies of Serbia, the inner party came out with a number of talk pieces in the highbrow press claiming that the civilian populations of these countries were guilty (in Iraq's case, of the crime of "complacency") and were responsible for, and should be punished for, the conduct of their rulers. See "[What it would take to Cleanse Serbia.](#)" Thus, the inner party has clearly embraced collective civilian guilt even in situations where civilians have no vote, and now advocate the use of military force to kill that civilian population as the appropriate response.

In the case of Serbia these talk pieces finally arrived at the conclusion that the appropriate remedy was conquest, military occupation and re-education.

That wisdom is now reflected in the slogan "ending states" or "forfeiting their sovereign rights" which you see popping up in the papers.

The problem with Islamic Terrorism is that it comes mainly from Afganistan, Pakistan and Iran, the central Asian regions of Islam, where inserting an infantry force to conquer and occupy the land is simply not practical. Unlike the flat desert of Kuwait, rugged terrain makes maneuver difficult and provides cover for the hundreds of thousands of fanatics who are willing to die for their cause. It is a relatively low tech operation in difficult terrain which would minimize our military advantages.

Even worse, the television cameras will be rolling at the backs of our troops documenting their suffering over very long periods of time.

The solution, of course, is the killing of the entire civilian population base that produces these "terrorists" by use of neutron bombs or poison gas, and that is precisely what the inner party is now lobbying to do, much to the horror of the generals.

Here is what is in play.

The Moslem fundamentalists have concluded that the Trade Towers attack has a high probability of provoking an ugly over-reaction of the sort that will cause a rebellion by the populations of the puppet regimes of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, the Emirates, Jordan and Egypt.

Once the population overthrows the puppet regimes, then the fundamentalists will have at their disposal the oil weapon and will no longer need to resort to terrorism.

They will simply shut off the oil and precipitate an economic depression that would deprive the empire of its ability to provide tangible benefits to its citizens, causing its racial components to

split apart just as the old Soviet Union (a close neighbor) flew apart.

Evidence that the fundamentalists have this calculus in mind can be found in the careful word choice of bin Laden, when he urged Americans to adopt a nationalist government that would represent American interests and not Israel's interest. It is clear that he has been surfing the internet.

Note the timing of this attack. It is right at the beginning of a relatively rare economic occurrence - the synchronous slowing of all the major economies of the world. Is the timing accidental?

Could these Moslem fundamentalists have studied Kondratief? Have they read about the Elliott grand super cycle wave?

If the empire does over-react and spur the Arab populations to overthrow the puppet governments and get their hands on the oil weapon, then the fundamentalists themselves will stop terrorism in a heartbeat, and give the inner party no pretext to invade and occupy Arabia - an invasion and occupation that would be necessary to keep the oil flowing.

In fact, the empire has controlled the oil flow in Arabia for 50 years. The only question has been how to control that flow at the least cost, and the cheapest way to do it has been to find compliant locals to do the job, thereby avoiding the wrath of the local population.

If the empire were to overturn those new fundamentalist regimes by invading Arabia and turning the oil back on, the occupation of Islam's holiest sites by the empire could provoke a jihad by all 1.5 billion Moslems worldwide (except in America, where Islam appears to be devolving into just another wimpy Protestant denomination).

The Moslem fundamentalists believe that their biggest problem is the softness of their own Moslem governments. They know the popular mood and know that an over-reaction by the empire would solve that problem.

Thus, the inner party is now pondering whether the outer party in America is enraged enough to abandon their notions of civilized warfare and contemplate wholesale genocide. Simply kill off the population bases that produce terrorists and be done with it.

The inner party clearly believes that the example of turning one Moslem country into a burning glass ball will frighten the Moslem populations left standing sufficiently to ensure docile acceptance of inner party rule.

See ["Time to use the Nuclear Option."](#)



Of course, the genocide option would work a profound transformation upon the attitudes of China, Russia, India, and Iran toward the empire. The genocide option is an inner party delusion, but it could happen.

Lesser options involve a clear risk of fundamentalist control of oil prices, and a consequent risk of worldwide depression and a splitting of the U.S. into separate racial republics as the expense of the racial spoils system becomes unbearable, and the dependent racial blocks erupt in violence in response to a cut back in their perceived benefits.

Powerful forces have now been unleashed, and one false step could lead, over a period of years, to disaster for the empire and total public exposure of the inner party and its power.

My bet is that the inner party lust for biblical genocide will be rejected by Bush out of instinct and not because of any understanding of the world situation.

However, it is very possible that he will see an opportunity to appease the inner party and appear tough and presidential at the same time by launching some big, messy and highly visible operation that may nevertheless destabilize all of the puppet regimes.

Naturally, being realists, Russia and China might help the empire stick its foot into that trap.

Such assistance will puff up the inner party's feelings of invincibility and increase the probability that the empire self destructs. Being relatively poor countries, China and Russia have less distance to fall, and being, respectively, a totalitarian and a relatively cohesive nation, they have far less risk of collapse.

They will survive the economic fallout.

The American empire may not.

And from that cause, a new American nation may be born.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to the White Awakenings Page](#)

(c) 2001 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

## Last Things

Oct. 26, 2001

That collector from Northern Virginia prods me once again to set forth clearly those "last things" - the flying ultimatums - which cannot be discussed publicly in America.

First, let us look at Bin Laden's demand or ultimatum. He has repeatedly and consistently stated that there will be no peace in America until:

We withdraw American forces from Arabia.

We cease aid to Israel.

We lift sanctions on Iraq.

Notice that all three of these demands relate to our activities within Arab territory. Bin Laden is not demanding that the U.S. surrender Dearborn, Michigan.

In fact, we could concede the above three demands with no adverse impact whatever upon America or its interests. Indeed, if public debate were allowed, it could reasonably be argued that Bin Laden is merely demanding that we take actions that are broadly consistent with our self interest.

The very reasonableness of his demands is a public embarrassment, causing our government to issue an unusual man-bites-dog demand to its boss, the controlled media, requesting that Bin Laden's utterances be kept off the air. Reason enough indeed to re-frame the issue and relentlessly pound the American public with a message that Bin Laden is not, contrary to his words, demanding our exit from the Arab world, but rather that he is demanding that we change our own essential values.

The propaganda campaign is absolutely absurd on its face. Bin Laden hates us because of our freedom and our democracy? It is a blatant insult to the intelligence of the American people, and a wildly improbable story as there is no connection whatever between the condition of the

Arab world and whether we choose freedom and democracy for ourselves. To argue that Bin Laden and the terrorists hate us because of our freedom and democracy is to argue that there is nothing we can do to halt the terrorism other than to destroy the population base from which the terrorists arise. It is the belief predicate to genocide.

How could Bin Laden or the Arab world expect to benefit from our rejection of democracy, or our elimination of our own freedom? Is this really something that could enter into the calculus of a dissident Arabian multi-millionaire? Are they really going to plunge themselves into the dreadful consequence of a war with us for the abstract and incorporeal purpose of liberating us from the clutches of democracy and freedom?

To pose the question is to answer it.

National interests have fallen off the table of public discourse, and the NWO version of international relations has been reduced to the white hat - black hat simplicity of Hollywood - ascriptive status meriting death for those upon whom we paint black hats.

And it is a very odd sort of democracy which does not allow public discussion of what is in our national interest.

Hence the American ultimatum to the rest of the world

Hunt down and deliver your terrorists to us.

We will not negotiate.

Fail to deliver them, and we will destroy you.

One could be tempted to analogize the flying ultimatums to the summer following the assassination of the Archduke of Sarajevo prior to WW1. However the extremity of the American demand and the imbalance between the American demand and Bin Laden's demands is historically unprecedented.

But the most remarkable aspect of our response to the terror attacks has been the cavalier attitude of our government toward the hand that feeds it.

In my last piece entitled "The End Game" I described an international system of financial rewards and punishments that holds the American Empire together. As a condition of its existence, the Empire must provide tangible benefits to its voting public or it will collapse.

In response to four hijackings by a small group of men that our controlled media calls

"cowards," the government decides to shut down the entire air traffic system and the securities markets for a week.

The government response was stunning in its disproportion and self-destructive effect.

It was immediately obvious after the initial terrorist onslaught, that further hijackings with knives would not work. To commandeer a plane, the hijackers would have to fill more than half the seats, producing a statistically improbable passenger profile that would have been immediately visible to the pilots, who never would have pushed back. It was obvious by mid-day on 9-11 to anyone with an IQ above 100 that the terrorist hijackings were a "one-off" event. The terrorists had "shot their wad" and were done with airplanes.

The objective of our government on the morning of 9-11 should have been to minimize the damage caused by the attack. There was nothing the government could do at that point to prevent the collapse of the towers and the consequent destruction of 30 million square feet of office space. Cheap steel with a low melting temperature had done its work.

The suicide squads which slammed those planes into the towers could not have imagined in their wildest dreams that 7 office buildings would collapse as a result. Much less would they have imagined that our government would shut down half the economy and magnify the damage a hundred fold.

One failing of democracy is the need for "bread and circuses" as the voting franchise inevitably degrades.

In his classic work "The Collapse of Complex Societies" Joseph Tainter observes that all complex societies must invest in "legitimizing activities" and that maintaining legitimacy becomes more and more costly the more complex and diverse the society becomes. The costs of these "legitimizing activities" can lead to collapse.

To be effective, action against terrorists must be carried out in secret by relatively small numbers of government agents. Effective anti-terrorist actions are invisible to the population and thus ineffective as a legitimizing display. So apparently, our government felt compelled to "do something" on 9-11 to show the masses that it was in control, and it apparently concluded that shutting down the air traffic system for a week would show the people that it was "doing something" to protect them - a legitimizing display with huge costs.

Many bearish investment pundits have identified the danger inherent in our debt balloon that has been financing the Empire's economic growth during the past decade.

What most of these bearish analysts ignore is the relative ease with which the Fed or Treasury

can monetize this debt now that all currencies are purely imaginary. The Federal Reserve can purchase the paper of a new government agency which will use the proceeds of the Fed purchases to buy up defaulting debt and create new dollars in the process. Our bearish analysts would argue that this process is inflationary, but forget two things. First, the amount of debt monetized can be controlled so as to keep the supply of dollars relatively stable by replacing only those dollars disappearing in defaulted debt. Second, most goods production has moved to Asian and third world countries which compete to export goods to us based on their abundant supplies of cheap labor.

Thus, the Empire's international economic system has been structured so as to insulate American monetary and debt policy from inflation of goods prices, and it is clear that Alan Greenspan and Bob Rubin - the architects of this system - think they have the debt balloon wired and that defaults can be monetized with far less inflation and interest rate risk than most analysts suspect.

The imbalances which the Empire is not equipped to handle are more physical in nature - the excessive numbers of computers and routers purchased by business that are no longer needed, and which have caused a bear market in tech stocks of epic proportions. (Another that we will encounter in the future is our replacement with new discoveries of only 60% of the amount of oil we have used over the past 25 years.)

As a consequence of moving most manufacturing off-shore, our economy has come to depend on "business services" - the vast armies of upper middle class Americans working as investment bankers, accountants, consultants, and lawyers all frantically laboring 14 hour days preparing and delivering wildly expensive spreadsheets and Power Point presentations which supposedly deliver valuable "information" but which are, in reality, nothing more than worthless sales pitches.

Shutting down the air traffic system strikes at the heart of the business services sector of our economy, demonstrating to all just how dispensable these Power Point presentations really are.

This sector has metastasized far beyond any reasonable need, and our prosperity now completely depends upon it. The business services sector provides the lions share of high paying jobs - it employs the outer party, the 20% of our population which the inner party must keep happy. And without thinking, our government shut it down for a week.

I often joke privately that it will be time to unleash Thor's Hammer and begin the revolution when the FBI paychecks are late. It is a timetable that has always seemed utterly fanciful until the week following 9-11. Government reacting badly makes all things possible.

Twenty years hence, when the costs of supporting 70 million aging and unhappy boomers collides with the costs of buying peace from disgruntled minorities, maintaining a vast

infrastructure of public employment and armies of police along with ever more frequent campaigns of high altitude bombardment, all things are possible.

One thing, however is certain.

The Moslem world clearly recognizes that our economic prosperity is part of a culture that has produced dying populations throughout Russia, Europe, North America and Japan.

They see our talk about democracy and freedom as glitzy wrapping around a package that delivers prosperity joined at the hip with advertising and entertainment which propagandizes females into rejecting monogamy, embracing sexual hedonism and behaving like irresponsible adolescent males.

If hedonism leads to pregnancy, this seductive package of "democracy and freedom" applies its economic pressures to ensure that the woman kills the baby before it gains the wind to cry.

They see a culture in which immigrants are imported to keep wage rates low for working people, and in which the working people are distracted from their plight by constant free entertainment glorifying and impliedly promising instant gratification, hedonistic pleasures and perpetual adolescent irresponsibility. Most members of the upper middle class work frantic 14 hour days to escape the economic and cultural effects of this "democracy and freedom" they so ardently urge upon their lesser brethren and, lacking the time or energy to indulge in the promised vices themselves, nonetheless seem to take immense satisfaction from the idea that these corrupt entertainments are available to them in an abstract and largely theoretical way as "alternative lifestyles," "options" or "choices."

The Moslem world sees very clearly the catastrophically low birthrates of 1.3 per woman (Italy and Japan) and about 1.6 per woman (Euro Americans) - and recognizes that these races are doomed to be displaced and disappear within 200 years if they remain upon their present secular and modernist course.

For a tribe or a people to propagate itself over time, it must repel aliens, reject alien vices, and reinforce among its members the willingness to make the personal, individual sacrifices necessary to keep its collective cradle full.

Any race that fails this central mission of life dies out.

So how would you expect devout Moslems to react to an invitation to join the living dead?

In all social primate groups, young males at the margin of the group are pre-programmed to sacrifice their lives to ensure the survival of their own kind. Anthropologists categorize it as the

ultimate in altruistic behavior, because it so obviously and mortally conflicts with the young male's individual self interest.

Their unplanned and spontaneous aggression is warfare of the most elemental and pure kind.

It matters not whether his name is Muhamed Atta or Eric Rudolph. Unless such young men are socially programmed to ignore plainly observable facts, a significant number will perceive just how threatening our modern consumer culture is to the long term survival of his tribe or his people, and they will react in a predictable fashion.

This true warfare bears little kinship to the typical European war full of "command and control" in which huge numbers of peasants are propagandized into a fighting frenzy with ideological abstractions and then herded to their deaths for some unnamed objective of alienated and invisible elites directing that "command and control."

Consistent with its most recent traditions, our government has undertaken a second very expensive legitimizing display by bombing Afghanistan. It is a display that is utterly irrelevant for the purpose of rounding up terrorists who reside in the United States or preventing new ones from entering. But it is nevertheless essential to legitimize the Empire's rule and show the people that it is "doing something." And of course it will show any marginal young males among the Moslem billion who do not already understand, that slow death through vice and luxury is not an option but is mandatory, and is enforced by smiling blond pilots who cheerfully give the thumbs up sign for their media overlords after each delivery of quick death from safe and comfortable altitudes.

We all know who the cowards are.

And hell will come again to breakfast in New York.

A new wave of pessimism in the public mood of grand supercycle degree (lasting 70 years) has been announced by the herald of a bear market and the entry into the lists of Jihad, closing on and wounding his opponent MacWorld. The defeat of MacWorld (or more precisely, the stripping away of 200 years worth of egalitarian delusions from Western Europeans) is absolutely essential to the survival of every race on the planet. None who succumb to MacWorld's siren song will survive.

But there is no logical connection whatever between free trade and the ideological baggage of human fungibility, equality and extreme individualism which seems to accompany it in actual practice, so there should be no need for violence to separate the wheat of free trade and commerce from the chaff of egalitarianism and its accompanying corruptions. We can have commerce and trade without stimulating it with toxic doses of vice, hedonism and

irresponsibility. Thus, in a logical world, the inner party and the outer party elites would admit their error and desist for the good of mankind and the good of their own peoples.

But this century begins badly, and delusions of this magnitude - handmaidens of important power and status relationships - are never surrendered peacefully.

Bin Laden and his ilk are not our allies in this contest.

Ultimately, he is quite happy to see us destroy ourselves as long as we leave him and his people alone.

In contrast, our people are the walking dead and we have a duty to rescue them.

And for this reason we are in a much worse and more dangerous position. Breaking the delusions of our own kind will be a long, difficult and dangerous process - similar to, but far less amusing than the journey of the mind undertaken by Don Quixote slowly and by degrees - a journey which saw his *Dulcinea* gradually metamorphose from a *doncella* into something closer to the factual truth, an intermediate stage *puti-doncella*, and finally, a simple *puta*.

It is completely incomprehensible how George Bush can watch our television and then wonder why Moslems hate us. It is hard to imagine how he can state with a straight face that they need even greater doses of our television so they will understand how good we Americans really are. The prognosis for peace and progress is not good.

An Empire that has made wildly expensive promises to its own people that are impossible to keep and is being hectored by suicidal warriors from outside will ultimately persecute witches and heretics from within who refuse to embrace its toxic delusions. In extremis, such persecutions become inexpensive legitimizing displays for those determined to prevent a flood of defections from the delusions that keep them in power.

Success for us is far more problematic and uncertain for us than it is for the Moslem world.

They may survive merely by refusing to jump into our cesspool.

We can only survive by persuading our own to exit a cesspool to which they are very much addicted and in numbers sufficient to secure a perimeter in which our peace and independence cannot be threatened.

A much more difficult task!

But one I am sure we all embrace with enthusiasm!



Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to the White Awakenings Page](#)

(c) 2001 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

## The Domestic End Game

March 4, 2002

I can recall very clearly one morning many years ago while commuting to work in the North suburbs of Chicago hearing the announcement that the government was removing home prices from the CPI. That was 1981, if I am not mistaken. At that time, the CPI was running at about an 8% annual rate of increase, largely because of soaring home prices.

The rise in home prices created a new trend. After 14 years of stagnating stock prices some homeowners would keep their old homes when they moved and rent them in the expectation that the price of the home would keep rising. Thus, the rents were typically set at the homeowners old mortgage rate plus the real estate taxes. I was renting just such a home at the time, and the rent was a mere 3% of the market value of the house. The cash outlay, even net of taxes, was far less than a mortgage on the full market value of the home.

In the place of housing prices the government substituted precisely this type of rent, available on a mere 2% of the total housing stock, and called it "imputed rent." Thus, it was the rental rate charged by the 2% of homeowners who were the most optimistic about price appreciation, so that they could hold on to their first homes and sell them later. All they needed to cover was their cash outlay for mortgage and taxes, and they had to offer a rental bargain to lure away tenants from the siren song of appreciation and tax deductions that they might otherwise have if they purchased a house instead of renting a house.

Of course this imputed rental vastly understated the actual cash outlay for housing by about 55% of the American public which owned homes, but that was precisely the point. In response to the inflation of the 1970's Congress indexed both Social Security and Federal income tax marginal rates to the CPI, which was then based upon a fixed basket of goods. Thus, inflation hurt our imperial government by raising its costs (Social Security) and lowering its revenues (indexed marginal tax rates). This CPI adjustment had the effect of repealing the politically popular protections enacted by Congress to shield the public from the effects of inflation (raising their taxes and lowering their retirement incomes).

And since shelter costs represented 40% of the CPI, I knew that the CPI would chronically understate inflation from that point onward. Instead of a fixed basket of goods, it had become a

political fiction, created by un-elected inner-party bureaucrats to preserve the power of the imperial government they so thoroughly idolized.

Some twenty years later I read a news article which states that the average Social Security Benefit has just been increased to reflect this year's CPI and is now \$872 per month.

Tilt!!!

An efficiency apartment in what our imperial elites affectionately refer to as the "fly-over" areas of the country costs \$550 per month.

So how on earth can anybody actually live on Social Security?

Folks, social security has already been repealed.

Game over!!!

Twenty years of inner party monkeying with the CPI has produced a pot of water with a gradually rising temperature which has finally cooked the frog.

As the infirmities of old age set in, most of the elderly end up in retirement homes.

A decent retirement home costs about \$20,000 per year. What kind of care can a Social Security recipient expect in exchange for his monthly check of \$872?

The answer - mean, nasty, brutish and short!

The inner party has crafted an old age program that more closely resembles Logan's Run (a sci-fi movie you all should see) than old age support. And this specially engineered Logan's Run will have a differential impact - hitting the hardest those population groups that are the least cohesive, the least tribal and the most infected by the culture of extreme individualism. Fifty percent of the Euro-American elderly face a very bleak future indeed.

The brutality and euthanasia carried out randomly against the Euro-American elderly by nursing home staffs drawn from population groups trained to view us as oppressors, haters, and the racial enemy, will in practical effect serve the imperial government's interests by reducing its costs. Managements of these facilities will have a massive interest in hushing it up and spinning it out of existence, and while the rare instances of public exposure will call forth public investigations and promises of reform, nothing much will come of it because the inner party will not benefit.

Some of the more obvious fraud in the CPI has become public. For example, while less than 50% of the public has personal or home computers, personal computers are in the index because their prices are falling. Meanwhile, college tuition, which 60% of the public must pay, is not in the CPI because it has been rising very rapidly.

Jimmy Rogers, a long time critic of the CPI cites the famous example of the Chevy Camaro which may cost \$22,000 on the dealer's lot, but which is carried on the books of the CPI at \$7,600. The imperial government considers airbags, catalytic converters, fuel injection systems and anti-lock brakes "quality improvements" and has reduced the price of cars in the CPI to reflect these "improvements". When they first started this process, the adjustments were small, but now they have become so large as to be an obvious embarrassment.

Much less well understood are the effects of chain weighting.

Like most of the outer party, I never ventured into a grocery store during my working career. Similarly, I had never ventured inside a Wall Mart.

I used to mention that inflation was falling to my wife, and she would uniformly insist that the news reports were bull.

Indeed, early retirement has opened up whole new vistas on the problem of government lies (which have become one and the same with inner party lies) and their relation to our collective fate.

I actually went into a grocery store and did some shopping.

After 20 years of absence, it was a cultural shock. Suddenly, I had graphic images to associate with the manipulative techniques of "chain weighting," substitution effects and "quality improvements".

The first thing I noticed is that there are two entirely separate freezer sections for cold cuts, hot dogs and sausage at opposite ends of the store. In one section, the cold cuts that I was familiar with 20 years ago cost about \$7 per pound. I was shocked at how expensive the sliced roast beef, cheddar, Swiss cheese and summer sausage had become.

These expensive cold cuts were near the entrance to the store on the way to the section where busy yuppies can pick up their chicken dinners.

Back in the rear of the store next to the dairy section was a much larger selection of cold cuts and hot dogs that generally cost about \$3 per pound. And I was fascinated to learn what this stuff was made of.

As it turns out, most of the hot dogs and bologna are chicken or turkey - something which they were never made from when I was growing up and which I had never been aware of before - apparently made up of 50 percent soy bean meal and 50 percent chicken or turkey parts. The few hot dogs and bologna selections labeled "beef" consisted of hearts, kidneys, and other parts that are hard on the digestive system, along with the usual helping of soy bean meal.

Suddenly it all became clear.

We now have our very own version of Soylent Green (another sci-fi movie you should see), as these new meat flavored and textured soybean concoctions have become a mainstay of most of our people's diets. Of course, it is dressed up to look like the foods we had 30 years ago.

In truth, it is one step above the fare offered for sale in the pet food isle, that costs about fifty cents a pound.

The imperial government has promulgated regulations allowing the food industry to deceive us by labeling as chicken or beef, that which is fractionally chicken or beef, while the statisticians have lowered CPI by taking advantage of the "substitution effects" of increasing consumption of the soy bean byproducts blended in with the chicken and beef.

Chain weighting means that as people respond to the inflation of beef prices and consume less, the government decreases the weight or percentage for beef in the CPI basket of goods. Thus, the only way you can have inflation with chain weighting is if wages are rising fast enough that people can afford to keep buying the same stuff.

Put another way, all you have to do to eliminate inflation in a chain weighted CPI is keep wage rates from rising. Then, people are forced to substitute cheaper goods, and the more expensive ones gradually disappear from the index.

My trips to the grocery store in retirement have taken on a special meaning. I now watch and wonder at my fellow Euro-Americans strolling contentedly in the isles. They remind me of a huge herd of docile cattle quite content to chew their cud and hope that their imperial masters slaughter them slowly and painlessly.

The critical point is that this herd is fully capable of a thunderous and wildly destructive stampede if aroused - but otherwise they are utterly incapable of organizing and doing the relatively easy and non-destructive things that would force their imperial masters to represent their interests. After all, the numbers are still on their side.

Every time I go to the grocery store I carefully observe my fellow Euro-Americans and ponder this central question. What exactly do we carry in our own evolutionary psychology that makes

us so uniquely vulnerable among humankind?

What is it that makes our people unwilling to confront what they plainly see right in front of their noses?

Professor Kevin MacDonald has plumbed the depths of the evolutionary psychology of the inner party - a psychology that explains their total dominance of our society and culture. His discussions of the psychoanalytic movement, the Frankfurt School and the criticism of gentile culture in "The Culture of Critique" are so brilliant and important that I have assigned that book the status of one of the seven pillars of WN.

However, the inner party's strength does not explain our weakness and passivity - our total unfitness for survival in a multicultural society.

In fact, there is virtually nothing written about our own evolutionary psychology with one possible exception.

Back in 1978 John Murray Cuddihy wrote "No Offense: Civil Religion and Protestant Taste" a brilliant piece (the title of which was suggested by Jeffery Hart and Joe Sobran back in better days!) which suggests what is lodged so deeply in the Euro-American evolutionary psychology.

As Andrew M. Greeley states on the dust jacket:

"Bourgeois Civility ... is clearly one of the most important "compromises" by which we hold our multiethnic, pluralistic society together. Cuddihy is the first American sociologist to dig deeply into the greatest mystery of all about American pluralism: How does the nation survive? The book is critically important for anyone who finds it astonishing that a country as large, as diversified, as quickly put together as the United States has managed to endure with only one Civil War and with a bare minimum of violence compared to the other great continental pluralisms of the World."

In Cuddihy's own words:

"I argue in this book that we will never know what "civil religion" is until we stand it on its head, inverting civil religion into the religion of civility." ... under the cover of its prim title, [the religion of civility] in its rites and practices, is activist, aggrandizing, subversive, intrusive, incivil. This complex code of rites instructs us in the ways of being religiously inoffensive, of giving "no offense," of being religiously sensitive to religious differences. Being complexly aware of our religious appearances to others is to practice the religion of civility. Thus, [the religion of civility] is the social coreography of tolerance. It dances out an attitude."

Cuddihy has hit upon something profound. While the rules and dogmas of this religion of civility are nowhere set forth on paper, they are universally followed and vigorously enforced in our everyday lives. Being thus unexpressed but uniformly understood and enforced, this "religion of civility" is quintessentially a racial phenomenon. For better or for worse, it is our very own racial phenomenon. It can only exist as a result of our evolutionary psychology.

What Cuddihy fails to note is that this religion of civility has no hold whatsoever on the inner party which routinely sponsors artists and art exhibitions with display "piss Christ" and other offensive works. The unending inner party efforts to drive even neutered and watered down religious themes from public Christmas celebrations is also offensive, as are their unending demands that various parts of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John be ignored by Christian denominations (these demands are set forth in "Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism", a research project and book sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (1966) and the acquiescence of organized Christendom to all those demands is recounted triumphantly by Elliott Abrams in his 1997 book "Faith or Fear.")

The religion of civility is confined to the European Descendants of Christendom.

Cuddihy argues that in response to the bloody religious wars from 1500 - 1700 in Europe, a reaction set in during the Enlightenment (1700 - 1800) which gradually stripped religions of their intense beliefs, rendering them mere denominations capable of coexisting in a civil society.

Sir Arthur Keith would argue that the development of Cuddihy's religion of civility was a by-product of a 1000 year process of tribal amalgamation of Europe, during which kings conquered neighboring tribes and fused their loyalties into those of broader multi-ethnic nationalisms. During this 1000 year process, tribal loyalties were repressed by force, and tolerance drummed into the heads of our European populations by the sticks and carrots of force and patronage.

The Ole Ygg would argue that the process of tribal amalgamation was only possible in Europe because of a 5000 year old evolutionary psychology forged by the certainty of starvation in northern winters for those who carelessly offended neighboring villagers upon whom they might have to depend for survival if crops failed or fish migrated from habitual fishing banks.

In such a harsh environment, habits of civility would confer an enormous survival advantage. Indeed an invader could find lots of uninhabited spaces to settle in the northern wastes, but unless that invader was already familiar with the local fishing and farming techniques, it would perish by spring. Suspicion and hostility toward strangers were not necessary to secure genetic separation nor safety from invasion from afar.

Sadly, we were all illiterate 2000 years ago and have no records of this.

The only tantalizing scrap I have been able to find is Wayne Johnston's marvelous description of the Southern Coast of Newfoundland in pages 344 through 355 of his historical novel "Colony of Unrequited Dreams." He notes the generosity and complete lack of suspicion toward strangers exhibited by desperately poor and isolated subsistence fishermen 75 years ago. These people were so completely isolated from contact with the outside world and with the neighboring villages that each developed its own dialect of English that was very difficult for anyone outside the village to understand.

"What I had not realized was how cut off from the world in both space and time these people were. Most of them did not understand or even have a word for the concept of government . [They] had only a rudimentary understanding of what a country was. And at the same time were destitute beyond anything I imagined when I first set out. And these were the people I thought to unionize, organize? I was able to get across only the notion that I had come to try to help them. But as I had with me none of the forms of help they were familiar with - no supply boat, no medicine, no clerical collar - they regarded me as something of a crackpot, showing up from out of nowhere empty-handed but apparently convinced that my mere presence among them would somehow improve their lot. Yet if I had told the head of any household that from now on I would live with him, he would have assured me that I was welcome.

"At the sight of an unfamiliar person in their harbor, people came running from their houses. They ran, it turned out, because to the first person to shake my hand would go the privilege of serving us a cup of tea or putting us up for the night. I was greeted with open hearted bemusement, welcomed into a home where my insistence on talking unions and politics was viewed as a forgivable, but not to be encouraged shortcoming. Of course they would join my union, they said, seeming embarrassed as if it impugned their hospitality for me to have to ask for anything. But it turned out they had no money for union dues nor for anything else."

Where could such natural and unschooled civil behavior toward strangers come from?

Apparently the ancestors of these people were English farmers transported to Newfoundland 200 years earlier, who had to be teach themselves how to fish in order to survive.

And isn't this exactly the kind of behavior you would expect if you were transported back in time 6000 years to the stone houses pictured in National Geographic in the Orkney Islands north of Scotland when they were first built?

This is what I ponder while roaming the isles of the grocery store and surveying the great herds of docile Euro-Americans.



They seem incapable of recognizing obvious facts that might offend other groups in our multicultural experiment just as the primitive Newfoundlanders of 75 years ago were incapable of considering the option of expelling Joe Smallwood (protagonist of this historical novel and first provincial premier of Newfoundland following Union with Canada in 1949) back onto the ice floes from which he came.

Sadly, we can no longer go to Newfoundland and study these people, because Joe Smallwood removed them from their remote island villages and sent them to government sponsored "employment centers" on the main island, where they have been deluged with televised images from Hollywood.

So one is left to ponder just how deeply rooted this instinctive lack of suspicion might be, and at what point empathy for the individual casualties of this multicultural experiment might galvanize us to collective defensive action?

It seems readily apparent that a certain focused rudeness is essential for survival in a multicultural society. Can our people figure out appropriate non-violent behaviors on their own and implement them as individuals? Or are they completely dependent on charismatic leaders to stir them up against an enemy and its agenda?

Only time will tell.

In the meantime the domestic end-game of our imperial government is quite clear.

The fundamental falsehood of the CPI has produced a perpetual and enormous tax increase aimed largely at the middle class - a tax increase that has allowed the imperial government to dramatically reduce its outstanding debt. This huge tax increase has created a vast and permanent fiscal drag on the economy which our imperial government has managed to counteract by convincing the consumer to do the opposite of what the government is doing, namely, to pile into debt, thereby vastly increasing his risk profile.

To facilitate increasing consumer indebtedness, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac have financed a spectacular boom in housing prices (all comfortably outside of the CPI) that has allowed consumers to pull cash out of their homes by periodically refinancing their mortgages and increasing their debt.

At the same time, Trotskyite inner party vanguardists like Alan Greenspan have infiltrated the Republican party and actively encourage the more extreme ideologies of atomized individualism, one of which is a seething contempt for Social Security which they have successfully implanted among outer party baby boomers (ensuring that they will not come to the defense of their lesser brethren dependent upon it). The vanguard has convinced them that

they can do better for themselves by investing in the stock market and in MacMansions.

It is an obviously absurd strategy, as the very same ugly demographics which inform the conservative's contempt for Social Security - and which have induced our imperial government to lie its way out of Social Security - will be absolutely lethal for housing and stock prices just as soon as baby boomers begin to retire in significant numbers.

Nevertheless, our upper middle class baby boomers want to believe that they can escape without resort to rudeness.

The central characteristic of all multicultural societies is that groups use the central government to compete for resources. Groups compete even as individual members of those groups smile in the faces of members of other groups with whom they interact from day to day. Groups which master this essentially duality of existence do very well in multicultural societies.

Members of groups which refuse to compete experience significant adverse headwinds, the effects of which are, from a statistical perspective, incredibly difficult for an individual to escape.

As I wander through the isles of the local grocery store I watch and wonder. It occurs to me that the obedient herd is not really contented. They clearly cannot be happy with the \$3 per pound mystery "meat" parading as hot dogs and cold cuts.

But it is a profound inhibition against rudeness and uncivil behavior that keeps the discontent in check.

Meanwhile our imperial government has created a wildly unbalanced and unstable economic structure that is certain to be the source of much serious discontent over the next 20 years.

But when you watch what the imperial government actually does, you see that it is paring back its debt and conserving its resources as if to save them to counter that discontent not with ameliorative relief efforts (which it vigorously foreswears with lies) but with force.

It is spending a significant amount of money to accustom its core Euro-American population to the sight of other Euro-Americans being randomly selected and searched in public, thereby desensitizing them to the very techniques that will routinely be used against them once they are provoked to resistance by the inevitable economic crises.

It is only a question of time before we are required to carry ID cards and submit to arbitrary searches just like Palestinians.

Forget about the gentle slaps on the wrist that our imperial government meted out to inner party rioters back during the civil rights, SDS and free speech riots of the 1960s. The treatment the imperial government is preparing to dish out to us is - how shall we say it - a tad more brusque!

I see an imperial government that fully expects to be able to exploit economic crises it knows are coming to speed up our destruction and displacement, and is preparing to do just that!

The collector from Northern Virginia, who I often mention, runs ad hoc focus groups in which he pokes and prods members of the outer party to articulate that which they all clearly must see and understand.

He reports that they all understand the taboos quite well, and that they all firmly resist articulating some fairly obvious truths. The source of the inhibition is unclear, particularly when it can reasonably be deduced from the questions that the questioner will not be offended by a taboo response.

The older respondents are so pleased with their stock portfolios and their home price appreciation that they feel no discontent at all. It is only the younger Euro-American males who almost uniformly express a mild if unfocused sense of dissatisfaction.

The good news is, I think we can work with that.

We know from history that Euros are not always peaceful, cooperative and trusting of strangers.

Further, in its hubris, the inner party has constructed a very complex and unstable train with lots of moving parts, and many opportunities to derail.

We have the option of sitting and waiting as passive observers for one of those accidental derailments.

But the key to our success when those happen will be a clear understanding of our own evolutionary psychology and the limits it imposes upon our ability to persuade our own people to become pushy, demanding, and rude.

To be credible, we are going to have to demonstrate a concern and caring for our own through tangible relief efforts when the economic calamities arrive.

And if collective self defense requires passionate acts and charismatic leaders, we can produce them.

But like any good infantry platoon leader, my task is to keep the young hero's head down and

out of the line of fire until his organizing activities and oratory can actually produce worthwhile results.

And to that task I remain firmly committed.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to the White Awakenings Page](#)

(c) 2002 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

## The New Feudalism

Dec. 24, 2002

Those of us privileged to grow up among the inner party quickly come to know that quite often things are not as they appear on the surface.

For example, I have long known that the inner party supports the progressive income tax because they benefit from paying it. And the larger their payment and more disproportionate relative to our own, the more they benefit.

It is a self-evident proposition if you stop and think about it - self evident, that is, to all but conservative Republicans who cherish the notion that they can remake the inner party into disciples of Adam Smith, and thus useful political allies, by promising to lower their income tax bills.

The wild improbability of this conservative Republican hope reminds me of a hilariously naive film produced by Goebbels during WWII entitled, in English, "Hitler gives the [inner party] a Town." in which he shows the inner party inmates at the Theresienstadt concentration camp being taught crafts and the raising of vegetables so that they could learn to be like other Germans and, presumably, assimilate and lead normal German lives after the war.

But by calling the conservative Republican hopes and the German film hilariously naive, I do not mean to belittle those entertaining the hope. After all, Theodor Hertzl, founder of Zionism, had a similar dream of a territorial nation in which the inner party would grow their own crops, sweep their own streets, collect their own garbage, and produce their own crafts.

And the sole reason why the Israeli - Palestinian conflict continues is precisely because wage rates sufficient to induce members of the inner party to perform such tasks would render the entire national enterprise wildly uneconomic. The inner party needs Palestinian labor to perform these essential tasks and has developed a particularly nasty form of multi-culturalism which provides the cheap labor that is the object of all multi-culturalisms, but which dares not attempt Western methods of deceiving the cheap alien labor into peaceful relations with the standard unifying public mythos of equality and preference schemes for its leadership.

If such diaspora methods were adopted, then Israel's essential character as an inner party racial-state would be lost to its core population. To forge a system that squares the occupational proclivities of the core inner party population with its emotional demand for an explicitly racial state, they have created a system in which alien laborers are housed in ghettos and searched each day on their way to work (much as the outer party in the U.S. is searched at airport gates). Instead of propaganda and preferences, Israel has resurrected the classic bolshevik program of decapitation against the alien leaders within those ghettos who are killed by occupying soldiers in plain view of their neighbors if they oppose the subjugation of their people.

It is yet another failed Twentieth Century experiment in inner party domination, and a lesson to nationalists everywhere on what to avoid when in the process of nation building.

Good fences make good neighbors only if honest labor is rewarded not only with a living wage, but by a culture that marks labor's contribution with honor and social respect.

In medieval times, European kings collected their taxes from the lesser nobles who collected rents from their tenants.

Thus, kings had a powerful interest in pursuing policies which enhanced the wealth of the tax paying nobles. And the position of the nobles was enhanced by paying the taxes. They had the ear of the king as to the policies, practices and laws that would benefit them all.

The nobles clearly understood that the extractive powers of a strong government were unmatched, and that the rent-seeking opportunities afforded by shaping its policies were equally unmatched. Indeed, tax revolts by nobles were rare, and were typically fought over the issue of who should do the taxing. Opposition to taxation itself was never put forward by them as an explicit ideology nor an active political program.

It was left to the Scottish nationalist Adam Smith (see *Race and Economics*, Thomas Sowell) to develop the ideology of low taxes and unregulated private enterprise as a political program for limiting the power of multi cultural empires (England) and thus maximizing the freedom of action and power of ethnic minorities within the empire.

Opposition to taxes represents the civilization of the peasant revolt, and is thus anathema to grandees everywhere and to races which have adopted the mind set of grandees.

At the age of 14, the Ole Ygg instantly recognized a fellow tribesman in the excellent work of the Reverend Mr. Smith.

I thought his idea a capital one, and imagined it would be embraced by all minorities everywhere. Naturally, I took great alarm at the uniform rejection of his vision by my inner

party classmates and could not extract from them a satisfactory explanation for that rejection. I was not then aware of the equally uniform lack of interest in tax cutting and limited government by nobles, grandees and dominant imperial elites the past.

While the names we use are different, little of substance has changed as we move from the medieval to modern times.

The facts of disproportionate inner party incomes and progressively disproportionate inner party tax payments are crystal clear. What has been lacking, up until last week, was any clear statement by a politician in the employ of the racial extortion coalition that shows an overall solicitude for their prosperity and wealth, and that makes a direct connection between that wealth and the fiscal health of the government.

Tracing back from the multitude of complex federal programs and policies to the incomes and interests of those who pay the greatest taxes is a Herculean task. What I needed was fiscal emergency that would cause a puppet politician to give up the ghost and make that connection obvious.

And indeed, last week was most excellently productive in that regard, as help finally arrived from Gray Davis, Governor of California, in a press conference he held on December 18, 2002 concerning the escalating deficits and fiscal crisis in his state:

"As you well know, we have a very progressive system in this state. 80% of our revenues come from 10% of the tax earners. So, we depend heavily on the well-being of highly compensated Californians. From 1995 to 2000 these taxpayers experienced an increase in what they were providing state government on the order of about 18% in '95, '96, '97, and '98, and then it shot up in '99 to about 25%, and a little higher in 2000. In 2001, they actually dropped down to zero, so there was a dramatic falloff in 2001. And 2002 they are down about 3%...

"But when you have a very progressive tax system which basically exempts everyone from taxes making up to \$45,000 a year and depend heavily on the performance of the top ten percent of your wage earners, then you run the risk that, if they do badly, services have to be reduced and there's not the revenue for other things we'd like to do in government. So, if there is one single problem that has caused this problem, this is it.

"Another way of looking at it: **If you just took people whose incomes exceed a million dollars**, and look at the impact they've had on state revenues again going back to '95 - it was a 46% increase that year in what they contributed to state revenues. '96 it was a 20% increase, 33% increase in 1997, 21% increase in 1998, 62% increase in 1999, 45% increase in 2000, and a drop off of 47% in 2001. That's about a 50% drop in the revenues coming into state coffers from the millionaires in one year.

"There's another way of looking at it, because capital gains is a big part of the problem. Obviously, people that do well invest their money. Many of their investments are in the stock market. I've told you many times that the NASDAQ was at 5,000 in April 2000; it's now at about 1,400 - it's a 75 or 80% reduction. Here again, from '90 through '95, you have a fairly steady indication of how much money is coming into the coffers of around \$20 billion. Then you have a pretty good run up from '95 up through '98 - we're up to about \$50 billion. But you never realize this until after the fact, but you have a spike in 2000 up around \$110 billion. 2001 you're back down to \$40 billionish and 2002 will be less, so that's another way of looking at the same picture."

Notice that Governor Davis is talking about people who make over a million dollars a year.

As I have mentioned before, the pay pyramids in publicly held corporations are incredibly narrow at the top.

The CEO's earn well over a million dollars each, but the very purpose of corporations is economic efficiency, and that means holding down salaries for everyone else - something which corporations do quite well. There are more athletes in the NFL and NBA earning a million dollars per year than there are CEO's of the fortune 500. Add to the athletes several thousand 8-A preference program government contractors, add another few thousand actors, actresses, rock stars, movie and TV producers, along with many thousands of investment bankers, contingency fee trial lawyers, venture capitalists and hedge fund managers and you begin to understand the occupational and income profile of the real constituency of the Democratic party in the U.S.

Every one of these occupational categories is heavily regulated by the government, every one is populated overwhelmingly by Democrats, and every one depends on continued favor and permits from government for its prosperity.

In contrast, the bedrock of the Republican party is the hundreds of thousands of engineers, doctors, accountants and middle managers in corporate America who earn from \$100,000 to \$300,000 per year. Their incomes are regulated largely by supply and demand. Thus, they see no visible connection between government policy and their incomes, and they are subjected to higher marginal rates than the million dollar earners because of the phase-outs of personal exemptions and itemized deductions, as well as the alternative minimum tax.

Their interests are served by the classic peasants revolt, and they respond politically to the ideologies and political programs of the peasant revolt so long as they are packaged in polite and universalized forms.

Last week the Wall Street Journal was kind enough to flesh out this picture of our new feudal



overlords with an article entitled "Options Frenzy: What Went Wrong?" On page B-2 of the 12/17/02 edition. The article lists the ten CEO's who recieved the largest single year option exercises during the stock market bubble.

Here they are:

CEO	Option Exercise
Lawrence Ellison	\$706 million
Michael Eisner,	\$570 million
Michael Dell	\$233 million
Sanford Weill	\$220 million
Thomas Siebel	\$175 million
Stephen Case	\$158 million
John Chambers	\$156 million
Gerald Levine	\$153 million
Jozef Straus	\$150 million
Howard Solomon	\$147 million

Of the ten, seven are inner party and two, Case and Chambers, are outer party. I am unsure about Siebel.

What you see in the table above is a clear representative picture of the "inner party" as originally conceived by the brilliant Italian economist Vilfredo Pareto and defined by its economic function and its direct ties to government power. (The Ole Ygg uses Pareto's term to refer to the overwhelmingly dominant racial/ethnic group within Pareto's functionally defined "inner party," as well as their less prosperous and less well connected kinsmen who share their psychological feelings of dependence upon, and allegiance to, state power as a dominant tool in the racial struggle for power and dominance). With many inner party sources affirming that more than 50% of the World's billionaires are inner party, it is clear that when you subtract the oil sheiks and princes from the mix, most billionaires in the European world all belong to the same temple.

Thus, the degree of solicitude by politicians for the interests of grandees earning in excess of a million dollars per year has profound consequences not only for government revenues, but for the outcomes of the racial struggle for power and dominance as well - a struggle which the largely Republican outer party barely recognizes.

During normal times, the politicians supported by our new class/race of grandees crow about

the necessity for high taxes and income redistribution. This is their way not only of promising tangible benefits to the racial extortion coalition that forms the bedrock of their party, but of motivating those constituent racial groups to turn out at the polls by offering them the psychic satisfaction of punishing their racial adversaries as well.

And the lesser races within the inner party engineered racial extortion coalition never figure out who pays the most taxes and never calculate the leveraged return these inner party grandees receive from their ability to shape government policy in their own favor.

All the inner party need do is import low IQ hostile races incapable of connecting the dots, and the racial extortion coalition takes on the characteristics of a perpetual motion machine.

Thus, during normal times the inner party controlled politicians stay on message.

But these are not normal times, and Governor Davis is faced with a fiscal crisis but has little power to fix the problem because the government policies that he must rely upon to restore the wealth and incomes of the grandees are primarily federal.

In Governor Davis' own words:

" We had a lot of one-time solutions, and we did it in part because everyone from Alan Greenspan on down was saying, "The economy will recover - it will recover in the spring of 2002. In the worst-case in the summer of 2002, but it will recover." And so we didn't want to savage health and welfare programs and knock people off of programs for which they are eligible when we think the economy is going to bounce back that quickly. Now, the finance department has its conference with a number of financial experts and the consensus now is that it will be very unlikely there will be a recovery in 2003 at all and we'll have to wait until 2004. But now we are faced with a very different situation and you'll see when I make my budget plan on January 10th, with a very different response."

As you can see, Governor Davis drifted off message and revealed the fact that our super rich are joined at the hip to the government as a means of deflecting blame - because the problem can only be solved if Alan Greenspan and the Federal government can reflate the bubble. The state of California has very little power to fix the problem on its own.

Indeed, the fact that Governor Davis drifted off message indicates that our high income grandees have reached a state of political nirvana, where their incomes and tax payments have become so huge that they no longer have to assume the posture of supplicants or make bribes, but can rely upon the government and politicians to serve their interests sua sponte - without excessive prompting, just like in feudal times.

The nature of the new feudalism should alert you to opportunities and dangers.

First, it seems abundantly clear that the government will do all in its power to reflate the bubble and attempt to preserve inner party incomes and control, which have become very nearly identical, at the margin, to its own tax revenues.

Thus far, efforts to keep the bubble inflated have done little besides boosting the price of gold. The more desperate the reflation efforts become, the higher gold prices will rise.

And rising gold prices are a form of peasant revolt.

Rising gold prices threaten not only the leveraged financial structures by which the inner party extracts its rents, but the power of the American Empire itself, which is tied to the vast pool of dollars held by other countries.

Given who is involved and given the political stakes, it seems crystal clear that efforts to keep the bubble inflated will persist for many years, thus guaranteeing that present market trends continue for a very long time.

The inner party and the American Empire will eventually become desperate and will seek domestic enemies to blame - anti-egalitarian heretics and economic saboteurs. In the early stages, asset confiscations will be the punishment of choice, as these now require mere "connections with" and "links to" someone bad, rather than the more traditional proof of overt criminal acts.

Any bank branch manager will tell you how trivially easy it is for the government to erase your bank balance - it exists only in a computer memory bank. Same applies to your brokerage account which exists only in a computer memory bank. Given the identity and "connections" of our new feudal lords, it will also be easy for the private entities they control to make your dollar denominated balances disappear as soon as they feel threatened.

And if your dollar balances disappear without explanation, who is going to believe that you didn't lose or spend them?

In contrast, the confiscation of your physical gold requires much more intrusive and old fashioned processes. The government will need a warrant which not all federal judges and magistrates are slutty enough - nor yet sufficiently intimidated by all those mysterious Izzy art students showing up unexpectedly at their front doors - to rubber stamp.

And when an armed SWAT team shows up to break down your door and search your personal effects, it is frightfully visible to your neighbors, and has a clear demonstrative effect -

particularly when they know you to be a peaceful sort and learn that gold was the object of the search.

Second, the existence of the new feudalism places a particular burden on the inner party neo-conservatives to explain their precise role in this system.

If we make an alliance with them, or accept their leadership, how exactly do we benefit?

Do any of their policy prescriptions to limit government really cripple the wealth and power of their fellow inner party grandees? For if not, then the racial extortion enterprise keeps chugging along undisturbed, and our median incomes which are already 20% lower than those of our racial competitors of the same IQ will continue to decline, as the animus of university admissions officers coincides to an increasing degree with the economic interests of their employers in discriminating against our children - all because we increasingly lack the incomes to pay high tuition and to make conspicuous displays of generosity as alumni, relative to our racial competitors with similar IQs and much higher incomes.

Is the intensity of inner party neo-conservative effort motivated by a generous impulse to benefit us in some way - to restore us to equality relative to those in competing racial groups with the same IQ?

Or is the degree of neocon effort carefully proportioned to the power of their statist brethren - protecting them by diverting political discontent into safe channels, and keeping the escape routes open to the special hell hole they have created for themselves in the middle east in the event of an emergency?

We are no longer so easily diverted!

Yggdrasil-

---



[Back to the White Awakenings Page](#)

(c) 2002 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



## CONCEPTUAL BREAKTHROUGHS

This is the Breakthrough series. These posts are all conceptual breakthroughs by other authors. These articles are important to the White Nationalist cause and help form an intellectual background for the movement.

1. [What is Racism?](#)
2. [The "Radio Project" and "Little Annie"](#) 
3. [Who Rules America?](#)
4. [Leaderless Resistance](#)
5. [Revolutionary Majorities](#)
6. [The Race War of Black Against White](#) 
7. [The Truth About Slavery](#)
8. [The Holocaust Controversy](#)
9. [The Morality of Survival](#)

---

**BACK**

(c) 1996-1998 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.

---

# WHAT IS RACISM?

by Thomas Jackson

{Originally Published in American Renaissance, Vol 2, No. 8}

There is surely no nation in the world that holds "racism" in greater horror than does the United States. Compared to other kinds of offenses, it is thought to be somehow more reprehensible. The press and public have become so used to tales of murder, rape, robbery, and arson, that any but the most spectacular crimes are shrugged off as part of the inevitable texture of American life. "Racism" is never shrugged off. For example, when a white Georgetown Law School student reported earlier this year that black students are not as qualified as white students, it set off a booming, national controversy about "racism." If the student had merely murdered someone he would have attracted far less attention and criticism. Racism is, indeed, the national obsession. Universities are on full alert for it, newspapers and politicians denounce it, churches preach against it, America is said to be racked with it, but just what *\*is\** racism?

Dictionaries are not much help in understanding what is meant by the word. They usually define it as the belief that one's own ethnic stock is superior to others, or as the belief that culture and behavior are rooted in race. When Americans speak of racism they mean a great deal more than this. Nevertheless, the dictionary definition of racism is a clue to understanding what Americans *\*do\** mean. A peculiarly American meaning derives from the current dogma that all ethnic stocks are equal. Despite clear evidence to the contrary, all races have been declared to be equally talented and hard- working, and anyone who questions the dogma is thought to be not merely wrong but evil.

The dogma has logical consequences that are profoundly important. If blacks, for example, are equal to whites in every way, what accounts for their poverty, criminality, and dissipation? Since any theory of racial differences has been outlawed, the only possible explanation for black failure is white racism. And since blacks are markedly poor, crime-prone, and dissipated, America must be racked with pervasive racism. Nothing else could be keeping them in such an abject state. All public discourse on race today is locked into this rigid logic. Any explanation for black failure that does not depend on white wickedness threatens to veer off into the forbidden territory of racial differences. Thus, even if today's whites can find in their hearts no desire to oppress blacks, yesterday's whites must have oppressed them. If whites do not consciously oppress blacks, they must oppress them UNconsciously. If no obviously racist individuals can be identified, then *\*institutions\** must be racist. Or, since blacks are failing so terribly in America, there simply must be millions of white people we do not know about, who are working day and night to keep blacks in misery. The dogma of racial equality leaves no room for an explanation of black failure that is not, in some fashion, an indictment of white

people.

The logical consequences of this are clear. Since we are required to believe that the only explanation for non-white failure is white racism, every time a non-white is poor, commits a crime, goes on welfare, or takes drugs, white society stands accused of yet another act of racism. All failure or misbehavior by non-whites is standing proof that white society is riddled with hatred and bigotry. For precisely so long as non-whites fail to succeed in life at exactly the same level as whites, whites will be, by definition, thwarting and oppressing them. This obligatory pattern of thinking leads to strange conclusions. First of all, racism is a sin that is thought to be committed almost exclusively by white people. Indeed, a black congressman from Chicago, Gus Savage, and Coleman Young, the black mayor of Detroit, have argued that only white people *\*can\** be racist. Likewise, in 1987, the affirmative action officer of the State Insurance Fund of New York issued a company pamphlet in which she explained that *\*all\** whites are racist and that *\*only\** whites can be racist. How else could the plight of blacks be explained without flirting with the possibility of racial inequality? Although some blacks and liberal whites concede that non-whites can, perhaps, be racist, they invariably add that non-whites have been forced into it as self-defense because of centuries of white oppression. What appears to be non-white racism is so understandable and forgivable that it hardly deserves the name. Thus, whether or not an act is called racism depends on the race of the racist. What would surely be called racism when done by whites is thought to be normal when done by anyone else. The reverse is also true.

Examples of this sort of double standard are so common, it is almost tedious to list them: When a white man kills a black man and uses the word "nigger" while doing so, there is an enormous media uproar and the nation beats its collective breast; when members of the black Yahweh cult carry out ritual murders of random whites, the media are silent (see AR of March, 1991). College campuses forbid pejorative statements about non-whites as "racist," but ignore scurrilous attacks on whites.

At election time, if 60 percent of the white voters vote for a white candidate, and 95 percent of the black voters vote for the black opponent, it is white who are accused of racial bias. There are 107 "historically black" colleges, whose fundamental blackness must be preserved in the name of diversity, but all historically white colleges must be forcibly integrated in the name of... the same thing. To resist would be racist.

"Black pride" is said to be a wonderful and worthy thing, but anything that could be construed as an expression of white pride is a form of hatred. It is perfectly natural for third-world immigrants to expect school instruction and driver's tests in their own languages, whereas for native Americans to ask them to learn English is racist.

Blatant anti-white prejudice, in the form of affirmative action, is now the law of the land. Anything remotely like affirmative action, if practiced in favor of whites, would be attacked as

despicable favoritism.

All across the country, black, Hispanic, and Asian clubs and caucuses are thought to be fine expressions of ethnic solidarity, but any club or association expressly for whites is by definition racist. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) campaigns openly for black advantage but is a respected "civil rights" organization. The National Association for the Advancement of White People (NAAWP) campaigns merely for equal treatment of all races, but is said to be viciously racist.

At a few college campuses, students opposed to affirmative action have set up student unions for whites, analogous to those for blacks, Hispanics, etc, and have been roundly condemned as racists. Recently, when the white students at Lowell High School in San Francisco found themselves to be a minority, they asked for a racially exclusive club like the ones that non-whites have. They were turned down in horror. Indeed, in America today, any club not specifically formed to be a white enclave but whose members simply happen all to be white is branded as racist.

Today, one of the favorite slogans that define the asymmetric quality of American racism is "celebration of diversity." It has begun to dawn on a few people that "diversity" is always achieved at the expense of whites (and sometimes men), and never the other way around. No one proposes that Howard University be made more diverse by admitting whites, Hispanics, or Asians. No one ever suggests that National Hispanic University in San Jose (CA) would benefit from the diversity of having non-Hispanics on campus. No one suggests that the Black Congressional Caucus or the executive ranks of the NAACP or the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Educational Fund suffer from a lack of diversity. Somehow, it is perfectly legitimate for them to celebrate \*homogeneity\*. And yet any all-white group - a company, a town, a school, a club, a neighborhood - is thought to suffer from a crippling lack of diversity that must be remedied as quickly as possible. Only when whites have been reduced to a minority has "diversity" been achieved.

Let us put it bluntly: To "celebrate" or "embrace" diversity, as we are so often asked to do, is no different from \*deploring an excess of whites.\* In fact, the entire nation is thought to suffer from an excess of whites. Our current immigration policies are structured so that approximately 90 percent of our annual 800,000 legal immigrants are non-white. The several million illegal immigrants that enter the country every year are virtually all non-white. It would be racist not to be grateful for this laudable contribution to "diversity." It is, of course, only white nations that are called upon to practice this kind of "diversity." It is almost criminal to imagine a nation of any other race countenancing blatant dispossession of this kind.

What if the United States were pouring its poorest, least educated citizens across the border into Mexico? Could anyone be fooled into thinking that Mexico was being "culturally enriched?" What if the state of Chihuahua were losing its majority population to poor whites who



demanded that schools be taught in English, who insisted on celebrating the Fourth of July, who demanded the right to vote even if they weren't citizens, who clamored for "affirmative action" in jobs and schooling?

Would Mexico - or any other non-white nation - tolerate this kind of cultural and demographic depredation? Of course not. Yet white Americans are supposed to look upon the flood of Hispanics and Asians entering their country as a priceless cultural gift. They are supposed to "celebrate" their own loss of influence, their own dwindling numbers, their own dispossession, for to do otherwise would be hopelessly racist.

There is another curious asymmetry about American racism. When non-whites advance their own racial purposes, no one ever accuses them of "hating" another group. Blacks can join "civil rights" groups and Hispanics can be activists without fear of being branded as bigots and hate mongers. They can agitate openly for racial preferences that can come only at the expense of whites. They can demand preferential treatment of all kinds without anyone ever suggesting that they are "anti-white."

Whites, on the other hand, need only express their opposition to affirmative action to be called haters. They need only subject racial policies that are clearly prejudicial to themselves to be called racists. Should they actually go so far as to say that they prefer the company of their own kind, that they wish to be left alone to enjoy the fruits of their European heritage, they are irredeemably wicked and hateful.

Here, then is the final, baffling inconsistency about American race relations. All non-whites are allowed to prefer the company of their own kind, to think of themselves as groups with interests distinct from those of the whole, and to work openly for group advantage. None of this is thought to be racist. At the same time, \*whites\* must \*also\* champion the racial interests of non-whites. They must sacrifice their own future on the altar of "diversity" and cooperate in their own dispossession. They are to encourage, even to subsidize, the displacement of a European people and culture by alien peoples and cultures. To put it in the simplest possible terms, white people are cheerfully to slaughter their own society, to commit racial and cultural suicide. To refuse to do so would be racism.

Of course, the entire non-white enterprise in the United States is perfectly natural and healthy. Nothing could be more natural than to love one's people and to hope that it should flourish. Filipinos and El Salvadorans are doubtless astonished to discover that simply by setting foot in the United States they are entitled to affirmative action preferences over native-born whites, but can they be blamed for accepting them? Is it surprising that they should want their languages, their cultures, their brothers and sisters to take possession and put their mark indelibly on the land? If the once-great people of a once-great nation is bent upon self-destruction and is prepared to hand over land and power to whomever shows up and asks for it, why should Mexicans and Cambodians complain?

No, it is the white enterprise in the United States that is unnatural, unhealthy, and without historical precedent. Whites have let themselves be convinced that it is racist merely to object to dispossession, much less to work for their own interests. Never in the history of the world has a dominant people thrown open the gates to strangers, and poured out its wealth to aliens. Never before has a people been fooled into thinking that there was virtue or nobility in surrendering its heritage, and giving away to others its place in history. Of all the races in America, only whites have been tricked into thinking that a preference for one's own kind is racism. Only whites are ever told that a love for their own people is somehow "hatred" of others. All healthy people prefer the company of their own kind, and it has nothing to do with hatred. All men love their families more than their neighbors, but this does not mean that they hate their neighbors. Whites who love their racial family need bear no ill will towards non-whites. They only wish to be left alone to participate in the unfolding of their racial and cultural destinies.

What whites in America are being asked to do is therefore utterly unnatural. They are being asked to devote themselves to the interests of other races and to ignore the interests of their own. This is like asking a man to forsake his own children and love the children of his neighbors, since to do otherwise would be "racist."

What then, is "racism?" It is considerably more than any dictionary is likely to say. It is any opposition by whites to official policies of racial preference for non-whites. It is any preference by whites for their own people and culture. It is any resistance by whites to the idea of becoming a minority people. It is any unwillingness to be pushed aside. It is, in short, any of the normal aspirations of people-hood that have defined nations since the beginning of history - but only so long as the aspirations are those of whites.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## The "Radio Project" and "Little Annie":

The Story of the Stanton-Lazersfeld Program Analyzer.

exerpts from:

-----

THE NEW DARK AGE- The Frankfurt School and "Political Correctness"

by Michael J. Minnicino

The Frankfurt School:

Bolshevik Intelligentsi

The single, most important organizational component of this conspiracy was a Communist thinktank called the Institute for Social Research (I.S.R.), but popularly known as the Frankfurt School.

In the heady days immediately after the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, it was widely believed that proletarian revolution would momentarily sweep out of the Urals into Europe and, ultimately, North America. It did not; the only two attempts at workers' government in the West--in Munich and Budapest--lasted only months. The Communist International (Comintern) therefore began several operations to determine why this was so. One such was headed by Georg Lukacs, a Hungarian aristocrat, son of one of the Hapsburg Empire's leading bankers. Trained in Germany and already an important literary theorist, Lukacs became a Communist during World War I, writing as he joined the party, "Who will save us from Western civilization?"

\* \* \*

At its core, the dominant Western ideology maintained that the individual, through the exercise of his or her reason, could discern the Divine Will in an unmediated relationship. What was worse, from Lukacs' standpoint: this reasonable relationship necessarily implied that the individual could and should change the physical universe in pursuit of the Good; that Man should have dominion over Nature, as stated in the Biblical injunction in Genesis. The problem

was, that as long as the individual had the belief--or even the hope of the belief--that his or her divine spark of reason could solve the problems facing society, then that society would never reach the state of hopelessness and alienation which Lukacs recognized as the necessary prerequisite for socialist revolution.

The task of the Frankfurt School, then, was first, to undermine the Judeo-Christian legacy through an "abolition of culture" (Aufhebung der Kultur in Lukacs' German); and, second, to determine new cultural forms which would increase the alienation of the population, thus creating a "new barbarism." To this task, there gathered in and around the Frankfurt School an incredible assortment of not only Communists, but also non-party socialists, radical phenomenologists, Zionists, renegade Freudians, and at least a few members of a self-identified "cult of Astarte." The variegated membership reflected, to a certain extent, the sponsorship: although the Institute for Social Research started with Comintern support, over the next three decades its sources of funds included various German and American universities, the Rockefeller Foundation, Columbia Broadcasting System, the American Jewish Committee, several American intelligence services, the Office of the U.S. High Commissioner for Germany, the International Labour Organization, and the Hacker Institute, a posh psychiatric clinic in Beverly Hills.

\* \* \*

Of the other top Institute figures, the political perambulations of Herbert Marcuse are typical. He started as a Communist; became a protege of philosopher Martin Heidegger even as the latter was joining the Nazi Party; coming to America, he worked for the World War II Office of Strategic Services (OSS), and later became the U.S. State Department's top analyst of Soviet policy during the height of the McCarthy period; in the 1960's, he turned again, to become the most important guru of the New Left; and he ended his days helping to found the environmentalist extremist Green Party in West Germany.

In all this seeming incoherence of shifting positions and contradictory funding, there is no ideological conflict. The invariant is the desire of all parties to answer Lukacs' original question: "Who will save us from Western civilization?"

Theodor Adorno and Walter Benjamin

Perhaps the most important, if least-known, of the Frankfurt School's successes was the shaping of the electronic media of radio and television into the powerful instruments of social control which they represent today. This grew out of the work originally done by two men who came to the Institute in the late 1920's, Theodor Adorno and Walter Benjamin.

\* \* \*

In essence, Adorno and Benjamin's problem was Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, Leibniz had once again obliterated the centuries-old gnostic dualism dividing mind and body, by demonstrating that matter does not think. A creative act in art or science apprehends the truth of the physical universe, but it is not determined by that physical universe. By self-consciously concentrating the past in the present to effect the future, the creative act, properly defined, is as immortal as the soul which envisions the act. This has fatal philosophical implications for Marxism, which rests entirely on the hypothesis that mental activity is determined by the social relations excreted by mankind's production of its physical existence.

\* \* \*

Marx sidestepped the problem of Leibniz, as did Adorno and Benjamin, although the latter did it with a lot more panache. It is wrong, said Benjamin in his first articles on the subject, to start with the reasonable, hypothesizing mind as the basis of the development of civilization; this is an unfortunate legacy of Socrates. \* \* \* The origin of science and philosophy does not lie in the investigation and mastery of nature, but in the naming of the objects of nature; in the primordial state, to name a thing was to say all there was to say about that thing.

\* \* \*

This philosophical sleight-of-hand allows one to do several destructive things. By making creativity historically-specific, you rob it of both immortality and morality. One cannot hypothesize universal truth, or natural law, for truth is completely relative to historical development. By discarding the idea of truth and error, you also may throw out the "obsolete" concept of good and evil; you are, in the words of Friedrich Nietzsche, "beyond good and evil."

\* \* \*

Thus, Benjamin continued, objects still give off an "aura" of their primordial form, but the truth is now hopelessly elusive. In fact, speech, written language, art, creativity itself--that by which we master physicality--merely furthers the estrangement by attempting, in Marxist jargon, to incorporate objects of nature into the social relations determined by the class structure dominant at that point in history.

\* \* \*

From 1928 to 1932, Adorno and Benjamin had an intensive collaboration, at the end of which they began publishing articles in the Institute's journal, the *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung*. Benjamin was kept on the margins of the Institute, largely due to Adorno, who would later appropriate much of his work. As Hitler came to power, the Institute's staff fled, but, whereas most were quickly spirited away to new deployments in the U.S. and England, there were no job

offers for Benjamin, probably due to the animus of Adorno. He went to France, and, after the German invasion, fled to the Spanish border; expecting momentary arrest by the Gestapo, he despaired and died in a dingy hotel room of self-administered drug overdose.

Benjamin's work remained almost completely unknown until 1955, when Scholem and Adorno published an edition of his material in Germany. The full revival occurred in 1968, when Hannah Arendt, Heidegger's former mistress and a collaborator of the Institute in America, published a major article on Benjamin in the *New Yorker* magazine, followed in the same year by the first English translations of his work. Today, every university bookstore in the country boasts a full shelf devoted to translations of every scrap Benjamin wrote, plus exegesis, all with 1980's copyright dates.

\* \* \*

### Political Correctness

The Adorno-Benjamin analysis represents almost the entire theoretical basis of all the politically correct aesthetic trends which now plague our universities. The Poststructuralism of Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault, and Jacques Derrida, the Semiotics of Umberto Eco, the Deconstructionism of Paul DeMan, all openly cite Benjamin as the source of their work. The Italian terrorist Eco's best-selling novel, *The Name of the Rose*, is little more than a paean to Benjamin; DeMan, the former Nazi collaborator in Belgium who became a prestigious Yale professor, began his career translating Benjamin; Barthes' infamous 1968 statement that "[t]he author is dead," is meant as an elaboration of Benjamin's dictum on intention. Benjamin has actually been called the heir of Leibniz and of Wilhelm von Humboldt, the philologist collaborator of Schiller whose educational reforms engendered the tremendous development of Germany in the nineteenth century. Even as recently as September 1991, the *Washington Post* referred to Benjamin as "the finest German literary theorist of the century (and many would have left off that qualifying German)."

Readers have undoubtedly heard one or another horror story about how an African-American Studies Department has procured a ban on *Othello*, because it is "racist," or how a radical feminist professor lectured a Modern Language Association meeting on the witches as the "true heroines" of *Macbeth*. These atrocities occur because the perpetrators are able to plausibly demonstrate, in the tradition of Benjamin and Adorno, that Shakespeare's intent is irrelevant; what is important, is the racist or phallogocentric "subtext" of which Shakespeare was unconscious when he wrote.

When the local Women's Studies or Third World Studies Department organizes students to abandon classics in favor of modern Black and feminist authors, the reasons given are pure Benjamin. It is not that these modern writers are better, but they are somehow more truthful because their alienated prose reflects the modern social problems of which the older authors

were ignorant! Students are being taught that language itself is, as Benjamin said, merely a conglomeration of false "names" foisted upon society by its oppressors, and are warned against "logocentrism," the bourgeois over-reliance on words.

If these campus antics appear "retarded" (in the words of Adorno), that is because they are designed to be. The Frankfurt School's most important breakthrough consists in the realization that their monstrous theories could become dominant in the culture, as a result of the changes in society brought about by what Benjamin called "the age of mechanical reproduction of art."

### Social Control: The "Radio Project"

In 1937, the Rockefeller Foundation began funding research into the social effects of new forms of mass media, particularly radio. Before World War I, radio had been a hobbyist's toy, with only 125,000 receiving sets in the entire U.S.; twenty years later, it had become the primary mode of entertainment in the country; out of 32 million American families in 1937, 27.5 million had radios -- a larger percentage than had telephones, automobiles, plumbing, or electricity! Yet, almost no systematic research had been done up to this point. The Rockefeller Foundation enlisted several universities, and headquartered this network at the School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University. Named the Office of Radio Research, it was popularly known as "the Radio Project."

The director of the Project was Paul Lazarsfeld, the foster son of Austrian Marxist economist Rudolph Hilferding, and a long-time collaborator of the I.S.R. from the early 1930's. Under Lazarsfeld was Frank Stanton, a recent Ph.D. in industrial psychology from Ohio State, who had just been made research director of Columbia Broadcasting System--a grand title but a lowly position. After World War II, Stanton became president of the CBS News Division, and ultimately president of CBS at the height of the TV network's power; he also became Chairman of the Board of the RAND Corporation, and a member of President Lyndon Johnson's "kitchen cabinet." Among the Project's researchers were Herta Herzog, who married Lazarsfeld and became the first director of research for the Voice of America; and Hazel Gaudet, who became one of the nation's leading political pollsters. Theodor Adorno was named chief of the Project's music section.

Despite the official gloss, the activities of the Radio Project make it clear that its purpose was to test empirically the Adorno-Benjamin thesis that the net effect of the mass media could be to atomize and increase lability--what people would later call "brainwashing."

### Little Annie and the "Wagnerian Dream" of TV

In 1939, one of the numbers of the quarterly Journal of Applied Psychology was handed over to Adorno and the Radio Project to publish some of their findings. Their conclusion was that Americans had, over the last twenty years, become "radio-minded," and that their listening had

become so fragmented that repetition of format was the key to popularity. The play list determined the "hits"--a truth well known to organized crime, both then and now--and repetition could make any form of music or any performer, even a classical music performer, a "star." As long as a familiar form or context was retained, almost any content would become acceptable. "Not only are hit songs, stars, and soap operas cyclically recurrent and rigidly invariable types," said Adorno, summarizing this material a few years later, "but the specific content of the entertainment itself is derived from them and only appears to change. The details are interchangeable."

The crowning achievement of the Radio Project was "Little Annie," officially titled the Stanton-Lazersfeld Program Analyzer. Radio Project research had shown that all previous methods of preview polling were ineffectual. Up to that point, a preview audience listened to a show or watched a film, and then was asked general questions: did you like the show? what did you think of so-and-so's performance? The Radio Project realized that this method did not take into account the test audience's atomized perception of the subject, and demanded that they make a rational analysis of what was intended to be an irrational experience. So, the Project created a device in which each test audience member was supplied with a type of rheostat on which he could register the intensity of his likes or dislikes on a moment-to-moment basis. By comparing the individual graphs produced by the device, the operators could determine, not if the audience liked the whole show-- which was irrelevant--but, which situations or characters produced a positive, if momentary, feeling state.

Little Annie transformed radio, film, and ultimately television programming. CBS still maintains program analyzer facilities in Hollywood and New York; it is said that results correlate 85% to ratings. Other networks and film studios have similar operations. This kind of analysis is responsible for the uncanny feeling you get when, seeing a new film or TV show, you think you have seen it all before. You have, many times. If a program analyzer indicates that, for instance, audiences were particularly titilated by a short scene in a World War II drama showing a certain type of actor kissing a certain type of actress, then that scene format will be worked into dozens of screenplays--transposed to the Middle Ages, to outer space, etc., etc.

The Radio Project also realized that television had the potential to intensify all of the effects that they had studied. TV technology had been around for some years, and had been exhibited at the 1936 World's Fair in New York, but the only person to attempt serious utilization of the medium had been Adolf Hitler. The Nazis broadcast events from the 1936 Olympic Games "live" to communal viewing rooms around Germany; they were trying to expand on their great success in using radio to Nazify all aspects of German culture. Further plans for German TV development were sidetracked by war preparations.

Adorno understood this potential perfectly, writing in 1944:

Television aims at the synthesis of radio and film, and is held up only because the



interested parties have not yet reached agreement, but its consequences will be quite enormous and promise to intensify the impoverishment of aesthetic matter so drastically, that by tomorrow the thinly veiled identity of all industrial culture products can come triumphantly out in the open, derisively fulfilling the Wagnerian dream of the Gesamtkunstwerk--the fusion of all the arts in one work.

The obvious point is this: the profoundly irrational forms of modern entertainment--the stupid and eroticized content of most TV and films, the fact that your local Classical music radio station programs Stravinsky next to Mozart--don't have to be that way. They were designed to be that way. The design was so successful, that today, no one even questions the reasons or the origins.

### III. Creating "Public Opinion":

#### The "Authoritarian Personality" Bogeyman and the OSS

The efforts of the Radio Project conspirators to manipulate the population, spawned the modern pseudoscience of public opinion polling, in order to gain greater control over the methods they were developing.

Today, public opinion polls, like the television news, have been completely integrated into our society. A "scientific survey" of what people are said to think about an issue can be produced in less than twenty-four hours. Some campaigns for high political office are completely shaped by polls; in fact, many politicians try to create issues which are themselves meaningless, but which they know will look good in the polls, purely for the purpose of enhancing their image as "popular." Important policy decisions are made, even before the actual vote of the citizenry or the legislature, by poll results. Newspapers will occasionally write pious editorials calling on people to think for themselves, even as the newspaper's business agent sends a check to the local polling organization.

The idea of "public opinion" is not new, of course. Plato spoke against it in his Republic over two millenia ago; Alexis de Tocqueville wrote at length of its influence over America in the early nineteenth century. But, nobody thought to measure public opinion before the twentieth century, and nobody before the 1930's thought to use those measurements for decision-making.

It is useful to pause and reflect on the whole concept. The belief that public opinion can be a determinant of truth is philosophically insane. It precludes the idea of the rational individual mind. Every individual mind contains the divine spark of reason, and is thus capable of scientific discovery, and understanding the discoveries of others. The individual mind is one of the few things that cannot, therefore, be "averaged." Consider: at the moment of creative discovery, it is possible, if not probable, that the scientist making the discovery is the only person to hold that opinion about nature, whereas everyone else has a different opinion, or no

opinion. One can only imagine what a "scientifically-conducted survey" on Kepler's model of the solar system would have been, shortly after he published the Harmony of the World: 2% for, 48% against, 50% no opinion.

These psychoanalytic survey techniques became standard, not only for the Frankfurt School, but also throughout American social science departments, particularly after the I.S.R. arrived in the United States. The methodology was the basis of the research piece for which the Frankfurt School is most well known, the "authoritarian personality" project. In 1942, I.S.R. director Max Horkheimer made contact with the American Jewish Committee, which asked him to set up a Department of Scientific Research within its organization. The American Jewish Committee also provided a large grant to study anti-Semitism in the American population. "Our aim," wrote Horkheimer in the introduction to the study, "is not merely to describe prejudice, but to explain it in order to help in its eradication.... Eradication means reeducation scientifically planned on the basis of understanding scientifically arrived at."

### The A-S Scale

Ultimately, five volumes were produced for this study over the course of the late 1940's; the most important was the last, The Authoritarian Personality, by Adorno, with the help of three Berkeley, California social psychologists.

In the 1930's Erich Fromm had devised a questionnaire to be used to analyze German workers psychoanalytically as "authoritarian," "revolutionary" or "ambivalent." The heart of Adorno's study was, once again, Fromm's psychoanalytic scale, but with the positive end changed from a "revolutionary personality," to a "democratic personality," in order to make things more palatable for a postwar audience.

Nine personality traits were tested and measured, including:

- \* conventionalism--rigid adherence to conventional, middle-class value
- \* authoritarian aggression--the tendency to be on the look-out for, to condemn, reject and punish people who violate conventional value
- \* projectivity--the disposition to believe that wild and dangerous things go on in the world.
- \* sex--exaggerated concern with sexual goings-on

From these measurements were constructed several scales: the E Scale (ethnocentrism), the PEC Scale (political and economic conservatism), the A-S Scale (anti-Semitism), and the F Scale

(fascism). Using Rensis Lickerts's methodology of weighting results, the authors were able to tease together an empirical definition of what Adorno called "a new anthropological type," the authoritarian personality. The legerdemain here, as in all psychoanalytic survey work, is the assumption of a Weberian "type." Once the type has been statistically determined, all behavior can be explained; if an anti-Semitic personality does not act in an anti-Semitic way, then he or she has an ulterior motive for the act, or is being discontinuous. The idea that a human mind is capable of transformation, is ignored.

The results of this very study can be interpreted in diametrically different ways. One could say that the study proved that the population of the U.S. was generally conservative, did not want to abandon a capitalist economy, believed in a strong family and that sexual promiscuity should be punished, thought that the postwar world was a dangerous place, and was still suspicious of Jews (and Blacks, Roman Catholics, Orientals, etc. -- unfortunately true, but correctable in a social context of economic growth and cultural optimism). On the other hand, one could take the same results and prove that anti-Jewish pogroms and Nuremburg rallies were simmering just under the surface, waiting for a new Hitler to ignite them. Which of the two interpretations you accept is a political, not a scientific, decision.

Horkheimer and Adorno firmly believed that all religions, Judaism included, were "the opiate of the masses." Their goal was not the protection of Jews from prejudice, but the creation of a definition of authoritarianism and anti-Semitism which could be exploited to force the "scientifically planned reeducation" of Americans and Europeans away from the principles of Judeo-Christian civilization, which the Frankfurt School despised. In their theoretical writings of this period, Horkheimer and Adorno pushed the thesis to its most paranoid: just as capitalism was inherently fascist, the philosophy of Christianity itself is the source of anti-Semitism. As Horkheimer and Adorno jointly wrote in their 1947 "Elements of Anti-Semitism": Christ, the spirit become flesh, is the deified sorcerer. Man's self-reflection in the absolute, the humanization of God by Christ, is the proton pseudos [original falsehood]. Progress beyond Judaism is coupled with the assumption that the man Jesus has become God. The reflective aspect of Christianity, the intellectualization of magic, is the root of evil. At the same time, Horkheimer could write in a more-popularized article titled "Anti-Semitism: A Social Disease," that "at present, the only country where there does not seem to be any kind of anti-Semitism is Russia" [!].

This self-serving attempt to maximize paranoia was further aided by Hannah Arendt, who popularized the authoritarian personality research in her widely-read "Origins of Totalitarianism". Arendt also added the famous rhetorical flourish about the "banality of evil" in her later "Eichmann in Jerusalem": even a simple, shopkeeper-type like Eichmann can turn into a Nazi beast under the right psychological circumstances--every Gentile is suspect, psychoanalytically.

It is Arendt's extreme version of the authoritarian personality thesis which is the operant

philosophy of today's Cult Awareness Network (CAN), a group which works with the U.S. Justice Department and the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith, among others. Using standard Frankfurt School method, CAN identifies political and religious groups which are its political enemies, then re-labels them as a "cult," in order to justify operations against them. (See box.)

## The Public Opinion Explosion

Despite its unprovable central thesis of "psychoanalytic types," the interpretive survey methodology of the Frankfurt School became dominant in the social sciences, and essentially remains so today. In fact, the adoption of these new, supposedly scientific techniques in the 1930's brought about an explosion in public-opinion survey use, much of it funded by Madison Avenue. The major pollsters of today--A.C. Nielsen, George Gallup, Elmo Roper--started in the mid-1930's, and began using the I.S.R. methods, especially given the success of the Stanton-Lazersfeld Program Analyzer. By 1936, polling activity had become sufficiently widespread to justify a trade association, the American Academy of Public Opinion Research at Princeton, headed by Lazarsfeld; at the same time, the University of Chicago created the National Opinion Research Center. In 1940, the Office of Radio Research was turned into the Bureau of Applied Social Research, a division of Columbia University, with the indefatigable Lazarsfeld as director.

After World War II, Lazarsfeld especially pioneered the use of surveys to psychoanalyze American voting behavior, and by the 1952 Presidential election, Madison Avenue advertising agencies were firmly in control of Dwight Eisenhower's campaign, utilizing Lazarsfeld's work. Nineteen fifty-two was also the first election under the influence of television, which, as Adorno had predicted eight years earlier, had grown to incredible influence in a very short time. Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborne -- the fabled "BBD&O" ad agency--designed Ike's campaign appearances entirely for the TV cameras, and as carefully as Hitler's Nuremberg rallies; one-minute "spot" advertisements were pioneered to cater to the survey-determined needs of the voters.

This snowball has not stopped rolling since. The entire development of television and advertising in the 1950's and 1960's was pioneered by men and women who were trained in the Frankfurt School's techniques of mass alienation. Frank Stanton went directly from the Radio Project to become the single most-important leader of modern television. Stanton's chief rival in the formative period of TV was NBC's Sylvester "Pat" Weaver; after a Ph.D. in "listening behavior," Weaver worked with the Program Analyzer in the late 1930's, before becoming a Young & Rubicam vice-president, then NBC's director of programming, and ultimately the network's president. Stanton and Weaver's stories are typical.

Today, the men and women who run the networks, the ad agencies, and the polling organizations, even if they have never heard of Theodor Adorno, firmly believe in Adorno's

theory that the media can, and should, turn all they touch into "football." Coverage of the 1991 Gulf War should make that clear.

The technique of mass media and advertising developed by the Frankfurt School now effectively controls American political campaigning. Campaigns are no longer based on political programs, but actually on alienation. Petty gripes and irrational fears are identified by psychoanalytic survey, to be transmogrified into "issues" to be catered to; the "Willy Horton" ads of the 1988 Presidential campaign, and the "flag-burning amendment," are but two recent examples. Issues that will determine the future of our civilization, are scrupulously reduced to photo opportunities and audio bites--like Ed Murrow's original 1930's radio reports--where the dramatic effect is maximized, and the idea content is zero.

### Who Is the Enemy?

Part of the influence of the authoritarian personality hoax in our own day also derives from the fact that, incredibly, the Frankfurt School and its theories were officially accepted by the U.S. government during World War II, and these Cominternists were responsible for determining who were America's wartime, and postwar, enemies.

In 1942, the Office of Strategic Services, America's hastily-constructed espionage and covert operations unit, asked former Harvard president James Baxter to form a Research and Analysis (R&A) Branch under the group's Intelligence Division. By 1944, the R&A Branch had collected such a large and prestigious group of emigre' scholars that H. Stuart Hughes, then a young Ph.D., said that working for it was "a second graduate education" at government expense. The Central European Section was headed by historian Carl Schorske; under him, in the all-important Germany/Austria Section, was Franz Neumann, as section chief, with Herbert Marcuse, Paul Baran, and Otto Kirchheimer, all I.S.R. veterans. Leo Lowenthal headed the German-language section of the Office of War Information; Sophie Marcuse, Marcuse's wife, worked at the Office of Naval Intelligence. Also at the R&A Branch were: Siegfried Kracauer, Adorno's old Kant instructor, now a film theorist; Norman O. Brown, who would become famous in the 1960's by combining Marcuse's hedonism theory with Wilhelm Reich's orgone therapy to popularize "polymorphous perversity"; Barrington Moore, Jr., later a philosophy professor who would co-author a book with Marcuse; Gregory Bateson, the husband of anthropologist Margaret Mead (who wrote for the Frankfurt School's journal), and Arthur Schlesinger, the historian who joined the Kennedy Administration.

Marcuse's first assignment was to head a team to identify both those who would be tried as war criminals after the war, and also those who were potential leaders of postwar Germany. In 1944, Marcuse, Neumann, and Kirchheimer wrote the Denazification Guide, which was later issued to officers of the U.S. Armed Forces occupying Germany, to help them identify and suppress pro-Nazi behaviors. After the armistice, the R&A Branch sent representatives to work as intelligence liaisons with the various occupying powers; Marcuse was assigned the U.S. Zone,

Kirchheimer the French, and Barrington Moore the Soviet. In the summer of 1945, Neumann left to become chief of research for the Nuremberg Tribunal. Marcuse remained in and around U.S. intelligence into the early 1950's, rising to the chief of the Central European Branch of the State Department's Office of Intelligence Research, an office formally charged with "planning and implementing a program of positive-intelligence research to meet the intelligence requirements of the Central Intelligence Agency and other authorized agencies." During his tenure as a U.S. government official, Marcuse supported the division of Germany into East and West, noting that this would prevent an alliance between the newly liberated left-wing parties and the old, conservative industrial and business layers. In 1949, he produced a 532-page report, "The Potentials of World Communism" (declassified only in 1978), which suggested that the Marshall Plan economic stabilization of Europe would limit the recruitment potential of Western Europe's Communist Parties to acceptable levels, causing a period of hostile co-existence with the Soviet Union, marked by confrontation only in faraway places like Latin America and Indochina--in all, a surprisingly accurate forecast. Marcuse left the State Department with a Rockefeller Foundation grant to work with the various Soviet Studies departments which were set up at many of America's top universities after the war, largely by R&A Branch veterans.

At the same time, Max Horkheimer was doing even greater damage. As part of the denazification of Germany suggested by the R&A Branch, U.S. High Commissioner for Germany John J. McCloy, using personal discretionary funds, brought Horkheimer back to Germany to reform the German university system. In fact, McCloy asked President Truman and Congress to pass a bill granting Horkheimer, who had become a naturalized American, dual citizenship; thus, for a brief period, Horkheimer was the only person in the world to hold both German and U.S. citizenship. In Germany, Horkheimer began the spadework for the full-blown revival of the Frankfurt School in that nation in the late 1950's, including the training of a whole new generation of anti-Western civilization scholars like Hans-Georg Gadamer and Juergen Habermas, who would have such destructive influence in 1960's Germany. In a period of American history when some individuals were being hounded into unemployment and suicide for the faintest aroma of leftism, Frankfurt School veterans--all with superb Comintern credentials -- led what can only be called charmed lives. America had, to an incredible extent, handed the determination of who were the nation's enemies, over to the nation's own worst enemies.

#### IV. The Aristotelian Eros:

##### Marcuse and the CIA's Drug Counterculture

In 1989, Hans-Georg Gadamer, a protege of Martin Heidegger and the last of the original Frankfurt School generation, was asked to provide an appreciation of his own work for the German newspaper, Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung. He wrote,

One has to conceive of Aristotle's ethics as a true fulfillment of the Socratic challenge, which Plato had placed at the center of his dialogues on the Socratic question of the good.... Plato described the idea of the good ... as the ultimate and highest idea, which is supposedly the highest principle of being for the universe, the state, and the human soul. Against this Aristotle opposed a decisive critique, under the famous formula, "Plato is my friend, but the truth is my friend even more." He denied that one could consider the idea of the good as a universal principle of being, which is supposed to hold in the same way for theoretical knowledge as for practical knowledge and human activity.

This statement not only succinctly states the underlying philosophy of the Frankfurt School, it also suggests an inflection point around which we can order much of the philosophical combat of the last two millenia. In the simplest terms, the Aristotelian correction of Plato sunders physics from metaphysics, relegating the Good to a mere object of speculation about which "our knowledge remains only a hypothesis," in the words of Wilhelm Dilthey, the Frankfurt School's favorite philosopher. Our knowledge of the "real world," as Dilthey, Nietzsche, and other precursors of the Frankfurt School were wont to emphasize, becomes erotic, in the broadest sense of that term, as object fixation. The universe becomes a collection of things which each operate on the basis of their own natures (that is, genetically), and through interaction between themselves (that is, mechanistically). Science becomes the deduction of the appropriate categories of these natures and interactions. Since the human mind is merely a sensorium, waiting for the Newtonian apple to jar it into deduction, humanity's relationship to the world (and vice versa) becomes an erotic attachment to objects. The comprehension of the universal--the mind's seeking to be the living image of the living God--is therefore illusory. That universal either does not exist, or it exists incomprehensibly as a *deus ex machina*; that is, the Divine exists as a superaddition to the physical universe -- God is really Zeus, flinging thunderbolts into the world from some outside location. (Or, perhaps more appropriately: God is really Cupid, letting loose golden arrows to make objects attract, and leaden arrows to make objects repel.)

The key to the entire Frankfurt School program, from originator Lukacs on, is the "liberation" of Aristotelian eros, to make individual feeling states psychologically primary. When the I.S.R. leaders arrived in the United States in the mid-1930's, they exulted that here was a place which had no adequate philosophical defenses against their brand of Kulturpessimismus [cultural pessimism]. However, although the Frankfurt School made major inroads in American intellectual life before World War II, that influence was largely confined to academia and to radio; and radio, although important, did not yet have the overwhelming influence on social life that it would acquire during the war. Furthermore, America's mobilization for the war, and the victory against fascism, sidetracked the Frankfurt School schedule; America in 1945 was almost sublimely optimistic, with a population firmly convinced that a mobilized republic, backed by science and technology, could do just about anything.

The fifteen years after the war, however, saw the domination of family life by the radio and

television shaped by the Frankfurt School, in a period of political erosion in which the great positive potential of America degenerated to a purely negative posture against the real and, oftentimes manipulated, threat of the Soviet Union. At the same time, hundreds of thousands of the young generation--the so-called baby boomers--were entering college and being exposed to the Frankfurt School's poison, either directly or indirectly. It is illustrative, that by 1960, sociology had become the most popular course of study in American universities.

Indeed, when one looks at the first stirrings of the student rebellion at the beginning of the 1960's, like the speeches of the Berkeley Free Speech Movement or the Port Huron Statement which founded the Students for a Democratic Society, one is struck with how devoid of actual content these discussions were. There is much anxiety about being made to conform to the system--"I am a human being; do not fold, spindle, or mutilate" went an early Berkeley slogan--but it is clear that the "problems" cited derive much more from required sociology textbooks, than from the real needs of the society.

### The CIA's Psychedelic Revolution

The simmering unrest on campus in 1960 might well too have passed or had a positive outcome, were it not for the traumatic decapitation of the nation through the Kennedy assassination, plus the simultaneous introduction of widespread drug use. Drugs had always been an "analytical tool" of the nineteenth century Romantics, like the French Symbolists, and were popular among the European and American Bohemian fringe well into the post-World War II period. But, in the second half of the 1950's, the CIA and allied intelligence services began extensive experimentation with the hallucinogen LSD to investigate its potential for social control.

It has now been documented that millions of doses of the chemical were produced and disseminated under the aegis of the CIA's Operation MK-Ultra. LSD became the drug of choice within the agency itself, and was passed out freely to friends of the family, including a substantial number of OSS veterans. For instance, it was OSS Research and Analysis Branch veteran Gregory Bateson who "turned on" the Beat poet Allen Ginsberg to a U.S. Navy LSD experiment in Palo Alto, California. Not only Ginsberg, but novelist Ken Kesey and the original members of the Grateful Dead rock group opened the doors of perception courtesy of the Navy. The guru of the "psychedelic revolution," Timothy Leary, first heard about hallucinogens in 1957 from Life magazine (whose publisher, Henry Luce, was often given government acid, like many other opinion shapers), and began his career as a CIA contract employee; at a 1977 "reunion" of acid pioneers, Leary openly admitted, "everything I am, I owe to the foresight of the CIA."

Hallucinogens have the singular effect of making the victim asocial, totally self-centered, and concerned with objects. Even the most banal objects take on the "aura" which Benjamin had talked about, and become timeless and delusionarily profound. In other words, hallucinogens instantaneously achieve a state of mind identical to that prescribed by the Frankfurt School



theories. And, the popularization of these chemicals created a vast psychological liability for bringing those theories into practice.

Thus, the situation at the beginning of the 1960's represented a brilliant re-entry point for the Frankfurt School, and it was fully exploited. One of the crowning ironies of the "Now Generation" of 1964 on, is that, for all its protestations of utter modernity, none of its ideas or artifacts was less than thirty years old. The political theory came completely from the Frankfurt School; Lucien Goldmann, a French radical who was a visiting professor at Columbia in 1968, was absolutely correct when he said of Herbert Marcuse in 1969 that "the student movements ... found in his works and ultimately in his works alone the theoretical formulation of their problems and aspirations [emphasis in original]."

The long hair and sandals, the free love communes, the macrobiotic food, the liberated lifestyles, had been designed at the turn of the century, and thoroughly field-tested by various, Frankfurt School-connected New Age social experiments like the Ascona commune before 1920. (See box.) Even Tom Hayden's defiant "Never trust anyone over thirty," was merely a less-urbane version of Rupert Brooke's 1905, "Nobody over thirty is worth talking to." The social planners who shaped the 1960's simply relied on already-available materials.

## Counterculture

The Frankfurt School's original 1930's survey work, including the "authoritarian personality," was based on psychoanalytic categories developed by Erich Fromm. Fromm derived these categories from the theories of J.J. Bachofen, a collaborator of Nietzsche and Richard Wagner, who claimed that human civilization was originally "matriarchal." This primordial period of "gynocratic democracy" and dominance of the Magna Mater (Great Mother) cult, said Bachofen, was submerged by the development of rational, authoritarian "patriarchism," including monotheistic religion. Later, Fromm utilized this theory to claim that support for the nuclear family was evidence of authoritarian tendencies.

In 1970, forty years after he first proclaimed the importance of Bachofen's theory, the Frankfurt School's Erich Fromm surveyed how far things had developed. He listed seven "social-psychological changes" which indicated the advance of matriarchism over patriarchy:

- \*The failure of the patriarchal-authoritarian system to fulfill its function," including the prevention of pollution

- \*Democratic revolutions" which operate on the basis of "manipulated consent"

- \*The women's revolution"

\*Children's and adolescents' revolution," based on the work of Benjamin Spock and others, allowing children new, and more-adequate ways to express rebellion

\*The rise of the radical youth movement, which fully embraces Bachofen, in its emphasis on group sex, loose family structure, and unisex clothing and behaviors

\*The increasing use of Bachofen by professionals to correct Freud's overly-sexual analysis of the mother-son relationship--this would make Freudianism less threatening and more palatable to the general population

\*The vision of the consumer paradise.... In this vision, technique assumes the characteristics of the Great Mother, a technical instead of a natural one, who nurses her children and pacifies them with a never-ceasing lullaby (in the form of radio and television). In the process, man becomes emotionally an infant, feeling secure in the hope that mother's breasts will always supply abundant milk, and that decisions need no longer be made by the individual."

An overwhelming amount of the philosophy and artifacts of the American counterculture of the 1960's, plus the New Age nonsense of today, derives from a large-scale social experiment sited in Ascona, Switzerland from about 1910 to 1935.

Originally a resort area for members of Helena Blavatsky's Theosophy cult, the little Swiss village became the haven for every occult, leftist and racialist sect of the original New Age movement of the early twentieth century. By the end of World War I, Ascona was indistinguishable from what Haight-Ashbury would later become, filled with health food shops, occult book stores hawking the I Ching, and Naturmenschen, "Mr. Naturals" who would walk about in long hair, beads, sandals, and robes in order to "get back to nature."

The dominant influence in the area came from Dr. Otto Gross, a student of Freud and friend of Carl Jung, who had been part of Max Weber's circle when Frankfurt School founder Lukacs was also a member. Gross took Bachofen to its logical extremes, and, in the words of a biographer, "is said to have adopted Babylon as his civilization, in opposition to that of Judeo-Christian Europe.... if Jezebel had not been defeated by Elijah, world history would have been different and better. Jezebel was Babylon, love religion, Astarteam, Ashtoreth; by killing her, Jewish monotheistic moralism drove pleasure from the world."

Gross's solution was to recreate the cult of Astarteam in order to start a sexual revolution and destroy the bourgeois, patriarchal family. Among the members of his cult were: Frieda and D.H. Lawrence; Franz Kafka; Franz Werfel, the novelist who later came to Hollywood and wrote The Song of Bernadette; philosopher Martin Buber; Alma Mahler, the wife of composer Gustave Mahler, and later the liaison of Walter Gropius, Oskar Kokoschka, and Franz Werfel; among others. The Ordo Templis Orientalis (OTO), the occult fraternity set up by Satanist Aleister

Crowley, had its only female lodge at Ascona.

It is sobering to realize the number of intellectuals now worshipped as cultural heroes who were influenced by the New Age madness in Ascona--including almost all the authors who enjoyed a major revival in America in the 1960's and 1970's. The place and its philosophy figures highly in the works of not only Lawrence, Kafka and Werfel, but also Nobel Prize winners Gerhardt Hauptmann and Hermann Hesse, H.G. Wells, Max Brod, Stefan George, and the poets Rainer Maria Rilke and Gustav Landauer. In 1935 Ascona became the headquarters for Carl Jung's annual Eranos Conference to popularize gnosticism.

Ascona was also the place of creation for most of what we now call modern dance. It was headquarters to Rudolf von Laban, inventor of the most popular form of dance notation, and Mary Wigman. Isadora Duncan was a frequent visitor. Laban and Wigman, like Duncan, sought to replace the formal geometries of classical ballet with re-creations of cult dances which would be capable of ritualistically dredging up the primordial racial memories of the audience. When the Nazis came to power, Laban became the highest dance official in the Reich, and he and Wigman created the ritual dance program for the 1936 Olympic Games in Berlin--which was filmed by Hitler's personal director Leni Reifenstahl, a former student of Wigman.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# "Leaderless Resistance"

An Essay by L. R. Beam

The concept of leaderless resistance was proposed by Col. Ulius Louis Amoss, who was the founder of International Service of Information Incorporated, located in Baltimore, Maryland. Col. Amoss died more than 15 years ago, but during his life he was a tireless opponent of Communism, as well as a skilled intelligence officer.

Col. Amoss first wrote of leaderless resistance on April 17, 1962. His theories of organization were primarily directed against the threat of eventual Communist takeover in the United States. The present writer, with the benefit of having lived many years beyond Col. Amoss, has taken his theories and expounded on them.

Col. Amoss feared the Communists. This author fears the federal government. Communism now represents a threat to no one in the United States, while federal tyranny represents a threat to EVERYONE. The writer has joyfully lived long enough to see the dying breaths of Communism, but may unhappily remain long enough to see the last dying gasps of freedom in America.

In the hope that, somehow, America can still produce the brave sons and daughters necessary to fight off ever-increasing persecution and oppression, this essay is offered. Frankly, it is too close to call at this point. Those who love liberty, and believe in freedom enough to fight for it, are rare today; but within the bosom of every once great nation, there remains secreted the pearls of former greatness.

They are there. I have looked into their sparkling eyes; sharing a brief moment in time with them as I passed through this life. Relished their friendship, endured their pain, and they mine. We are a band of brothers native to the soil, gaining strength one from another as we have rushed headlong into battle that all the weaker, timid men say we can not win. Perhaps not... but then again, perhaps we can. It's not over till the last freedom fighter is buried or imprisoned, or the same happens to those who would destroy their liberty.

Barring any cataclysmic events, the struggle will yet go on for years. The passage of time will make it clear to even the more slow among us that the government is the foremost threat to the life and liberty of the folk. The government will no doubt make today's oppressiveness look like grade school work compared to what they have planned in the future. Meanwhile, there are those of us who continue to hope that somehow the few can do what the many have not.

We are cognizant that before things get better they will certainly get worse as government shows a willingness to use ever more severe police state measures against dissidents. This changing situation makes it clear that those who oppose state repression must be prepared to alter, adapt, and modify their behavior, strategy, and tactics as circumstances warrant. Failure to consider new methods and implement them as necessary will make the government's efforts at suppression uncomplicated. It is the duty of every patriot to make the tyrant's life miserable. When one fails to do so he not only fails himself, but his people.

With this in mind, current methods of resistance to tyranny employed by those who love our race, culture, and heritage must pass a litmus test of soundness. Methods must be objectively measured as to their effectiveness, as well as to whether they make the government's intention of repression more possible or more difficult. Those not working to aid our objectives must be discarded, or the government benefits from our failure to do so.

As honest men who have banded together into groups or associations of a political or religious nature are falsely labeled "domestic terrorists" or "cultists" and suppressed, it will become necessary to consider other methods of organization, or as the case may very well call for: non-organization.

One should keep in mind that it is not in the government's interest to eliminate all groups. Some few must remain in order to perpetuate the smoke and mirrors for the masses that America is a "free democratic country" where dissent is allowed. Most organizations, however, that possess the potential for effective resistance will not be allowed to continue. Anyone who is so naive as to believe the most powerful government on earth will not crush any who pose a real threat to that power, should not be active, but rather at home studying political history.

The question as to who is to be left alone and who is not, will be answered by how groups and individuals deal with several factors such as: avoidance of conspiracy plots, rejection of feebleminded malcontents, insistence upon quality of the participants, avoidance of all contact with the front men for the federals - the news media - and, finally, camouflage (which can be defined as the ability to blend in the public's eye the more committed groups of resistance with mainstream "kosher" associations that are generally seen as harmless).

Primarily though, whether any organization is allowed to continue in the future will be a matter of how big a threat a group represents. Not a threat in terms of armed might or political ability, for there is none of either for the present, but rather, threat in terms of potentiality. It is potential the federals fear most. Whether that potential exists in an individual or group is incidental. The federals measure potential threat in terms of what might happen given a situation conducive to action on the part of a resistive organization or individual. Accurate intelligence gathering allows them to assess the potential. Showing one's hand before the bets are made is a sure way to lose.

The movement for freedom is rapidly approaching the point where, for many people, the option of belonging to a group will be non-existent. For others, group membership will be a viable option for only the immediate future. Eventually, and perhaps much sooner than most believe possible, the price paid for membership will exceed any perceived benefit. But for now, some of the groups that do exist often serve a useful purpose either for the newcomer who can be indoctrinated into the ideology of the struggle, or for generating positive propaganda to reach potential freedom fighters. It is sure that, for the most part, this struggle is rapidly becoming a matter of individual action, each of its participants making a private decision in the quietness of his heart to resist: to resist by any means necessary.

It is hard to know what others will do, for no man truly knows another man's heart. It is enough to know what one himself will do. A great teacher once said "know thyself." Few men really do, but let each of us promise ourselves not to go quietly to the fate our would-be masters have planned.

The concept of leaderless resistance is nothing less than a fundamental departure in theories of organization. The orthodox scheme of organization is diagrammatically represented by the pyramid, with the mass at the bottom and the leader at the top. This fundamental of organization is to be seen not only in armies, which are, of course, the best illustration of the pyramid structure, with the mass of soldiery (the privates) at the bottom responsible to corporals; who are in turn responsible to sergeants, and so on up the entire chain of command to the generals at the top. But the same structure is seen in corporations, ladies' garden clubs, and in our political system itself. This orthodox "pyramid" scheme of organization is to be seen basically in all existing political, social, and religious structures in the world today, from the Federal government to the Roman Catholic Church.

The Constitution of the United States, in the wisdom of the Founders, tried to sublimate the essential dictatorial nature pyramidal organization by dividing authority into three: executive, legislative, and judicial. But the pyramid remains essentially untouched.

This scheme of organization, the pyramid, is not only useless, but extremely dangerous for the participants when it is utilized in a resistance movement against state tyranny. Especially is this so in technologically advanced societies where electronic surveillance can often penetrate the structure, thus revealing its chain of command. Experience has revealed over and over again that anti-state political organizations utilizing this method of command and control are easy prey for government infiltration, entrapment, and destruction of the personnel involved. This has been seen repeatedly in the United States where pro-government infiltrators or agent provocateurs weasel their way into patriotic groups and destroy them from within.

In the pyramid form of organization, an infiltrator can destroy anything which is beneath his level of infiltration, and often those above him as well. If the traitor has infiltrated at the top, then the entire organization from the top down is compromised and may be traduced at will.

## "Leaderless Resistance" -- Part Two

A recent example of the cell system taken from the left wing of politics are the Communists. The Communists, in order to get around the obvious problems involved in pyramidal organization, developed to an art the cell system. They had numerous independent cells which operated completely isolated from one another and particularly with no knowledge of each other, but were orchestrated together by a central headquarters. For instance, during WWII, in Washington, it is known that there were at least six secret Communist cells operating at high levels in the United States government (plus all the open Communists who were protected and promoted by President Roosevelt), however, only one of the cells was rooted out and destroyed. How many more actually were operating, no one can say for sure.

The Communist cells which operated in the U.S. until late 1991 under Soviet control could have at their command a leader who held a social position which appeared to be very lowly. He could be, for example, a busboy in a restaurant, but in reality a colonel or a general in the Soviet Secret Service, the KGB. Under him could be a number of cells, and a person active in one cell would almost never have knowledge of individuals who were active in other cells; in fact, the members of the other cells would be supporting that cell which was under attack and ordinarily would lend very strong support to it in many ways. This is at least part of the reason, no doubt, that whenever in the past Communists were attacked in this country, support for them sprang up in many unexpected places.

The effective and efficient operation of a cell system after the Communist model is, of course, dependent upon central direction, which means impressive organization, funding from the top, and outside support, all of which the Communists had. Obviously, American patriots have none of these things at the top or anywhere else, and so an effective cell organization based upon the Soviet system of operation is impossible.

Two things become clear from the above discussion. First, that the pyramid form of organization can be penetrated quite easily and it thus is not a sound method of organization in situations where the government has the resources and desire to penetrate the structure, which is the situation in this country. Secondly, that the normal qualifications for the cell structure based upon the Red model does not exist in the U.S. for patriots. This understood, the question arises "What method is left for those resisting state tyranny?"

The answer comes from Col. Amoss who proposed the "Phantom Cell" mode of organization which he described as Leaderless Resistance. A system of organization that is based upon the cell organization, but does not have any central control or direction, that is in fact almost identical to the methods used by the committees of correspondence during the American Revolution. Utilizing the Leaderless Resistance concept, all individuals and groups operate independently of each other, and never report to a central headquarters or single leader for

direction or instruction, as would those who belong to a typical pyramid organization.

At first glance, such a form of organization seems unrealistic, primarily because there appears to be no organization. The natural question thus arises as to how are the "Phantom Cells" and individuals to cooperate with each other when there is no inter-communication or central direction?

The answer to this question is that participants in a program of leaderless resistance through "Phantom Cell" or individual action must know exactly what they are doing and how to do it. It becomes the responsibility of the individual to acquire the necessary skills and information as to what is to be done. This is by no means as impractical as it appears, because it is certainly true that in any movement all persons involved have the same general outlook, are acquainted with the same philosophy, and generally react to given situations in similar ways. The previous history of the committees of correspondence during the American Revolution shows this to be true.

Since the entire purpose of leaderless resistance is to defeat state tyranny (at least in so far as this essay is concerned), all members of phantom cells or individuals will tend to react to objective events in the same way through usual tactics of resistance. Organs of information distribution such as newspapers, leaflets, computers, etc., which are widely available to all, keep each person informed of events, allowing for a planned response that will take many variations. No one need issue an order to anyone. Those idealists truly committed to the cause of freedom will act when they feel the time is ripe, or will take their cue from others who precede them. While it is true that much could be said against this kind of structure as a method of resistance, it must be kept in mind that leaderless resistance is a child of necessity. The alternatives to it have been shown to be unworkable or impractical. Leaderless resistance has worked before in the American Revolution, and if the truly committed put it to use themselves, it will work now.

It goes almost without saying that Leaderless Resistance leads to very small or even one-man cells of resistance. Those who join organizations to play "let's pretend" or who are "groupies" will quickly be weeded out. While for those who are serious about their opposition to federal despotism, this is exactly what is desired.

From the point of view of tyrants and would-be potentates in the federal bureaucracy and police agencies, nothing is more desirable than that those who oppose them be UNIFIED in their command structure, and that EVERY person who opposes them belong to a pyramid style group. Such groups and organizations are easy to kill. Especially in light of the fact that the Justice (sic) Department promised in 1987 that there would never be another group to oppose them that they did not have at least one informer in! These federal "friends of government" are ZOG or ADL intelligence agents. They gather information that can be used at the whim of a federal D.A. to prosecute. The line of battle has been drawn.



Patriots are **REQUIRED**, therefore, to make a conscious decision to either aid the government in its illegal spying (by continuing with old methods of organization and resistance), or to make the enemy's job more difficult by implementing effective countermeasures.

Now there will, no doubt, be mentally handicapped people out there who will state emphatically in their best red, white, and blue voice, while standing at a podium with an American flag draped in the background and a lone eagle soaring in the sky above, that, "So what if the government is spying? We are not violating any laws." Such crippled thinking by any serious person is the best example that there is a need for special education classes. The person making such a statement is totally out of contact with political reality in this country, and unfit for leadership of anything more than a dog sled in the Alaskan wilderness. The old "Born on the Fourth of July" mentality that has influenced so much of the Aryan-American Patriot's thinking in the past will not save him from the government in the future. "Reeducation" for non-thinkers of this kind will take place in the federal prison system where there are no flags or eagles, but an abundance of men who were "not violating any laws."

Most groups who "unify" their disparate associates into a single structure have short political lives. Therefore, those movement leaders constantly calling for unity of organization, rather than the desirable Unity of Purpose, usually fall into one of three categories:

1. They may not be sound political tacticians, but rather, just committed men who feel unity would help their cause, while not realizing that the government would greatly benefit from such efforts. The Federal objective, to imprison or destroy all who oppose them, is made easier in pyramid organizations.
2. Or, perhaps, they do not fully understand the struggle they are involved in, and that the government they oppose has declared a state of war against those fighting for faith, folk, freedom, property and constitutional liberty. Those in power will use any means to rid themselves of opposition.
3. The third class calling for unity, and let us hope this is the minority of the three, are men more desirous of the supposed power that a large organization would bestow, than of actually achieving their stated purpose.

Conversely, the **LAST** thing federal snoops want, if they had any choice in the matter, is a thousand different small phantom cells opposing them. It is easy to see why. Such a situation is an intelligence nightmare for a government intent upon knowing everything they possibly can about those who oppose them. The Federals, able to amass overwhelming strength of numbers, manpower, resources, intelligence gathering, and capability at any given time, need only a focal point to direct their anger [ie Waco]. A single penetration of a pyramid style organization can lead to the destruction of the whole. Whereas, leaderless resistance presents no single

opportunity for the Federals to destroy a significant portion of the resistance.

With the announcement of the Department of Justice (sic) that 300 FBI agents formerly assigned to watching Soviet spies in the U.S. (domestic counter-intelligence) are now to be used to "combat crime," the federal government is preparing the way for a major assault upon those persons opposed to their policies. Many anti-government groups dedicated to the preservation of the America of our Forefathers can expect shortly to feel the brunt of a new federal assault upon liberty.

It is clear, therefore, that it is time to rethink traditional strategy and tactics when it comes to opposing state tyranny, where the rights now accepted by most as being inalienable will disappear. Let the coming night be filled with a thousand points of resistance. Like the fog which forms when conditions are right, and disappears when they are not, so must the resistance to tyranny be.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

Distribute Freely.

---

# "Revolutionary Majorities"

An Essay by L. R. Beam

If citizens of this country ever again enjoy the blessings of liberty and true freedom, it will not be the result of a majority of its citizens having risen up in righteous indignation at governmental abuse of themselves and their culture. If a restoration of the Constitution of our forbearers occurs - with all that this implies - it will probably not be because a plurality of citizens fought for it, supported it, or cared one way or another. If lawful government is reestablished it will come about because a revolutionary majority makes it happen.

Within the American historical experience a revolutionary majority may be defined as any number of citizens sufficient to initiate general hostilities against a destructive government.

The American Revolution of 1776 defines the term, sets the precedent and provides the example for patriots of today.

Throughout most of the Revolutionary War, those patriots who were seeking to overthrow the government lacked support of over two-thirds of their fellow citizens. John Adams, one of the "radicals" in favor of the Revolution and who was later to become the second President of the United States, stated that depending on how the war was going, those fighting for freedom had the opposition of from a third to two thirds of the people. Others like Pennsylvania delegate to the Continental Congress Joseph Galloway was sure that four-fifths of the people "were or wanted to be, loyal to the King." (Galloway eventually sided with the Loyalists, as those who supported the King's government were called.) Colonel London Carter, a member of the Virginia aristocracy and a strong patriot, stated in his diary in March of 1776 (but a bare three months before the signing of the Declaration of Independence) that an observer of events in the Northern colonies was sure "nine-tenths of the people are violently against it" (independence).

The exact number of "the friends of government", as the patriots disparagingly referred to those who opposed the Revolution, cannot be stated with accuracy. As John Adams indicated, the number was in a constant state of flux, depending on political events and who was winning in the armed conflict. One thing is certain, however; the American Revolution was anything but a broad-based popular uprising of a disaffected people. Rather, it was a very unpopular rebellion of a politically radical minority who, because they possessed a clear understanding of the rights of man coupled with a deep concern for the state of relative personal freedom, were able to perceive the shackles of tyranny prior to their being presented for fastening. This discernment of tyranny at a distance not only set them apart from their fellow man but constrained them to rebel.

The radical political leaders of the Revolution such as John Adams, Samuel Adams, Patrick Henry, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, Richard Henry Lee, John Hancock, and Joseph Warren, to name but a few of the more well known, had to conduct their struggle for freedom in the face of disapprobation and rejection by their peers before the time of actual armed conflict, and after its commencement to charges and cries of "incendiaries and traitors." Indeed "the friends of government" knew little restraint when it came to condemning the Republic's Founders. The Loyalists called Washington, among other things; a liar, perjurer, murderer, blasphemer, criminal, traitor, patron of villainy, and a villain's chief. The other Founders fared little better and were variously referred to as being dregs, illiberal (sic!) and violent men, despicable wretches, bandits, rude, and depraved. While thus labeled by "respectable citizens," these men led the country toward rebellion.

Correspondingly, the Founders had an analogous movement among the common people which, although the objective of overthrowing the government was the same, the methods were those resorted to by people in every age when faced with overpowering force of all-powerful government, namely, mob action, riots, uprisings, midnight forays, and harassment, intimidation, or terroristic acts directed against governmental supporters. All of these and other acts came under the single heading of patriotism so far as their perpetrators were concerned.

After a review of non-battlefield hostilities, it becomes apparent that the American Revolution was won more by mob action than by armed conflict! Thus, any idea that the Revolution was won in an ordeal of battle is out of place in view of the facts.

During the entire length of the armed conflict from 1775 to 1781, the King's armies lost only 1,512 men killed in battle; this seven-year, battle-death casualty rate was exceeded by Union forces at Cold Harbor in 1864 during the first eight minutes of a single engagement. The King's armies had previously lost far larger numbers of men in the Seven Years War (French and Indian Wars) yet pressed on to victory. An adequate explanation then of the patriots' final triumph over the government must be provided by other than a military victory.

An answer, in great part, lies in the violence and vigilante action carried on by the patriots against the government and its supporters! Though most Americans today are familiar with the Boston Tea Party, few know much about the secret organization that conducted it, the Sons of Liberty. Led by Samuel Adams, John Hancock, Dr. Warren ("the greatest incendiary of them all"), and Paul Revere, they met in secret, dressed in disguises, and carried out vigilante actions under the cover of darkness. This revolutionary Ku Klux Klan was as much dreaded by "the friends of government" as its ideological offspring, the Klan, ever was by unruly Blacks. The Sons of Liberty and other similar groups were responsible, during the course of the conflict for independence, for causing tens of thousands of Loyalist to flee the country (the Klan was usually satisfied with merely running undesirables out of the county).

The means were simple and effective. Terror and intimidation were directed against the Loyalists. Methods used to create these twin scourges of "the friends of government" included, but were not limited to, whippings, coats of tar and feathers, banishment, church burnings (if run by a Loyalist preacher or used for a Loyalist meeting place), confiscation of property, and wherever deemed necessary - death of any one of several reliable methods.

Other patriotic groups formed throughout the thirteen colonies to carry on a relentless persecution of "the friends of government." Each organization operated independently of the other though often exchanged information on Loyalists.

Often these ad hoc associations went by the name of "Committees of Public Safety," though the name as well as the tactics employed varied from place to place. Thus in the colony of New York, the patriots bluntly called themselves "the oppressors of the friends of government" and stated proudly that they tarred and feathered governmental supporters with the "decorum that ought to be preserved in public punishments." Boston had its mysterious "Joyce Junior" who led a group of Knight Riders and enforcers who saw to it that those who did not display the necessary revolutionary mentality were properly punished. The rebel Continental Congress established "associations," whose purpose was to locate the Loyalists and turn their names over to the local vigilante to be dealt within the manner they deemed proper. In every colony, if the accusation was one of giving information to government agents, the traitor to liberty was hanged by the neck or dealt with in some other terminally appropriate manner.

Even religious leaders were not exempt from the patriotic purges that cleansed away supporters of the king. Preachers who failed to support the cause of liberty (or who had forgotten that David slew Goliath rather than turning the other cheek) were run out of town on a rail in the glowing light of the flames from their quickly disappearing church. This was considered leniency, others were forced to flee to England or Canada in fear of their lives.

By the end of the conflict in 1781, for every government Red-Coat killed on the battlefield, seventy Loyalists had been driven from their homes and forced to settle in England or Canada, totaling over one hundred thousand people.

The government and its "friends" accused the revolutionary freedom fighters (whom they often called "the Sons of Anarchy") of "committing the most shocking outrages" and of "daily invasions upon private property" while led by men who were "well known incendiaries and traitors," whose chief purpose in life was to commit "crimes against the Constitutional authority of the State" (historically, government's which have oppressed and abused their citizens justify their actions based on the "law" or "Constitutional authority").

No doubt, had the effort to overthrow the government been unsuccessful, the Founding Fathers and their citizen supporters would have been hanged by "the friends of government," as the very worst sort of traitors and terrorists.

In summary of the American Revolution, while Washington's determined and skillful leadership of the army, no doubt made victory possible, it did not assure it. The Spirit of '76 - a massive campaign of terror directed by patriotic citizens against all those who supported the government was the deciding factor that brought freedom to America.

American Constitutional liberty was born in mob pressure, fostered by secret societies, nurtured during seven years of intimidating violence, and institutionalized at the expense of well over a hundred thousand people. With this American history in mind, one who is faithful to the ideas of the Founding Fathers of this nation can have nothing but contempt and suspicion of the motives (or ignorance) of those people both within and without the government who would condemn citizens of today "for taking the law into their own hands" in defense of their rights.

Had those who desired liberty in 1776 waited until a numerical majority of their fellow citizens were ready to "wake-up" (as the saying is today) to fight for the overthrow of the government, or had they hesitated in the use of "illegal" force and violence (force and violence are never legal except when used by those in power) against their governmental enemies, they would have all died in their old age as law-abiding subjects of the King - minus their freedom.

Patriots of 1775 considered the sympathies of less than a third of the people sufficient to begin general hostilities against their oppressors. Herein lies the historical context of the American revolutionary majority. It has been wisely said that those who do not know and understand history can repeat its successes.

In America today, the manacles of slavery and destruction once forged in London by the King are now forged in Washington. Acts of tyranny are carried out in the name of the federal government rather than in the name of the Throne. The vicious enforcers of dictatorial policies often call themselves F.B.I. or I.R.S. agents instead of his Royal Majesty's troops or tax collectors of the Realm. Substituting for the Redcoats of the British are the "bluecoats" of the bureaucrats and in far greater numbers. Though babblings for "the divine rights" of kings to rule have ceased, modern fools prattle of "democratic majorities" composed of an illiterate electorate enfranchised for the purpose of dispossessing the descendants of the Founders. While different in nomenclature the end results are exactly the same - the dark, cold, tight chains of slavery.

A numerical majority of today's citizens cannot read these footprints of tyranny nor understand where they lead. In this they are no different than their counterparts of 200 years ago. Modern governments have mass communications to subtly guide the thinking of their subjects; thus is seen the phenomenon of today's citizen rushing forth to place the cuffs of bondage upon his own wrist by irrationally clamoring (as he has been indoctrinated) for more laws and government to solve problems created by an excess of both. This mental inversion, whereby the citizen willfully aids in efforts to subjugate himself, is of no small import for those who treasure their liberty. The implications are many, but the consequences could be singular: a

governmentally programmed democratic majority may, as they dance along to mental tunes played by an electronic band of orchestrated communication, gleefully drag down (with their self-fastened chains) everyone else in the black hole of oblivion.

Only one thing seems capable of closing the yawning mouth of the pit and that is the formation of a new revolutionary majority coupled with resurrection of the Spirit of '76. Anything short of this seems certain to pass on to today's children an increasingly difficult task of freeing themselves from transistorized chains of governmental control. Such a legacy is the bequeathal of cowards, not free men.

The first American Revolutionists accused those who ruled them of excessive taxation, interference with property rights, illegal search and seizure, not protecting the citizens from incursions by several thousand Indians, policies destructive of the general welfare, and "altering fundamentally the form of our government," among other things.

Today the federal government taxes its subjects for forty percent of their income, instead of the three percent (less than a dollar twenty a year) tax of the King; interferes with the ownership and use of virtually every description of property; authorizes everything from game wardens to I.R.S. agents to search, arrest, or seize property without a warrant. It allows fifteen million aliens to illegally cross its borders in less than a ten-year period; and conducts a policy of systematic extermination of its young men through no-win wars, and subjects the Founders' children to enforced equality. Each of the acts, individually amounts to altering fundamentally the form and purpose for which the federal government was created. Taken as a whole, they are a cry for - nay - a demand for, a new campaign of terror conducted against the government and its friends in the great American tradition of 1776.

An examination of the depth and magnitude of policies fostered by federal rulers detrimental to the people of present day America make the abuses of the English King's government pale into insignificance. One thing is clear; comparison of the criminal acts of the two governments makes those who value their liberty and freedom long for the bitter days of English despotism.

While there are many similarities between the first American Revolution and the second (coming soon at a place near you), there are also significant differences.

The first and paramount dissimilarity is that while our heroic Forefathers fought to overthrow their legally constituted government and were thus revolutionaries in the truest sense of the word, those who seek to break the quickly tightening bands of servitude today war against an illegal government that imposes itself upon the people under the color of the law. By the Washington regime's disobedience to and violation of the bonds of the Constitution, established by the Founders of this country, it has made of itself an unlawful body with no more right to govern the American people than has the present Queen of England. That the government survives despite the crimes it has committed is explainable only because the atrocities it

systematically imposes are papered over with a veneer of legality. Propaganda that numbs the mind keeps people from rising against those who abuse them.

There is no law in this country - other than power, which currently rests with the Pirates of the Potomac, who pose as our lawful government while using overpowering force to quell those who resist their destructive policies. The Constitutional Revolutionist of today is actually fighting for a transfer of power from those who can make no legitimate claim to power, to those who inherently hold it as a natural right - the lawful citizens of this country.

Another salient difference between the first American Revolution and the second is the contrast between the quality of the people of then and now. Our ancestors were strong men, who stated often that they were resolved "to die as free men rather than live as slaves." They were conditioned to doing their own thinking while at the same time ever holding before themselves the guiding lights of honor and duty.

Today, raised in the lap of luxury, many people gladly exchange their freedom for the right to accumulate material possessions. Not one person in fifty can truthfully state that his opinions are the result of independent research rather than the mindless acquisition of pre-programmed "opinions" obtained by indulging in endless hours of obeisant T.V. watching (that modern day golden calf of those lost in the mental wilderness). Further, most Americans do not know the meanings nor values of honor and duty, the two great concepts of higher man.

It is quite clear that the virtue of the present generation has declined to such a miserable degree that most people will never voluntarily help to make themselves free. Consequently they will have to be made to make themselves free.

A great objective of revolutionary majorities is that of thrusting freedom upon those who are too weak to make themselves free while providing its blessings for the stronger, more noble elements of the race. This is done in the firm belief that under sound government, future generations will be naturally healthy in mind and spirit. The revolutionary patriot benignantly grants freedom to others while establishing framework that will allow posterity to be both free and strong. Other than the "great commission" of the Lord, no calling is as exalted or as honorable. These two significant differences - one of law, one of character - between the first struggle for freedom and the present one is deserving of substantial thought and analysis by those capable of so doing. Consider what type of self-preserving behavior can be expected from a government that already wades to its knees in the blood of young men deliberately sacrificed to the false god of Internationalism. Were the government really intent on opposing Communism, it would start a war in Washington and work its way to Vietnam. What behavior can be expected from a people who willingly pass their sons through the fire to be consumed? Each of these concepts deserve most careful examination.

Opposing the federal purveyors of mass murder and the "the friends of government" who make



such perfidy possible are men who trace their political lineage to times of Magna Carta, and who are mental as well as physical descendants of the Founding Fathers. They believe, as did their forbearers, that government is a social contract entered into by people of a similar mind for their mutual benefit. This agency created by the people can only, legitimately, be their servant - never their master. Further, it cannot possess lawful authority to deprive those who create it (or their heirs) of natural rights. In normal times men who arrayed themselves against the criminal acts of government would be called Constitutionals, but "these are the times that try mens souls" as well as test their courage. Thus contemporary patriots become known as Constitutional Revolutionists determined to overthrow every vestige of unlawful government doing so with a firm belief that honor demands and duty requires the reestablishment of the law of their fathers.

It can be realized then, that those who remain guilty of loyalty to the present illegal government in the District of Columbia are chargeable with treason to the Constitution of the United States and deserving the same fate of their historical predecessors who, in the name of the King, trampled upon sacred rights of Englishmen in 1776.

It should be stated in their defense, however, that most of those who are participants in this odious transgression against the good of our noble forbearers do so in complete ignorance of the law. Having obtained ninety-five percent of their misinformation from government licensed T.V. and the remaining five percent from conversations with others who are also completely maladroit at obtaining facts on their own, they are victims of methodical thought control which began during their childhood and has been continued at a subliminal level throughout their lives.

Though no doubt the maxim "ignorance of the law is no excuse for its violation" makes these people criminals, the mitigating circumstances of their lawlessness should be considered by those who are seeking to reestablish lawful rule in this country.

A period of grace, commensurable with what the struggle will allow, is in order, thus providing the present supporters of unlawful government an opportunity to defect as they became cognizant of the law.

By this fraternal act to the erring members of our race we serve not only the interest of justice but, at whatever point in time the grace period is of necessity terminated, all excuse for collaboration with the enemy will have been removed. Having held long aloft the olive branch of peace and forgiveness, no just complaint can be made by those who failed to avail themselves of it, when with the other hand, the terrible swift sword of vindication falls upon their necks.

Even after the patriots of today have invoked "the Spirit of '76," and have successfully dammed the Mississippi with rotting corpses of the lying politicians, criminal bureaucrats, racial traitors,

communists, assorted degenerates, cultural distorters, and those who resist the implementation of lawful Constitutional government, these patriots will have exhibited far more restraint and benevolence than the present government of the United States. For while Constitutionlists of today war against those guilty of the most heinous crimes upon our people, usurpers in Washington destroy in mind and wherever possible the bodies of those guilty of nothing more than having white skin.

Coalescing within America today is a second revolutionary majority whose members in the spirit of their forbearers are resolved to die as free men rather than to live as slaves. Like their noble ancestors, today's revolutionary majority must fight for the children of carping critics just as fiercely as for their own families. Emulating its predecessor, obedience is given only to the dictates of the code of natural law. For once again the enemies of liberty use the law of the nation as their shield - yea - even their justification for destroying freedom of the people. A government exceeding the power granted by their fathers - they are not bound to obey but bound to resist.

John Adams said, that "freedom is a counter balance for poverty, discord, and war," and that if the revolutionary struggle failed, it would be because moderates tried to find a "middle ground" and to conduct "half a war," for freedom. Likewise, today's tired voices are heard calling for politics as usual - moderation as always. Such thinking has allowed generations to die in chains in former times and will so again if adhered to.

The age of the conservative like that of the dinosaur, has ended. Now begins a new age, destiny calls for her great men who by their iron will alter the pages of history from that of a tale of shame, cowardice, and decline, to a saga of glory, bravery, and rebirth. Soon, very soon, we will have a revolutionary majority...

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

Distribute Freely.

---

# "THE RACE WAR OF BLACK AGAINST WHITE"

by Paul Sheehan. Saturday, 20 May 1995

The Sydney Morning Herald (Australia)

The longest war America has ever fought is the Dirty War, and it is not over. It has lasted 30 years so far and claimed more than 25 million victims. It has cost almost as many lives as the Vietnam War. It determined the result of last year's congressional election.

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

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

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

Nearly all the following figures, which speak for themselves, have not been reported in America:

\* According to the latest US Department of Justice survey of crime victims, more than 6.6 million violent crimes (murder, rape, assault and robbery) are committed in the US each year, of which about 20 per cent, or 1.3 million, are inter-racial crimes.

\* Most victims of race crime - about 90 per cent - are white, according to the survey "Highlights from 20 Years of Surveying Crime Victims", published in 1993.

\* Almost 1 million white Americans were murdered, robbed, assaulted or raped by black Americans in 1992, compared with about 132,000 blacks who were murdered, robbed, assaulted or raped by whites, according to the same survey.

\* Blacks thus committed 7.5 times more violent inter-racial crimes than whites even though the black population is only one-seventh the size of the white population. When

these figures are adjusted on a per capita basis, they reveal an extraordinary disparity: blacks are committing more than 50 times the number of violent racial crimes of whites.

\* According to the latest annual report on murder by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, most inter-racial murders involve black assailants and white victims, with blacks murdering whites at 18 times the rate that whites murder blacks.

These breathtaking disparities began to emerge in the mid-1960's, when there was a sharp increase in black crime against whites, an upsurge which, not coincidentally, corresponds exactly with the beginning of the modern civil rights movement.

Over time, the cumulative effect has been staggering. Justice Department and FBI statistics indicate that between 1964 and 1994 more than 25 million violent inter-racial crimes were committed, overwhelmingly involving black offenders and white victims, and more than 45,000 people were killed in inter-racial murders. By comparisons 58,000 Americans died in Vietnam, and 34,000 were killed in the Korean war.

When non-violent crimes (burglary, larceny, car theft and personal theft) are included, the cumulative totals become prodigious. The Bureau of Justice Statistics says 27 million non-violent crimes were committed in the US in 1992, and the survey found that 31 per cent of the robberies involved black offenders and white victims (while only 2 per cent in the reverse).

When all the crime figures are calculated, it appears that black Americans have committed at least 170 million crimes against white Americans in the past 30 years. It is the great defining disaster of American life and American ideals since World War II.

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

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

Distribute Freely.

---

# The Truth About Slavery

American Dissident Voices

National Vanguard Books  
Post Office Box 330  
Hillsboro, West Virginia 24946

FAX 304-653-4690

The history of America and of Western Civilization is not being taught as it should be in our schools and universities today. Historical facts are suppressed, and what is taught is distorted in such a way as to advance the world government agenda, with all inconvenient historical facts, knowledge of which might cause our young people to question that agenda, purposely left out.

It is a tragedy of monumental proportions that our schools have been converted into "liberal" brainwashing institutions, though I do feel a sense of encouragement when I read that more and more real Americans are taking their children out of the public schools and teaching them at home. As regular listeners to this program know, the global elite that push multiculturalism push it because it undermines our national and racial sense of identity, and not out of any love or concern for ethnic minorities. In fact, it should be obvious to everyone that multiculturalism and globalism threaten the racial and cultural integrity of all peoples, not just White Americans. Nevertheless, because America is, or was until recently, a predominantly White nation, one of the primary ways that national disintegration is promoted by the destroyers of nations in this country is by the inculcation of White guilt for Black slavery.

By recounting and emphasizing again and again the real and imagined sufferings of Black people under slavery, the White student is made to feel that his ancestors were cruel, morally retarded, and evil. They are made to feel that they owe Black people a nearly infinite compensation, since, they are taught, Black people's problems today are the legacy of hundreds of years of slavery for which White people are responsible. They are taught that the relative prosperity which we enjoy today was achieved largely by exploitation of Black slaves. Is it any wonder that thousands of our young people join Jesse Jackson in chanting "Hey Hey Ho Ho, Western Culture's Gotta Go"? Is it any wonder that they all too often reject our European cultural heritage and embrace all forms of alien styles of music, dancing, dress, grooming and slang, from Jamaican "rasta" to "gangsta rap"? Is it any wonder that White teenagers are committing suicide in higher numbers every year? They have received, in our public schools and colleges, not a "liberal education," but an education by liberals. They have been taught very well indeed -taught that they and their ancestors and their traditions and their natural feelings

are worthless and an obstacle to be overcome.

Now these liberal lies are easily countered by facts. The primary fact that must be emphasized is that many hundreds of thousands of White people were slaves in early America. In fact, White slavery was not only extremely common, but until the late 18th century it was far more common than Black slavery here. Also little known is the fact that living and labor conditions for Black slaves, bad as they often were, were usually far better than those for White slaves.

At this point, many of you are probably saying "White slaves? What in the world is he talking about? Sure, there were White indentured servants and apprentices in colonial America, and maybe sometimes they were treated badly, but actual White slavery - that's something that disappeared with the Romans and the Vikings. And to compare White indentured servants to Black slaves is the worst sort of racist distortion of history!"

Some of you are probably saying or thinking exactly that, and quite frankly to most of us the idea of White slavery in early America is hard to accept, schooled as we are by the controlled media and the liberal-dominated public schools. But researcher and writer Michael Hoffman has recently come out with one of the most earth-shaking works of historical research in the last decade, entitled *They Were White and They Were Slaves*. This program is based on Mr. Hoffman's original research into documents long hidden from the public eye and revealing a very different America from that presented in the controlled media.

(Following from TWWATWS)

There is a history of White people that has never been told in any coherent form, largely because most modern historians have, for reasons of politics or psychology, refused to recognize White slaves in America as just that.

Today, not a tear is shed for the sufferings of millions of our enslaved forefathers. 200 years of White slavery in America have been almost completely obliterated from the collective memory of the American people. Writer Elaine Kendall asks "Who wants to be reminded that half - perhaps as many as two-thirds - of the original American colonists came here, not of their own free will, but kidnapped, shanghaied, impressed, duped, beguiled, and yes, in chains - ?...we tend to gloss over it... we'd prefer to forget the whole sorry chapter."

A correct understanding of the authentic history of the enslavement of Whites in America could have profound consequences for the future. Most of the books on White labor in early America use words like "White indentured servitude," "White bondservants," "White servants," etc. Few are now aware that the majority of these so-called "servants" were bound to a condition more properly called permanent chattel slavery unto death. The papers legally allowing the enslavement, called indentures, were often forged by kidnappers and press-gangs; and in cases where these papers did not literally specify a life term of servitude, the slave-owner had the

legal right to unilaterally increase the length of the term on the flimsiest pretexts. The so-called "apprentices" or "indentured servants" had no say in the matter. These enslaved White people are, however, never called slaves by establishment academics and media spokesmen. To do so would destroy the myth of unique Black victimhood and universal White guilt.

Today, with the massive concentration of educational and media resources on the Black experience of slavery, the unspoken assumption has been that only Blacks have been enslaved to any degree or magnitude worthy of study or memorial. The historical record reveals that this is not the case, however. The word "slave" itself is derived from the word "slav," a reference to the Eastern European White people who, among others, were enslaved by their fellow Whites, by the Mongols, and by the Arabs over a period of many centuries.

According to Thomas Burton's Parliamentary Diary 1656-1659, in 1659 the English parliament debated the practice of selling British Whites into slavery in the New World. In the debate, these Whites were referred to not as "indentured servants" but as "slaves."

In the Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies of 1701, we read of a protest over the "encouragement to the spiriting away of Englishmen without their consent and selling them for slaves, which hath been a practice very frequent and known by the name of kidnapping." In the British West Indies, plantation slavery was instituted as early as 1627. In Barbados by the 1640s there were an estimated 25,000 slaves, of whom 21,700 were White.

This document records that while White slaves were worked to death, as they cost next to nothing, there were Caribbean Indians brought from Guiana to help propagate native foodstuffs who were well-treated and received as free persons by the wealthy planters.

The Englishman William Eddis, after observing White slaves in America in the 1770s wrote: "Generally speaking, they groan beneath a worse than Egyptian bondage." Governor Sharpe of the Maryland colony compared the property interest of the planters in their White slaves, with the estate of an English farmer consisting of a "Multitude of Cattle."

Lay historian Col. A. B. Ellis, writing in the British Newspaper Argosy for May 6, 1893, said: "Few, but readers of old colonial state papers and records, are aware that between the years 1649 to 1690 a lively trade was carried on between England and the plantations, as the colonies were then called, [a trade] in political prisoners... they were sold at auction... for various terms of years, sometimes for life, as slaves."

Sir George Sandys' 1618 plan for Virginia referred to bound Whites assigned to the treasurer's office to "belong to said office forever." The service of Whites bound to Berkeley's Hundred was deemed "perpetual."

Numerous documents from the seventeenth, eighteenth, and even nineteenth centuries reveal that these Whites in bondage certainly referred to themselves as slaves, and there are even records of Blacks referring to them as "White slaves." Did you know that the expression "kidnapping," (originally kid-nabbing) had its origin in the abduction of poor White children to be sold into factory slavery in Britain or plantation slavery in America? Did you know that the expression "spirited away" likewise originated with the White slavers, who were also called "spirits"?

The White slavery in America was but an extension of the White slavery in the mother country, Britain, where the legal form of contracted indentured servitude and apprenticeship was maintained as a spurious cover for plain and simple lifetime chattel slavery. Particularly shocking was the enslavement of White children for factory labor. Children were openly seized from orphanages and workhouses and placed in the factories.

In Brian Inglis' *Poverty and the Industrial Revolution* we read: "Here then was a ready source of labor - and a very welcome one. The children were formally indentured as apprentices... What happened to them was nobody's concern. A parish in London, having got rid of a batch of unwanted pauper children, was unlikely to interest itself in their subsequent fate... The term 'apprenticeship' was in any case a misnomer...."

In Marjorie Cruikshank's *Children and Industry*: "many employers imported child apprentices, parish orphans from workhouses far and near. Clearly, overseers of the poor were only too keen to get rid of the orphans... children were brought (to the factories) like 'cartloads of live lumber' and abandoned to their fate... poor children, taken from workhouses or kidnapped in the streets of the metropolis, used to be brought down by... coach to Manchester and slid into a cellar in Mosley Street as if they had been stones or any other inanimate substance."

White children worked up to sixteen hours a day and during that period the doors were locked. Children - and most of the mill workers were children - were allowed out only to 'go to the necessary.' In some factories it was forbidden to open the windows... The child 'apprentices' who were on night shift might have to stay on it for as long as four or five years. They were lucky if they were given a half penny an hour.

This was labor without any breaks - unceasing labor. When the children fell asleep at the machines, they were lashed into wakefulness with a whip. If they arrived late to the factory, talked to another child, or committed some other infraction they were beaten with an iron bar known as a "billy-roller," eight feet long and one inch and a half in diameter. Many were thus murdered, often for trifling offenses such as calling out names to the next child.

Thousands of children were mangled or mutilated by the primitive factory machinery every year. They were often disfigured or disabled for life, then abandoned, receiving no compensation of any kind. Similar conditions obtained for enslaved White children on this side



of the Atlantic, as what William Blake called "these Satanic Mills" spread to our shores.

Historian Oscar Handlin writes that in colonial America, White servants could be bartered for a profit, sold to the highest bidder for the unpaid debts of their masters, and otherwise transferred like moveable goods or chattels...

The controlled media focus exclusively on the enslavement of Blacks. The impression is given that only Whites bear responsibility for enslaving Blacks and that only Blacks were slaves. In fact, Blacks in Africa engaged in extensive enslavement of their own kind. Slavery was endemic in Africa, with entire tribes being enslaved through conquest on a regular basis. When Arabic, Jewish and White slave traders arrived on the coast of sub-Saharan Africa, they seldom if ever had to travel inland and fight or pursue their quarry. They were met on the coast by Africans more than willing to sell slaves to them by the thousands. And in America, records show that Black slaves were owned, not just by a few wealthy Whites, but by free Blacks and by Cherokee Indians. In some cases, these Blacks and Indians even owned White slaves.

White slaves were actually owned by Blacks and Indians in the South to such an extent that the Virginia Assembly passed the following law in 1670: "It is enacted that no negro or Indian though baptized and enjoying their own freedom shall be capable of any such purchase of Christians." The records of the time reveal that free Blacks often owned Black slaves themselves. In 1717, it was proposed that a qualification for election to the South Carolina Assembly was to be "the ownership of one White man."

From 1609 until the early 1800s, between one half and two thirds of all the White colonists who came to the New World came as slaves. White slaves cleared the forests, drained the swamps, built the roads, sweated in the fields, and died like flies in hellish factories. Owned like property, they had no rights nor recourse to the law. Fugitive slave laws applied to them just as to Blacks if they should flee their masters. Black slaves were expensive, and though at times cruelly used, were not often used beyond the limits of human endurance. That would have been a waste of a costly investment. White slaves, however, consisting of the poor and unwanted "surplus population" of Britain, were available for nearly nothing, just a few pence for a thug to billyclub them and shanghai them aboard a westward-bound vessel. Thus they were expendable.

Both psychologically and materially Whites in modern times are called upon to bear burdens of guilt and monetary reparation for Black slavery. This position is based entirely on enforced ignorance and the deliberate suppression of the record of White slavery in North America.

Reparations? Welfare and affirmative action as compensation for past slavery? Leaving aside for the moment the very questionable idea of punishing the great-grandson for the sins of the great-grandfather, let us consider the principles involved. Far more Whites in America are descendants of White slaves than are descendants of slave owners. And considering the endemic nature of slavery in Black Africa, it is quite likely that a large proportion of Blacks in

America have ancestors who were themselves slave owners. So let us hear no more of White guilt and endless payments and "affirmative action" to atone for the sin of the enslavement of Blacks. These endless payments themselves are a form of slavery. For the good of all races and peoples, let us rid ourselves of slavery for all time.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

Distribute Freely.

---

# THE HOLOCAUST CONTROVERSY:

## The Case for Open Debate

### THE CONTEMPORARY ISSUE

No subject enrages campus thought police more than holocaust revisionism. We debate every other great historical controversy as a matter of course, but influential pressure groups with private agendas have made the Jewish holocaust an exception. Elitist dogma manipulated by special interest groups has no place in academia. Students should be encouraged to investigate the holocaust story the same way they are encouraged to investigate every other historical event. This isn't a radical point of view. The premises for it were worked out some time ago during a little something called the Enlightenment.

### THE HISTORICAL ISSUE

Revisionists agree with orthodox historians that the German National Socialist State singled out the Jewish people for special and cruel treatment. In addition to viewing Jews in the framework of traditional anti-Semitism, the Nazis also saw them as being an influential force behind international communism. During the Second World War, Jews were considered to be enemies of the State and a potential danger to the war effort, much like the Japanese were viewed in this country. Consequently, Jews were stripped of their rights, forced to live in ghettos, conscripted for labor, deprived of their property, deported from the countries of their birth and otherwise mistreated. Many tragically perished in the maelstrom.

Revisionists part company with orthodox historians in that revisionists deny that the German State had a policy to exterminate the Jewish people (or anyone else) by putting them to death in gas chambers or by killing them through abuse or neglect. Revisionists also maintain that the figure of 6 million Jewish deaths is an irresponsible exaggeration, and that no execution gas chambers existed in any camp in Europe which was under German control. Fumigation gas chambers did exist to delouse clothing and equipment to prevent disease at the camps. Most likely it is from this lifesaving procedure that the myth of extermination gas chambers emerged.

Revisionists generally hold that the Allied governments decided to carry their wartime "black propaganda" of unique German monstrosity over into the postwar period. This was done for essentially three reasons. First, they felt it necessary to continue to justify the great sacrifices that were made in fighting two world wars. A second reason was that they wanted to divert attention from and to justify their own particularly brutal crimes against humanity which, apart from Soviet atrocities, involved massive incendiary bombings of the civilian populations of

German and Japanese cities. The third and perhaps most important reason was that they needed justification for the postwar arrangements which, among other things, involved the annexation of large parts of Germany into Poland. These territories were not disputed borderlands but included huge parts of Germany proper. The millions of Germans living in these regions were to be dispossessed of their property and brutally expelled from their homelands. Many hundreds of thousands were to perish in the process. A similar fate was to befall the Sudeten Germans.

During the war, and in the postwar era as well, Zionist organizations were deeply involved in creating and promulgating anti-German hate propaganda. There is little doubt that their purpose was to drum up world sympathy and political and financial support for Jewish causes, especially for the formation of the State of Israel. Today, while the political benefits of the holocaust story have largely dissipated, the story still plays an important role in the ambitions of Zionists and others in the Jewish community. It is the leaders of these political and propaganda organizations who continue to work to sustain the holocaust legend and the myth of unique German monstrosity during the Second World War.

For those who believe that the Nuremberg Trials revealed the truth about German war crimes, it is a bracing shock to discover that the then Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, Harlan Fiske Stone, described the Nuremberg court as "a high-class lynching party for Germans. "

## THE "PHOTOGRAPHS"

We've all seen "The Photographs." Endlessly. Newsreel photos taken by U.S. and British photographers at the liberation of the German camps, especially the awful scenes at Dachau, Buchenwald and Bergen-Belsen. These films are typically presented in a way in which it is either stated or implied that the scenes resulted from deliberate policies on the part of the Germans. The photographs are real. The uses to which they have been put are base.

There was no German policy at any of those camps to deliberately kill the internees. In the last months of the war, while Soviet armies were advancing on Germany from the east, the British and U.S. air arms were destroying every major city in Germany with saturation bombing. Transportation, the food distribution system and medical and sanitation services all broke down. That was the purpose of the Allied bombing, which has been described as the most barbarous form of warfare in Europe since the Mongol invasions.

Millions of refugees fleeing the Soviet armies were pouring into Germany. The camps still under German control were overwhelmed with internees from the east. By early 1945 the inmate population was swept by malnutrition and by epidemics of typhus, typhoid, dysentery and chronic diarrhea. Even the mortuary systems broke down. When the press entered the camps with British and U.S. soldiers, they found the results of all that. They took -- "The Photographs."

Still, at camps such as Buchenwald, Dachau and Bergen-Belsen tens of thousands of relatively healthy internees were liberated. They were there in the camps when "The Photographs" were taken. There are newsreels of these internees walking through the camp streets laughing and talking. Others picture exuberant internees throwing their caps in the air and cheering their liberators. It is only natural to ask why you haven't seen those particular films and photos while you've seen the others scores and even hundreds of times.

*Documents.* Spokespersons for the Holocaust Lobby assure us that there are "tons" of captured German documents which prove the Jewish genocide. When challenged on this, however, they produce only a handful of documents, the authenticity or interpretation of which is always highly questionable. If pressed for reliable documentation, the Lobby will then reverse itself and claim that the Germans destroyed all the relevant documents to hide their evil deeds, or it will make the absurd claim that the Germans used a simplistic code language, or whispered verbal orders for mass murder into each others' ears.

The truth appears to be, with regard to the alleged extermination of the European Jews, that there was no order, no plan, no budget, no weapon (that is, no so-called execution gas chamber) and no victim (that is, not a single autopsied body at any camp has been shown to have been gassed).

*Eyewitness Testimony.* As documentary "proofs" for the mass-murder of the European Jews fall by the wayside, Holocaust historians depend increasingly on "eyewitness" testimonies (and censorship) to support their theories. Many such testimonies are ludicrously unreliable. History is filled with stories of masses of people claiming to be eyewitnesses to everything from witchcraft to flying saucers.

During and after the war there were "eyewitnesses" to mass murder in gassing chambers at Buchenwald, Bergen-Belsen, Dachau and other camps in Germany proper. Today, virtually all recognized scholars dismiss this eyewitness testimony as false, and agree that there were no extermination gas chambers in any camp in Germany proper.

Establishment historians, however, still claim that extermination gas chambers existed at Auschwitz and at other camps in Poland. The eyewitness testimony and the evidence for this claim is, in reality, qualitatively no different than the false testimony and evidence for the alleged gas chambers at the camps in Germany proper.

During the war crimes trials many "eyewitnesses" testified that Germans made soap out of human fat and lamp shades from human skin. Allied prosecutors even produced evidence to support those charges. Today, most scholars agree that the testimony was false and the evidence to support it was manufactured.

With regard to confessions by Germans at war crimes trials, it is now well documented that

many were obtained through coercion, intimidation and even physical torture.

Auschwitz. British historian David Irving, perhaps the most widely read historian writing in English, has called the Auschwitz death-camp story a "sinking ship" and states that there were "no gas chambers at Auschwitz."

The Auschwitz State Museum has recently revised its half-century-old claim that "4 million" humans were murdered there. The Museum now says maybe it was "1 million." But what documentary proof does the Museum provide to document the 1 million figure? None. Revisionists want to know where those 3 million souls have been the last 45 years. Were they not part of the fabled Six Million? One might ask why, when some 3 million Auschwitz dead were brought back: to life (by the stroke of a pen, as it were, much like they "died" in the first place) that no one in the Holocaust Lobby thought a celebration to be in order.

Those who are most dedicated to promoting the Holocaust story complain that "the whole world" was indifferent to the genocide which allegedly was occurring in German occupied Europe. When asked why this was the case the promoters usually respond by saying that it was due to some great moral flaw in the nature of Western Man. At other times they made the absurd claim that people did not realize the enormity of what was happening. It is true that the world responded with indifference. E low else should people have responded to that which they did not believe, and which for them was a non-event?

For it is certain that if there had been "killing factories" in Poland murdering millions of civilians, the Red Cross, the Pope, humanitarian agencies, the Allied governments, neutral governments, and prominent figures such as Roosevelt, Truman, Churchill, F.eisenhower and many others would have known about it and would have often and unambiguously mentioned it, and condemned it. They didn't. The promoters admit that only a tiny group of individuals believed the story at the time -- many of whom were connected with Jewish propaganda agencies. The rise of the Holocaust story reads more like the success story of a PR campaign than anything else.

Winston Churchill wrote the six volumes of his monumental work, The Second World War, without mentioning a program of mass-murder and genocide. Maybe it slipped his mind. Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his memoir Crusade in Europe, also failed to mention gas chambers. Was the weapon used to murder millions of Jews unworthy of a passing reference? Was our future president being insensitive to Jews?

## POLITICAL CORRECTNESS And HOLOCAUST REVISIONISM

Many people, when they first hear holocaust revisionist arguments, find themselves bewildered. The arguments appear to make sense but, they reason, "How is it possible?" The whole world

believes the holocaust story. It's just not plausible that so great a conspiracy to suppress the truth could have functioned for 50 years.

To understand how it could very well have happened, one needs only to reflect on the intellectual and political orthodoxies of medieval Europe, or those of Nazi Germany or the Communist-bloc countries. In all of these societies the great majority of scholars were caught up in the existing political culture. Committed to a prevailing ideology and its interpretation of reality, these scholars and intellectuals felt it was their right, and even their duty, to protect every aspect of that ideology. They did so by oppressing the evil dissidents who expressed "offensive" or "dangerous" ideas. In every one of those societies, scholars became Thought Police.

In our own society, in the debate over the question of political correctness, there are those who deliberately attempt to trivialize the issues. They claim there is no real problem with freedom of speech on our campuses, and that all that is involved with PC are a few rules which would defend minorities from those who would hurt their feelings. There is, of course, a deeper and more serious aspect to the problem. On American campuses today there is a wide range of ideas and viewpoints that are forbidden to be discussed openly. Even obvious facts and realities, when they are politically unacceptable, are denied and suppressed. One can learn much about the psychology and methodology of thought police by watching how they react when just one of their taboos is broken and holocaust revisionism is given a public forum.

First they express outrage that such offensive and dangerous ideas were allowed to be expressed publicly. they avoid answering or debating these ideas, claiming that to do so would give them a forum and legitimacy. Then they make vicious personal attacks against the revisionist heretic, calling him dirty political names such as "anti-Semite," "racist" or "neo-Nazi," and they even suggest that he is a potential mass murderer. They publicly accuse the revisionist of lying, but they don't allow the heretic to hear the specific charge or to face his accusers so that he can answer this slander.

The Holocausters accuse revisionists of being hate filled people who are promoting a doctrine of hatred. But revisionism is a scholarly process, not a doctrine or an ideology. If the holocaust promoters want to expose hatred, they should take a second look at their own doctrines, and a long look at themselves in the mirror.

Anyone on campus who invites a revisionist to speak is himself attacked as being insensitive. When a revisionist does speak on campus he is oftentimes shouted down and threatened. If he has books or other printed materials with him they might be "confiscated." All this goes on while the majority of faculty and university administrators sit dumbly by, allowing campus totalitarians to determine what can be said and what can be read on their campus.

Next, the thought police set out to destroy the transgressor professionally and financially by

"getting" him at his job or concocting a lawsuit against him. The courts are sometimes used to attack Revisionism. The holocausters often deceptively claim that revisionist scholarship has been proven false during a trial. The fact is, revisionist arguments have never been evaluated or judged by the courts in an atmosphere of intellectual freedom.

Finally, the thought police try to "straighten out" that segment of academia or the media that allowed the revisionists a forum in the first place.

It can be an instructive intellectual exercise to identify taboo subjects, other than holocaust revisionism, which would evoke comparable responses from thought police on our campuses.

Recently, some administrators in academia have held that university administrations should take actions to rid the campus of ideas which are disruptive to the university. This is a very dangerous position for administrators to take. It is an open invitation to tyranny. It means that any militant group with "troops at the ready" can rid the campus of ideas it opposes, then impose its own orthodoxy. The cowardly administrator finds it much easier and safer to rid the campus of controversial ideas than to face down a group of screaming and snarling militants. But it is the duty of university administrators to insure that the university remains a free marketplace of ideas. When ideas are used as an excuse to disrupt the campus, it is the disrupters who must be subdued, not the ideas.

## CONCLUSION

The influence of holocaust revisionism is growing steadily both here and abroad. Those who become involved in the controversy created by revisionist theory represent a wide spectrum of political and philosophical positions. They are certainly not the scoundrels, liars and demons the Holocaust Lobby makes them out to be.

Nevertheless, there are those who use revisionist scholarship as a weapon to attack Jews with. The Holocaust Lobby has chosen to demonize and attempt to censor all revisionists for what a minority do and say. We choose a different path. We will use revisionism as a tool to remove from the holocaust story all that is false, after which it will be useless as a weapon with which to attack Jews or any other ethnic group.

The fact is, there are no demons in the real world. We are at our worst when we see those who do not believe what we believe to be an embodiment of evil, and then begin to demonize them. Such people are preparing to do something simply awful to their opponents. Their logic is that you can say or do anything you want -- to a demon!

The demonizers are going to fail. Growing numbers of revisionist sympathizers and supporters assure us that the political forces that promote the Jewish holocaust story as it stands today are



going to have to accept the role that revisionist scholarship plays in promoting open debate on the controversy in our universities and media. The effect will be to broaden intellectual freedom for all of us, no matter what any one of us believes or doubts. That's what academics are supposed to do. Until they begin to do it with respect to the holocaust controversy, others will have to do it for them.

\*\*\*\*\*

Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH) is now on the Internet!. We have our own Web-site. You can reach us at:

<http://www.valleynet.com~brsmith/>

There you will be able to download "46 Unanswered Questions About the World War Two 'Gas Chambers'" at no charge! Plus, you will find articles not only on the gas chamber tales but on War Crimes trials and on the links connecting Zionism, Stalinism and the Holocaust.

\_ "The Video of the Century" \_

In addition, you will find background on our powerful video documentary on fraud at Auschwitz, "David Cole Interviews Dr. Franciszek Piper" This is the video so damaging to the Holocaust Lobby that college administrators and faculty "lean" on student editors to not allow advertisements for it to be run in campus newspapers.

And there's more! On the CODOH Web-site you will find excerpts from Bradley R. Smith's book, Confessions of a Holocaust Revisionist, and from two works-in-progress, Break His Bones and A Personal History of Moral Decay. If you're not Online yet, find someone who is and have them beam you up.

Information packet (by post), including "46 Questions" and the most recent issue of Bradley Smith's newsletter, Smith's Report: \$3

Copies of this leaflet (postpaid): 10 copies for \$2. 50 copies for \$5. 100 or more copies: 8 cents each.

CODOH has no affiliation with any political organization or group. Your contribution to CODOH will be used to disseminate the good news of holocaust revisionism. Our overhead is minimal.

Every contribution counts. Address all correspondence and checks to:

Bradley R. Smith, CODOH

Tel: 209.627.8757 Fax: 209.733 2653

Email: brsmith@valleynet.com

PO Box 3267 Visalia CA 93278

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

Distribute Freely.

---

# The Morality of Survival

by Michael W. Masters

From the July, 1995, and August, 1995, issues of 'AMERICAN RENAISSANCE'

"[The West] has not yet understood that whites, in a world become too small for its inhabitants, are now a minority and that the proliferation of other races dooms our race, my race, irretrievably to extinction in the century to come, if we hold fast to our present moral principles."

--Jean Raspail, "The Camp Of The Saints"

The loss of racial identity in the Western world is symptomatic of a deeper crisis within the European peoples, whose culture and technology have provided the world with much of what we know today as modern civilization. At its core, the crisis is the inevitable consequence of a profound, and perhaps fatal, misunderstanding of the nature of morality. We have lost sight of ancient and eternal laws of Nature on which our civilization must be based if we are to survive. We no longer have the luxury of indulging in universalist altruistic principles that, no matter how noble they may appear, have driven us to the brink of ruin.

Demographic projections based on American and European immigration policies, as well as the evidence of one's own senses as one walks the streets of any large Western city, point to a bleak future. Within a century or two, perhaps less, the peoples of the West, those whose ancestry derives from the Nordic and Alpine subraces of Europe, will have ceased to exist as a cohesive entity. How quickly the end will come depends on immigration rates, differential birthrates among ethnic groups, and mixed-race childbearing rates. But the final outcome is fixed so long as we adhere to our present course.

And yet, frank discussion of the outcome, the submergence of the race that produced the world's first, and perhaps only technological civilization, is usually silenced with words like "racist," "bigot," and "xenophobe." Neither the flawed moral system that enforces this silence nor the people who support it will outlive the demise of the West. But when the West is gone, it will be of little consolation that those responsible will have expired as well. If we are to reverse course, it is vital that we take steps now, before it is too late.

If, today, the West's moral system is flawed, how can it be corrected? The first question we must ask is whether it is moral for ethnic groups as well as individuals to seek survival. And if so, what are the moral actions we may undertake to secure survival? What must be the moral

basis of our civilization if it is not to be lost? In his book, "Destiny of Angels", Richard McCulloch calls these questions a matter of "ultimate ethics."

## The Moral Dilemma of the West

The dilemma of our people is the product of a deep misconception about nature and morality. It arises from the mistaken, sentimental belief that altruism can be extended beyond its evolutionary origin--kinship and within-group altruism--to the whole of humanity. It results from failure to accept the role of genetic factors in defining human temperament and potential.

The standards that govern public debate are reminiscent of the Dark Ages in that they have no basis in science or in human experience. Instead, they consist of moralistic assertions derived from a world view rooted in radical egalitarianism. The long term consequence of adherence to these principles is rarely examined, let alone subjected to scientific scrutiny.

Most Western people would agree that an innate sense of right and wrong plays a key role in the Western moral system, a system that values individual worth and reciprocal fairness. The tragedy of this moral view is that it has been extended to the world at large--seemingly the most noble behavior humanity has ever exhibited--and has become the threat to the survival of the West.

As biologist Garrett Hardin demonstrated in his 1982 essay, "Discriminating Altruisms," universalism--a chimerical One World without borders or distinctions--is impossible. Groups that practice unlimited altruism, unfettered by thoughts of self-preservation, will be disadvantaged in life's competition and thus eliminated over time in favor of those that limit their altruistic behavior to a smaller subset of humanity, usually their own genetic kin, from whom they receive reciprocal benefits.

Professor Hardin writes:

"Universalism" is altruism practiced "without discrimination" of kinship, acquaintanceship, shared values, or propinquity in time or space . . . . To people who accept the idea of biological evolution from amoeba to man, the vision of social evolution from egoism to universalism may seem plausible. In fact, however, the last step is impossible . . . . Let us see why.

"In imagination, picture a world in which social evolution has gone no further than egoism or individualism. When familialism appears on the scene, what accounts for its persistence? It must be that the costs of the sacrifices individuals make for their relatives are more than paid for by the gains realized through family solidarity . . . .

"The argument that accounts for the step to familialism serves equally well for each succeeding step--except for the last. Why the difference? Because the One World created by universalism has--by definition--no competitive base to support it . . . [Universalism] cannot survive in competition with discrimination." [emphasis in original]

Professor Hardin adds:

"[W]e must not forget that for three billion years, biological evolution has been powered by discrimination. Even mere survival in the absence of evolutionary change depends on discrimination. If universalists now have their way, discrimination will be abandoned. Even the most modest impulse toward conservatism should cause us to question the wisdom of abandoning a principle that has worked so well for billions of years. It is a tragic irony that discrimination has produced a species (homo sapiens) that now proposes to abandon the principle responsible for its rise to greatness."

It is to the advantage of non-Europeans, virtually all of whom retain their cohesion as distinctive, discriminating groups, to exploit the economic wealth and social order of the West, benefits many demonstrably cannot create for themselves. When this cohesive drive is placed in competition with self-sacrificing Western altruism, there can be only one outcome. In the near term, Europeans will be displaced by groups acting in their own self-interest. In the long run, biological destruction awaits us. Since those who displace us do not, by definition, maintain our moral standards -- for if they did, they would not be replacing us -- our flawed moral system will vanish with us.

The fact that universal, self-sacrificing altruism destroys its practitioners is its most obvious flaw. Any survivable moral order must recognize this.

### The Cosmic Race

The dream of a Utopia in which racial harmony prevails, has never come true. Today, racial encroachment is a threat to the very existence of Western peoples. Lawrence Auster, author of "The Path to National Suicide, An Essay on Immigration and Multiculturalism," has elsewhere summarized the situation thus:

"Modern liberalism told us that racial differences don't matter, and on the basis of that belief, liberals then set about turning America into a multiracial, integrated, race-blind society. But now that very effort has created so much race consciousness, race conflict and race inequality, that the same liberals have concluded that the only way to overcome those problems is to merge all the races into one. The same people who have always denounced as an extremist lunatic anyone who warned about 'the racial dilution of white America,' are now proposing, not just the dilution of white America, but its complete elimination. Race-blind ideology has led directly to the most race-conscious --- and

indeed genocidal---proposal in the history of the world."

This change of strategy was signaled by the cover story of a Fall 1993 special edition of "Time". The story featured a computer synthesized image of a woman representing the intermixture of all of the ethnic population elements of the United States in their present proportions. The subliminal message conveyed by this computerized android, obviously still of predominantly European ancestry, was: "Don't worry, this is harmless." Or, in the current idiom of multiculturalism, "let us celebrate our diversity." Of course, this image represents the utter destruction of diversity, not its conservation.

This computer-generated android is a lie. The American population base is in a state of rapid change. Whites are now having fewer children, and there are thus fewer whites of child bearing age than "Time" assumes. This is happening worldwide. The question is, what would be the result of this plan being carried forward on a larger scale, carried to its logical conclusion in a world \_sans\_ borders? Time's android is but a way station on the road to what some lovingly call the Cosmic Race.

People of European ancestry constitute something over ten percent of the world's population, but since 1980, white births amount to only a little more than five percent of the world's new children.

The birth rate in the West has fallen to dangerously low levels, now about 1.8 children per woman. A level of 2.1 is required to balance deaths. Birth rates in the third world remain very high, thanks in large measure to the infusion of Western food, medicine, and "peacekeeping."

Because people are not computer morphs but have discrete ancestors, let us assume that the fraction of people with European ancestry is now one-sixteenth of the child-bearing population. When the Time experiment is complete on a world-wide scale, the resulting human will have only one white great-great-grandparent. He will be visibly Asian since about 60 percent of the world's population is Asian. In round numbers, this amounts to ten of the sixteen great-great-grandparents, including four from China alone. Three would come from India and three more from Southeast Asia and the Middle East. Africa would supply three and non-white Latin America and the Caribbean basin the remaining two.

In this scenario, which is already unfolding on the North American continent and in Europe and Australia, the single European ancestor would leave no discernible residue in "homo cosmicus". Europeans would be extinct, fulfilling the nightmare vision that Jean Raspail described in "The Camp Of The Saints". This is not a condemnation of any real human being with such an ancestry. Nevertheless, this process would eradicate the biological diversity that multiculturalists claim to cherish. In its place would be only uniformity, the irreversible submergence of all races.

The passing of any race is an event of great significance. The destruction of an entire population is, in fact, genocide by the definitions of the UN Genocide Convention, which defines genocide as ". . . the destruction, in whole or in part, of an ethnic, racial or national group. The acts so defined include. . . the destruction of the conditions of life necessary for the physical existence of the group . . . ."

The debate about race must be framed in these terms in order to convey its true importance. The battle cannot be won by allowing the other side to limit the terms of debate by declaring certain subjects beyond discussion. The consequences are too important.

### The Dual Code of Morality

Why, though, does race matter? The answer lies in the biology of genes and in the impact of genetic kinship on altruism. For many decades, altruism was a paradox for theories of evolution. Darwin himself realized that altruism was difficult to explain in terms of individual "survival of the fittest." In his book, "Race, Evolution and Behavior," Philippe Rushton writes, "If the most altruistic members of a group sacrifice themselves for others, they run the risk of leaving fewer offspring to pass on the very genes that govern the altruistic behavior. Hence, altruism would be selected against, and selfishness would be selected for."

Prof. Rushton suggests that this paradox is resolved by genetic similarity theory, a field pioneered by biologist W.D. Hamilton and others. Prof Rushton writes:

"By a process known as kin selection, individuals can maximize their inclusive fitness rather than only their individual fitness by increasing the production of successful offspring by both themselves and their genetic relatives . . . . Genes are what survive and are passed on, and some of the same genes will be found not only in direct offspring but in siblings, cousins, nephews/nieces, and grandchildren . . . . thus, from an evolutionary perspective, altruism is a means of helping genes to propagate."

Over time, kin selection has resulted in a dual code of morality, an altruistic code for one's genetic kin and a non-altruistic code for everyone else. Anthropologists have suggested that humans evolved through a process of migration and tribal warfare between groups composed of genetically related individuals. In "A New Theory of Human Evolution", Sir Arthur Keith wrote:

"The process which secures the evolution of an isolated group of humanity is a combination of two principles . . . namely, cooperation with competition . . . . I hold that from the very beginning of human evolution the conduct of every local group was regulated by two codes of morality, distinguished by Herbert Spencer as the 'code of amity' and the 'code of enmity'."

Garrett Hardin writes:

"The essential characteristic of a tribe is that it should follow a double standard of morality--one kind of behavior for in-group relations, another for out-group."

In-group relations are characterized by cooperation while out-group relations are characterized by conflict. Liberals have tried to discredit the role of tribal conflict, claiming that such distinctions have been lost as groups reached nation size. But in so doing, they miss the vital message of genetic similarity theory. National ethnic groups represent the growth and consolidation of genetically related tribes over time.

Professor Hardin argues that, because of the nature of altruism and competition, the dual code of morality is inescapable and cannot be eliminated from human society:

"In the absence of competition between tribes the survival value of altruism in a crowded world approaches zero because what ego gives up necessarily . . . goes into the commons. What is in the commons cannot favor the survival of the sharing impulses that put it there--unless there are limits placed on sharing. To place limits on sharing is to create a tribe--which means a rejection of One World. . . . A state of One World, if achieved, would soon redissolve into an assemblage of tribes."

The in-group out-group distinction still operates today; it is only the battleground that has shifted. Tribal warfare has been replaced by territorial irredentism and competing birthrates.

The liberal campaign to eliminate feelings of national, cultural, or racial solidarity among Western peoples was undertaken largely in the hope that the abolition of "tribalism" would inaugurate an era of world peace. As Professor Hardin has shown, tribalism cannot be eliminated. Worse still, any idealistic group that unilaterally dismantles its own tribal sense will be swept away by groups that have retained theirs. Unless the current direction is changed, the West will be destroyed in this new form of biological warfare.

The dual code of morality is therefore the cornerstone on which any enduring moral order must be based. It is also an answer to the question of ultimate ethics posed earlier: "Is it moral for ethnic groups to seek to survive?" Since it is impossible to eliminate "tribes" from the human race, the answer to this question must be yes. That which is built inextricably into the laws of the universe cannot be immoral.

Universalists might try to caricature the dual code of morality as an invidious double standard, but it is something we practice every day without even thinking about it. Without it, no group, be it a family, club, corporation, political party, nation, or race would exist. It is how groups distinguish between members and non-members. Employees of the same company treat each



other differently from the way they treat competitors. Members of the same political party cooperate with each other and run against opponents. Families draw sharp distinctions between members and strangers. It is easy to overlook the dual code of morality precisely because it is so fundamental a part of human nature.

The "code of amity, code of enmity" explains racial loyalties. It is an extension of the biologically necessary fact that parents love their children more than the children of strangers. Such feelings are normal and natural. Yet "racism" has become the curse-word that stops discussion. Those who use the word as a weapon say that racial loyalty is racism when exhibited by whites but is justifiable pride when exhibited by non-whites. The word is simply a means of gaining power over people who have exaggerated moral scruples.

### The Biology of Diversity

Feelings of racial loyalty are grounded in biological differences. These are discussed authoritatively in J. Philippe Rushton's "Race, Evolution, and Behavior", but they do not imply that one race has a right to rule over another. Frank discussion of real differences must not be considered morally repugnant. Scientific truth cannot be racism, at least not in the pejorative sense that the word is now used.

Most forms of behavior (by whites) that are characterized as racism do not involve unprovoked assault on people of other races, but are simply the natural loyalty of humans for their own group. They are necessary for survival. Unprovoked violence is a moral evil, but by all statistical measures, whites are overwhelmingly the victims of crimes of racial violence, not the perpetrators.

Blacks are twelve percent of the population but commit almost two-thirds of the violent crime in America, are over twelve times more likely to murder whites than the reverse, are more than a thousand times more likely to rape white women than the reverse, and choose whites as crime victims fifty percent of the time compared to whites choosing blacks as victims only two percent of the time.

Interracial crime is just one manifestation of a fundamental biological principle called Gause's Law of Exclusion. In his book, "The Mammals of North America", University of Kansas biology professor Raymond Hall states the law as follows: "Two subspecies of the same species do not occur in the same geographic area." [emphasis in original] One will inevitably eliminate or displace the other. Prof. Hall specifically includes humans in this rule: "To imagine one subspecies of man living together on equal terms for long with another subspecies is but wishful thinking and leads only to disaster and oblivion for one or the other."

Oblivion need not come in the form of physical destruction. It may simply involve the loss of habitat. Harlem, Watts, East St. Louis, and many other black neighborhoods were once

occupied by whites. The arrival of blacks (or other non-whites) in sufficient numbers makes it impossible for whites to survive, whereas the process does not work in reverse. Even without the carnage of inter-racial crime, whites could be eliminated through sheer loss of territory. Viewed in biological terms, ethnic diversity is prelude to destruction.

The great majority of people, of any age and origin, do not concern themselves with the rise and fall of civilizations. Like fish in water, they are conscious of their environment only when it changes rapidly and threateningly, a rarity in most people's lifetimes. Yet civilizations do fall, and the warning signs for ours have been present for more than a century. Rudyard Kipling's line, "East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet," presaged the message of early twentieth century Americans, Madison Grant and Lothrop Stoddard, whose books, "The Passing of the Great Race" and "The Rising Tide of Color", helped bring about the immigration restrictions of 1924.

The 1924 national origins quota system was dismantled in 1965 during the wave of self-recrimination that accompanied the Civil Rights era. Should Chinese historians of the twenty-second century be writing the final history of Western civilization, no doubt they will cite the 1965 Immigration Act as the blow that broke the back of Western man.

Elmer Pendell, in his book, "Why Civilizations Self-Destruct", surveyed historians' theories as to why civilizations fall. They include Oswald Spengler's analogy to individual aging and death, theories of moral decay, and theories based on ecological deterioration. Concerning the latter, Garrett Hardin notes in "The Limits of Altruism":

"No civilization has ever recovered after ruining its environment."

All of these theories have their appeal, yet none is a complete explanation for what is happening to the West.

Pendell's own hypothesis seems closer to the mark. A civilization arises when natural selection produces a people of above-average intelligence. As the founders conquer natural culling forces, those who would have been removed from the population due to their lesser abilities survive and produce more children than the more intelligent founders. Francis Galton, Charles Darwin's cousin and author of "Hereditary Genius", first noted that 'men of eminence' have fewer children than the average. Eventually the intelligence level of the population falls below that needed to sustain civilization.

Pendell suggests another factor in the collapse of civilizations, the gradual adulteration of ethnically homogeneous founding populations through losses in wars and, in ancient times, the taking of slaves. The modern analogue of slavery is immigration.

Tenny Frank, in his book "History of Rome", wrote, "The original peoples were wasted in wars and scattered in migrations and colonization and their places were filled chiefly with Eastern Slaves." We cannot speak of the spirit of Rome or the culture of Rome, Frank said, "without defining whether the reference is to the Rome of 200 BC or 200 AD."

Theodor Mommsen wrote in "The History of Rome", "The patrician body. . . had dwindled away more and more in the course of centuries and in the time of Caesar there were not more than fifteen or sixteen patrician gentes (clans) still in existence." In 9 A. D. laws were passed requiring each patrician family to have three children. Lead poisoning has been implicated in the failure to reverse the decline of Roman blood, but the reasons do not change the outcome. Even in ancient Rome, slaves did not stay slaves forever, and their gradual suffusion through the population by intermixture would have contributed to Rome's demise. The same situation, massive infusion of non-Western peoples and a birthrate below replacement level, threatens the West, and for reasons quite unrelated to lead poisoning.

### After The Fall

Eric Fischer, writing in "The Passing of the European Age", said that a new civilization never arises where an earlier civilization has died. If Pendell's theory is correct and if the hypothesis of Tenny Frank and others explains the loss of a hereditary capacity for civilization, then Fischer's observation has a genetic explanation. Civilization cannot arise on the site of an earlier civilization once the hereditary character of the people is permanently altered. This process is happening in the Western world today through immigration, welfare, and liberal policies that promote the submergence of ethnic groups into a global "melting pot."

Should the West suffer the fate of Rome, there will be no recovery. Whether or not other civilizations arise among other peoples remains to be seen. Present economic success indicates that East Asia may be a future center of civilization. However, modern innovations flow predominantly from the creative wellsprings of the West. Whether innovation could be sustained in the absence of Western peoples remains to be seen. There is evidence that this might not happen; intelligence testing of Asians shows a relatively small standard deviation, suggesting a smaller right tail of the IQ distribution and a smaller percentage of innovative individuals.

Although dire predictions about the future are often ridiculed, it is wise to remember Rome--catastrophes can and do occur, and in a globally linked world, the consequences could be shattering.

In "The Limits of Altruism", Garrett Hardin cites Harrison Brown, author of "The Challenge of Man's Future", as the first person to recognize the vulnerability of the West's advanced civilization. Brown focused on the role of metals in modern civilization and on the technology required to obtain metals. Prof. Hardin summarizes the situation:

"Looking only at the copper component of the problem, we should note that preliterate man managed to create the Bronze Age only because of the ready availability of copper ores assaying greater than 20 percent. . . . Only the most primitive of means are required to process high grade ores. But now we are reduced to extracting our copper from ores that assay less than 1 percent, and soon we will have nothing better than 0.1 percent. It takes a very sophisticated technology to deal with low-grade ores, a technology that only a large population of technologically advanced people can muster."

Prof. Hardin continues, "Our many technologies form an incredible network of mutual support, mutual dependence. If this network were disrupted . . . it is doubtful if our kind of technology could ever be rebuilt. . . . On all counts, it looks as though our civilization, once fallen, will never be replaced by another of comparable quality."

Prof. Hardin suggests two possible causes for the destruction of modern civilization: nuclear warfare and a population crash brought on by exceeding the Earth's carrying capacity. However, "genetic submergence of the peoples with the innate ability to sustain civilization" will do just as well.

## The Roots of Western Order

The Map of Freedom, published annually by Freedom House, graphically demonstrates that free forms of government generally track population concentrations of people of European descent, a strong suggestion that freedom has a genetic origin. Although there are exceptions, notably Japan, which lost a nuclear war to the West and had a Western constitution imposed on it, the world of the free is largely the world of the Western European. The partially free include newly emerged Eastern Europeans and a scattering of other nations around the world. Much of Africa and Asia remains in the not free category. Thomas Jefferson foresaw this. Fearing "importation of foreigners," he wrote in "Notes on Virginia", "They will bring with them the principles of the governments they leave, or if able to throw them off, it will be in exchange for an unbounded licentiousness, passing, as usual, from one extreme to the other. . . . In proportion to their number, they will infuse into it [the nation] their spirit, warp or bias its direction, and render it a heterogeneous, incoherent, distracted mass."

Because economic inequality between groups inevitably produces envy, stable societies are almost always homogeneous. Multi-ethnic and multicultural societies live on the edge of dissolution. In such cases, the role of government turns to conflict management, as Brent Nelson points out in "America Balkanized". "Government as conflict management is an emerging theme of public life in the U.S., a theme which recurrently manifests itself in the concepts of dialogue, mediation, sensitivity, tolerance, and balance. The latter terms are increasingly the shibboleths of American public life. The fiction is maintained that these concepts . . . will produce a final resolution of intergroup conflicts. . . . [T]he reality is

something quite other." Laws against "hate crime" and "hate speech" reflect that other reality.

If today's ethnic minorities become a majority it will be beyond the power of Western peoples to control, peacefully by means of the ballot, the destiny of the nations that were once their own. There is no guarantee that protections prevalent in Western societies will be preserved in societies that become non-Western.

There is no historical reason to believe that governments based on principles of individual liberty will survive the disappearance of Western peoples.

Post-colonial Africa is enlightening. For the most part, the Dark Continent is reverting to its ancestral ways, suitably updated by the infusion of Western weapons, as evidenced by carnage in Somalia and Rwanda. That this disturbs our heightened Western sense of compassion is understandable. But sentimentality should not blind us to the long term implications for our own survival. Nature's books are being balanced in Africa, and they will be balanced in the West, either by us or by Nature itself. Just as giving food to people who cannot feed themselves simply hastens an inevitable population crash, bringing third world people into the West simply hastens the transformation of the West into an extension of the third world.

The European tradition of ordered, self-governing liberty is probably part of our genetic heritage. Throughout the third world, governments range from anarchy to dictatorship. That too, is surely genetic. Those few non-European countries that appear to be free have generally maintained democracy through intimate contact with the West. If Europeans are marginalized and ultimately absorbed by the third world, the idealism of Western liberalism that permitted the third world invasion will have proved to be a lethal genetic flaw.

Few concepts are more ingrained in Western thought than respect for the "rule of law." The West has a history of order that predates the eight-hundred-year-old Magna Carta. Roman Law was supreme in the Mediterranean world for nearly a thousand years. Unique among the peoples of the earth, the people of the West recognize, at least in theory, the subordination of government to individual rights. But laws have been instrumental in bringing on the current crisis. Although there is virtually no popular support for immigration in the Western world, it is everywhere proceeding under laws passed by governments elected by the people.

In the end, laws are no better at ensuring liberty than the people who make and enforce them. Sir Roger L'Estrange said, "The greatest of all injustice is that which goes under the name of law." America's Founders recognized the existence of a natural order to freedom that supersedes laws made by men. Although the American concept of liberty owed much to British and French political thought, the American act of creation, the Declaration of Independence, provided perhaps the best-known expression of "natural law" ever penned. Writing about securing "unalienable Rights" endowed by "Nature and Nature's God," Thomas Jefferson wrote:

"That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, having the foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness."

The rights Jefferson identified, "Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness," were set forth by George Mason in the Virginia Declaration of Rights, ratified on May 6th, 1776. Mason's work was the basis for Jefferson's statement, but the Mason version is superior because it eschews Jefferson's poetic nonsense about all men being created equal. Mason's language still stands as a monument of Western political thought:

"[A]ll men are by nature equally free and independent, and have certain inherent rights, of which, when they enter into a state of society, they cannot, by any compact, deprive or divest their posterity; namely, the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety."

Mason's words are preferable to Jefferson's for two reasons. First, he said that men are "equally free," not "equal." The difference is vast. There is ample evidence that Jefferson understood the difference as well as Mason, but much of the dispossession of Europeans in their own homelands can be traced to exploitation of this egalitarian philosophy by later Western liberals.

Second, Mason states directly the central thesis of natural law:

People cannot, by any agreement, deprive their posterity of rights. Natural law is therefore the fulcrum on which rests the case that immigration is genocide. The governments of the West have no right to impose present levels of immigration and race mixing on their people. Nor are we morally bound to accept them.

### The Ultimate Moral Principle

Mason recognized the role of "safety" as a motive for the creation of law and government. Others have said the same thing.

William Blackstone wrote, "self-defense is justly called the primary law of nature. . . [It] cannot be taken away by the laws of society." Jefferson wrote, "A strict observance of the written laws is doubtless "one" of the highest duties of a good citizen, but it is not "the highest". The laws of necessity, of self-preservation, of saving our country when in danger, are of higher obligation."

Their message is simple. Laws alone, independent of their survival utility, are not, and cannot be, the underlying basis of civilization. In the end, whoever makes and enforces the laws has the

power to determine who lives and who dies. "Survival is the ultimate principle upon which all enduring moral systems must be based." This is the third, and final, cornerstone of any permanent moral order, for any people who "divest" their posterity of the right to existence will vanish, and their flawed moral system will vanish with them.

All systems of law and government must serve the imperative of survival. Speaking on the eve of the War for Southern Independence, and in the aftermath of John Brown's attempt to incite a slave uprising at Harper's Ferry, President James Buchanan expressed the fear felt by white Southerners who saw their very existence imperiled: "Self-preservation is the first law of nature, and therefore any state of society in which the sword is all the time suspended over the heads of the people must at last become intolerable." Where law and survival were in conflict the Founders took their cue from Cicero: "Laws are silent in the midst of arms."

The West is surrendering the power of life and death into the hands of third world aliens. In a world ruled by the dual "code of amity, code of enmity," this decision, which was never subjected to systematic scrutiny by an informed electorate, is tantamount to suicide. Sometime in the next century, the sword Western society has suspended over its own head will become intolerable. What our response will be remains to be seen. If there is no response, the long descent into night is sure to follow.

Which Way Western Man?

What would be lost with the passing of Western civilization and its peoples? Two thousand years ago, the Roman historian, Tacitus, wrote in "De Germania" that the peoples of the Germanic tribes possessed a fondness for personal freedom, an independence of spirit, an unusually high status accorded women and a deep affection for the land. These traits have survived twenty centuries. Without the West, will the spirit of individual liberty persevere? The Map of Freedom suggests not. Despite the tendency of liberals to denigrate the only culture on earth that would tolerate their presence, these virtues uniquely characterize only Europeans and their civilization.

Now, the descendants of those same Germanic tribes, the ancestors of much of the white world, and the creators of the only advanced technological civilization the world has ever known, are on the road to extinction. Do Western moral principles require that its creators commit suicide in order to fulfill those principles? "Such a belief is insane". It therefore follows that if the West is to survive it must come to grips, as Jean Raspail foresaw, with the profoundly destructive nature of its moral beliefs.

Any enduring moral order must be based on the following principles:

- 1) a dual code of morality, which is of evolutionary origin, binds the members of ethnic and racial groups together;

2) universal, self-sacrificing altruism in a world in which racial cohesion is elsewhere the norm is lethal; and

3) the imperative of survival and the primacy of self-preservation supersede all laws made by man.

What then, must we do? Raymond Cattell, in his book "A New Morality From Science: Beyondism", called for a reversal of the universalist creed and creation of many social laboratories where evolution can proceed without harm or subjugation of anyone by anyone else. Wilmot Robertson urged this path as the basis of nationhood in "The Ethnostate". Richard McCulloch has elevated this principle to a "racial Golden Rule" in "The Racial Compact".

The only course that gives cohesive groups a chance to survive is ethnic separation. Without separation, the dual code of morality will ensure a long, chaotic period of strife and bloodshed. Eventually, what racial conflict does not finish, miscegenation, diminished birthrates, and physical and psychological displacement will. Personal liberty and individuality, without which Europeans simply cannot exist, will disappear long before the European genetic heritage is completely submerged. Lest this outcome seem remote and therefore of no concern, let the time scale of Rome's decline be always kept in mind. Though those reading this may or may not live to see the collapse of the West, the white children being born today may well suffer it.

Jean Raspail also believed that the end was not far off. In the introduction to the 1985 edition of "The Camp of the Saints", he wrote, "The Roman empire did not die any differently, though, it's true, more slowly, whereas this time we can expect a more sudden conflagration . . . . Christian charity will prove itself powerless. The times will be cruel."

Louis Veillot, the 19th century French writer, captured the dilemma facing the West in confronting peoples who do not conform to Western moral principles. "When I am the weaker, I ask you for my freedom, because that is your principle; but when I am the stronger, I take away your freedom, because that is my principle." The West must recognize this appeal for compassion by "the wretched refuse of [the non-Western world's] teeming shore," for what it is: a form of beguiling parasitism that can, by definition, only seduce those with Western moral principles.

In "The Decline of the West", Oswald Spengler wrote, "One grows or dies. There is no third possibility." The peoples of the West must come to believe in and act in accordance with the only moral principle Nature recognizes: for those who live in harmony with Nature, \_survival is moral\_. For those who do not, the penalty is extinction. Without this understanding, Western Man, progenitor of law, compassion, technology and a spirit of quest that is unparalleled in the history of the human race, will perish at the hands of those who do not possess the same innate spark. For the sake of our children who are yet to be, let us choose life--by whatever means we



must--while the choice is still ours.

Mr. Masters' essay, "We Are A People," appeared in the July-August (1995) issue of "Southern Patriot". His review of Garrett Hardin's "The Immigration Dilemma" appeared in the Summer (1995) issue of "The Social Contract".

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

Distribute Freely.



## MONEY AND MARKETS

This is Yggdrasil's Money and Markets series.

" Weekly charts and review of the Markets " 

" Nationalist Traders' Log " 

" Nationalist Traders' Charts " 

" Trading the NDX - How the Little Guys become Big Guys " 

"Gold and Social Control" 

Central Bank Gold Sales: 


"Social Control and the Stock Market" 

Slavery and The Federal Reserve: 

Gold and Silver Update 01/13/98: 

It's Different This Time! 12/23/98: 

The Demographics of Stock Investment. 07/07/99: 

Follow the Money! 07/18/99: 

---

**BACK**

(c) 1997-1998 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



## Nationalist Weekly Market Commentary

---

### Profiting from the NASDAQ mania.

For the week of 04/14/2003

Some mini rants tonight.

Rant number one.

We shall find out the real reason for the Iraq war as soon as we see what sort of government is installed. Will it be Ahmed Chalabi, the darling of Wolfowitz and Perle - the paid hireling of Israel who's first item of business will be the recognition of Israel (and the second, doubtless, making anti-semitism a capital crime, as in Leninist Russia)?

Any political scientist will point out the obvious - that Saddam's brutality dramatically lowered the amount of tangible benefits (oil revenues) that had to be shared with the people as a means of legitimizing his regime.

Do we really suppose that we are going to purchase legitimacy from the 22 million new welfare recipients we have so heroically acquired for less oil revenues than those shared by Saddam?

Are Americans peaceful and cooperative because they have an intangible called "freedom," or is it because they are prosperous? Would we in America be as tractable as we are now if our unemployment rate were 50% as it is in Saudi Arabia or Iraq?

If massive oil reserves are not sufficient for native Saudi and Iraqi leaders to provide prosperity and legitimize their regimes, why do we think these same oil reserves will be sufficient to legitimize a government we impose? What is the plan? Is it to ramp production and drive down prices?

And if the war is about oil, why have we not invaded Venezuela and Nigeria, where production has collapsed in the face of ethnic civil wars?

These new imperialists in the Bush administration have remarkably dull pencils.

Rant number two.

Let us suppose that a depression starts. Who are the most likely to indulge in panic selling? - those whose retirements depend on paper financial assets or those who own gold?

The bear market in gold was driven by the mining companies tripping over themselves to sell forward. They were (and still are) the leveraged shorts who would benefit from a deflationary panic, but they have been decreasing their short positions. The longs on the other side of the trade would be hurt by such a deflationary panic, but we have no idea who they are. We know the intermediaries who held their positions in street name, but we have no idea who the real players are and whether they plan to take delivery. In any event, as the mining companies reduce their hedge books, they are reducing the paper long positions - and thereby reducing the possibility of panic selling in gold.

Somehow I don't think we will make it to \$200 per oz.

Rant number three.

As a trader I am pathetically slow on the uptake. We have these wild allocation trade driven rallies in which the bond tanks and the stocks soar for an hour or so and then the rally melts away. Now after watching every one of these rallies melt away over the past month, I have finally figured out that these should be sold as soon as they lose momentum on the 5 minute chart. Well, better late than never!

Rant number four.

Be sure to ponder the charts of import prices and the PPI at the top of this week's [credit bubble bulletin](#) . Doubtless, our friend Prechter has a handy explanation - it is all those 1999 tech investors who are on a brand new speculative binge, filling their garages with tin, burlap and cotton seed oil in a vain attempt to make back their losses.

Rant number five.

Be sure to read [Too rich and sophisticated to work](#) for one of the best pieces I have ever read on gummint statistics.

End of rants.

I am a volume geek! OK? Price and volume don't lie, and I have replaced the charts of M3 and base with charts of the NDX and Nasdaq volume as well as the S&P 500 and NYSE volume in order to tell a tale of two markets.

To the charts!

## Monetary Conditions

*First a look at the monetary stimulus being provided by broad monetary growth M-3. This is the best and most timely proxy we have for total debt growth in the economy, and present economic growth is totally dependent on rapid debt growth.*


*The chart below shows the weekly Nasdaq 100 (NDX) in the bottom panel, the weekly M-3 in the middle panel and then the year-over-year growth rate (red) and 13 week growth rate (green) of M-3 annualized in the top panel.*



Falling volume means falling demand, and long running bear markets must have falling volume. If you have a dramatic price decline on rising volume, you have a correction in an ongoing bull trend, as the lower price simply increases demand. Until the long term trend in volume turns lower, you cannot claim that a secular bear trend has arrived. As you can see from the chart above, the NDX and NASDAQ have been in a

true secular bear market. This most recent war rally has not been able to boost the 33 dma of total volume above the 144 dma. Note that throughout the late 1990s mania, the 33 remained above the 144 dma most of the time. The NDX has been underperforming the SPX for about 3 weeks, and the trend of total volume is down going into the slow months of the year.

For another view, we turn to a chart of the St. Louis Adjusted Monetary Base, a narrow aggregate including only cash plus bank reserves, an aggregate that the Federal Reserve directly controls. The lower panel graphs the adjusted base, while the upper panel graphs the 13 week (green) and year over year (red) growth rates.



In contrast to the NASDAQ, the S&P 500 has been in a correction up until now, with 144 dma of NYSE volume rising steadily through the end of 2002. The 144 dma of NYSE volume has been falling for 3 1/2 months now, and this most recent war rally has not been able to bring the 33 dma back above the 144 dma. We are at a very important decision point for the SPX and for the bear market. Is it cyclical (and over) or secular and here to stay? We will know very soon. BTW, my guess is secular and we go down.


### Market Sentiment Indicators.

Below is a chart of the open interest ratio for the big NDX option contract. You will see the NDX in the lower panel, and the ratio of puts divided by calls for the NDX options in the upper panel. The NDX option open interest tends to be a smart money indicator, as this ratio tends to fall (increasing calls relative to puts) as the market moves down and to rise (decreasing calls relative to puts) as the market rises. A number above one means there are more puts outstanding than calls, and a number below one means more calls than puts.



The smart money on the big contract increases its put position further.

Next we have a chart with the Market Vane survey of investment professionals in the top panel and the SPX in the bottom. This serves as a contrary indicator.



Market Vane rises this week but remains in neutral territory. Note that that the [Investors Intelligence chart](#) is getting a bit frothy in the bullish direction this week.

*Below is a chart which plots the weekly SPX in the lower panel, and in the upper panel, the open interest ratio for small e-mini SPX futures traders, with their long positions divided by short positions. A ratio of one means that small traders hold as many long positions as short, a ratio above one means they are net long, while a ratio below one means they are net short.*



Bears gotta love this chart.

Below is a chart which plots the weekly NDX in the lower panel, and in the upper panel, the open interest ratio for e-mini NDX small traders, with their long positions divided by short positions. A ratio of one means that small traders hold as many long positions as short, a ratio above one means they are net long, while a ratio below one means they are net short.





Bears gotta love this one even more!

*Because the information content of the Comex gold commercials has been so low during this bull move, I am substituting the open interest ratio of the small gold traders in a new chart with the weekly nearby Comex gold future in the top panel, and the ratio of longs divided by shorts of the gold small traders in the bottom panel. Below one is net short while above one is net long.*



We have a turn in the ratio this week, and the odds favor a rally in gold.

*Below you will see a chart of AMG inflows with a 13 week moving average and a 5 week moving average of the data in the top panel. Because the software cannot accept negative numbers, 10 billion is actually the zero line for inflows. In the bottom panel, you will see a weekly chart of the NDX.*



The five week moving average hits the zero line as the famous victory has inspired the 401k crowd to pump a little money into stocks - a good deed that will not go unpunished.

## The Weekly Volume Indicators.

We switch to the most important chart, which is the weekly trading signal and then several charts which tend to confirm the message of that signal.

The chart below shows the DAILY NDX in the lower panel, the 8 day stochastic oscillator in the middle panel, and the accumulation/distribution index in the top panel. We get our weekly signals by following the 8 day stochastic oscillator in the middle panel. A sell signal is given when the fast line of the stochastic oscillator heads down while above the 80 line, and a buy when it heads up while below the 20 line. A buy signal is in green, a sell in blue, and a counter trend sell signal (which should be ignored by longer term traders) will be in purple, while a counter trend buy is in blue. A trend sell signal occurs when the accumulation/distribution indicator is lower than at the previous STO high, and a trend buy occurs when higher than at the previous STO low. Note that the trend marker (< or >) will change with the first trend signal failure. In any case, signals apply to the following day, and will not be moved once placed.



A grim chart as the big boys distribute stock to the allocation traders. We got our sell signal last Monday.


*An additional volume measure called the negative volume index is used to confirm trend and counter-trend signals. This index adds the percentage move in price to an accumulator for any day in which the volume is lower than the prior day. If volume is the same or higher, nothing is done. The index tends to show whether there is smart money distribution or accumulation underneath the surface that shows up in price whenever volume falls.*

*The chart below displays the NDX in the lower panel and the negative volume index in the upper panel, based on volume for the entire NASDAQ. If the market were accumulating, then price should rise as volume falls. The index below looks beneath the surface and is a predictor of the direction once the short term volume trend changes. It has a tendency to produce divergences in advance of major long term trend changes.*




The negative volume index just keeps falling.

The next chart displays the NDX in the bottom panel and a chart of the NASDAQ advancing volume in the top panel, with a 34dma in yellow and a 13dma in purple. Rallies require a rising trend of advancing volume. A falling trend in advancing volume will usually accompany a downtrend in the NDX. But the chief virtue of this chart is that the trend of advancing volume typically turns before the NDX changes trend, thus providing us with the holy grail of technical analysis - advance warning.



This is a very important chart and it looks weak to me.

Next, we have a chart of the weekly MACD, or moving average convergence- divergence index, a measure of weekly momentum in the NDX.



Dead money for the past four months.

### Short term market internals.

We begin with a fairly reliable short term sentiment chart which shows the NDX daily in the bottom panel and the CBOE "equity only" put/call ratio in the top panel. Most recently, short term tops tend to be signaled by the 5dma touching .55, while readings above .8 tend to indicate short term bottoms.



This week, I substitute the chart of gold with open interest which has touched the rising trend line and reversed higher. I am nibbling on the gold stocks and will be buying some metal as well. *Those of you who use CBOE levels in your daily trading can check this data intra day by visiting [CBOE half hour update](#) to help you with your end-of-day decisions.*

*The second chart has the NDX in the bottom panel and the NASDAQ new highs minus new lows in the top panel.*






This chart has changed character and is now neutral to bearish. *You can check this chart daily by looking at [NASDAQ New Highs, New Lows From StockCharts.com](#) which updates in the evening.*

*The next chart shows the new 52 week highs, minus the new 52 week lows for the 100 stocks within the NDX.*



This is a very important chart for NDX traders and it has turned very bearish.

*The next chart has the NDX in the bottom panel and the chart of the NASDAQ advancing issues minus declining issues in the top panel, with a 5 day moving average of the data in yellow and a 34 dma in red. Stochastic oscillator turns up when this 34 dma is moving up produce the best upside price gains, while Stochastic downturns while the 34 dma is trending down produce the best downside price moves.*



This chart is neutral to mildly bullish. *The same data is used to calculate the MacClellan Oscillator. See [NASDAQ MacClellan oscillator](#).*

## Interpretation of Weekly Signal Charts

I think we continue a gentle drift lower punctuated by furious allocation trade rallies.

*For mid week signal chart changes check below.*

[Nationalist Traders' Log](#)

---

## Disclaimer

The Ole Ygg is not a registered investment advisor. You are responsible for your own investment decisions. Do your own research, and if relying upon advice of others, seek counsel of a registered broker or investment advisor first. The above comments are intended as conceptual discussion of market direction and technical indicators only and are not a recommendation to purchase or sell any particular security.

---

[Back](#)



## Nationalist Traders Log

---

### Profiting from the NASDAQ Mania

**3:20 Eastern - Nov. 20, 2002**

Looks like we are setting up for the typical morning sell off - closing out my ndx long and hoping to purchase it cheaper in the morning - gambling on the intial claims news. Taking a very small position in the XAU based on hourly momentum loss and copper rally.

**2:38 Eastern - Nov. 20, 2002**

Looking at XAU - some support lurks at the 63.30 level. Now at 65.14.

Looks like the 20 pma of NYSE tick is rolling over, and we have a potential cross by the NYSE trin above its 20 pma on the 10 minute chart - would be a sell signal.

**1:38 Eastern - Nov. 20, 2002**

- went long the NDX at the close last night - debating whether to close or hold for another day - no sign of momentum loss yet on the hourly MACD.

Dec. Copper is up to 74, indicating economic expansion - while the bond is tanking as we get more allocation trades. Rising long rates are only bullish for the intermediate term.

XAU is losing its downward momentum on the hourly chart - looks like a long entry except that sentiment on the XAU option is lopsidedly bullish.

### Useful Links

- [Trading Charts Page](#) Ygg's Own trading charts!

- [YAHOO FINANCE](#) The best place for market news and quotes!
  - [CME Globex Flash Quotes](#) Check the NDX and SPX futures after hours.
  - [PRUDENTBEAR.COM](#)- Great daily market summary plus Wed. and Fri. extras!
  - [CONTRARYINVESTOR.COM](#)- Great Tues. and Thurs. market analysis!
  - [THE STREET.COM](#) An excellent free source of news and analysis, especially of after hours stock action.
  - [Shaeffer's Research](#) A great source of intra day commentary and trading ideas.
  - [SANDSPRING'S CHARTING AND ANALYSIS](#)- Top Quality!
  - [MOORE RESEARCH CENTER](#) Check after hours futures quotes for indication of market direction the next morning, including after hours gold, oil, bond and currency prices!
  - [DAILY COMMODITY PRICE CHARTS](#)
  - [KITCO'S REAL TIME CASH GOLD, SILVER AND PLATINUM PRICES](#)
  - [WORLD DAILY STOCK MARKET CHARTS](#) Check Asian markets at night and European markets prior to the opening for clues as to direction of U.S. market.
  - [NORTHERN TRUST'S DAILY ECONOMIC COMMENTARY](#) Great Analysis!
  - [TECHNICAL AND FUNDAMENTAL INDICATOR CHARTS](#) A superb collection!
  - [DECISION POINT TECHNICAL CHARTS](#) Another superb collection! However it is now available only on a subscription basis at \$10 per month.
  - [GET INFO ON PHILADELPHIA EXCHANGE OPTIONS](#) The XAU Gold stock contracts trade here!
  - [GET INFO ON CBOE INDEX OPTION CONTRACTS](#) Most of the best known contracts trade here!
  - [Askresearch.com charts](#). This one has real-time updating QQQ charts and other indexes.
  - [IQC.com charts](#).
  - [Stockcharts.com](#)
  - [Bigcharts.com](#)
- 

## Disclaimer

The Ole Ygg is not a registered investment advisor. You are responsible for your own investment decisions. Do your own research, and if relying upon advice of others, seek counsel of a registered broker or investment advisor first. The above comments are intended as conceptual discussion of market direction and technical indicators only and are not a recommendation to purchase or sell any particular security.

---

BACK

Design © 2000 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



## Nationalist Traders Charts

---

### Profiting from the NASDAQ Mania

#### Chart group commentary.

Updated 04/12/02

The flow of free info is shrinking as more and more sites go subscription.

I have updated the after hours links below and added a list of additional web sites by category.

#### Trading the NDX/QQQ

- [HOURLY NDX chart from BigCharts.com](#) Thirty minute delay
- [FIVE MINUTE QQQ chart from AskResearch.com](#) Real Time
- [TWO MINUTE QQQ chart from AskResearch.com](#) Real Time
- [NASDAQ TRIN Chart from Yahoo](#) Look before you trade!
- [NYSE TICK Chart from Ask Research](#) Real time!
- [HOURLY QQQ from Barchart.com](#) Delayed
- [HOURLY QQQ from SI](#) Delayed - yesterday's close.
- [DAILY QQQ from StockCharts.com](#) Stochastic Oscillator and Accumulation - Distribution.
- [CME NDX and SPX futures quotes](#) Real Time!

#### Trading the SPX

- [HOURLY SPX chart from BigCharts.com](#) Thirty minute delay
- [FIVE MINUTE SPX chart from AskResearch.com](#) Real Time
- [TWO MINUTE SPX chart from AskResearch.com](#) Real Time

- [NYSE TRIN Chart from Yahoo](#) Look before you trade!
- [NYSE TICK Chart from Ask Research](#) Real time!
- [CME NDX and SPX futures quotes](#) Real Time!

## Trading Energy (XLE), Oil (XOI) and Oil Service (OSX)

- [HOURLY XLE from Barchart.com](#) Delayed
- [DAILY XOI from Stockcharts.com](#) Last stick is current day delayed 30 min.
- [DAILY OSX from Stockcharts.com](#) Last stick is current day delayed 30 min.

## Trading the XAU

- [Dollar Chart \(Daily\) from Stockcharts.com](#) Last stick is current day delayed 30 min.
- [XAU Daily chart From StockCharts.com](#) Last stick is current day delayed.
- [Live cash Gold prices from Kitco.com](#) Plus Platinum and Silver
- [Lease and Forward rates from Kitco.com](#) Plus Platinum and Silver
- [BigChart HOURLY PDG](#) Thirty minute delay
- [Barchart HOURLY PDG](#) Thirty minute delay
- [SI HOURLY PDG](#) Updates intra day with thirty minute delay
- [FIVE MINUTE XAU chart from AskResearch.com](#) Real Time

## Indicator Charts

- [Yield Curve From StockCharts.com](#) Daily chart of interest rates.
- [NASDAQ New Highs, New Lows From StockCharts.com](#) Daily chart updates in evening.
- [NASDAQ MacClellan Oscillator From StockCharts.com](#) Daily chart updates in evening.
- [Brokerage Stocks \(XBD\) From StockCharts.com](#) Last stick is current day delayed 20 min.
- [Relative Strength Comparison](#) Interactive Java - fabulous!
- [AD and Volume Data](#) Yahoo
- [Quotes and News](#) Yahoo
- [Option volumes Report](#) CBOE
- [ETF Heatmap](#) NASDAQ
- [NDX Heatmap](#) NASDAQ

## Commodity Charts and Quotes



- [GS Commodity Total Return Chart](#) Daily GS commodities Index chart from Stockcharts.
- [Daily Commodity charts](#) Charts for each traded contract. Good symbol look up.
- [Bridge CRB quotes](#) By total and sub-index.
- [Hourly Dollar Chart](#) From Tradesignals (20 min delay)
- [15 Minute Dollar Chart - INO Charts](#) Cash Dollar Index. (20 min delay)
- [15 Minute Gold Chart - INO Charts](#) Must update symbol periodically. (20 min delay)
- [15 Minute Crude Chart - INO Charts](#) Must update symbol periodically. (20 min delay)
- [Hourly TBond Chart](#) From Tradesignals (20 min delay)
- [CBOT Long Bond quotes](#) 20 minute delayed quotes

## Streaming Real Time Java Market Monitor and Charts

- [Quote.com streaming quotes](#) Best site to monitor the indexes real time - plus long bond rate.
- [Astrikos Real time market watch](#) E-mini real time - or select from real time list - fantastic!

## After Hours and Pre-Open

- [Globex after hours](#) SPX, NDX and currency futures quotes.
- [Moore Research](#) After hours futures, currency, gold and oil.
- [Island top 20](#) After hours trading
- [NASDAQ 100 Pre-Open Indicator](#) Often more predictive than the futures.
- [NASDAQ 100 After hours Indicator](#) Often more predictive than the futures.

## Bonds

- [Bonds on line](#) Bond Research and commentary.
- [Bond page](#) Bond Research and commentary.
- [Investing in bonds](#) Bond Research and commentary.

## Charts

- [Prophet finance](#) Charting and Technical analysis.
- [Bigcharts](#) Charting and Technical analysis.
- [Barchart](#) Charting and Technical analysis.
- [Stockcharts](#) Charting and Technical analysis.

- [Askresearch](#) Charting and Technical analysis.

## Commentary

- [Thestreet.com](#) News, commentary and analysis.
- [CBS Marketwatch](#) News, commentary and analysis.
- [Briefing.com](#) News, commentary and analysis.

## Company Reports

- [Multexinvestor](#) Earnings, balance sheets, fundamentals.
- [Hoovers](#) Earnings, balance sheets, fundamentals.

## Economic Data

- [Economy.com](#) Economic Stats and Charts
- [Freelunch.com](#) Economic Stats and Charts
- [Dismal Scientist](#) Economic Stats and Charts
- [Ed Yardeni](#) Economic Stats and Charts

## Education

- [NASDAQ Investor Education](#) Tutorial on investment basics.
- [NASDAQ Investor Education](#) Tutorial on investment basics.

## Instant News

- [CNN financial news](#) Instant news.

## Fundamentals

- [Quicken web site](#) Fundamental data and analysis.
- [Money Central](#) Fundamental data and analysis.

## World Markets

- [Financial Times](#) World market news and analysis.

- [ADR.com](http://ADR.com) World market news - Foreign Stocks.

## Stock Screeners

- [Money Central](http://MoneyCentral.com) Stock screening and selection.
- [Wall Street City](http://WallStreetCity.com) Stock screening and selection.

## Tech Stock News

- [News.com](http://News.com) Technology news and commentary.
- [Siliconvalley.com](http://Siliconvalley.com) Technology news and commentary.

## Technical Analysis

- [Clearstation.com](http://Clearstation.com) Technical analysis tools and commentary.
- [Traders.com](http://Traders.com) Technical analysis tools and commentary.
- [The hard right edge](http://TheHardRightEdge.com) Alan Farley's chart trading site.

---

## Disclaimer

The Ole Ygg is not a registered investment advisor. You are responsible for your own investment decisions. Do your own research, and if relying upon advice of others, seek counsel of a registered broker or investment advisor first. The above comments are intended as conceptual discussion of market direction and technical indicators only and are not a recommendation to purchase or sell any particular security.

---

**BACK**

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Trading the NDX - How the Little Guys become Big Guys

10/14/00

Lets first review the vehicles available to you as a beginning trader, and then we will review the methodology that allows you to trade profitably with a minimum of time required during the day, and a minimum of interference with your work.

### Trading Vehicles

Less than \$500 - A QQQ call or put contract (NDX/40)

Let us suppose that you have very limited resources and you open a \$500 account with Ameritrade, E-trade or one of the other discounters. Make sure you get approval for option purchases, as there is little else you can buy for \$500. You will also need internet access during the day, although you will not necessarily need internet access to your account for trading. A phone call is just as fast. Check to see that the same low commission is charged.

Before you trade, you will need to access [Yahoo Finance](#). Type in QQQ to the left of the "get quotes" button and then select "options" in the pull down menu to the right of that button. Scroll down to the long list of QQQ options with ticker symbols, bid and asked quotes and, most important, open interest. You always want to trade a contract with high open interest, since that will be the most liquid with the smallest spread between the bid and the ask. If a contract has high open interest, your limit order is likely to be filled in between the posted bid and asked prices. Buy one with low open interest and you will have to use a market order to buy or sell it, and you will always be faced with a huge and unfavorable dealer spread in fast markets. Generally, you will get the largest percentage return by buying a strike price slightly above the current price, in the case of a call, and slightly below the current price, in the case of a put.

Less than \$1200 - CBOE mini NDX contract (NDX/10)

This contract is four times as large as the QQQ contract and roughly four times the price. Exercise of "in the money" contracts is in cash rather than in QQQ stock, and is automatic at most brokerages. This means that you must sell QQQ options before expiration unless you have enough money in your account to have the contract or contracts exercised on margin. With the CBOE mini, there is no practical requirement to trade it before expiration. Otherwise, the instructions are the same as for QQQ, except that the ticker symbol for yahoo is ^MNX.

More than \$5000 - QQQ stock (NDX/40)

Buying and selling the QQQ, an NDX tracking stock, on margin is the most conservative way in which to trade. Make sure your account at the discount broker is approved for margin purchases. While a typical 2 day swing of 3 points on the QQQ will usually produce a 50% profit on one of the above options, the market is going to be around a long time, and you should not be in any great rush. The commission charge of your discount broker is critical here as Schwab will charge \$60 dollars round trip, while most other discounters will charge in the neighborhood of \$30 for limit orders. Market orders with a \$7 commission are almost always going to be a bad deal on the bid-ask spread. One QQQ point is \$100 on a round lot of 100 shares now selling at about \$8000. You need a 3 point swing for the trade to make sense. The economics are much improved if you have \$10,000 of capital and trade 200 shares at a time.

More than \$25000 - CME NDX mini contract (NDX/5)

To trade this futures contract you will need a commodities account with a discount commodities broker. With \$25,000 you have enough margin to trade the big NDX contract, an instrument that gives you about \$330,000 of exposure. However, I strongly recommend against it as all big contract orders must go to the floor, where the floor trader has 2 minutes before he has to attend to your order and you will not get a fill report for about 10 minutes. A limit order is likely to be off the mark 2 minutes after it is placed, and a market order on a futures contract can be a real wild card in a fast moving market. In contrast, the mini NDX contract (about \$65,000 of exposure) trades electronically without going to the floor, and you can get instant fills from your broker. In addition, the CME provides live, real time quotes for this contract over the web at [CME Real Time Quotes](#) under the symbol NQZ00 towards the bottom of the list. The page refreshes every few seconds automatically, so you and your broker will be viewing the same information as you call in your order. Commissions are much lower than for QQQ tracking stock trades, as a round turn will cost only \$29 at most discounters, and there are no spreads as in options.

## How to trade

All of the above instruments trade according to the same rhythm. The first thing you will need is access to and familiarity with an hourly chart of the NDX or QQQ. The chart below is from [Bigcharts.com](#). You will need to go over to the side frame, select a moving average and type in 20, then select bollinger bands, then for the first lower indicator select Williams %R and then for the second lower indicator select the MACD. Play around with it until you can duplicate the chart you see below. This chart can just sit in an extra Netscape window dormant for most of the day while you do other things. You should check it and refresh the screen every couple of hours.

You will notice that the 20 period Bollinger bands and the 20 period moving average give you excellent entry and exit points when the NDX is trending. Basically, you sell whenever the QQQ hits the moving average (or perhaps one point above) and you buy back whenever the QQQ hits its lower bollinger (or perhaps 50 cents below). Remember, the object of trading is not to capture every last nickel, but to increase the cash in your account. You haven't lost a thing if the NDX moves beyond your exit point.




Over the past 10 days the NDX has been a sale every time the Williams %R hits the 20 line, and a buy every time it hits the 80 line. You will also notice that the 10 period Williams %R tends to be a couple hours early. This is a good thing, because the Bigcharts data feed is about 30 minutes delayed, and the last hourly bar you will see on that hard right edge of your screen is from one hour ago. So you need an indicator that alerts you to begin to pay attention before the probable turn arrives in real time. The Williams %R is your basic indicator.

Over the past 10 days, the most accurate hourly timing indicator in retrospect is the 12/26 MACD. But by the time you see a lower MACD divergence bar on the histogram, or a tick in the opposite direction from the %D line on the hard right edge of your screen, two hours of new trend has already passed you by. The MACD is too late to be a useful signal, but it is important because you want to enter a position while the hourly %D line is still trending against you, and you want to exit your position while the hourly %D line is trending in your favor. In other words, the time zone of action is generally in between the Williams %R signal and the MACD signal.

Once the Williams %R signal flashes, you should switch to a five minute realtime chart available free at [Ask Research](#). Select QQQ or NDX as appropriate and leave the time at the default 5 minutes, uncheck the volume box and check the Williams %R and MACD boxes under "Indicator Chart Settings", hit "go" and then observe the chart similar to the one below. This chart will automatically refresh every three minutes. You can make it refresh much more frequently if desired by selecting the

automatic refresh rate at the bottom.



You will notice that the Williams %R on this 5 minute chart nailed every QQQ trading top and bottom on 10/12/00 when it hit the 0% and 100% lines, respectively. On the short covering panic of 10/13/00, it nailed every trading entry to the long side at the 30 line.

The psychological difficulty that every trader faces is the fact that as this %R indicator is rising (or falling) on the hard right edge of your screen, you have no way of knowing that it won't keep on rising (or falling). Remember though that the entire methodology described in this post is designed to be certain of the trend by looking at the weekly trend, and then drilling down to the daily, the hourly and the 5 minute trends to be certain that we are maximizing the probability of a good entry at a short term counter-trend extreme. If the 3 dma on the daily chart is rising consistent with a positive weekly trend, you aggressively enter long (buy calls) at counter trend lows and exit less aggressively/ quickly at trend highs. If the 3 dma on the daily is falling consistent with a negative weekly trend, you aggressively enter short at counter trend highs and exit less aggressively/ quickly at the lows. If the daily 3 dma is moving counter to the weekly trend (as it is on the day this is written) then you must enter and exit aggressively with careful stop protection. Since option traders cannot use stops



effectively, they should stand aside until the weekly and daily are running in the same direction.

## **Risk Management.**

The most important element of risk management is having and following a system that keeps you trading with the trend in all relevant time frames.

For option traders using the system, the only effective means of risk control is to sell the contract as soon as you have decent economic profits. Remember that when you buy an option you are paying for time. The less time you keep it the less you pay. You must sell the option while the market is running in your direction while the premium is high and the contract is actively bid by other traders. In other words, if you own a call you must sell it while QQQ is rising, and if a put, while it is falling. Wait until the market turns, and the premium collapses and your profits melt away very quickly. Because of this fluctuation in premium or time and volatility value, stop loss orders for options are a very bad idea. The most important risk control is built into the trading system and the leverage of the contract and the limitation of your risk to the price you paid. Therefore, if the market starts running against you (indicating a probable daily trend change) then you must sell the contract on the first hourly %R move in your direction. Most trend changes will involve a "retest" of the breakout point (the price at which you bought the option) and you must sell the option at the first retest before the market reverses and heads back in the direction of the new trend.

The advantage of trading the QQQ or the mini NDX contract is that you can use stop loss orders to limit your losses. A second advantage is that you can and should wait until the Williams %R turns one tick in the direction of your trade before trading either vehicle. Unlike an option, a very important element of risk control when trading the QQQ or the NDX contract is entering as soon as the market begins to move in the direction of your trade. Then you place a stop loss order just above the high (or below the low) set immediately before your entry. The quicker the entry, the tighter the stop. In other words, if the NDX reverses on you and goes through the high (or low) that you just sold (or bought) then you don't want to own that position yet. You then reenter at the next higher high (or lower low) in the same fashion until the price action indicates a potential daily trend change, or you get it right! In general, stop orders make no sense at all except in reference to relevant chart tops or bottoms. Part of your risk control is having an exit strategy that forces you to let your profits run. This means you exit using the same method, drilling down from weekly, daily, hourly, and finally 5 minute trends and exiting immediately after the market reverses against your position.

Some traders will modify the above risk management rule by insisting that the high to be traded be accompanied by a lower high on the 5 minute RSI indicator or a lower high on the 2 minute MACD histogram (or that a low to be traded be accompanied by a higher low on these indicators). This refinement ensures that the short term up move (or downmove) to be traded is accompanied by falling momentum, thus increasing the odds of an immediate direction change in your favor. In general, this modification should not result in the loss of very many profitable entry and exit points. This same modification can be applied to option trades.

Some traders will go further and insist on waiting for a second lower high or higher low before



entering or exiting a trade. In general, this modification is desirable only for exit trades at extremes in the direction of the trend, as extra insurance that profits have been allowed to run to the maximum reasonable extent. Any asymmetry in your trading strategy should be biased in the direction of the trend.

Watch this web site and "paper trade" the system before you commit real money. Remember that the market will be around for a long time, and there is no rush. You will trade better if you feel that you understand what you are doing.

And good luck!

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Money and Markets Page](#)

(c) 2000 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Gold and Social Control

10/27/97

Are the gold stocks a buy? Probably. But stocks world wide are crashing, and you must wait until they stop falling. The gold stocks acted beautifully up until Friday when Switzerland announced that it would put a referendum to its people proposing a sale of half its gold reserves and the gift of the proceeds to Holocaust victims.

In a basing formation you often get panicky sell-offs that last one or two days. The referendum may not be that popular in Switzerland. In any event, the Goldman Sachs Commodity Index ("GSCI") is still in a nice uptrend, the CRB is in an uptrend, and the Dollar is falling. Platinum and silver are in uptrends (the charts have been making higher lows since July, in the case of Silver, and February in the case of Platinum.) M-3 is still on a tear. The XAU, an index of the larger gold stocks, has broken below its September low of 92 and may test the July low of 87. But the price of gold is diverging from the price trends in oil, silver and platinum, which it normally follows.

The headlines in the commodities pages blast about central bank gold sales. What they fail to mention is that through all the central bank selling over the past 4 years, there has been an 800 pound gorilla in the closet quietly buying all that gold. This gorilla doesn't care to prop up the price of what he is buying (like the typical mutual fund manager). He is perfectly content to see the price of what he has already bought fall further, so that he can buy more.

One thing we know for sure about the 800 pound gorilla is that he has protected cash flow. Unlike a hedge fund, which must generate profits at all times or sell out its positions, this gorilla makes his living on something other than appreciation of what he is now buying.

But let me emphasize that this gorilla has cojones - real big ones!

Not only has he bought up the gold the central banks have sold, but he has also bought up the next three years of production of all the senior mining companies. And, ladies and gentlemen, he has bought these thousands of tons of gold at 12 year record low prices.

Now let me ask you who you think is smarter, the 800 pound gorilla who is buying up all this gold at 12 year lows, or the genius central bankers who have watched gold fall from its highs of \$800 in 1980 and are selling now at multi-decade lows?

Well, what happens to gold and the gold stocks depends on what (if anything) the gorilla does on Monday.

If the stock market panic spreads from Asia to the U.S. market, then the gorilla will probably wait for lower prices (and so will the little monkeys like me who are watching him). If so, the gold stocks will sell off as badly or worse than the general market. The time to buy will be when the stock market stops going down.

But the currency crisis in Asia gives me an excuse to talk about broader trends in international economics that you will seldom see discussed in public because they involve money, wealth and social control.

The Asian nations have extraordinarily high national savings rates. The Japanese have a gross national savings rate of 30% of income and the Chinese 40%. As you might expect, a large supply of savings means a low price or low interest rates. In Japan, short term interest rates (including rates at the local bank) are a mere half of a percent, while long rates are 1.8%.

Real interest rates (the nominal rate less inflation) in Asian countries are sometimes zero or negative.

High savings and low interest rates give Asian manufacturers a source of cheap capital for expansion. This gives them a significant price advantage in international markets.

From the perspective of the manufacturing elites that run Japan (or China) this savings rate is both a source of wealth and a potential threat. Let's talk about the threat first. Elites everywhere must keep the peasants working. After all, someone must produce the goods in Japan and China. If the average Japanese saves 30% of his income each year, how long will it take for interest on his savings to replace 80% of his income, at which point he quits work?

If real interest rates are 8%, then the answer is 17 years. On the other hand, if real rates are 1.8%, then the answer is 73 years. In high-savings rate societies like Japan and China, a high interest rate policy would be a disaster, because the workforce would contract and wages would rise dramatically. Even worse, the peasants would no longer be dependent and subject to the social control of a "job."

Thus, for the Japanese and Chinese elites, high interest rates are a potential disaster.

But more important, low interest rates not only guarantee social control of the domestic population, but provide profit opportunities for the financial elites and the financial institutions they control. How? Simple!

A Japanese (or Chinese) bank can borrow from its customers at anywhere from .5% to 1.8% and then lend to the United States Government at 6%. Japanese corporations and wealthy individuals may lend their profits or savings in America, Europe, or Latin America at much higher interest rates than they can by making Japanese or Chinese savings deposits.

Asian countries such as Taiwan, Thailand, Hong Kong, Indonesia and Singapore, all have huge domestic savings rates and follow the same policy as Japan. The only thing needed to make sure their financial institutions and elites make money lending to U.S. borrowers at high interest rates is currency stability relative to the value of the dollar. So naturally, each of these countries pegged the value of its currency (more or less) to the value of the dollar.

Now pegging your currency to the value of the dollar is fine, as long as the banks and lending elites do not allow excessive lending to interest rate arbitragers (which puts downward pressure on the local currency), and as long as the products of the manufacturing elites are selling well in foreign markets. American buyers of stereos and computer parts pay in dollars, which must then be converted into Ringit, Bhat or Yuan to pay wages and purchase supplies. More dollars being exchanged for the local currency puts upward pressure on the local currency, while fewer dollars creates downward pressure.

And a slowdown in exports has precipitated the Asian currency crisis. The hedge funds began to detect the excesses, and they started selling the local Asian currencies. The local currencies fell in value.

Notice that the manufacturing elites benefit from the devaluation, because their borrowings are denominated in the low interest rate currency, and the lower currency value makes their products far more competitive in international markets. The financial elites who sold Baht, Ringit or Yuan earlier and invested in U.S. debt aren't hurt by this devaluation either. If these financial elites arbitrated by borrowing locally and lending internationally, they will profit twice, once on the high U.S. rates, and a second time because it is now cheaper to pay off the local lenders after the currency devaluation.

As you can see, it is the poor local savers, the peasants, who get clobbered. Their savings are now worth from 20% to 50% less depending on the country they live in. And because they buy bread in their own local currency, they will not notice the loss until their local prices begin to rise after the devaluation.

Thus the high savings rates of the peasants dictate a low interest rate strategy for the governing elites in Asia. These high savings rates are assets to be carefully managed.

The U.S. elites are faced with a mirror image of Asian societies. We have a 15% gross national savings rate. If we plug that rate into the retirement equation, we see that at an 8% real rate it

will take the average American peasant 24 years to save enough to replace 80% of his income and quit work. At a 4% real rate, it takes 38 years.

So the U.S. elites can allow much higher interest rates without disrupting the labor force.

The U.S. elites have created a consumerist debt-driven culture that craves imported goods. This profitable resource that U.S. elites control (ability to sell TVs and stereos into this debt dependent market) can be shared with foreigners. But the cost of capital is high for the U.S. manufacturing elites, and the cost of labor is relatively high.

Thus, there are three simple questions on the table in all these international trade disputes: 1) Who gets to sell into the American Market, and how much? 2) To what degree will the U.S. manufacturing elites be allowed to tap into the cheap capital and cheap labor of the Asian countries by borrowing in the local currency to build manufacturing plants there? and 3) to what degree will U.S. financial elites be allowed to participate in the rape of Asian peasants (alongside Asian banks) by borrowing Asian currencies at Asian interest rates and then investing the proceeds in high interest yielding dollar denominated debt?

That is what the complex technical disputes about tariffs, market access, and currency controls are really all about.

While the Fed Funds rate set by the Federal Reserve was 3% back in 1991 through 1993, U.S. investors with access to bank credit could borrow (with only 5% down) at 4% and invest the proceeds in the two year note at 6%. Now, they must borrow yen and take the currency risk. However, as long as the borrowed currency goes down, you make more than you anticipated on the arbitrage in rates. If Asian rates are low enough, you may be able to buy a derivative for a couple hundred basis points to hedge the currency risk. It cuts your profit in half, but then you don't have to spend nights watching your screen. Ahh - life's tradeoffs! Half of New York and Boston makes its living that way. It beats working for a living - and as Clark Gable said to Marilyn Monroe in that Classic movie "The Misfits" - "anything's better than wages!"

Now you should be asking at this point, "what does this have to do with gold?"

The answer is "plenty."

Without a government guarantee, or without gold reserves, a deposit at a bank is a very risky junk bond. The bank borrows from Peter at 3% and lends to Paul at 6%, making its living on the rate spread and having no money of its own. If Paul cannot repay his loan, Peter loses his deposit at the bank.

In the 19th century, no governments or central banks guaranteed deposits. So savers would not

put their money in a bank unless the bank had reserves of gold to guarantee its deposits.

Thus, having gold meant that the bank could borrow at a lower interest rate than if it did not. In other words, the bank's profit opportunity depended on its having gold. The more gold in reserve relative to deposits, the lower the interest rate the bank could pay its savers. The bank's owners would place 25 ounces of gold in the bank in exchange for its stock, and the bank would then borrow 100 oz from Peter at 3% and lend 100 oz to Paul at 6%. Thus, the yield on gold could be calculated quite easily, and depended on the amount of gold required to inspire confidence in the deposit. If 10 oz would do the trick, then the yield was a phenomenal 30%. If it took 50 oz then the yield on gold was only 6%. And that is why a bank's "reputation" was so important.

As in our example above, while deposits and loans were issued in local currencies, these currencies were all exchangeable for gold. It was the spreading of default risk over multiple loans, and the holding of gold reserves behind deposits that made the gathering of deposits at low interest rates possible. Thus, the role of gold in 19th century Europe was similar (in a way) to the role of high Asian savings rates today. It created an opportunity for financial arbitrage and made capital cheaper for local businesses.

Now in the first half of the 20th Century, advisors to governments discovered that economic growth, and thus national power, were constrained by how quickly mining companies could locate and extract more gold from the ground. If the mines could only add 2% to the gold stock each year, then deposits and loans could only grow at a 2% rate without threatening confidence in the banking system.

Governments needed faster growth so they could collect more taxes, buy more votes and fight more wars. The economists thought up the idea of Government insuring or guaranteeing bank deposits. Then, banks could get by with much smaller reserves set by government regulation. Gold would only be needed by governments to inspire confidence in the currency and maintain exchange rates.

And as long as governments agreed to expand deposits and loans at roughly the same rate, then there would be no embarrassing inter-governmental gold transfers.

For governments, the value of gold could be calculated the same old way - by determining the reduction in interest rates gold holdings inspired. But unlike the 19th century, the psychic link between gold and low interest rates began to fray.

Gradually, countries began to hold things called "dollars" as reserves behind their currencies rather than gold. The advantage of these "dollars" was that they could be invested in U.S. treasury notes and bore interest that parliaments and legislatures could measure and understand. The interest earnings made the central banks (which guaranteed the deposits of the peasants)

look like profit centers to the politicians.

Gradually, central banks became convinced that gold was not needed to inspire confidence in their currencies. It was better to have "dollars" which gradually replaced gold as the reserve currency. Besides, if you had enough "dollars," you could threaten to sell them all at once just before an election, driving up U.S. interest rates and producing a nasty recession. If you have enough dollars, you can get as much access to the credit-card enslaved American peasants as you wish, without fighting a nasty and expensive war.

Double bonus. No need for gold and no need for expensive armies.

So why would anyone (let alone some quiet 800 pound gorilla) want to buy gold?

To find the answer we must ask what is a "dollar."

A "dollar" is a computer cipher - a few electrons in someone's memory bank. So is the Yen, the Yuan, the Mark and the Frank. So are all the rest. Nothing but computer ciphers. Nothing but raw, unalloyed confidence. Nothing, in effect, but nothing!

The "dollar" is a belief system. A dollar is faith that it, and all of the other species and subspecies of computer ciphers which we value now and exchange for real things will continue to be valued in relation to those real things in a stable and predictable way - forever - Amen!

So what is the Gorilla betting on when he buys gold?

He is betting that the belief system we know as "a dollar" will crumble at some point.

The discipline of gold is lost, and the policy device for aligning confidence in modern currencies is the central bank's ability to increase interest rates. Instead of buying more gold, the central banks will raise the interest rate enough to attract funds into their currency. But the policy device for increasing confidence will deprive the elites of their profit opportunities and "unjustly" benefit the peasants.

Interest rate increases are tolerated now because the belief system holds that the interest rate increase need only be temporary until confidence is restored. What if high rates must be extended for long periods? What if nations give up on high interest rates and begin competitive currency devaluations to spur exports in the face of shrinking demand from aging populations all over the world?

What if the U.S. keeps importing millions of low I.Q immigrants and turns into (more of) a third world country which can no longer produce enough software to fund all the plastic debt

we incur for imported cars, televisions and VCRs?

What if, in 20 years, foreign holders of dollars begin to perceive a default risk on the dollar denominated debt they hold?

What if the dollar suddenly no longer is the reserve currency, and hundreds of billions of them flood back from foreign banks to America at a tiny fraction of the value they had before the flood started?

What if, as the Euro-American population ages, American consumption contracts, throwing Asian countries into nasty recessions and forcing them to sell those reserves denominated in U.S. dollars.

What if Iran sinks the Nimitz?

What if merchants refuse to exchange a loaf of bread for \$2, and demand instead \$2000?

The 800 pound gorilla is in no hurry. Nor should he be.

The belief system we know as "the dollar" will not collapse tomorrow.

However, it is clear that the 800 pound gorilla understands the uncertainty principle.

If confidence must once again be restored with gold reserves, then given the quantity of Dollars, Marks, Yen, Yuan, Ringit, etc. etc. those reserves will cost \$5000 per ounce, and not \$308. And that presupposes no increase in the units of these various "belief systems" outstanding between now and the day that the uncertainty principle raises its ugly head.

And that ladies and gentlemen, is all you need to know about economics, gorillas, gold and social control!

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

# YGGDRASIL

## Central Bank Gold Sales

Note 1:

If you believe the published demand numbers, we are all intimately familiar with the 800 pound gorilla.

For the gorilla is - women! That's right - women!

New mine production and central bank sales this year are estimated by CPM Group to equal about 100 million ounces, or about 31 billion dollars worth at current prices. Central bank sales will equal 17.5 million ounces this year.

Thus the gold market - including central bank sales - is actually relatively small. One good January of Mutual fund sales can come close to equaling gold sales for an entire year.

Investment demand accounts for only 8.7 million ounces this year. Jewelry purchases account for over 50 million ounces. Industrial (computer) uses account for the rest.

The Russian central bank is acquiring a large monetary supply of gold as everyone else is selling. They plan to acquire 64.3 million ounces, and have 14.23 million ounces right now.

Thus, Russia is a close as you will come to identifying a single 800 pound gorilla.

Total above ground supply is estimated at 130,000 tons. (A ton equals 32,272 ounces.) This supply - three quarters of which is in private hands - has a market value at current prices of about 1.31 trillion. Total U.S. debt (all sectors) now numbers 20 trillions.

Central bank gold holdings of 32,000 tons have a current market value of about 322 billions. The U.S. M-1 money stock (cash plus checkable deposits) is now 1.1 trillion. M-2 is 4 trillion.

I do not know what the world M-1 is, but it must be close to 10 trillion. Central bank gold at current prices is going to equal a much smaller fraction of World M-1 than 10%.

But as you can see, in a crisis the supply of gold is quite inelastic. If Bill Gates decided to buy \$30 billion worth in a single year, he would risk doubling the price. In reality, if central banks

suddenly decide to follow Russia's lead, it is going to take monster prices to coax the gold away from the necks of women in India, Thailand and Italy. (But in truth, as to that remaining 3/4 of the supply, we have no idea where it is. All we know is that it is not in the hands of hedge funds or momentum players ready to sell!)

Hence my guess at \$5000 an ounce in a monetary crisis.

Note 2:

Read your web site. Excellent analysis.

BTW, I don't put much credit in the sources of demand for gold ginned up by the analysts such as CPM group.

I strongly suspect that there is an economic war going on out there, and that someone is stockpiling the stuff in anticipation of a generalized currency collapse.

Can't prove it, but it just has that "feel" about it.

If I had to guess, I would pick the house of Saud. But given the size of the market, an Emir could easily do it too, but not out of petty cash.

Given the relative thinness of the gold market, a large buyer would be foolish to do anything other than identify himself as a "jewelry fabricator" and try to blend in with the crowd.

Note 3:

The gold market fascinates me because it represents the clash of wildly conflicting belief systems.

Given these conflicting belief systems, it is a market that is ripe for conspiracy theories.

My friends who are mining engineers all think (and were taught at places like the Colorado School of Mines) that holding precious metals is crazy. "There is just too much of the stuff in the ground." Prices will always go down, forever. The quicker you can sell it the better. If you can sell the stuff three years before you mine it, that is even better still!

This explains why management of the gold mining companies has sold forward at least three years of mine production.

The belief system that motivates investors generally is "momentum" or MO. There is no reason

to hold an investment unless it is going up RIGHT NOW. With the internet and faster, cheaper information at the fingertips of individuals, why would anyone buy on contrary opinion and wait? If your intellect tells you something is undervalued you take two aspirin and buy something else that is going up now! If it ain't got MO, it doesn't exist!

This explains lack of interest by ordinary investors, and the falling price trend for gold and gold stocks. After all, if the insiders are so negative on the stuff, why buy it?

But the buyer of all these forward sales?

Ah, there's the rub!

Rather than just buy on the open market, and drive up price, the buyer pays a central bank the current price to deliver physical gold right now. The central bank earns interest on the proceeds until it pays these proceeds to a mining company that has promised to deliver an equivalent number of tons years later at today's price. In the meantime, the central bank treats the piece of paper from the mine as if it were physical gold in its vaults.

The buyer apparently wants physical gold right now, and also apparently finds the paper promise from a mining company, which the buyer could procure more cheaply without the presence of a central bank in the transaction, unacceptable.

It is the classic maneuver of a purchaser and seller both fearing that their transaction will move the price, but fearing movement in opposite directions and for wildly opposing reasons. Each wishes to have his price set by market players (principally jewelry buyers) clearing much smaller volumes.

Now what does the structure of the transaction tell us about the beliefs of the buyer?

Most investors want to move the price up. If price doesn't move up (ideally, at the end of the acquisition program) how do you sell at a profit?

If you believe in the value of the dollar - or more accurately - the ability of central banks to maintain the value of currencies in general for very long periods of time, then gold has essentially zero long term investment value.

On the other hand, if you believe that our modern currencies will, given enough time, collapse, then gold is worth a large multiple of its current price. Thus we have the spectacle of a market that values gold at \$310 per ounce, when we know that it is either essentially worthless, or worth many times its current market price.

The structure of the forward sale tells us the purchaser does not expect to profit immediately and he does not expect to profit from an increase in jewelry demand. The fact that the deal results in immediate physical delivery clearly indicates that the buyer expects a generalized currency collapse or a collapse of the dollar but thinks (i) the timing of that event impossible to predict and (ii) that momentum investors simply will not have time to react.

Having gold will then allow him to issue a solid currency, or to back his existing currency, thereby leveraging his initial cheap investment by whatever multiple of gold backing the market will then accept.

It is a bearish long term bet on our modern "computer cipher" currencies.

Note 4:

The players with an obvious and intense interest in low gold prices are the central banks themselves.

Low gold prices validate their currencies.

Low gold prices validate the information content (such as it is) in their consumer price indexes.

Faith in the CPI is essential to keep savers believing that you can get a real yield on a 6% bond. Plus the CPI is used to index tax rates and to index Old Age benefits.

A low CPI increases taxes (by slowing the expansion of income brackets taxed at the lower marginal rates) while it contains the growth in the government's major liability, Social Security Old Age benefits.

Grumps like myself argue about the quality adjustments. A new Camaro that cost \$2800 in 1967 costs only \$7950 in our U.S. CPI. Never mind that a dealer will want \$21,000! The dealer obviously doesn't understand "quality improvements"!

But more fun than quality improvements are the "substitution adjustments." As the price of steak rises to the point that 20% of people switch to chicken, the weighting of steak in the CPI is reduced by 20%! Ingenious! Just wait till we all switch to soybean meal! That will sure make inflation go down!

In any event, the carping of common sense cannot withstand the market message of gold, which is depressed.

Fact is that the central banks cannot let the price of gold rise on a sustained basis, because then it will have MO! And you know how intensely attracted our baby boomers are to MO! It is one thing to allow stock prices to surge in a parabolic bubble, but it is quite another to allow gold to do this. Rising gold would trigger an exodus out of all the fake currencies, putting downward pressure on their prices while casting suspicion on the CPI. Such behavior by the peasants would badly damage their governments!

Beginning in 1988, the central banks began selling. At first they did it quietly. Now they are trying to jawbone the price down.

In order for the threat of sales to be credible, you must have gold to sell. The central banks have 12% less now than they did 9 years ago.

Over the last 4 years it has taken an accelerating amount of sales to keep the price down. The central banks can keep this up for quite a few years, but as soon as the market notices that the absolute size of the sales is declining (as it must to maintain the threat), the market is likely to test the resolve of the central banks on the upside.

Gold is nothing more than a competing currency.

Gold sales allow central banks to gun their money supplies while maintaining confidence and rate arbitrage opportunities for their financial elites.

Are Arabs happy to exchange cheap oil for cheap gold? Sure! At the margins they are! But well over 90% of their oil revenues are spent on goods and services denominated in currencies. Only a tiny fraction of what is left is spent on cheap gold.

However, (the anonymous poster) is right to point out that the resource rich countries (Arabia and Russia) do not have any real interest in defending the belief systems we call "currencies." Arabia and Russia are concerned only that there be a medium of exchange that allows the oil consuming nations to buy. It is the consuming nations that have an intense interest in defending currency values and in selling gold to do it.

The important thing to recognize is that gold sales are significant primarily for their impact on "market participants" (keeping us peasants in line!) These sales have very little impact on the relative values of currencies vis-a-vis one another.

In fact, public gold sales allow governments to maintain confidence while parting with much less gold than would have been required under the old gold standard (involving transfers between governments). The longer governments depress the price of gold, the more the imbalances will accumulate. Sooner or later, gold buyers will attack the currencies.

But in the meantime, gold is a very unattractive long term investment unless you are writing options on it.

The producers of gold do not believe in it and don't know how to defend its price. In this environment, the threat of central bank sales has allowed the commodity funds to push the price down at will with no resistance from investors. They are in the process of pushing it down to levels that trigger mine closures, curtail exploration and bankrupt weaker mines.

Bank selling creates volatility and opportunity for the futures traders.

And in the meantime, we wait.

Ygg-

---

[Back to New Additions Page](#)


(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.




## NEW ADDITIONS

This is Yggdrasil's New Additions series. Articles will be moved from this section to other appropriate categories after approximately two months.

### Nationalist Comments on the News - Updated Near Daily: Nationalist Comments on the News

Breakthrough 11. Jewish Involvement in Shaping American Immigration Policy, by Kevin MacDonald: PDF file (196k) 

White Awakening 47. Christianity - A Modest Defense 

White Awakening 49. White Map of the U.S. 

ADL "Jail for Americans" Ad: 

White Awakening 53. President Phone Sex 

White Awakening 54. Speech to the Tuesday Dinner Club - Washington D.C. 

---

**BACK**

(c) 1997-1998 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



## Nationalist Comments on the News

---

12/24/02

A Christmas present in the form of latest opus, [The New Feudalism](#)

Speaking of Christmas, I thought I should assemble my writings on Christianity in one spot, for organized holiday access.

[The Grinch](#)

[Christ the Tiger!](#)

[Christianity - A Modest Defense](#)

[Memoirs of Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds](#)

[The Posen Speech](#)

There is an incredibly important theoretical piece appearing in the Atlantic Monthly concerning computer modeling of artificial societies, an emerging science which illustrates that complex and unintended society wide consequences are driven by very simple and common-sense sets of preferences or rules of populations within those societies.

[The Atlantic Monthly.](#)

You will be pleased to learn that if each person wishes to have only two out of six of his nearest neighbors be of the same race, then neighborhoods will quickly segregate. You will also be interested in the work that has been done modeling genocides.

03/04/02



My it has been a long time! In atonement, I offer my latest - [The Domestic End Game](#).

09/14/01

More on the Trade Center attack - [The End Game](#).

09/13/01

### Additional Observations

I have spent some time watching the TV coverage of the attack on the World Trade Center and have been shocked at how blatantly certain aspects of that coverage have been managed.

Dan Rather and CBS staged a lengthy segment interviewing families of missing Cantor Fitzgerald employees. One of my e-mail correspondents worked at Cantor Fitzgerald and told me in no uncertain terms that it is an inner party stronghold. According to him, Fitzgerald never existed and was made a part of the name years ago to give the firm a multicultural aura.

Of about a dozen families with missing relatives shown by CBS, not a single one was inner party. Surprising also were the near uniform and heavy handed references in the interviews to the fact that the particular victims were wearing crucifixes. Knowing how intensely the inner party TV producers normally censor references to crucifixes, I was jerked by the short hairs from my media induced stupor to suddenly realize that not a single inner party victim had been mentioned or portrayed on any network, including Fox during the entire two days.

It is as if the inner party simply did not exist and suffered no casualties. The clear picture we are getting from the media is that this is an attack on Italian and Irish American Christians (there being no wasps to speak of in the New York area). Aside from the television news reporters themselves, who are conspicuously inner party, we are shown endless scenes of goy firefighters and police combating the effects of this attack, being elevated as heroes for doing that which is powerfully in the interests of an inner party which the media barons would have us believe is simply not a part of this story.

The media coverage is powerful instruction to the descendants of European Christendom as to the proper feelings that they should have towards this incident, suggesting by absence of any images of the true "diversity" of the target mix, that it is Italian and Irish Americans who were the intended victims.

Doubtless, one of the reasons the attackers selected the Trade center towers was to communicate the message to us in the outer party that hanging around in close proximity to

large concentrations of inner party is dangerous.

Not only were there large concentrations of inner party in those towers, but I know for a fact that a relatively large number of inner party wire pullers responsible for government policy choices - real and meaningful targets for those concerned about oppression of Palestinians and Arabs (as well as culture destruction in the United States) - had business addresses in those towers.

All of this, of course, has been completely concealed by the media, who want to thwart one of the relatively obvious messages intended to be conveyed by the attackers.

As I have watched the media coverage unfold, I have been staggered by the relentless, clearly premeditated and absolutely uniform content selection by all networks. I have also reached the conclusion that the power of the inner party television news producers over the attitudes and emotions of our people is near total - and in any event vastly in excess of any power which Goebbels may have projected over his people, and orders of magnitude greater than that exercised by the rather clumsy state organs of propaganda in the old Soviet Union.

Any country that has been watching this dazzling propaganda display should note well the consequence of allowing American media into their countries. From the moment our media are allowed in, the government and the people immediately lose control of their own culture, their own ethics, their morals, and the outcomes of any democratic processes by which they may govern themselves. The collective social decision about the behaviors and moral values that will best perpetuate their kind over generations is transferred from inherently democratic local associations such as schools, workplaces and houses of worship, to the hands of invisible aliens in distant lands who control the magic boxes in their living rooms - invisible aliens with absolutely no accountability for the consequences of the content that they generate.

For those of us who have broken outside of the Matrix of media mind control, the lesson is simple. We must extend understanding and compassion to our fellow descendants of European Christendom who have not yet broken free of the Matrix. Our people are in thrall to a propaganda machine that is far more totalitarian, far more relentless, and far more powerful than even I had imagined.

The ignorance of our people is not their fault, and their education by us must be undertaken delicately, methodically and with sensitivity to feelings they have understandably absorbed from the television producers.

We must resolve to be there for our fellows - battallions of mental rescue workers - ready when each tragic consequence of those attitudes befalls - to show them how those attitudes have brought them misery and exactly who has been responsible.

---

Be sure to read the latest - [Harvard Comes Knocking Again](#).

I have finally updated the [Culture Wars Page](#) to include a list of partially completed and overdue movie reviews, as well as the "Seven Pillars" booklist, consisting of the seven WN classics that everyone should possess, as well as associated major works which relate to the Pillar under which they have been placed. I expect to get scads of email about these choices, so feel free to have at it.

-----

05/06/01

I never dreamed that circumstances would force me to review a TV show, but I must for good cause. Here a review of [The Gilmore Girls](#).

-----

05/03/01

Interesting short piece in the April 2, issue of National Review on immigration by Ramesh Ponnuru. He argues that the anti-immigration faction which bases its objection on racial displacement is wrong politically as well as morally.

Rather, Ponnuru supports immigration restriction based on culture - the idea that we need a slow-down in immigration to allow time for the new arrivals already here to "assimilate".

Assimilate to what, exactly??

I defy anyone to identify and clearly define an American culture.

The NR piece is another one of those neocon articles which argues that our national identity is based on culture, but cannot bring itself to describe precisely what that culture might be or why, exactly, it might be worth preserving.

As Paul Weyrich has bravely pointed out, American culture has been completely destroyed. A vapid, contentless tolerance of all things good and evil hardly qualifies as a culture. I search in vain for any other unifying beliefs, values or rituals that are shared by all in this "nation".

We had a watered down American culture back in the 1950s when I was a little boy, but that culture died when Euro-America collectively decided that propagating its own genes into the future simply wasn't worth the individual effort and sacrifice, as that effort interfered too much with the business of getting and spending in our consumer society. Having decided to abandon its own future genetic survival at the personal level, it made no sense whatever to go through the personal or collective effort of defending those aspects of religion, ethical rules, and the arts that served the purpose of keeping our collective cradle full.

At bottom, our "culture" discarded all rules, rituals and traditions except those essential to keeping the cash register humming - hence the universal tolerance of everything and everybody.

Rather, we decided to restrict our own birthrate and then broadly but quietly approved Roe v Wade as a device for monkeying with everyone else's birthrates.

Passing one's genes on to the next generation is an aggressive and essential act in the drama of survival. There are no second place winners.

The advantage of a tribe or genuine nation is that a sense of relatedness - rooted in biology but expressed in religious belief, laws, and the arts - strongly favors you in your quest to reproduce yourself. You know you are in an alien land when the forces of the popular culture reward reproductive failure or otherwise make the reproductive task more difficult for you.

America abandoned its only remaining pretense to nationhood with the advent of Roe v Wade.

Indeed the most accurate symbol of our American "culture" is President Clinton firing all those blank rounds in the the Oval Office. Our "culture" urges us all to masturbate ourselves into oblivion, with Clinton leading the march and the typical soccer mom parading along behind smiling her broad approval. Thus, according to the neocons, the only serious immigration issue is how quickly we can corrupt the new arrivals into living the same lie, which, of course, is why Ponnuru knows better than to attempt do describe precisely what our "culture" might be.

The message to nationalists should be crystal clear. You must find a woman you love and start firing live and meaningful rounds. Help her fill the collective cradle of our small and scattered band! Forgo the entertainments of our popular culture in pursuit of a life-long commitment to that task!

Far more productive in the long run than allowing your frustrations to provoke you into throwing yourself in front of the tank treads of the universalist empire.

Be a survivor!

Ygg-

---

04/29/01

Ok, so much for short pieces. Be sure to see my latest, [Harvard Comes Knocking](#)

I have about 6 movie reviews in various stages of completion. I am so far behind it is not even funny. However, after several weeks of delay, I have added some particularly perceptive comments from a correspondent to the review of [Children of Heaven](#) which you should find quite interesting.

---

BACK

Design © 2000 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Christianity - A Modest Defense

I can recall so clearly those Sundays in my youth growing up in Cincinnati, Ohio in the 1950s. I attended a large Presbyterian church. I was one of the few who asked questions in Sunday School. And most of my questions were about the book of Matthew.

I remember one Sunday school teacher in particular. He was a lawyer, and a professor at the University of Cincinnati Law school. At the tender age of 12 I had just read Matthew 23, the famous condemnation by Christ of Scribes and Pharisees. So I asked this teacher, "what is a Pharisee?"

"I dunno."

He did not even care enough to look it up and give me an answer in the following week! Ironic - after all, they were (among other things too numerous to mention here) the first lawyers! The same happened with other Sunday school teachers - I can recall reading Mark Ch. 7, the exchange in which the Pharisees catch Christ's followers eating bread with unwashed hands contrary to the mosaic law of Exodus, Leviticus and Deuteronomy:

"7:5 Then the Pharisees and scribes asked him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders, but eat bread with unwashen hands? 7:6 He answered and said unto them, Well hath Esaias prophesied of you hypocrites, as it is written, This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me.' 7:7 Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.' \* \* \*

7:14 And when he had called all the people unto him, he said unto them, Hearken unto me every one of you, and understand: 7:15 There is nothing from without a man, that entering into him can defile him: but the things which come out of him, those are they that defile the man."

Indeed, in these passages Christ clearly repudiates parts of the old testament - at a minimum, the dietary laws - and perhaps much else. He quotes Isaiah for the purpose of identifying much of this Mosaic law as "the commandments of men."

So I asked the Sunday school teacher what else in the Old testament might Christ have repudiated. How about God's supposed injunctions to genocide in Deuteronomy Ch. 7 ? How about the ugly genocidal passages in Numbers Ch. 31? Did God really command Moses and his

people to do these things, or were these passages in Numbers, like the dietary laws of Leviticus 11, merely the commandments of men, and not of God?

Gee I dunno, ask the pastor!

It was clear to me that the pastor would flee from the prospect of having to explain Christ's repudiation of parts of the Old Testament. Pastors do not like complexity. It stirs doubts in parishioners minds. Rather, the pastor had this ugly tendency to quote short passages out of context to support some simple moral point when the whole seemed to me a much more complex tapestry.

Indeed I recall one Sunday in which our confirmation class was asked to go to the main sanctuary where a famous Dean of a Presbyterian theological seminary would be delivering the sermon. He talked about the passage that has always troubled Christians. In the moment of death on the cross, Christ says, "God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Well, it turns out that the Aramaic word that Christ used does not necessarily translate to "God the Father" but rather "Father of Israel" or more colloquially "Nation of Israel."

But it was obvious to this 12 year old that if Christ said "Nation of Israel, why hast thou forsaken me?" not only did the passage suddenly make sense from the perspective of the events immediately preceding the crucifixion (the preferred construction), but it had explosive theological implications as well. Christ appears to be un-choosing the Jews in the theological sense - altering God's covenant with Moses, and, perhaps, demolishing those disturbing anti-gentile passages in Exodus about slavery for gentiles, and the requirement to charge them interest on loans.

I was stunned. This man had removed many of my doubts and stubborn reservations. After all, I was not about to believe a faith that left me a second-class citizen, much less one that exposed me to divinely ordained genocidal attacks!

But outside the church doors after the sermon, it became clear that the Dean's message was utterly lost on the rest of the congregation. They did not understand or like it. Too complicated.

It was apparent to this 12 year-old, back in the 1950s, that Christianity was in trouble. None of the elders in my Presbyterian church cared enough to understand what Christ was really talking about. The pastor preferred the easy task of training sheep, and was perfectly content to forfeit the souls of the intellectually stronger wolves.

As fate would have it, our confirmation class used to sit in a circle, and knowing in advance that there would be dull spots, I strategically placed myself opposite little Suzy, so when the energy slipped out of the session I could ponder the beauty of her legs, and of life in general. The time was well spent!

Indeed, from the perspective of a White-nationalist, the question is: - to what degree might Christianity slow down the re-emergence of race consciousness of the White middle-class? The answer has two components. The first is a function of the numbers. According to the statistical department of National Review Magazine (Mar. 10, 1997 p 62),

"- Presbyterians, Methodists, and Episcopalians lose nearly half their young people for good.... 48 per cent of Presbyterian youth drop out of churchgoing altogether. In 1985 a third of the nation's Methodist churches had performed no baptisms."

"- The net figures: 30 per cent of Americans are totally secular in outlook, 29 per cent are barely or nominally religious, 22 per cent are modestly religious, 19 per cent (about 36 million people) regularly practice their religion."

Ralph Reed, the Executive Director of the Christian Coalition, published a seminal apologia in the Wall Street Journal on March 16, 1993 page A22 with the following statistics.

"According to a survey by Stanley Rothman and Robert Lichter, 86% of U.S. media leaders attend church infrequently or not at all. By contrast a survey conducted last month by the Marketing Research Institute found that 48% of Americans attend church twice or more a month. More than 100 million Americans attend church every month and approximately 30 million attend church four times a month or more. Yet few of our nation's journalists, professors and intellectuals can be found in the pews on any given Sunday."

While Reed's statistics sound a bit better on first reading, a closer examination reveals that the two sets of numbers are broadly consistent (except of course the 48% figure which would yield more Americans [125 million] attending twice or more per month, than the 100 million who attend only every month). For purposes of this discussion, I assume that church attendance patterns are similar among Blacks, Hispanics, and Whites. Thus, Both sources place approximately 80% of our White population in the secular, nominally religious, or modestly religious category. It is only among the devout 20% that we might expect religiously articulated moral codes to override perceptions of political self-interest.

These numbers confirm what we already should know from political outcomes we witness in the real world. If 60% of Americans were deeply religious, we would not have abortion on demand, condom distribution in the schools, and birth control without parental consent. It seems clear to me that the balance of power is held by the 60% that is completely secular or nominally religious. They will respond to perceptions of self-interest, as will most of the 22 percent share that is "modestly" religious. Based on the numbers, it is hard to argue that Christianity will significantly delay acceptance of the White racial consciousness.



The second component of the answer to the question whether Christianity will slow down the re-emergence of White racial awareness is the nature of the threat and White perceptions of it. White nationalists have a simple message for their fellow Whites:

Can trusting other races to treat us fairly as we slip into minority status be a smart strategy for individual Whites?

The typical White professional believes that it is only the bottom 20% of Whites who are hurt by "diversity" efforts, affirmative action and quotas. They think that they and their children will never be impacted. They fail to grasp that diversity is about power and control. Power does not flow from entry level jobs. The racial extortion coalition that firmly controls our media and national government is quite comfortable with the idea of Whites serving as infantry riflemen, police, trash haulers, security guards, prostitutes and fashion models. It is the sight of White males in top positions in the Fortune 500 which enrages them. A quick reading of Ellis Cose's "The Rage of a Privileged Class" will confirm it.

We have models of our future in towns and counties along the Texas border in which Whites comprise 30 to 40% of the population but hold none of the government jobs. None! The same is true of the State of Hawaii (33% White), and the District of Columbia (29% White). Both have only token numbers of Whites in their government bureaucracies. Our upper-middle class needs to understand that no matter which race is dominant, Mexicans along the Texas border, Blacks in the District, and Asians in Hawaii (Hawaii is only 2% Black and 7% Hispanic) the result is the same. Exclusion of Whites from jobs and positions of power.

At Harvard, 82% of the student body consists of racial minorities plus one White ethnic group (2% of our population) that consistently votes 80% Democratic and staffs the organizations of the other groups in the racial extortion lobby. 72% of the U.S. population gets only 18% of the seats. White gentiles are under-represented at Harvard by a factor of four times relative to their share of the population. In contrast, Blacks, who comprise 12% of the population, have 8% of the seats. We are under represented 2.66 times more severely than blacks.

Whatever Harvard's vision of "diversity" might be, it surely is not a vision that attempts representation in proportion to population. There is a clear loser here, and it is us. Based on the distribution of IQs and test scores among these competing populations, we would predict that our 72% of the population would be entitled to 55% to 60% of the places at Harvard, not 18%. Indeed, the picture improves only slightly when we add together the top 15 National Universities as ranked by U.S. News. Our 72% group gets only 38% of the seats. We are represented at only half our share of the population.

The middle class fails to grasp the essence of the problem. All the admissions departments need do to ensure the under- representation of White gentiles at the top of our educational hierarchy is to emphasize grades over test scores. Test scores are a much better predictor of success in later

life, but grades vary in meaning from school to school, and are a wondrously "flexible" tool in the hands of social engineers. Admissions officers can play all sorts of games with grades while purporting to be race-neutral.

The precise game they are playing shows clearly in the numbers.

Preferences for blacks and hispanics are a mere sidebar to the main story, needed only for keeping peace among the partners in the racial extortion coalition. And those racial preferences would not be needed at all but for the fact that our ghetto schools have been integrated with 20% to 30% White students who cluster at the top of their classes. Re-segregate, and the need for preferences based on race will go away.

Old myths die hard. The top three ethnic/racial groups in America in income and education are Jews, Japanese and Chinese, in that order. With the next census, Indians and Pakistanis will be added. The facts of displacement at the top of the education and income spectrum are crystal clear. The problem is that the typical middle-class White sees none of this. And the White elites are especially unaware that they are the principal target. But I do not believe this failure of vision is the fault of Christianity.

Rather, Europe has been so overwhelmingly powerful and prosperous, relative to the rest of the World, for so many years that displacement is unthinkable to most Whites. They simply cannot imagine it. They will absorb the message only slowly, as actual experience contradicts the propaganda that surrounds them.

In truth, the regime of force and fraud that we live under is, over the long term, wildly unstable.

But I suspect that the real reason why the "Christian question" is so disturbing to White nationalists is that most of us feel badly about the Churches' efforts to compound the threat to our earthly interests. We are angered by our feelings of ambivalence toward a religion that has stood at our roots and nourished our culture for 1700 years.

We feel like Charles Martel, (the Eighth Century King of the Franks famed for expulsion of the Africans from Southern France) who upon hearing the crucifixion story shouted "If only I had been there with my sword!"

Amen, brother Charles!

It is hard to accept that the Church of Charles Martel, and his legendary followers, Roland and, a century later, El Cid Campeador, has been reduced to a caricature fit only for inclusion in Conan O'Brien's late night "wussy wagon," or worse - the rituals of mass suicide acted out upon Christianity's fringes.

Reforming institutional Christianity seems like one more burden thrust on the small and beleaguered band that sees the danger clearly. But the flip side to that coin is opportunity. A single medium size church with 600 families will have an annual budget of from \$400,000 to \$600,000 per year. That is more than any White racist or White nationalist organization anywhere now raises. Truth, a little bit of courage, and a little bit of just one of those budgets could go a long way. I am convinced that the words of Christ are no barrier. The bible verse most frequently cited as arguing for integration and amalgamation is the parable of the good Samaritan. Now the typical Christian minister or priest will tell you that the parable of the good Samaritan begins with Luke 10:29. But of course, you cannot understand the story unless you recognize its beginnings in Luke 10:25.

"10:25 And, behold, a certain lawyer stood up, and tempted him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?"

The interrogator is trying to trick Christ into saying something that will justify killing him. That is a characteristic of much of Christ's life. Approximately half of his teachings are responses to questions posed by his enemies who want an excuse to kill him. The parable continues:

"10:26 He said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou?"

10:27 And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself."

Now the word "neighbour" is critically important. It is used throughout the Old Testament to draw that all-important line between the code of amity applying to one's own tribe or race, and the code of enmity that applies to "strangers" or "sojourners" (King James) or "aliens" in the newer versions. In the old testament "neighbour" is used dozens of times and it almost always means "fellow Jew." Indeed, Christ uses a narrower term "brother" in his elaboration upon the commandment "thou shalt not kill" in his famous "Sermon on the Mount" (Matthew 5:22) restricting its moral reach in a manner consistent with the dual code that was so well understood at the time, and which was part of the law of Moses.

Christ continues the parable of the good Samaritan:

"10:28 And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right: this do, and thou shalt live.

10:29 But he, willing to justify himself, said unto Jesus, And who is my neighbour?"

Thus, the precise question posed to Jesus by the lawyer is, "How do you define the group which I should love as myself? In other words, who are your tribesmen or "who is a Jew"? It is an

anthropological question. Jesus responds with an anthropological answer:

"10:30 And Jesus answering said, A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves, which stripped him of his raiment, and wounded him, and departed, leaving him half dead. 10:31 And by chance there came down a certain priest that way: and when he saw him, he passed by on the other side. 10:32 And likewise a Levite, when he was at the place, came and looked on him, and passed by on the other side. 10:33 But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was: and when he saw him, he had compassion on him, 10:34 And went to him, and bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine, and set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn, and took care of him. 10:35 And on the morrow when he departed, he took out two pence, and gave them to the host, and said unto him, Take care of him; and whatsoever thou spendest more, when I come again, I will repay thee. 10:36 Which now of these three, thinkest thou, was neighbour unto him that fell among the thieves? 10:37 And he said, He that shewed mercy on him. Then said Jesus unto him, Go, and do thou likewise."

To understand Christ's anthropological answer, you have to understand who the players are. The priest who ignored the injured man was a Jew and comes from the occupational class that wishes to kill Jesus to preserve its power. The Levite is from one of the 12 tribes of Israel that happens to be a tribal enemy of Christ and his followers. Of the three, the Samaritan is the only gentile, and is the only one who has compassion on the injured man. Indeed, the passage makes no sense unless you understand the racial and tribal differences.

Jesus is saying that race is a matter of psychology. If a "stranger" or "sojourner" displays the code of amity toward you, then repay him in kind. Indeed, Christ's command to the lawyer "go, and do thou likewise" is a command to show mercy to the lawyer's fellow Jews, Christ and his followers, and to stop trying to kill them. On its most basic literal level, Christ is pleading for a restoration of racial solidarity.

It is the same viewpoint expressed in Jean Raspail's famous novel "Camp of the Saints." One of the final seven defenders of Western Civilization on that hilltop in France had a black skin, and hailed from India, but was in every psychological sense a Westerner. In a word, he is "White." The final defenders of the West accept him as one of their own.

Christ's answer in "the parable of the good Samaritan" is the same. It is a broadly "nationalist" answer. It is also indistinguishable from the answer I gave in Yggdrasil's Lesson 6 and the "What is White Nationalism?" FAQ (both available at <http://www.ddc.net/ygg/>) to the question "what is a race?" and "who is White?" I prefer the functional definition based on the tendency of groups to band together and compete against one another. Membership depends on psychology, and the combatants know perfectly well which side they are on. While physical features will predict 99% of the cases, ultimately it is the desire to band together and to defend the group's interests that determines membership.

But more important, the functional definition allows us to identify our enemies more accurately by allowing us to recognize what Sir Arthur Keith (the British anthropologist) called "race forming behaviors," - that is, divisive sub-groupings within a biological race that set themselves apart and form new groups based upon (among other things) displays of moral superiority and higher class status that take the form of sacrificing, opposing or betraying the interests of their larger racial or national grouping. The Levites did exactly this in defining Christ and his followers as a tribal enemy. Modern liberals do the same.

Note what Christ does not say. He does not say that race and tribe do not matter. Nor does he say "race does not exist." He does not say all men the world over are "neighbors" without distinction. He does not say that you must turn the other cheek even if aliens are invading and intend to displace or kill you. The good Samaritan story does not support any of the modern secular moral nostrums that command integration, amalgamation, mass surrender or any other disappearance of race, nation or tribe. The modern interpretations of these ancient words are clearly "laws written by men".

It is clear to me that the Christian churches can be reformed. There is no reason why parishioners must tolerate clergymen who actively limit the range of our concerns to "saving souls" for the nether world when we are under attack in this world. They can help us repel that attack at the same time. Most readers of this newsgroup understand that the institution of slavery may be an abomination. But we now have our Bibles on CD Rom. We can find every reference to "slave" in that Bible in 20 minutes. Modern technology will keep the Church honest. Whatever else may be true of slavery, it is not possible to argue sensibly that slavery is condemned by the Bible. It isn't.

Similarly, it is now impossible to conceal from the typical parishioner the aggressive attitudes of Christ towards his tormentors, and the obvious dual code he carried with him and repeatedly displayed in his unvarying and pre-judged reactions toward pharisees and Levites. It is impossible to keep parishioners from assembling Oxford English Dictionary style analyses of every use of the term "neighbour" or "brother." It is impossible to keep the curious young 12 year-old in confirmation class from focusing on the incredible cynicism with which Christ himself regarded the clergymen (scribes, pharisees, hypocrites, vipers) of his own time. In short, modern technology makes it much tougher for clergymen to lie about what the Bible means and get away with it.

If we may return to Ralph Reed's apologia, he makes the point that:

"Part of the answer lies in the church's abdication of its responsibility to the broader culture. After the Scopes trial of 1925, people of faith withdrew to their churches, creating a cultural ghetto of their own making. Their recent re-entry into civic life after decades of neglect has been greeted with fear."

The modern Christian church craves social respectability above all else. It will bend with the winds, as it has for the past two centuries. The church is a follower, the least dangerous estate.

The major problem confronting the movement favoring White racial awareness is the White triumphalist message that many racially conscious Whites seem to prefer. By "White triumphalism", I mean messages about how wonderful our culture is, how powerful it is, and the marvels of our science and technology. The problems are two-fold:

First, White triumphalism is the public image that allows liberals to caricature White racial awareness as mean-spirited and selfish. After all, if White civilization is so powerful and successful, how can you justify restricting third world access to it? Opposing affirmative action and immigration looks like denying entry level jobs to poor people who just want a chance to contribute and succeed. White triumphalism yields the moral high-ground.

Second, if White culture and civilization is indeed so wonderful and powerful, then why not fight among ourselves over who should control it? After all, there is plenty of wealth and power to go around, and weakening Western culture and dissipating a little of that power is nowhere near as important as the question of which classes of Whites shall control it! Indeed, White triumphalism is the "sine qua non" of liberalism - the image that makes White elites comfortable about their race-forming behaviors - those intense efforts to set themselves apart from and above their fellow Whites.

In truth, Western culture today means McDonalds and Coke, not Bach or Beethoven!

The White culture we export is straight from the sewers of Hollywood. We are not wealthy. Since the 1980's the ratio of total debt to GDP has risen from about 1.4 times to 2.6 times. We are a society that consumes more than we produce. Each year an additional 3% of our GDP is borrowed. The U.S. may have a potent military, but it marches strictly to the tune of alien foreign powers. Israel first, and a couple of newcomers. Japan holds over a trillion dollars of federal debt. They pay tens of millions of dollars each year to consultants and lobbyists in Washington to make sure that their trade surpluses with us are allowed to continue and that they can continue to buy those bonds. If we do anything to displease them, they will sell those bonds, drive interest rates up 400 basis points, and produce a nasty recession. Private institutions in the U.S. that have real levers of power are acquisition targets of Japan. Sony has already bought Columbia Pictures. More acquisitions will follow, as they learn the business.

Liberal democracy has left us open to foreign domination. Buying our politicians is much cheaper and much safer than starting a war to attain similar objectives. Recently, China has been playing the same game, generating huge trade surpluses, buying treasury bonds, and buying our White House in the last election. They have discovered how easy it is to get power over us. The typical White baby boomer loves the cheap foreign goods that generate these trade surpluses.

The sad truth is that Whites in the United States and Europe have nothing to wax triumphal about. Our civilization is a debt- addicted cesspool in which Whites are irresistably drawn to modern- day glass beads - BMWs and Guess Jeans - the bright shiny objects that trap the primitive mind! Overpriced baubles have us completely in thrall. We have handed our future over to our creditors. It is the kind of behavior you would expect from primitive slaves.

The economic philosopy of modern Whites is neither capitalism nor free enterprise, but rather ponzi schemes, multi-level marketing, "Dare to be Great," and "something for nothing". It is only when the White elites begin to perceive this pattern as a threat to their own and their children's interests that racial consciousness will re-emerge. The Christian church will remain a passive observer from the sidelines, for the truth is that Christianity is in full retreat along with the White race. Absent reform, it will wait until the dust settles and then slip comfortably into its modern role of providing moral justification for the victor.

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

## **Memoirs of Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds**

April 4, 2002

Before I begin this review of "Extraordinary Popular Delusions" I should offer a few introductory remarks about the Seven Pillars.

The Seven Pillars listed here, and those books listed under each pillar, form a perfect circle. In reviewing those books, I will attempt to put forward a unified theory of Euro-American nationalism.

In addition, these reviews should provide you with a framework for forecasting the future, within broad limits.

I should note that a few of the pillars have significant flaws. For example, the first three chapters of "The Collapse of Complex Societies" by Joseph Tainter set forth his critique of alternate theories of societal collapse. These chapters set a new low in academic pettiness and arrogance. They are not worthy of any book. But then suddenly in chapter 4 the waters part and the heavens open up upon a transcendently brilliant analysis.

In addition, *The Dispossessed Majority*, the first explicit Euro-American nationalist work, contains a disturbing residue of nostalgia for a Northern European nationalism. I suspect that the condescending treatment of our Eastern and Southern European brothers was intended as a political expedient to induce the northern Europeans of the author's acquaintance to accept the reality of a pan-European nationalism. However, once past that irritant, the book is an epic breakthrough which marks the rejection of imperialism and "white triumphalism," - setting forth the foundations of modern Euro-American nationalism by cataloging our vulnerability to displacement.

Surprisingly, I was unable to find any coherent and helpful works in English translation from the Third Reich explaining how National Socialism might save us. Most of the major works of that period, including Rosenberg's "Myth of the Twentieth Century" and Hitler's "Mein Kampf" are dreadful tomes, which fail to recognize our basic predicament. The best explanation I can



find of National Socialism is Lincoln Rockwell's "White Power." Once past the humiliating title, you will find an excellent book with a superb and simple explanation of the theory behind National Socialism.

Finally, I should also mention what I consider to be a significant flaw in Sir Arthur Keith's masterpiece, *Ethics and Evolution*, in which he narrows Christianity to Matthew 5 (the Sermon on the Mount) and simply ignores the rest. It is an understandable flaw, given that empire builders since the Emperor Constantine have seen this marvelous catalogue of the "code of amity" as useful in amalgamating newly conquered tribes and nations and fusing their identity into a broader imperial "nation." The Church also saw this modern catalogue useful for the purpose of vaulting tribal and national boundaries and building an ecclesiastical empire in which the entire planet would submit to Rome. Thus, Christianity has been corrupted by Western elites for 1600 years and Sir Arthur merely accepted the modern practitioners interpretation without protest.

In our modern multi-cultural societies, this universalized image of the brotherhood of man has filtered down into the lower ranks, as individual clergymen translate the Sermon on the Mount to mandate a standardless tolerance of all things - turning ones cheek to all manner of vice and overt attacks - a tolerance that is useful, so the modern clergy believe, for keeping the pews full on Sundays without regard to race, creed, national origin or sexual orientation.

So I pardon Sir Arthur for accepting the practice of Christianity as he found it, rather than trying to instruct the world on its true meaning. Nevertheless, a short paragraph noting that Christianity reinforced genetic isolation and conferred practical survival advantages for the first three centuries of its existence - and ceased to do so once it fell into the hands of empire builders - would have been a vast improvement.

After much reflection I decided that the most important book for understanding our present predicament and our future course of action must explain our own central tendency and weakness - the quality that has led to our current precarious position. And indeed Charles Mackay's masterpiece *"Memoirs of Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds"* written in 1841 explains that flaw or weakness - our propensity to delude ourselves in ways that are wildly contrary to our own self interest, both individually and collectively - with incomparable wit and style.

No enemy could have brought the descendants of European Christendom to our current pass.

Our own delusions are responsible. We have done it to ourselves.

We have a long history of doing it, as Charles Mackay demonstrates.

The book is popular today because of its brilliant and revealing descriptions of our "crowd behavior" during the investment manias such as the Tulip Mania (1635), John Law's Mississippi scheme (1720), and the South Sea Bubble (1721). Mackay's retelling of these classic investment manias in the first three chapters of the book would be valuable even if you stopped at that point.

But for Euro-American Nationalists, the book has overpowering importance and explanatory value. You should not stop with the investment manias, because there are much more serious manias which regularly grip us.

The most important chapters are those in which Mackay retells the history of the Crusades (1096 to 1291), and I should note that the dates of these major self-destructive manias will become important when I review Robert Prechter's "At the Crest of the Tidal Wave").

Apparently at the end of the 11th Century, a mere three centuries after expelling the Moors from Southern France, Europe was so prosperous that the Nobles felt they could undertake a conquest of the birthplace of Christ.

The crusades illustrate a fundamental racial characteristic of our people. We fight wars not for our own collective survival and not to further our own interests, but rather to vindicate some theoretical abstraction - in the case of the crusades it was to conquer the holy lands in the name of Christianity.

Now if one were to stop and consider whether the armed conquest of Palestine was the most effective and efficient means of spreading Christianity, then the answer was certainly "no". Missionary work is far less likely to harden hearts than armed invasion.

Palestine was an impoverished land. Invasion could not secure much profitable trade, nor could it afford Europe a source of plunder or tribute. The inhabitants of Palestine presented no threat to the people of Europe. Conquest of Palestine could do nothing to enrich the European participants, nor could such conquest secure any survival advantage upon their European peoples.

Indeed, one searches in vain for any words of Christ that would vindicate such an adventure. Nowhere can I find him instructing his disciples to invade other nations to attack and kill potential converts. Rather, in Mackay's account, it seems much more of a gesture intended to allow the European nobles to prove their own religiosity and heroism to themselves.

From a genetic and mathematical standpoint, it makes sense for a man to sacrifice his own life to save 3 brothers or 7 cousins. And indeed all of humanity, being social animals, seem pre-programmed to sacrifice themselves in just such a way, but without any precise or

individualized calculus.

The conquest of Palestine by European crusaders violates nature's basic law, as it could confer no survival advantage upon the European peoples, nor could it increase the probability that the genes of the participants themselves might appear in future generations. Indeed the ferocity of their commitment to the cause was inversely proportional to the potential benefit.

Thus, the crusading impulse appears primarily as a very expensive and wasteful (from a standpoint of individual genetic success) ornament of social status - a proof of right thinking ideals to the society which surrounded the bearer of those ideals.

In fact, the only sacrifice that Christ demands of his followers is faith. But faith is not perceptible socially except by outward display. And for warriors meaning to impress other warriors within a warrior elite, the only display likely to matter is a military display with all of its attendant risks.

Social science teaches us to suspect that noblemen would not engage in such wasteful and dangerous displays of self-righteousness unless such displays were in fact rewarded by the society which surrounded them. Indeed, the propensity to such displays would most probably not occur unless similarly wasteful displays of self-righteous behaviors had been rewarded regularly in the past with positions of leadership and social esteem.

Those of you who have jumped ahead and read Geoffrey Miller's "The Mating Mind" will recognize instantly that my view of the crusades represents an extension of Professor Miller's thesis that the human mind evolved to its present capabilities not because it conferred a technological advantage in the struggle for survival, but as an expensive and essentially "wasteful" ornament in the sexual selection process. Singing, story telling, and cave drawings were the emblems of fitness for mating in our tribal bands 40,000 years ago just as Porsche sports cars, Armani suits and expensive diamonds are the expensive and wasteful ornaments of fitness for mating today.

But of course Mackay's description of the Crusades adds a broader dimension to that theory by suggesting that our self-destructive group manias are a profound part of our own evolutionary psychology and bear a basic and fundamental relationship to the size and capacity of our brains. Manias of millennial dimension (such as the crusades and the modern "human equality" mania) are wasteful ornaments of "right thinking" indulged without a care as to our individual or collective self interest and carried to extremes of self destruction similar to the behaviour of lemmings jumping off a cliff.

Intellect and technology are fairly recent and accidental by-products of that brain - by-products that can save our race if collectively we can learn to supplant the status seeking wasteful displays with a hard-headed recognition of our collective self interest.

I should note that the Crusades marked the climactic extreme of an elite based on military prowess and military ideals. From the ninth through the 13th centuries, nobility was defined by leadership in battle. It was a life marked by unpleasant physical effort and high mortality. The collective and socially reinforced mania of this military elite produced its destructive climax during the crusades, and following the height of that elite's mania, the noblesse d' epee was replaced by an entirely different elite - with an entirely different set of status markers described as the "code of the gentlemen".

In the place of the intense and absolutely sincere religiousity of the famous crusading kings - Louis VII through Louis IX of France and Richard I of England, you get the ribald humor and religious skepticism of Shakespeare and his enthusiastic audience of youthful earls two centuries later.

Under this new elite, the military become hired hands rather than rulers. The "gentleman" hires others to do his fighting for him. A gentleman is fundamentally manipulative - the nascent "managers" of our modern age. Leadership in battle is reserved for unfortunate younger sons of noblemen and the intelligent and upwardly mobile risk-takers, while the actual soldiers are procured from the undesirables and especially white Christian ethnic minorities - the famous Scots guards and Welsh rifles of Imperial Britain.

The gentleman becomes not a military leader but the "rentier."

He makes his living collecting rents from his lands worked by tenants, and disdains labor of any sort because it is a marker of low status. He devotes his energies to art, music and literature.

Two hundred years after Shakespeare, we find the world of the gentleman rentier expressed in its purest form in the novels of Jane Austen, where fortunes are much celebrated and admired, but the means of acquiring such a fortune may never be discussed.

Throughout Jane Austen's masterpieces, *Pride and Prejudice*, *Sense and Sensibility*, and *Mansfield Park*, we find repeated statements to the effect that "liberal opinions" are required of a prospective mate. In her novels we find not only powerful confirmation of Professor Miller's thesis, but we also find in them very clear descriptions of the social interactions that create the impulsive and irresistible pressures to conform to the mania and accept its false premises.

The basic and universal characteristic of a mania is collective group belief in what we all know as individuals to be obviously false, or to be dangerously contrary to our interests.

Manias are always begun by elites, the most intelligent members of society believe the most earnestly, while the humble workers of our race tend to remain skeptical and relatively

unenthusiastic. Hence the extreme irony of Mackay's title. The delusions he describes are not "popular" nor are they the province of "crowds" but rather of the educated, literate and propertied. After all, to participate in an investment mania, you must have money to invest.

But to sell a book to literate members of English Society in 1841, one must condescend to that audience and make it appear that manias are the peculiar province of low status undesirables. The author knows better, but then he also knows that the only way to induce the elites to abandon manias is to paint manias with the brush of low status. Logic will never dissuade them.

Of course, by deceptively painting manias as "popular" and the province of "crowds," the author fails miserably to cure the disease. He leaves every right thinking reader with the escape hatch of thinking that avoiding manias is as simple as avoiding low status crowds.

But it is the need to impress one's fellows through the display of right feelings and sensibilities that drives all manias. And the right feelings and the sensibilities that convey the greatest status among our race are those feelings which are the most contrary to our own self interest and the most solicitous of and generous toward the interests of others. The crass accumulation of wealth and the preservation of race or nation do not confer status. Rather, it is the renunciation of wealth and the sacrifice of our racial interests that elicits the greatest wonder and admiration and serves to set us apart, as individuals, from those so crass as to admit concern about such things.

And for over 200 years, we Europeans have been firmly in the grip of a much more powerful and destructive mania than that which gripped the crusaders. Ever since the American and French Revolutions (which marked the end of the last grand supercycle downturn in public mood) we have been embroiled in the mania of human equality.

The mania of the Crusades - the apogee of the warrior class - has this much in its defense: The divinity of Christ is not susceptible to disproof by readily observable fact.

In contrast, examine the statement authored by Thomas Jefferson and placed in our Declaration of Independence - it is the very premise upon which the American nation is founded: "We hold these truths to be self evident - that all men are created equal."

It is obviously and self evidently false.

Our own eyes tell us the contrary - that all men are profoundly unequal in their abilities and aptitudes, and that the groups to which they attach themselves display average inequalities as well.

It is clear that the slave owning Jefferson knew his statement was false at the time he made it.

So then the question is, why did he say it?

The personal driver behind Jefferson's statement was, of course, that all educated property owners were equal to their competitors, the hereditary aristocrats in Europe, and should share power with them.

But when we hear the straight forward declaration of self-interest, we recognize instantly that educated property owners are few in number and are utterly powerless without the support of the millions who are not educated and do not own property, but are forced to sell their labor. Thus, the educated property owners - the gentleman rentiers - have no claim to political legitimacy unless they can enlist the support of those who are propertyless and uneducated.

The gentlemen rentiers of America's founding must fight a war against the Universalist Empire of Britain and cannot do it alone. And as the gentleman is inherently manipulative and deceptive, he makes an open ended promise that he knows is based on a wildly and obviously false notion that all men are created equal. It results in an implied promise that Jefferson knows will be utterly impossible to keep. But Jefferson makes the deceptive and manipulative promise anyway, because it is in his individual interest to make it.

The problem with his statement, and the proof of its essential deceptive nature is the boundless potential for destruction held within it.

If all men are created equal, then why should Jefferson and the other founders be rich while most of their countrymen are poor?

At bottom, the statement that all men are created equal justifies the conquest of the entire world under a single empire, with the imposition of a single language and laws. After all, if all men are created equal, then the numerous local hues and divisions between us are all irrational and should be repressed by force. Ultimately those differences should be blended out of existence.

It is a doctrine that gives rise to endless opportunities to profit from deception and manipulation, setting set one tribe against another with appeals to equality, while allowing confiscation of the produce of the hardworking and productive by appeals to equality interests of the less productive and less hardworking.

Of course, the Inner Party would spot the opportunities immediately upon their emancipation in the 19th Century, and exploit them with devastating effect in the 20th.

The opportunities for profit are endless. All it takes is a deceptive and manipulative "gentleman" to manage the promises, metering them out as the occasion demands.

And if you think about it, it is obvious that the "gentleman" product of the Enlightenment has no real choice. The thousand year process of de-tribalization and amalgamation so elegantly chronicled by Sir Arthur Keith has produced an educated man of property who by 1775 can no longer say that he will depend upon his ethnic kinsmen to protect his freedom, property and sovereignty, because he no longer has any sense of that kinship.

Rather he is reduced to promising that everyone on the planet can share with him as an equal.

Borders become meaningless, barriers of language and culture meaningless, and powerful aesthetic notions of beauty and worth which attach to specific racially determined features and assert themselves so powerfully in the process of sexual selection, all become irrational nuisances to be suppressed in the name of equality and the advantage of universalist empire.

This distinction between tribe and race is critical for us Western Europeans to understand.

Race is a rather recent reality, the importance of which is only recognized by the "pioneers, "those of our brethren at the fringes of the empire who actually administered it and had extensive contact with alien races, or in more recent times, had extensive contact because we grew up in less desirable neighborhoods in one of the many multi-cultural paradises egalitarians have created for us.

It is only after extensive contact with other races that we come to realize just how profoundly hostile they are to the survival of the European race. It is only after extensive contact that we realize just how limited and narrow our individual, personal options will become if these aliens are ever allowed a measure of power over us, and it is only after a hard nosed appraisal of that individual personal loss of choice, freedom and opportunity that we understand the importance of infusing racial identity into the dual code of amity for those within the race and enmity for those without.

However, racializing a de-tribalized population is a difficult business. A task made infinitely more difficult by a socially reinforced mania which demands that we all acquiesce in demonstrable and obvious falsehoods.

Unfortunately, it will be much easier to position ourselves to be the saviours of our race after the inevitable and intensely unpleasant collision with reality, than it is to attempt to talk them out of a mania that will only be reinforced by our resistance.

Thus, we are faced with the Hobson's choice of confronting our own kind now and hoping to change their behavior while they still have numbers and legal power on their side, or waiting until after the unpleasant collision, when we will be a distressed and impoverished minority.

Those of us determined to attack the mania now must guard against the assumption that others will respond as we do when we explain the obvious silliness and falsehood of the egalitarianism and the obvious threat it poses to our collective self interest and survival. The very fact that otherwise sensible people can be made to acquiesce in a social order based on obvious and readily observable falsehoods is testimony to its strength - not its weakness.

It is also testimony to how violently and viciously the mania will be defended.

And it is in connection with our efforts to uproot this mania that we should read with particular interest, the witch trials described by Mackay.

The enlightenment secularized and neutered Christianity as a force in public life in response to the slaughters of the religious wars in Europe.

In place of Christianity, the enlightenment substituted a brand new faith - the brotherhood of man, in the vain hope that it would end intra-European violence. Of course, this new faith, based as it was upon demonstrable and obvious falsehoods, could only progress and be sustained with violence, and true to form, the blood began to flow almost immediately with the French revolution beginning in 1791.

This new faith was tailor made to justify imperial wars of conquest, designed to bring the message of human equality and the material betterment of trade to those in need of uplift.

But it has always been resistance to that new faith from European groups that has prompted the most savage outbreaks of bloodshed, from the U.S. Civil War, to the Boer War, to the Revolution of 1918 in Russia, and, ultimately the German reaction to that threat.

The prosperity that followed WW-2 has reduced the inclination of Euros to resist the human equality mania en-mass, resulting instead in localized witch hunts, including war crimes prosecutions and hate crimes laws.

As I have stated in prior posts, our challenge to this false god - the brotherhood of man - must be adapted to the circumstances existing at the time.

It is completely clear that this particular delusion - like the crusading spirit in 1090 AD - is not merely a matter of internal belief, but rather external display adopted for the purpose of acquiring status through careless disregard of self interest and racial survival.

While many of our race will be convinced by facts and logic, the most effective way of defeating the mania will be public ridicule.



We need to poke fun at public displays of this faith in the universal brotherhood of man. We must ridicule every public display of this faith so as to strip it of its value as an emblem of social status.

We must become rude in public places - focusing "our new hardness" on the ridiculousness of this manic faith. Those who choose to display this absurd faith in public should be made to pay an immediate price in the form of public ridicule. That will deter others of our own kind from indulging in similar displays.

In times of relative prosperity, people want to be happy. They will ignore bad news. They want to feel good about themselves. In such a psychological environment, interrupting the flow of social reinforcement for destructive status displays can have a profound effect.

And you cannot interrupt the flow of social reinforcement by adopting a low status label - by claiming to be a KKK member, for example - just to gain the attention of the media. Adopting emblems and symbols that the controlled media has invested billions of dollars stigmatizing as low status merely serves to reinforce the belief among the outer party that their displays of the egalitarian delusions confer precisely what they seek - the opinion of their neighbors that they are "good people".

Thus, in order to interrupt the status transmission mechanism, the outer party must value your opinion of them. You must appear to be just like them. That means you must avoid markers of low status.

Our new hardness - the willingness to be rude and pushy in the defense of our own survival - demands first that we ridicule belief in the universal brotherhood of man in relatively light hearted ways that interrupt the flow of social reinforcement, and we cannot do this effectively if we brand ourselves as low status "haters" who's opinions should be ignored.

Light hearted humor will make it much more difficult for others impose negative stereotypes on you and make them stick.

As much as I admire the success of the National Alliance in marshaling real resources to reach our people with the unvarnished truth (and in this respect it is the only game in town) I would encourage the good Doctor to interrupt the monotone negative images of racial assaults, culture destruction and alien domination, and occasionally introduce his group to the public by distributing brochures showing the utter silliness of the social displays staged by our outer party elites.

Even if we cannot shame the outer party elites into fleeing their egalitarian delusions, it is critically important that the ordinary working Euro-Americans who must pay the price of their

delusions be less in awe of their status, and less inclined to accept their leadership.

Let a thousand experiments bloom.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to the Culture Wars Page](#)

(c) 2002 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



## CULTURE WARS

This is a selection of movie reviews and other commentary on the cultural conflict.

1. Eyes Wide Shut WNC 🕶️
2. Children of Heaven WNC 🕶️
3. The Seven Samurai NC 🕶️
4. Braveheart WNC 🕶️
5. Dr. Strangelove WNC 🕶️
6. The Gilmore Girls 🕶️

Coming Soon!!

Movies:

1. Shall we Dance (Japan) NC
2. East West (France) WNC
3. An Englishman Went up a Hill WNC
4. Bonfire of the Vanities WNC
5. A Clockwork Orange WNC
6. 2001 Space Odessey WNC
7. The Color of Paradise (Iran) WNC
8. Unforgiven and Apt Pupil WNC
9. Bladerunner WNC
10. Arlington Road WNC

Books - The Seven Pillars of WN with their Ancestors and Progeny:

1. Memoirs of Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds -Mackay
  - Don Quixote - Miguel De Cervantes
  - At the Crest of the Tidal Wave - Prechter
  - The Posen Speech Oct. 4, 1943 - Heinrich Himmler

## 2. Evolution and Ethics - Sir Arthur Keith

- A New Theory of Human Evolution - Sir Arthur Keith
- The Mating Mind - Geoffrey Miller
- Genetics & Education - Arthur Jensen
- The Bell Curve - Herrnstein & Murray
- Race, Evolution and Behavior - Rushton
- The Book of Matthew - St. Matthew

## 3. Jewish History, Jewish Religion - Israel Shahak

- The Samson Option - Hersh
- By Way of Deception - Ostrovsky
- The Fatal Embrace - Ginzberg
- The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion - Anonymous
- The Controversy of Zion - Douglass Reed
- The Book of Matthew - St. Matthew

## 4. The Culture of Critique - MacDonald

- The Ordeal of Civility - John Murry Cuddihy
- Margaret Meade and American Samoa - Freeman
- A People Who Shall Dwell Alone - MacDonald
- The Book of Matthew - St. Matthew

## 5. Albion's Seed - Fischer

- Locksley Hall - Alfred Lord Tennyson
- No Offense, Civil Religion and Protestant Taste - John Murray Cuddihy
- The Decline of the Wasp - Schrag
- The Demographic Struggle for Power - Milica Zarkovic Bookman

## 6. The Dispossessed Majority - Wilmot Robertson

- Time on the Cross - Fogel & Engerman
- Alien Nation - Brimelow
- Oswald Mosely - Robert Skidelsky
- White Power - George Lincoln Rockwell
- My Awakening - Duke

## 7. The Collapse of Complex Societies - Joseph Tainter

- The Social Contract - Richard Ardrey
  - The Turner Diaries - William Pierce
  - Paul Revere's Ride - Fischer
  - Civil War II - Thomas Chittum
  - The Prince - Machiavelli
- 

**BACK**

(c) 1996-2000 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



## Eyes Wide Shut

---

Folks, we are now into Presidential primary season, and the beauty contest is frightful dull, or more precisely, frightfully devoid of content.

So it is time for a temporary shift in focus.

For some time I have been concerned that we in the nationalist movement pay insufficient attention to culture and the arts. I am convinced that the same sensitive "code" antenna that we apply to news articles can be applied to movies. So let's place a few under the "Jewelers loop" and discover the deeper meaning.

Stanley Kubrick's "Eyes Wide Shut" is a 10 karat D flawless - as good as it gets!

If you have already seen this movie I want you to see it again. If you haven't seen it, go. And enjoy the female nudity. It is all for a good cause.

For the truth is that Kubrick has grabbed the football and scored a touchdown. Many have seen the movie but (almost) nobody saw the quarterback sneak.

The kick off to my curiosity about this movie came in two parts; first, a clear memory of Kubrick's past masterpieces packed with profoundly politically incorrect content. He is not above using sex and violence to lure us to the theater to see messages that are profoundly disturbing to universalist egalitarians. 2001 Space Odyssey and Clockwork Orange are classic examples. This is another.

Next, and more important, were the uncomfortable movie critics on TV who, while admitting that this movie was about sex, thought that the American public would not want to see it.

At the first exhortation not to see this film, my code antennae sprung erect.

A clear warning that something in this film is at odds with the agenda of the inner party culture

destroyers.

(For a subtle piece that uses every tool in the Hollywood arsenal of culture destruction to maximum effect see "The Election".)

The clear message from the inner party critics was that they wanted this movie to fail at the box office. Of course, I did not expect them to articulate their own reasons why. That isn't how our social signaling and instruction system works here in America. But in truth, I am not sure the inner party critics could articulate their reasons. Most likely, they watched the movie and smelled vague danger, but because the movie lacked any easily recognizable tag of hostility, they could not instantly summon the appropriate verbal script of rebuke.

Yes folks, its that good!

And the reason is the movie's simple act of deception. The inner party cannot recognize that a candid, relaxed portrait of themselves in their element is a hostile act. They may not like it, but they cannot bring themselves to bitch out loud.

In order to tell you why it is that good, I am going to have to "spoil" the movie for you. But since the movie does not really center on a plot, there is little suspense to spoil, and of course there are higher values involved.

Tom Cruise, plays an outer party doctor living and practicing medicine in New York City. It is Christmas time in New York, and you cannot help but notice Kubrick's deft portrait of Christmas in New York as something quite different from, for example, Christmas in Oklahoma. Few apartments we see house Christians, but all have "Christmas" trees and ornaments. Not a crucifix nor a manger to be seen anywhere. (For reasons that entirely escape me, our ancient paganism is improbably and yet profoundly comforting to the inner-party alien, who for inexplicable reasons is frightened to death by the sermon on the mount. If they think Christ is scary, just provoke us into bringing Thor's Hammer out of retirement! - but then I digress.)

Tom and his wife, Nicole Kidman are on their way to a Christmas party hosted by his wealthiest patient.

At the party, a guest attempts to seduce Kidman, while Cruise has to attend to a nude model or prostitute who has overdosed in the bedroom of his host. The host appreciates Cruise's emergency services and his discretion. The host's ethnic origin is entirely obvious (played by Sydney Pollack). On his way back to join the party, Cruise is accosted by two models who apparently want to double team him.

The sexual predation at the party is blatant. It is also accepted by all the party goers as if it were the natural state of enlightened humanity.

Cruise spots a friend who dropped out of his medical school class playing piano at the party. Cruise promises to come see him play at a local club.

The next evening, (actually, the movie moves quickly, and I might have the events a bit out of order) Cruise and Kidman decide to share a marijuana smoke before they get intimate, and this provokes a remarkably aggressive verbal attack from Kidman in which she talks about a fantasy of making love with another man.

Cruise, in his intoxicated condition gets called by the daughter of another wealthy patient who has just died. Cruise goes to the apartment of the patient. The daughter, who is engaged to be married, comes on to Cruise, with her fiance in the next room. Cruise maintains his professionalism.

After the visit, he takes a walk and is accosted by a prostitute on the street. He goes with her to her apartment and is interrupted by a cell phone call from Kidman wanting to know if she should wait up. He says no, but the mood is spoiled so he leaves.

He then goes to the club to see his piano playing friend, and is told of parties where his friend is paid a fortune but must play blindfolded. The friend never knows where the parties are and only finds out that one is starting and given the password for entry an hour in advance. He is escorted to the party by guards. After the piano player's cell phone rings, Cruise twists his friend's arm for the location and password. At this point the serious adventures begin.

To gain access to the party, Cruise must rent a costume and a mask, which he does, from an amusingly predatory costume rental proprietor.

He takes a cab to the party at a huge mansion out on Long Island.

He walks in on an orgy unlike any other you have seen or imagined. It is highly organized. There is more voyeurism than action. The entire performance seems carefully orchestrated, and the participants, including the master of ceremonies, the nude entertainers, and the masked party goers all seem to know each other and what to expect. Neither the need for nor the function of the masks is entirely clear.

The master of ceremonies is an old man with a staff who directs the nude ladies with cabalistic chants.

Cruise is approached by one of the young ladies who warns him to flee or he will be killed.



Cruise declines, and is exposed by the master of ceremonies. The girl who warned him offers to sacrifice herself if he will be allowed to leave alive, the deal is struck, and Cruise is expelled by the guards and goes home.

The next day, he notices a news item to the effect that the girl who sacrificed herself for him was found dead. He goes to look at her in the morgue at the hospital.

He returns the costume (with the exception of the mask) to the predatory owner, and his girlfriend.

He tries to track down his piano playing friend, can't find him, and notices that he is being followed.

That evening, he visits the prostitute's apartment, and encounters her female roommate who lets him in. The roommate delivers the bad news that the prostitute tested positive for HIV and is gone.

Tilt!

The problem with this movie is that you tend to get caught up in the swirl of action, and the message can rip right past you. But when the roommate conveys the bad news about HIV, I am jolted erect in my seat. The Hollywood culture destruction machine would never allow this sort of scene in one of its movies.

So what is going on here?

At a minimum, we have a conservative message being thrust upon an unwilling audience, but perhaps there is much more. The AIDS interruption lifts me up out of the delirium of action and forces me to whip out that jeweler's loop.

And suddenly it is painfully obvious.

Cruise is a typical outer party professional earning a good living in an intensely remote and hostile land. You are instantly struck by his isolation, and the isolation of his family. No co-workers to talk this over with and to understand or come to his aid. And he is utterly unwelcome in the cabal. His role is to work, pay taxes and not think too hard!

Like all outer party elites in the big city, he is absolutely clueless about how the society around him really works, and why it works the way it does, and then suddenly he stumbles upon the inner sanctum of the inner party. He sees the rewards and entertainments that draw them together, and he also experiences first hand the terror they can inflict on wayward members or

unwanted intruders.

Movie hell! This feels like real life in the big apple!

The ending to this movie has two parts. First, his wealthy patient friend, played by Sidney Pollack, calls and asks him to come over. Pollack then explains that he was at the orgy, that Cruise is in "way over his head," that it was he, Pollack, who had him followed. His piano playing friend was put on a plane back to Seattle, the girl wasn't killed but died of an overdose, and nobody was killed by this Cabal that he is a part of. He, Pollack, is explaining because he trusts Cruise to stop investigating and just forget this ever happened.

The movie goer is left with an intense feeling of alienation. There is a powerful and disciplined cabal that runs things from behind the scenes, and maintains its membership with corrupt entertainments and enforces discipline with terror.

But, of course, according to one of its organizers, It's harmless. Just a few nebbishes from Brooklyn who wouldn't hurt a fly havin a little fun. Hey, it might be a dictatorship, but it is a benevolent and fun loving dictatorship, so that makes it OK!

All the while , of course, Pollack is delivering a not-so-subtle economic threat, which as we all know, is exactly how it works in real life.

In the meantime, of course, Cruise has explained to Kidman the whole series of misadventures before his meeting with Pollack, and is fearful that his marriage might be in danger. He has arranged with her and their daughter to go Christmas shopping, which sets up the final scene in FAO Schwartz.

Now curiously, the critics hate this ending, claiming it is no ending at all.

But to normal viewers, the conclusion is absolutely pre-ordained. My wife knew the outcome ten minutes before the end.

After all, Cruise and Kidman are sojourners in a hostile and alien land. When Cruise pops the fateful question, Kidman responds as she must, but in a playful and hip way.

So it is no wonder that critics absolutely hate this movie.

The reason they hate it is that the typical outer party viewer is left with a powerful feeling of vague threat from a predatory culture in which a cabal such as the one portrayed in this movie makes perfect sense. The kabal is populated with people who show harmless and genial public faces during the day, but cannot show their real faces among themselves at private parties after

dark.

It is some of the richest symbolism I have seen on celluloid. This flick veers awfully close to the truth folks. And it gets away with it!!

I give it four stars.

Not as great as "The Good, the Bad and the Ugly", but great nevertheless.

I would be interested in hearing from readers with other views.

Yggdrasil-

---

## **Three Additional Views on "Eyes Wide Shut"**

Before I get to those views, I should note that I am always tense when I go see a movie. My code antennae and culture attack defenses stand at the ready. My wife can tell within 20 minutes if I will like it, or fly off into an enraged rant at the end.

So it is something of a shock then when I go to a movie and find myself completely relaxed and transported to the original form of Western Civilization, untainted by the "culture of critique," and without a trace of The Attack, nor any other crimping of ourselves to avoid giving offense to those angered by our existence.

In this last decade of the Twentieth Century, things have reached such a pass, that to produce a movie that glorifies Western Civilization as it once was, without sex or violence, and without the overt social or political content directed at desensitizing us to behavior that deviates from Western norms, or otherwise "reforming," "remaking", "reeducating," corrupting and weakening us, is in itself a revolutionary (if often accidental) act.

I want to recommend two such movies. They are both delightful.

The first is "The Winslow Boy."

Here is a review: [The Winslow Boy](#).

The Movie was owned and produced by Sony Classics. One hundred years hence, anyone wanting to find out what Western Civilization was might have to travel to Japan.

The second is "An Ideal Husband".

It is a screen adaptation of an Oscar Wilde play of the same name.

Here is a review: [An Ideal Husband](#)

Now on to Kubrick

When I review a serious movie, one I rate a Nationalist Classic, I try to react to the movie itself, and what I see within its four corners. I try not to speculate on the motives of the writers, director and producers. After all, the significance of the movie is the actual impact on the audience, and not what the producer or director was subjectively trying to accomplish.

This is particularly true of Kubrick, who has produced three masterpieces, Dr. Strangelove, 2001 Space Odyssey, and Clockwork Orange, each of which deal with the very essence of the universalist state, the nature of bureaucracy, and the evolutionary-nationalist core of humanity. Kubrick himself could have had any number of possible subjective intentions when he produced and directed these films, including showing his fellow tribesmen just how alien and dangerous WE are, even in our modern, degraded state - or perhaps scaring the bejabbers out of his fellow tribesmen, just like the ADL does, but on a much higher intellectual and artistic level.

Who knows!

None of that is relevant. What matters is the meaning of his movies for us.

With that in mind, I would like to share with you the text of three very perceptive e-mails on "Eyes Wide Shut".

Email One:

Welcome back. You succinctly summed up the movie. I felt the same way, that Kubrick was telling us that we have no power. After all, the height of success for most of us is to achieve the level of wealth and social standing of that New York doctor played by Cruise. The doctor, who is portrayed as being at the top of the heap when the film opens is shown to be a nobody as the film progresses. For some reason I took the inner party people at the orgy to be participating in some Satanic ritual. They certainly weren't Christians! Overall I agree with your assessment of the film.

May you never tire,

E-mail Two:

I admit I was going to let this movie slide away unwatched till you mentioned its subtle theme causing me to reconsider. I'm in agreement with the critics somewhat on the ending. That is unless Kidman's character was expressing some sort of resigned cynicism with a touch of sarcasm added for good measure saying in affect "F\*\*k off you SOBs."

The characters seem to take parallel courses thru the movie though both characters arrive at slightly different emotional states at the end Cruise in a state of insecurity and Kidman more like a Siegfried in front of the dragon. A great movie director leaves his audience with a defining moment and Kubrick (at least to me) delivers it with a line "to laugh in your face" as pronounced by Kidman in her replaying of her dream. I see the whole face and cruel purpose of Jewish inspired Liberalism in that telling [line] with Kidman's haggard appearance and an emotional state played out, one of disbelief and fear for the unknown course she would be forced down.

I think we have to admit Anglo-Saxon, Germanic, Nordic cultures play out with simple almost childlike themes, Melville's "Billy Budd" a fantastic parable comes to mind. That line uttered by Kidman was meant to crush those ideals and that way of thinking of life and how we face it. Maybe a few people would understand the way we do but you're right - a vague uneasiness is probably the best to hope for amongst the unwashed. I'll ask some of my unenlightened friends what they thought of it, and that is probably what I'll hear besides comments on the nudity.

If I may suggest a movie with somewhat the same theme, "The Matrix" a techno violence B type if you like that sort of thing. At the end I sat there thinking, "How could they make such a blatant movie?" Thank you for your time. If the take on the ending was 180 degrees off perhaps a follow up commentary summarizing the many other viewpoints of it.

E-mail Three:

Dear Sir:

After seeing the film ("Eyes Wide Shut") a few weeks ago with a MOT ("Member of the Tribe"), I pointed out to her that Kubrick was also a MOT. Nothing but a shrug; she wondered how her parents would like the film, (esp. the sex parts) having not seen it yet.

I was uneasy throughout. The Jewishness of the Christmas party in the first half of the film, was somewhat apparent, the leering "Hungarian" seducer, the host's adventures with a drugged "shiksa". The "Russian" owner of the costume store pimping his daughter

(?)...Now that I think about it, most things alien are presented as something twisted or disgusting (e.g the Asians who used the shop-keepers "daughter," the adulteress whose father had just died.).

Did Kubrick really make this as a jab at the "inner elite" or one against the foolish goyim who play with fire?

Curiouser and curiouser....think I'll take another look.

Cordially,

For a picture of Kubrick see:

[Kubrick picture](#)

Yggdrasil-

---

**BACK**

Design © 1999 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



## Children of Heaven

---

*A Nationalist Classic.*

This is an absolutely charming movie about two impoverished children who must share a single pair of shoes after the older brother (age 8) loses his younger sister's pair.

I highly recommend that you rent the video from your local rental and watch it with your families.

There is not a hint of sex or violence anywhere in it.

The movie is in Farsi (Iranian), with English subtitles.

It is truly odd how occasional reminders of civilization seem able to vault the walls and moats around Hollywood.

But increasingly, the truly subversive stuff seems to float in from abroad undetected by Hollywood branch of the Inner Party with its curiously dull radars. In the consummate irony, this movie is distributed in the U.S. by Sumner Redstone's Miramax, an Inner Party purveyor of culture destruction nonpareil. As I watched this import, I was reminded of an Austrian girl friend who told me back in 1971 that she and her Austrian friends had crossed the border into Czechoslovakia and saw "Fistful of Dollars" twenty two times!

I knew then in 1971 that we had already won the cold war. It was only a matter of time.

If the censors in Czechoslovakia could not recognize Sergio Leone's consummate paean to the invisible hand of capitalism - a killer with no name driven by the profit motive to exterminate the forces of gun running and whiskey smuggling evil, then the system was hopelessly crippled.

I cannot imagine what Miramax's motive might have been. Perhaps some staffer thought he could make a few quick bucks at no risk, given that the film was already produced and the story

is so charming. It would have great appeal to the "small town family market" which Michael Medved says is huge, but which Hollywood routinely ignores.

Just another example of the invisible hand doing good despite the worst intentions of the body and mind to which it is attached. And the Hollywood branch of the Inner Party is so deeply corrupted by their own toxins, that they can no longer see or understand what they import.

Adam Smith, allow me to introduce you to Sir Arthur Keith.

The movie opens upon an impoverished Arab family living in a traditional Arab village. The father works at a factory and is active at the Mosque, while the mother stays home with the kids.

The boy takes his sister's shoes to the village cobbler for repair, and then stops by a small vegetable store to buy potatoes. Everywhere in the village there is trust, with merchants, craftsmen and landlords extending credit, although not without discussion and disagreement. A trash scavenger accidentally picks up the sisters repaired shoes, setting in motion the main story line.

The family lives in a one-room apartment, and the girl and boy exchange written notes about the missing shoes to conceal the economic disaster from their parents. The parents presumably are illiterate and unable to read the notes. Horatio Alger, phone home!

Despite the poverty, there are certain minimum standards in this community that the little boy and girl understand perfectly well, and one is that you cannot attend school without shoes.

A single school facility apparently operates on a split shift, accommodating girls first, and then boys later. The two decide to share the boy's sneakers, and they devise an elaborate scheme for the girl to run to a spot after her school ends where the boy can exchange the sneakers for sandals (which apparently cannot be worn to school), and then the boy can race to school on foot and almost be on time.

A Westerner is immediately struck by the fact that these very young children can run through the streets of this economic slum without the slightest concern for safety. Crime is simply not a threat. Given the poverty in which they live, these people have a remarkably civilized existence, in which everyone in the community looks after everyone else.

The first hint we get of more powerful nationalist themes is when we hear the little girls, assembled in formation in the school yard, recite "I am the flower of the nation" with no smirks or other hints of the "culture of critique."



Naturally, my culture destruction and code antennae are erect and on full power scan at this point.

I assume that this movie was originally intended for an Arab audience. While the country in which this movie was filmed might be obvious to an Arab, it was far from obvious to me. I never saw a specific country mentioned in the subtitles nor in any pictures or flags. It occurred to me that it might be a broader racial nation to which the message was directed.

As you might expect, the younger sister spots another girl at school wearing her shoes, and she and her brother go to the girl's house to ask for the shoes back. At the house, they see that the little girl's father is a blind peddler, and they know, without saying a word, that they cannot ask for the shoes.

The children, despite their tender age, do not have to be told. A deeply imbedded social understanding and a natural form of social cohesion reign supreme in this village.

It so happens that the little boy is one of the top students in the school and wins a fancy pen from the teacher, which he gives to his younger sister as recompense for losing the shoes. As it happens, the sister drops the pen, it is picked up by the little girl who has her shoes, who then returns the pen the next day. These very young children have absorbed a very strenuous honor system and follow it instinctively.

The father obtains some old gardening equipment from a friend and decides to take his son "uptown" to see if he can make some extra money gardening on weekends. Thus begins an overpowering scene in which the father is riding his bicycle on a modern freeway, with his son perched on the handle bars, moving slowly among the fast moving "tribe of the Mercedes." He rides past gleaming glass towers toward the suburban neighborhood in which this tribe lives.

We of the West have been conditioned to expect from such a scene of economic contrast conflict and guilt, or at a minimum, some serious preaching about economic inequality. As you watch this powerful and beautifully done scene, you think - its coming - one of Baskin Robbins 31 flavors of Marxism is about to be served, and we experts will, of course, have to place it in its broader category of reform, conservative or orthodox varieties.

Yet our Western Marxist expectations are frustrated.

The first interaction of the Father with these suburbanites is culture shock.

The mutual trust of the village is entirely missing.

When he rings their doorbells and talks into their electronic gate microphones, he doesn't know

what to say and identifies himself as he would in the village. The glass tower people assume he is an intruder and threaten to call the police. He flees.

After a few disastrous rings, the 8 year old boy blurts out that they are gardeners looking for work. He apparently figured out that he must immediately state not his identity, but his function - what he does to benefit the potential customer. From that point on the introductions go more smoothly, especially when announced by the voice of an 8 year old.

Shortly, there is a several hour gardening job from a suburban boy and his grandfather. The Father earns more money than he earns all week at the factory. On one level, the movie nearly resembles an instruction video for poor Arabs on interactions with their newly affluent glass tower brethren.

Upward mobility is a hallmark and a sine qua non of cohesive societies. This movie powerfully celebrates it, reinforcing the sense of mutual obligation between the poor to reach out and to the wealthy to employ when they do reach out.

Any resolution of potential economic inequality that does not result in Marxist alienation and conflict makes a nationalist statement, for it shows a people capable of retaining their ethnic cohesion as they adapt to economic change. It is a message of rebirth and continuity.

In this movie, genetic self-similarity triumphs over economic difference, as indeed it must in any society which hopes to survive over many generations.

This movie is art powerfully in the service of nation building - a step on the road to creating social cohesion in Arab societies as prosperity arrives and people move out of traditional tribal villages and interact with well-to-do neighbors. Rather than stir up conflict between economic classes, it shows the poor how to overcome poverty and achieve upward mobility without losing or sacrificing their traditional culture.

Wow.

The movie has many brilliant flourishes. The eight year-old boy enters a national 4k distance race in hopes of winning 3rd place and the third prize pair of sneakers. The first prize is a fancy vacation at an expensive resort. He has no comprehension of what a vacation is or what this might be worth. In a four way photo-finish he is forced to win the race rather than coming in third, and is quite dejected.

The penultimate scene shows the father buying a pair of shoes for the daughter and sneakers for the boy and stuffing them into his bike basket, a touching little reminder of his successful role as provider.

It is a beautiful and poignant work.

Of course, this movie will go a long way toward generating sympathy toward Arabs in the eyes of Westerners who see it. One would like to think that a few American voters might be less likely to support our alien government that starves them with economic boycotts and bombs them from safe altitudes. However, I doubt very much if that was the original purpose of the movie.

On one level, when you see a movie like this you cannot but feel joy that at least one race on this earth is free from the grip of Hollywood.

But at the same time you begin to see what would be possible if we were free in America to harness the power of culture and the media to improve our own civilization, and preserve our own race.

There is also a profound sense of loss as we see others using the medium of film to take charge of their own evolutionary destiny and direct it in positive ways, as Hollywood and our government use that medium to tear down and destroy.

Rent it, watch it, and let me hear your views.

Yggdrasil-

And now from an e-mail correspondent arrives the following:

I finally got around to watching Children of Heaven with my family.

It was as good as you said.

My five-year-old was SOBBING as the little boy explained to his sister that he'd lost her shoes. She wants to watch it again. I bought the film, so I'm sure it will become one of her favourites.

A couple of comments.

First, you mention in your review the possibility that this film was about Arabs. This Farsi-language film clearly took place in Iran. It was about the Iranian nation, not about any other.

The Iranians are not a semitic people like the Arabs, but are rather an Indo-European tribe - our distant cousins. The Iranians were conquered by the Arabs and converted to Islam, so you see some of the darker features that you see among the Arabs in some of them. But the essential

Aryan nature of their culture tells true.

Note that the Iranians are allied with the Indo-European Russians and Armenians against the non-Indo-European Turks, Azeris, Georgians, and Arabs (big war with the Iraqi Arabs). This is more than just historical accident - it is rather the echo of an ancient kinship.

A couple of other points.

Recall that the father was crying before he served tea at the mosque. I believe the father was engaged in ritual weeping over the Shi'ite saint Ali, and I think this was an important moment in the film. I am no expert in things Islamic, but this is how I understand the history.

Ali was the Prophet Mohammed's kinsman and son-in-law (having married Mohammed's favourite daughter, Fatima). A power struggle followed Mohammed's death circa 632, and one faction (now called the Shi'ites) believed that Ali should be Mohammed's successor, whereas the other side (now called the Sunni's) backed another candidate. Ali lost this struggle, and was killed (I think even tortured) by the other side. Shi'ite Muslims solemnly commemorate Ali's death every year, which involves ritual weeping and other practices.

As a result of Ali's death Islam lost its tribal roots, and became a cosmopolitan movement. The political center of the Islamic movement went, upon Ali's death, from tribal Mecca to cosmopolitan Damascus in Syria. Interestingly, the Shi'ites believe that Ali was the carrier of an oral tradition received directly from Mohammed necessary for the proper interpretation of the Koran, and that this oral tradition was lost forever with Ali's death.

Now, the film's little protagonist's name was Ali, and surely that was no accident. I think that some central point was being made that Iranian Shi'ites would understand. Were I to venture a guess, I'd say it is that religion cannot be separated from the tribe; that it is really of the tribe, by the tribe, and for the tribe.

As you point out, little Ali knew many important things that he'd not been taught in school, or even in the mosque. There is a tribal tradition that forms the context for all else, and without which no abstract moral system - no matter how intricate - could make sense. Thus, the film seems to be saying that no true religion can be cosmopolitan - at least that it cannot be completely cut off from its roots in human tradition. This bolsters the nationalist message you rightly discern in the film.

It also struck me how genuine the father's weeping was. He truly mourned that ancient catastrophe involving the Islamic Saint Ali. Yet, somehow by weeping for Saint Ali he was somehow ACTUALLY weeping over the present pain of his own son Ali, although he didn't know it. It was almost as if by mourning the death of Mohammed's cousin and son-in-law, he

was vicariously repenting his own inadvertent failings as a father.

The scene in the rich section of town made a powerful point about the alienation and atomization the de-tribalized elite experience. The wealthy were so very isolated behind their steel gates - at war with even their closest neighbors. This was of course in complete contrast to the tribalist collective of the slum where all watched out for all.

The little rich boy was heartbreakingly lonely. I'm convinced that when he spoke with Ali via the intercom that he saw a rare opportunity to actually play with another kid, and so he woke his grandfather to beg him to hire Ali's father - just so he could spend a few blessed hours in the company of another child. Ali was equal to the task, too. Ali showed no resentment despite all the material luxury of the rich child's surroundings. Ali instinctively just displayed the love he'd have for a younger brother. The little rich boy had fallen asleep in Ali's arms, and as he left Ali gave him a teddy bear. It was a real reminder to Iran's well-to-do not to forget who their brothers are. Beautiful.

I've experienced places like Ali's neighborhood, although never one that poor. It is wonderful in many ways. How I wish my nation had that. How I wish we were a nation. No wonder Iran hates us. We really are trying to destroy their tradition, and with it their tribe. It makes me feel ashamed - because I truly wish them nothing but the very best.

I join you in wishing that my own daughters could proclaim themselves the flower of the American nation without a hint of Sienfeldesque irony.

Keep those film reviews coming in!

---



BACK

Design © 1999 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



## **The Seven Samurai**

---

*A Nationalist Classic.*

It is remarkable really.

Back in the 1960's I used to read about a "Marxist" Japanese movie entitled "The Seven Samurai" which supposedly inspired an equally Marxist (or was it existentialist?) American western knock off entitled "The Magnificent Seven" starring Steve McQueen. Well, I saw the American version live at the theater and could not discern anything remotely Marxist about it - perhaps because I attended the wrong temple and lacked the cultural background necessary to understand Marxism.

In my temple, Marxism appeared as a simple form of slavery for Christians, and I didn't see any of that in the movie.

It was only a couple years ago that I managed to see and record the original Japanese masterpiece directed by Akira Kurosawa on the cable network.

I was absolutely stunned.

This is the most important and explicit nationalist movie I have ever seen.

A copy should be available in the foreign films section of your local Hollywood Video. I urge you to rent and watch it once for the enjoyment and a second time for the nuance.

The nationalist themes are not quite as in your face and obvious as they are in Braveheart, that other giant among nationalist classics, but it is a more important and more realistic treatment of the major dilemmas which haunt all modern nationalists. And for that reason, it has more important lessons for us.

I suppose that any movie set in an impoverished village might be viewed as Marxist, as the

village might resemble in the mind's eye of a modern, the kibbutz or the collective farm, where life is natural and inequality at a minimum.

Of course, professing Marxists have no intention of living in an impoverished village themselves. Rather, this ideal is for others, and not so much a real village but rather an ersatz psychological village, to benefit those consigned to such a "natural" existence of centrally planned labor as may be chosen for them by Marxists.

For indeed, Marxism in all of its modern flavors is a yearning for dominance over alien tribes and races which are needed and tolerated only because the Marxists disdain cleaning up after themselves, and need contented servants to do their dirty work (or in the Frankfurt School flavor, to consume and rack up debt). It is all about the propaganda and force needed to ensure a willing labor supply, with the romance of the Shtetl, or kibbutz, as the idealized model by which the Marxists rationalize for their own psychic comfort the imposition of equalizing poverty and labor upon the lesser races over which they hold sway. Same old slavery - different marketing.

And as Professor Kevin MacDonald would clearly hold, the marketing of utmost importance is to the importuning minds of the Marxist elites themselves. One must delude ones self in this modern world, before one can successfully delude the masses.

The Seven Samurai was produced in 1954, shortly following the defeat of Japan.

When you watch this movie I think you will agree that its meaning to a Japanese of that era must have been crystal clear. The rather clear and obvious purpose is to bind up the wounds between the warrior class that has just lost a calamitous war, and the rest of the nation (symbolized by the farmers in this movie) for whom the war was a disaster.

But I am not really concerned with the immediate meaning of this movie for a Japanese audience in 1954. Nor am I particularly interested in dissecting the elaborate "code" so deftly employed to remain within the obvious limits imposed by American censors who occupied Japan until 1952, and by their hand picked Japanese successors.

Rather, I am intensely interested in its meaning for us as modern-day nationalists of a Euro-American persuasion.

As I watched this movie, I was overwhelmed by the sense that it was speaking directly to me, with messages of overpowering modern importance. It may have been set in Japan, but it was not uniquely nor exclusively Japanese.

The movie opens on a small farming village in 16th century Japan. The village is mired in

poverty but is nevertheless plundered by bandits following every harvest. In our first encounter with the bandits, from a distance, their leaders appear to be wearing the familiar Viking helmets with horns coming out of them.

Thus, not more than 5 minutes into this 3 hour and 20 minute epic, my code antennae are at max alert. After all, it was Viking marauders who just nuked Hiroshima and Nagasaki a few years back, killing hundreds of thousands of civilians over the issue of how Japan was to surrender - whether their Emperor would be required to shuffle on down to the banana boat, so to speak, in the process.

It is not clear to me whether Japanese would react to these costumes in the same way. Doubtless the costumes are authentic suits of armor from 16th century Japan, but in all probability, the Japanese of 1954 would be at least as familiar with the horned helmeted image of the marauding barbarian Norsemen as they would the details of armor bandits might have used 500 years ago. In any event, the bandits are unmistakably alien in their appearance and demeanor.

The villagers argue about whether to fight or negotiate, and consult the village patriarch who says they shall fight. He remembers a particularly bad season for bandits years ago and recalls that all the villages were burned down save one, which survived because they hired a few Samurai to defend them. The villagers are instructed to go find Samurai and hire them.

Missing from the discussion is any mention of a "government" or even the concept of government. Recall that this drama takes place at a time when the Kings of Europe not only had sizeable standing armies, but had sizeable armies of clerks keeping tax records, and battalions of magistrates and sheriffs spread throughout the land, as well as professional cadres of court advisors. A troupe of 41 similar bandits operating anywhere within 16th Century Europe would have met a very quick and decisive end at the hands of the nearest national army.

What we see spread before us in *The Seven Samurai* is a rich tableau of the natural libertarian state of nature, in which there is no mention of government at all. In passing, I should note the extreme irony that this perfect state of freedom from the restraints of government, and indeed the lack of any consciousness of what government might be, should exist in the most cohesive and racially homogeneous nation on earth. Perhaps that is the only soil in which true freedom can grow! Indeed, perhaps government as we know it was invented for the very purpose of amalgamating differing tribes, depriving them of their independence and suppressing their consciousness of ethnic difference, all in the service of empire.

Instead of a plea to government, we have a candid debate among the villagers about the costs and benefits of paying tribute to the bandits as against the costs of hiring the Samurai.

The primary impression one gets of the villagers is fear. Fear of strangers and fear of their own inability to put up a collective defense. In this sense, the movie is anthropologically correct. The



villagers are all related by blood. They are a tribe possessed of a dual code, suspicious of the harm that may be inflicted by all strangers, by bandits certainly, and by the Samurai, probably.

So at length, a few villagers set out to the large town with nothing more than a large bowl of rice with which to hire Samurai to defend them.

In the next segment of the film we are introduced to the Samurai themselves. They have no coherent organization, and all appear to be freelance contract workers or fighters for hire. While there is mention of the fact that they are members of a Samurai caste by birth, you never see a Samurai woman, and indeed, the warriors are all "rogue males" mired in poverty, beset with exceptionally high mortality, having a very low statistical probability of passing their own genes on to the next generation, and an absolute zero chance of engaging in the kind of "high investment parenting" that would be required to produce one such as themselves.

Like the warrior ant, they exist to sacrifice themselves for someone else.

In a word, they are all "lone wolves," surprisingly individualistic for Japanese. None are members of any organized gang or male hunting group.

Most are mired in poverty and live on the edge of starvation. While they may be members of a higher caste than the farmers, they are poorer, having no security, and possessing only the tools of their trade.

In searching for defenders, the farmers judge these Samurai by the way other Samurai react to them. A particularly astute older Samurai rescues a child from a thief holding her hostage by disguising himself as a priest. After his triumph, a young Samurai begs him to be his "Sensei," his teacher, leader and guide.

The farmers ask the aging Sensei to help them in exchange for three meals a day. He is convinced of the justice of their cause and agrees. The Sensei then hires five other Samurai on the same terms, and with a very rough farmer boy who wishes to be a Samurai, the seven return with the farmers to defend the village.

On arrival, the Sensei speaks with the patriarch, and then takes charge, plotting strategy and organizing the farmers to building earthworks, constructing moats and destroying bridges so as to limit access routes into the village. He delegates to the other Samurai the job of teaching to farmers to fashion primitive spears or pikes from bamboo, and then training them in their use.

All goes quite well until the seventh Samurai finds the farmers' cache of swords and armor taken from Samurai they have killed in the past - Samurai on the run from the armies of defeated war lords. The Samurai they have hired take this as an affront, and a repudiation of

their sacrifices, but decide to continue to fight for the farmers despite their treachery.

Is this all beginning to sound vaguely familiar to you nationalists?

The Samurai hold themselves in readiness to protect their fellow Japanese at all times, but are hated and feared by them most of the time, absent a clear and present danger. The Samurai are held in contempt by those they live to protect. In fact, they are hunted down and killed when vulnerable. And it is only in times of dire threat that the ordinary people will value the Samurai and submit to the leadership and guidance of the Sensei.

There are three houses that lie outside the perimeter of the village and are indefensible. The occupants of these houses mutiny and attempt to desert the defense of the village, only to be chased by the Sensei with his sword drawn. They submit and the Sensei delivers a stirring speech, which is the highlight of the movie.

The outlying houses are three!

The village has twenty!

We can't endanger twenty for three.

No outlying house can be saved while the village proper is destroyed.

Remember! That is war!

You're all in one boat.

He who thinks only about himself will destroy himself too!

Such selfishness will not be tolerated!

I cannot imagine a more beautiful and moving statement of the nationalist credo! But you are going to have to see it in the dramatic original to truly understand.

While the Samurai have only their traditional swords and bows, the bandits have three guns. Thus, the survival of the village is dependent upon the cunning, skill and disciplined use of traditional means and technologies against superior and alien technology.

In the process of saving the village, and of killing all of the bandits, four of the seven Samurai are killed.

The closing scene is one of the most powerful in any movie ever produced.

The farmers are planting the rice. As the three surviving Samurai contemplate the scene of renewed economic activity and the restoration of normal village life, they turn to the burial sites of their fallen comrades.

We see a grave site consisting of a large dirt mound, stark in its poverty and simplicity. At the top of the mound we see four smaller mounds with the Samurai swords emplaced as markers.

In contemplating the scene the Sensei says to his trusted co-warrior:

Again we're defeated.

The winners are those farmers. (The nation!)

Not us.

And thus it will be always among those born with an independent and warlike spirit.

In times of peace and prosperity, our own Euro-American village will not want to hear our message! And that is understandable, for according to the lessons of the of The Seven Samurai, this is in accord with the very nature of things among a people. However, as our Euro-American village begins to sense the danger, it will be our duty to respond for them and to expect nothing but danger, sacrifice and death in return.

And as it happens, none of us can serve in any official capacity as guardians of our people as long as those services are under the thumb of alien masters.

So in the meantime, it is our duty to wait patiently, and to hold ourselves in readiness.

Every one of you has skills and a role to play.

It is your duty to resist debt and conspicuous consumption. Do not allow your labor to strengthen our Marxist slave masters. Build your resources and contribute to the effort to spread our message to those with the spirit to hear and join our movement.

It is your duty to spread your genes into the next generation.

Any young lady who is willing to interact with you has already inherited the essential core of racial awareness that you seek. Remember, our ideas have been branded as markers of low status and low ability to support and nurture children. Stick to the socially acceptable displays

of love, tenderness and dependability that are the psychological markers of evolutionary fitness in the sexual selection process. Display fitness for supporting her and nurturing her children in an appropriate male role.

It is your duty to spread the message of your commitment and your calling in ways that do not diminish your own status or livelihood. Among probable enemies keep your counsel, yet spread the message diligently among our own who display a disposition to understand and respond positively.

It is your duty to accumulate the resources to be a good missionary for the cause and to contribute to the efforts of others who display great skill in that calling.

It is your duty to be patient and to remember that your calling is one of measured and disciplined sacrifice for a nation that will only value that calling in times of emergency and may never acknowledge nor approve your efforts on their behalf.

As the emergency of our people becomes more apparent to all, one from among us will emerge as the Sensei, the Leader, the Fuhrer. We will know him when the time arrives.

And when that Leader emerges, and upon taking diligent counsel announces to us that the time has indeed arrived, then shall we unleash the ancient hammer of Thor - the hammer of our hallowed ancestors and departed heroes! Only then shall we demonstrate to the other nations of the World just how seriously we take the survival of our own, and just how little selfishness and individualism we will tolerate until the emergency has passed and our independence and control over our own destiny have been assured.

To the performance of all of the above duties I strictly enjoin each of you,

as I remain faithfully yours,

Yggdrasil-

---

**BACK**



## **Braveheart**

---

*A Nationalist Classic.*

Braveheart, is THE white nationalist masterwork.

It's message is remarkably explicit.

Braveheart the movie, and indeed, the life of the historical Sir William Wallace, dramatizes the very central dilemma of Western Civilization.

But before you can really understand Braveheart, you must understand The Seven Samurai, that giant of Eastern Nationalism.

There is a reason why I reviewed it first, before reviewing Braveheart.

Recall that The Seven Samurai is written from the perspective of the aristocracy, the Samurai. The message of that movie is that the Japanese elite exists to sacrifice themselves for their people. And the movie itself powerfully reinforces that sense of duty and sacrifice among that Japanese elite. It is the Japanese peasants that are inconstant and untrustworthy - at times disloyal and self interested. But in times of danger and external threat, the Japanese elite will always rally to defend them.

It is a picture of a nearly perfect nationalism.

In sharp contrast, Braveheart shows us a peasant revolt. A revolt of a nationalist White underclass. The main message of Braveheart is that the Western elites had entered the age of decadence at least 700 years ago. Even in nationalistic and intensely tribal places like Scotland, these elites have been divorced from us for a very long time. They do not represent us, and perhaps, never will. This message of Braveheart is something we must contend with and plan for.

So let's examine the nationalism of this movie. It consists of five distinct phases.

The first phase is the education of youth. As a young boy, Wallace sees a dozen rebellious Scottish nobles lured to a parley only to be hung by the English king. Wallace's father and older brother head off to battle and return dead, as young Wallace is handed over to his uncle who sees to his education.

As far as we know historically, Sir William Wallace (1270-1305) was the second son of Sir Malcolm Wallace. The title "Sir" meant that Sir William and his father owned some land, a few horses and some weapons. They were also under military obligation to some Barron or Earl. But the economic portrayal in the movie is accurate. No fancy art collections, furniture, china or other extravagant displays of surplus would exist in the homes of Scottish nobles, much less in the homes of working knights of the common "Sir" variety.

The significance of this phase of the movie is to introduce the audience to the fine art of racial and ethnic decapitation. Kill off the independent minded leaders and more compliant and treacherous ones will fill the void. Note well that this actual historical practice long preceded the Marxist ideological justification for it and its exponential expansion under Bolshevism.

The second phase of the movie finds an adult Wallace, the courting male, returning from his foreign education, and displaying all the right symbols of evolutionary fitness for marriage and child rearing. He is, according to the movie, a man of peace, wishing only to be a farmer and to raise a family. Those of you in the movement should mark well his displays of self-discipline and intellectual accomplishment in courting his intended. He does not rise to provocation. He displays all of those qualities that indicate his ability to support and nurture her children over the long haul. He certainly does not daydream out loud about Scottish nationalism nor wars of independence and secession.

It is only when the woman he secretly marries is assaulted by English soldiers, that his violence begins, and only after the English magistrate kills her that his massive rebellion begins.

Thus, in the movie, the *cassus belli* is the defense of Scottish women. And indeed, it is hard to conceive of an individual motivation more powerful, or closer to the hearts of modern nationalists.

It is here in phase two that we get our first deviation from the historical William Wallace and our first evidence of explicitly nationalist choices in the construction of the story line. The historical Sir William Wallace certainly did rise to provocation, as he killed a young Englishman named Shelby in a one-on-one fight which would have been classified as a hate-crime had King Edward been burdened by the need to wend his way past the halachic complexities imposed on a criminal justice system bent on coddling criminals but punishing severely any assault against preferred groups of victims. The historical Sir William was

outlawed, and had no choice but to head for the hills and rally his countrymen to attack the agents of the King who were hunting him down.

But the Producer, director and star chose a modification of history which he must have known would have a much greater emotional impact on the typical modern male moviegoer. Upon seeing phase two of this movie, every male descendent of European Christendom would immediately understand its modern relevance.

For the dimmer lights among us, who might not be entirely clear by this point how profoundly disagreeable this movie is to the sensibilities of the inner-party, Mel Gibson threw in a gratuitous but very nice touch in the form of an explicitly homosexual English Prince of Wales, who, along with his pretty-boy friends, is portrayed in a most unflattering and negative light. It is unclear whether this subplot is there for our edification and amusement or whether it was included for the additional purpose of jabbing the proverbial finger in the eye of the Hollywood culture destruction machine.

Once the love of William Wallace's life is dead, and the violence begins, phase III of the movie, that of rebellion, warfare and betrayal follows.

Throughout the movie, King Edward is constantly bribing the Scottish nobles with more lands and more titles if they will deny Wallace and his infantry the armored cavalry and other support they need to win battles. The Scottish nobles see the issue as purely one dimensional - what is in their interests. Never once do they recognize that the only reason the English king is willing to give them lands is that their peasants are rebellious and tribally minded. Giving the nobles additional lands is far cheaper than fighting the Scots as a unified people.

The nobles never ask themselves what would happen to them if their own people were suddenly de-nationalized and rendered meek and obedient. Would not the English King strip them of their lands just as quickly as he granted them? Indeed, they acquired the lands only because of the threat of nationalist rebellion. Once that nationalism is extinguished, how secure are those lands? How could they possibly keep those lands except by keeping that nationalism alive?

Indeed, the nobles see none of it.

And in this respect the dilemma faced by William Wallace is unchanged to this day. We have an inner party composed primarily of aliens who have taken over all positions of power in the electronic media, the universities and the government in the U.S. They have mounted a massive cultural attack on the descendants of European Christendom throughout the Western world through their electronic media with the objective of de-racinating and de-nationalizing them. At the same time, they have enacted a series of anti-discrimination laws, sexual harassment laws and other schemes that are clearly intended, and have the actual effect of displacing the outer party elites.

And the ultimate tragedy for our Western elites is that they are incapable of understanding that their own collective survival depends on ours. Without us they will be displaced and quickly perish in this Darwinian world of racial and ethnic competition. Neither prosperity nor intelligence guarantee victory, and a disembodied elite, with no base of racial support simply cannot compete.

Yet our outer party elites prattle on about individual merit, racial integration and globalism, all wonderful sounding universalisms, while remaining utterly oblivious to the particularist fate that awaits them once the inner party becomes secure that we have been stripped of our racial awareness and are no longer capable of mounting a meaningful "peasant revolt".

Like the Scottish nobles who attributed their own good fortune at the hands of the English king to the importance of their own individual positions, our Western outer-party businessmen attribute their own position to their own individual talents. It has never occurred to them to ask how long the inner party elite, or their black and brown coalition partners will allow them to retain those positions once their fear of us is gone.

Now it may have been somewhat reasonable for Scottish nobles in 1295 to reason that Scottish nationalism was a permanent condition and would never disappear. And indeed, the English King had no effective means at his disposal to displace those feelings of nationalism. But how can an outer party CEO of a fortune 500 company in the year 2000 possibly ignore the vast juggernaut of inner party propaganda directed at his fellow Euro-Americans as vast governmental and foundation resources are used to stir up tribalism and racial feeling among the inner party's black and brown coalition partners.

Only an outer party elite could stubbornly refuse to follow the massive flows of money and resources and find the truth. The racial and ethnic groups committing these vast resources do so with the idea that this massive investment will produce results. It is the height of arrogance and complacency for the outer-party elites to think that it will not lead precisely in the direction it is headed, to the utter displacement of them and their children.

How can a Euro-American CEO of a fortune 500 company possibly believe he will be allowed to prosper and keep his fortune once immigration makes his racial group a political minority and once the propaganda juggernaut has demoralized and destroyed the only threat which enforces restraint upon the racial coalition seeking to displace him?

In this third phase of the movie we are introduced not only to the central dilemma of the West, its corrupted elites blinded by individualism, but to a potential, if temporary, solution as well.

In Sir William Wallace, we have the charismatic leader who rallies the peasants and overcomes



the reluctance and self interest of the corrupted elites. In this respect Sir William Wallace is perhaps first in a long line of nationalist leaders, including Cromwell, Napoleon, Forrest, Paul Kruger, and Hitler, all of whom conform to the same broad pattern. First, they have enormous charismatic appeal. They have the ability to fire the imaginations of their fellow nationals. Second, for the most part, they come from the middle of the social spectrum and the top of the ability spectrum. Finally, because their movement is premised upon leadership, the movement is inevitably temporary. It does not survive the death of the leader.

And it is here that an appreciation of *The Seven Samurai* is important. Contrast the leadership of Wallace to the leadership of the sensei, part of a permanent caste with a permanent code of responsibility and self sacrifice. The sensei is not charismatic. He merely reinforces consensus norms with discipline and self sacrifice. It is a different vision of leadership with more lasting, cross generational results.

What we must do is build a leadership that persists over generations and is capable of recognizing what needs to be done depending on the demands of existing circumstances.

It is only at very rare times in history when outbursts of violence from charismatic leaders will be met with success. More typically, they are crushed under the tank treads of universalism, and become, like the nobles in the opening scene of *Braveheart*, object lessons to others in the rewards of meekness and obedience.

Sir William Wallace was partially successful only because Edward was tied up in wars in France. In the modern world, our own William Wallaces must become persistent evangelists for the cause, and await a time when the inner party beast is otherwise occupied before we can assert our own sovereignty. And even then, an infrastructure must be in place that ensures our control over our own destiny has become organic and second nature to our people - from top to bottom - and thus can be perpetuated beyond the life of the leader.

Our first priority is to equip ourselves, as a people, with the ability to encode the urgency of our own survival, and create permanent private associations which work tirelessly toward that survival in ways that will be apparent to us, and yet apparent only to a small minority of our enemies. We must avoid the mistakes of the U.S. Civil War and the Boer War, mistakes that were repeated in the 1930's by those who, by that time, should have known better.

I should note one particularly jarring scene in *Braveheart*.

In the middle of one battle, King Edward has Irish infantry charging at Wallace's Scottish forces. As they meet in the center of the field of battle, the Irish and Scots embrace each other, and the Irish turn around to face the English instead.

Historically, of course, the scene is utter fantasy. It never happened. And indeed the scene is only plausible to a movie audience living in the final quarter of the 20th century. Plausible because of what we Euro-Americans have learned about racial and ethnic politics, and of course, fervently to be wished by all white nationalists, who are only too painfully aware that all of the descendants of European Christendom must hang together or we shall surely hang separately.

This rather discordant scene amplifies the message of Braveheart to a level of significance far beyond the typical Eastwood shoot-em-up, for example, in which the symbol of European strength and resistance exists only as the lone individual adrift in a polyglot world, destined for absorption or displacement even as the lonely, unhappy, hero resists that absorption and displacement through a dazzling display of individual aggression. The last Mohican, if you will.

This fictional Irish mutiny elevates Braveheart to a plane high above any strict historical narrative of the particular national expression of William Wallace back in 1296, and makes it a unique expression of modern white nationalism. This scene recognizes that the universalizing empire of Britain (and its huge, mongrelizing Twentieth Century heir) is the enemy of every European people (including the English themselves, ultimately) and that only by joining forces can that universalizing empire (with its new inner party elite and their black and brown imports) be overthrown.

But as we all know, the retribalization of us Euros on purely racial lines is not anywhere near as smooth nor as easy as it appears in this fantasy battle scene in Braveheart. All of which begs the question how this scene made it into the movie in the first place.

It is possible that the scene could be viewed as a marketing ploy, to make the movie appeal to a wider audience based on historical ethnic identity. But then the scene must still be believable within the context of the movie itself to that ethnically aware audience to be effective, and it is hard to understand how a modern producer could take that risk without grasping the white nationalist core of what he is putting on film. How could he include it without faith that such a core would resonate among most viewers?

Finally, you often hear Wallace in the movie speak of fighting for "freedom." He uses that word frequently in his exhortations to the troops. Curiously, no one else in the movie ever mentions the word. And indeed, as you think about this "freedom" it is entirely unclear exactly what he means. His contemporaries all live on isolated farms and they are free to do whatever they please. They can drink, party, run around naked, and there are no English around to interfere with such individual activities. Indeed, it would seem that the only time "freedom," as moderns understand it, could be impinged would be those brief and infrequent times when some soldier with an alien crest on his uniform shows up and draws his sword, depriving the victim of property or life - much more immediate injuries than the mere control of behavior implied in the modern notion of individual "freedom."

Indeed, Gibson's Braveheart uses the word "freedom" as modern code for something else. As I pointed out in the Introduction to Sir Arthur Keith, the word "freedom" has come to have two meanings. Primarily, the word "freedom" has evolved in our modern world to mean what the inner party wishes it to mean, namely the ability to indulge in individual vices such as adultery, abortion, drug use and homosexual sodomy without interference by the government or one's religious neighbors. Secondly, it might also mean the ability to move to and work where you please, all individual freedoms.

But it becomes obvious as you hear the movie version of William Wallace utter this word, that he intends nothing of the modern kind. Back in the 13th Century, the word "freedom" probably meant not being under an obligation of servitude nor payment to some overlord. And yet Wallace clearly is not talking about abolishing obligations of servitude or payment to Scottish nobles or a Scottish king.

Rather, it becomes clear that Wallace is using the term "freedom" in exactly the same way that a modern member of a dissident militia group uses the term. It is a code word meaning independence of the group and control over its evolutionary destiny. In the context, that is the only meaning the word can possibly have.

The fourth phase of the movie portrays his life following his defeat at Falkirk, his continuing guerrilla warfare against the English in the hills, a fictional dalliance with the queer prince's queen (played by the exquisite Sophie Marceau) sent to negotiate with Wallace, and his final betrayal and execution.

The fifth and final phase of the movie is very short, and you have to watch the scene very carefully to catch its significance.

Following Wallace's execution, we see a fictional dramatization of the prelude to the battle of Bannockburn in 1314, a scene in which Robert the Bruce, then King of Scotland, is expected to pledge fealty to the English crown before an English army and is waffling as ever over what to do. Finally he makes up his mind and decides to fight, shouting to his assembled troops "you bled with Wallace, now bleed with me!"

It is a remarkable scene fraught with ambiguity and indecision. Note that Robert the Bruce does not say, "fight for freedom" nor "fight for Scotland", nor "fight for the freedom of Scotland". Rather, he asks the assembled Scots to fight for him and his crown, implying that the nation and his crown are one and the same thing. Thus, the independence to be won at Bannockburn is conditioned on the individual interest of this particular nobleman. The Scots fight and win, but Scotland and its people are not yet in the equation. Once again, we see a uniquely modern nationalist perspective.

Fascinating.

The historical Robert the Bruce began his military campaign almost immediately upon the death of Wallace in 1305, betraying King Edward in 1306 and then undertaking a long struggle similar to Wallace's before subduing the Scottish Earls and being recognized as king by the Pope in 1309. He then gradually drove the forces of the incompetent (but not homosexual, as far as we know) Edward II out of Scotland, culminating in the historical battle of Bannockburn, in which the English army surely understood well in advance exactly what they were to face.

In conclusion, I must confess that reviewing this movie is difficult. It is difficult because it hits way too close to home. Rather than a dry history of Scotland 700 years ago, it seems to deal with very real issues of today with the historical backdrop a mere symbolic representation of today's reality.

It is also difficult because it is hard to believe that such a movie could ever be produced and displayed in public in modern America.

What you see on the screen is so completely unexpected that you recoil - at the theater you look around at the rest of the audience nervously to see if anyone else is watching you to see if you "get it."

You are not a fraction of the way through this two reeler of an epic and you are wondering how on earth such a politically incorrect movie could ever have been financed by Hollywood.

Of course, the short answer is that Hollywood had absolutely nothing to do with this film.

It was bankrolled by its Star and director, Mel Gibson, with an assist from Alan Ladd, Jr. and one Bruce Davey. Other than the film editor, not an inner party member anywhere around this film. Gibson was born in upstate New York and raised in Australia. So while it is obvious that Gibson feels an emotional connection to the story of Sir. William Wallace, such empathy for the original is quite obviously driven by experiences seven centuries removed and half way around the World from the original. Perhaps it is a connection born of these experiences shared by us in the audience that makes this such a powerful movie.

The very existence of this movie begs all sorts of profound questions. I was reminded of the major philosophical question explored by the Victorian Poets, whether an artistic representation is conscious craft or unconscious inspiration. When one hears Gibson speak on the television talk shows there is no hint that he could be so crafty and devious as to create an explicit white nationalist masterpiece and slip it past the social censor so effortlessly. Could the message to us be an accident? Is history inherently and inevitably nationalist when presented straight up, with only the distorting lens of the inner party to conceal its meaning?

And as I debate with myself whether those explicit WN scenes are the accidental product of the Muse, or whether they are included as a result of conscious craft, I must lean in the direction of conscious craft. There are simply too many wonderfully instructive WN inclusions for all of them to have been an accident.

(If you have any doubts, by all means go see "The Patriot" just released. The critics uniformly hate it, and for good reason. It shows the classic Western peasant's revolt in full bloom, with only one token bow to the demands of multi-culturalism, offset by the deft touch of casting Jason Isaacs, a visible member of the inner party, as the murderous British Col. Tavington, the very poster boy of a Bolshevik church-burning terrorist in action. It is a blatant pro-militia movie, one which the critics would just as soon you not see.)

But the real wonder is the fact that Braveheart was released to critical acclaim, rather than massive protest. Indeed, there is a powerful message in its generally positive critical reception.

The average culture critic in American has no idea what white nationalism is, and absolutely no capacity to recognize it when he sees it.

For us that is wildly optimistic news, for it intimates that our movement can, if we are smart, propagate itself without much resistance.

In truth, the movie is a masterpiece of modern coding.

It is a magnificent flower poking its head up through the layers of concrete in which our dying civilization has been encased by the inner party and its culture of critique.

And finally, the movie is difficult to review because it leaves you with a rather pessimistic sense of realism. Western nationalism is dramatically different from Japanese nationalism. Theirs comes from the top down, with the aristocratic samurai sacrificing themselves for the benefit of their nation. In the West, nationalism simmers up from the bottom, from the ordinary folk in the form of peasant revolts, for which we always pay a terrible price - harassed and betrayed at every turn by a Western elite that sees themselves as a race of nationless global supermen rather than the flabby and defenseless daydreamers they really are. It is, of course, a fatal illusion. The real world around them is filled with hostile races seeking to displace and enslave them and their children, even as they idealize a world full of win-win transactions and peace through World commerce and global mobility of capital.

The Movie Braveheart leaves you with a distinct sense that our struggle has been ongoing for over 700 years now, and that it will continue on for quite some time to come.

There is no letup and no relief in sight.

And depending upon your disposition that is either good news or bad.

It is our very own reality.

Yggdrasil-

---

[BACK](#)

Design © 2000 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



## **Dr. Strangelove**

---

*A Nationalist Classic.*

This masterpiece of Stanley Kubrick was produced in 1963 and is a nationalist classic.

Now you should find it strange to hear me argue that this "leftist movie" is a nationalist classic, but it clearly is. For beneath the superficial layer of supposed leftist pacifism is a very extensive and accurate portrayal of an ethnic stereotype that most reading this web site will not instantly recognize.

That is because it is the stereotype of us, as seen by the inner party.

And this is what makes Strangelove so important.

Ultimately, this should come as no real surprise, because Kubrick knows full well any movie about a renegade military initiating nuclear war must be populated with believable characters, and although he has absolutely no interest in producing films which strengthen our understanding, he cannot portray the vision of us shared by his own tribe without showing us precisely what they see, if only we are willing to look.

His vision of us, the outer party, is crystal clear, as is his vision of the core reality which must ultimately drive us.

As I recall, I was a very young man in high school when I first saw this movie in 1963.

All I knew entering the theater was that this was a "pacifist" flick, and I wanted to see what the enemy was saying. I was expecting crude propaganda, but what I saw was quite complex and stunning. It answered a number of questions that had been accumulating as a result of the unintelligible mysteries encountered at that magnet school I attended dominated by inner party kids.

In the first two years of junior high, I witnessed these children of wealth and privilege rail in favor of redistributing wealth, and in favor of confiscatory graduated income taxation. They could easily have begun the wealth redistribution right there on the spot by writing me a big check - something which somehow never happened.

It didn't take a rocket scientist to note that this passion for wealth redistribution was not directed towards the wealthy in any universal sense, but rather a sub-class of the wealthy, defined by criteria that the inner party socialists were stubbornly unwilling to disclose.

I knew immediately that confiscatory taxation was a threat to upward mobility, and thus could have no purpose other than keeping me "in my place". At the tender age of 16, I began to conclude that these "socialist" passions were directed toward me, a thinly veiled yet obvious program of freezing existing status relationships and preventing competition from the peasants.

The welfare programs these confiscations purchased seemed a sop, an afterthought to rationalize the real purpose, and at best an insult to our abilities and resourcefulness, as humans had made remarkable progress over the past ten thousand years without them, depending on family, village and tribe for emergency assistance.

What remained a total confusion was how these wealthy inner party "socialists" could feel so secure in the knowledge that they would be able to guarantee themselves an exemption from the confiscatory effects of their program, an exemption which was entirely unspoken and just as entirely obvious.

Their acquiescence in the high taxes only made sense if they knew they could evade them, or if they felt that their own incomes were so easily taken from others in the first place that their own tax bills were nothing other than an indirect funneling of other peoples' money into governmental institutions that they controlled. These people were far too smart to be mistaken about such things.

But the greater mystery lying behind it all was just how these inner party kids defined themselves and how these political attitudes and instruction were spread amongst themselves. None of that effort was publicly visible in high school.

The important words from these inner party classmates of mine always meant their opposite. And so I began searching for answers. At age 14 I subscribed to National Review magazine. At age 15 I began frequenting the John Birch society book store in hope of finding those answers.

Naturally, the logic of free market individualism attracted me, for it seemed that the best way to stop them was to hamstring the socialist state and cripple its power to limit my upward mobility by limiting its powers generally.



I was much taken with the doctrines of Adam Smith, Herbert Spencer and the rest of the laissez faire individualists, because their doctrines seemed a logical way of defending myself against the predations of these "socialists" who always seemed to speak in riddles meaning the opposite of what they say.

But even at age 16 I had this nagging doubt about the effectiveness of a universalist response to a particularist urge on the part of obvious adversaries.

Now I must also confess that while my family's residence was on the wrong side of the tracks, my immigrant Anglo Saxon parents selected it because it lay upon the edge of an upscale elementary school district that was overwhelmingly from the same tribe.

And I noted with dismay that none of the kids from my own elementary school seemed interested in any of this once we arrived in high school. With few exceptions, none seemed to spot the inherent contradictions behind the urge for wealth redistribution nor did any seem adept at guessing what the hidden agendas might be.

On the whole, my social friends from similar ethnic background seemed remarkably complacent and unconcerned about the emotional forces behind the riddles that were rapidly shaping the contours of public life in America. While many were quite talented in English and math, very few seemed to have the capacity to recognize what was going on politically at the most elemental level.

And because pacifism (remember that this is before 1967!) came from the same crowd as "redistribution of wealth", I suspected and feared that as gun control was a program to render me individually defenseless, so pacifism was merely a means of rendering people like me collectively defenseless.

It was all of a piece.

And thus armed, I marched into the movie theater at age 16, and saw for the first time Dr. Strangelove.

Now before I begin to recall my own reactions to the film, I should note that later in life, I purchased the 1985 videotape from RCA/Columbia Home Pictures, and on the back of the cardboard dust-jacket is the most remarkable explanation of the movie imaginable. The reviewer argues that the two generals, Ripper and Turgidson concocted a scheme to bomb Russia, and that the brains behind the scheme belong to Dr. Strangelove.

Wow!

The movie itself is quite clear that the opposite is true. The scheme is the idea of Ripper alone, a base commander, and the dialog makes clear that Turgidson, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs knows who Ripper is, but does not know him personally. And indeed, it is clear from a remark to one of his fellow officers that Turgidson never knew of or met Dr. Strangelove, a special advisor to the president, before the emergency meeting following launch of Ripper's nuclear bombers. Further, it is clear that Turgidson is disposed to be suspicious and hostile towards Strangelove because of his German nationality (remember that this movie is set in 1956).

In fact, this movie does have a universalist message in the thick outer layer of its many meanings. Kubrick's very argument is that the all of the bureaucratic "fail-safe" plans and safeguards to prevent an unauthorized nuclear attack are rife with unanticipated holes. Obviously if all the key players who designed and later implement the fail-safe system conspire to defeat it, then an unauthorized attack is inevitable. But such an interpretation of the movie is not only contrary to the dialog, but it defeats Kubrick's very message, namely, that the best laid bureaucratic plans and safeguards have vulnerabilities that can be exploited by those who are quite a distance removed from the centers of power that develop and maintain the system.

There is no safety in bureaucracy.

The nature and limitations of central planning and bureaucracy is a persistent theme throughout Kubrick's films, especially, his two later masterpieces, 2001 Space Odyssey and A Clockwork Orange.

At its core, Kubrick's demonstration of the vulnerability of bureaucratic safeguards and indeed, the ineptness of bureaucracy itself, is profoundly anti-modern.

And it is the inevitable corollaries to this anti-modern theme that give the dust jacket reviewer trouble digesting the message. For if bureaucracy is vulnerable to the particular agendas of bureaucrats (base commanders) then the end product of modern universalist bureaucracy is not predictable and universalist, but rather particularist and "personnel dependent," a conclusion that could cause the masses of outer party sheep to wander off in all sorts of directions that the producer and current owners of this film clearly do not want them wandering.

As I watched those scenes which introduced Ripper in the first 30 minutes of the movie, I felt a sense of profound humiliation.

What puzzled me so intensely back in those days were the obvious similarities and connections between Communism and liberalism, and the obvious sympathies of liberals toward communism including its many slaughters.

Ripper explained it all as a conspiracy, and regales us with fluoridation of the water as proof of this conspiracy. And of course, this was exactly the nonsense I heard at the John Birch Society.

Here we have millions of people being killed under the frighteningly vague titles of "wrecker" and "enemy of the people" and not one liberal demands that communist apologists set forth the precise elements of these crimes.

Fluoridation is the least of our problems. It was absurd and humiliating.

And yet as the rest of the movie unfolds, I realize that Ripper is clearly portrayed as the most intelligent of the outer party officers. Significantly, he is the only officer without a Southern accent.

It became clear to me that while Ripper was intended to be perceived as a comically deranged lunatic by us, Kubrick was careful to make a much larger point to a narrower audience. The reason why "we" are so dangerous, is because the smarter we are, the more likely we are to latch on to pure theoretical abstractions as explanations for much simpler things.

It is a racial characteristic. Neither Ripper nor any of the other outer party officers portrayed in the movie ever asks the question "who benefits from communism?" If the program is obviously flawed at delivering economic growth maybe its objective is something other than economic growth! Indeed, the most obvious beneficiaries are those who acquire power under the system and when you look at the early politburos, you will see that there wasn't a Russian anywhere to be found. All were inner party and minority nationalities.

And that tells you communism probably has a lot more to do with race than with economics.

But of course Ripper will have none of it. Communism is a universalist economic ideology. The fairly obvious notion that the universalist economic doctrine is a mask or device for the acquisition of power over potentially hostile races never crosses his mind, despite his obvious high IQ.

And the universalist ideology is spread not by broad and easily identified groups of people who expect to benefit, but rather by a tiny conspiratorial cabal that is impossible to identify.

The second aspect of Ripper's mental process that Kubrick elaborates in some detail is his obvious failure to ask "is nuclear war in my interest?" Rather, Ripper is more than willing to undertake a crusade to rid the world of this universalist abstraction by initiating a nuclear war despite its obvious fatal consequences to himself.

And as you examine European history it is tough to argue that Kubrick is wide of the mark.

We do have powerful mental tendencies toward abstract ideologies and crusades that are wildly contrary to our own interests. His point is fairly taken. It is a racial characteristic, a propensity or

inclination shared by most of us. And indeed it is the most intelligent and best educated among us who are most inclined to crusading, witness the barons and dukes who left their estates unguarded in the 12th and 13th centuries, rode to the holy land on horseback, and bleached its sand with their bones.

Wildly contrary to their own interests!

A more recent and potentially far more destructive example is our passionate commitment to diluting our own Euro populations by promoting free immigration and racial integration despite a stunning and absolutely uniform Twentieth Century record of violence and discord in all multi-racial and multi-ethnic nations throughout the World.

Next we meet the chairman of the joint chiefs, Turgidson. He is also quite intelligent and has the best imitation of a Southern Accent that George C. Scott is capable of rendering. All things in life relate to his bureaucratic agenda which is "the missile gap". In comparison to Ripper, Turgidson appears quite sane, and yet he also regards Communism as a pure theoretical abstraction.

Like Ripper, he never asks the broader question of "who benefits?" Nor does he recognize that the typical Russian peasant or Russian soldier has little or nothing to do with communism. Indeed, communism as an instrumentality of power acquisition is a practice restricted to a very tiny slice of the Soviet population.

And as I have stated elsewhere, once the inner party was removed from power, communism withered on the vine in the Soviet Union as the ethnic Russian KGB and military officers couldn't figure out why the screwed up system was ever cobbled together in the first place. (Actually, I am exaggerating here, as I suspect most of them understand full well why it was patched together, and by whom. But if I am wrong in that suspicion then even our very distant kinsmen in Russia are doomed as we are!)

Next, we are introduced to Dr Strangelove himself.

When I walked into the theater, I expected Strangelove to be the very likeness of Dr. Werner von Braun, the German scientist responsible for our missile technology and space program.

Now Von Braun was well know and often pictured in the media of the time, a large and muscular fellow, the very stereotype of the Aryan physique which our modern culture destroyers love to portray as movie villains.

Well, we didn't get anything remotely resembling von Braun.

The characters previously introduced and developed in this movie are all quite human and believable. We have all seen people like them.

But Strangelove is something else.

He is a shriveled cripple in a wheelchair with an effeminate voice and gestures. Ironically he could "pass" for a member of the inner party.

The symbolism is quite striking and I understood immediately. Strangelove does not really exist, but then he **MUST** exist, because these outer party leaders are so utterly lacking in the basic political instincts necessary for survival that there just has to be someone like Strangelove hiding behind the throne or they would have perished long ago.

Strangelove's role is absolutely essential. It must exist somewhere. But Strangelove the character is not at all believable.

The dramatic tension is nicely balanced, as Strangelove the character provokes sympathy rather than fear, even as his message is as fearsome as it is inevitable.

For when it becomes clear that the one damaged bomber commanded by Slim Pickens has missed the recall signal and will get through and find a target, thereby detonating the doomsday device designed to guarantee retaliation, Strangelove lays out the consequences and the only logical response with stunning clarity.

They must use a computer to identify a few thousand of the most intelligent men and ten times as many of the most attractive women, set aside provisions for a 90 year underground stay until the radiation dies down, and in the meantime go about the business of producing the master race. Since Ripper, in combination with the Russian doomsday device, has triggered a massive acceleration of the pace of evolution, we have no choice but to take advantage of it and produce desirable results.

Just as the existence of Strangelove is an inevitability, it is equally inevitable that he will give Nazi counsel, for sooner or later these strange but numerous people with their wild abstractions and dangerous crusades must have someone competent looking out for their collective survival in a competitive world. In times of extreme danger, it is inevitable what his advice will be. A group cannot survive without struggle, and to survive it must prevail over its competitors.

It is inevitable.

Strangelove is a hardball pitch straight down the middle toward the primal fear of Kubrick's fellow tribesmen. (Indeed a reader plausibly suggests that Strangelove is clearly modeled on Dr.

Edward Teller, a Manhattan Project nuclear scientist and inner party member, thus compounding the ambiguity and upset, as it is probably their own tribesmen hiding behind the throne who, when faced with annihilation, will be forced to advise these fools to behave like Nazis.)

And indeed, the very strangeness of Strangelove's demeanor, his mechanical arm that insists on giving the Nazi salute at inappropriate times, allows those sitting around me at the theater to laugh and dismiss him as a comic freak.

But I knew that my inner party friends at school would not dismiss him at all.

Nor did I.

And the brutal frankness of Kubrick's exposition raised all kinds of prohibited questions in this 16 year old mind.

Is human evolution exclusively driven by individual selection? Or is group selection also a factor as the inevitability of Strangelove would so clearly imply?

If group survival is important and collective defense inevitable, then why was I worrying about shrinking the power of government? Was that an entirely rational response as opposed to harnessing its power and resources to the collective survival?

Political outcomes in the real world were, for the first time, beginning to make a bit more sense as I walked out of that theater.

Yggdrasil-

Below is an exceptionally perceptive addition by a reader:

One interesting point in that movie also is the danger of bureaucracy lacking a self-correcting mode, no matter how well one tries to instill one. The use of "Plan R" by a lower echelon commander is one obvious one. I was also struck watching that movie, the part where the Canadian (British) Air Force officer, Mandrake, is approached by an Army Major (Col.) Bat Guano, played by Keenan Wynn. While the bureaucrats at the top must stop Ripper's bombers, and Mandrake is intent on stopping them as well, Major Guano, the quintessential warrior ant, has very specific and limited orders that don't include talking to Group Captain Mandrake. He muddles about with how Gen. Ripper was shot, whether Capt. Mandrake was a "prevert", going off on his own path without ever once getting close to doing what his masters require that he must to fulfill their intent. He's another dangerous bureaucratic servant. Indeed, this movie has a lot of warrior ants going off in all directions without being clued in to the motivations of their

masters. The bomber pilots show this in the best detail. Their orders received, whatever else happens, they can and will proceed to their targets whatever that means. They have orders in hand and the true necessities of those in Washington bear nothing on that. Turgidson is another warrior ant, fully prepared to go full-bore into the nuclear crusade regardless of his own interests. The intentions and necessities of the puppeteers do not and cannot impress upon him. What the IP is confronted with here is a very scary potential scenario. The bureaucratic machine that they rely on, that they think they control, is filled with intelligent people fully capable of acting in furtherance of the goals with which they've been presented and indoctrinated in. The fact that these are not the true goals of the people in control of them is a fact that they cannot be allowed to become aware of, and that disconnect makes potential for very dangerous mistakes. In other words, a common understanding and mutual goal that allows subordinate commanders to properly understand and act in accordance with the commander's intent is lacking, and a move towards the commander's goal resting on the actions and performance of subordinates will not survive a breakdown in communications created by the implicit disorder, uncertainty and fluidity of conflict. Since the IP cannot inform every bureaucrat in their system what their goal is, the system by definition is a clusterfuck, (a very precise and well understood military term) unable to know what it's right and left hands are doing.

\* \* \*

Strangelove is an interesting character to say the least. I didn't get where he came from either. He did indeed seem a radical disconnect from the rest of the characters in the movie. The counsel of reason, he even asked the Soviet Ambassador why they didn't tell the world about their doomsday device, thereby allowing civilization to proceed uninterrupted. Although the model is a few years early, that role could fit with a Henry Kissinger type role, the classic insider, playing a game of "detente", the wheeling and dealing to keep these barbarians from... going back to being barbarians. The Teller model suggestion is interesting, and cuts right to the heart of the message of us being numerous and dangerous aliens. Of course, Teller and many of those like him, like Oppenheimer, who worked on the Manhattan Project, were IP. They hoped that what they were unleashing into the world was first to be turned against Germany, naturally. Of course, that didn't happen, they were forced to settle with Dresden, the horrors inflicted on von Paulus' army, and the ongoing communization and deculturalization of Germany as punishment while the unpredictable cattle went and used the bomb elsewhere. In this light, we can view politics such as pacifism and disarmament not as much as a simple, broad, universalist attempt at weakening our defenses but rather coming from a specific point of view that we are simply too stupid, dangerous and unpredictable to have such power left to our hands. I would put forth that were we to have used the bomb as we were supposed to against Berlin, Muenchen or Hamburg, the prevailing tenets of disarmament, the assumption that we will inevitably use the atom for evil, would find much less of a voice.

Ultimately, of course, Strangelove does offer the Nazi weltanschauung to his new advisees. Ironically, this is probably something the IP would understand well. Is not their entire history predicated on the group, even in small numbers, surviving and keeping cohesion? Under ordinary circumstances, of course, this thinking would be permitted for them alone. But if the alternative is being left to fight for food in the post-apocalypse against still far greater numbers of Europeans, (probably with an even greater numbers disparity, as many of the big cities IP seems to instinctively flock to would be destroyed far more completely than the open, less urbanized stretches of Middle America) then in this case inviting the Europeans to act like Nazis serves, ironically, to further their own group survival. \* \* \*

---

**BACK**

Design © 2000 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.





## **The Gilmore Girls**

---

Evenings typically find me down here in the study fooling with some data and otherwise plotting support and resistance targets and what-if scenarios for the next day.

Now as most of you know, I finally got the females at Ygg house to agree to cancel the cable TV, the most significant and effective revolutionary act you can perform in favor of our collective survival.

Remarkably, it is still perfectly legal!

Forget freedom of speech and internet censorship! You will know that our cause is permanently lost only when the inner party lobbies through a law requiring us all to subscribe to cable TV and jailing us for two years for attempted cancellation or non-payment. Thank God for Holocaust denial, which diverts so much inner party energy. What they should be doing is force feeding us cable TV even to the point of wiring our eyes open and applying drops, as in that famous scene from "A Clockwork Orange."

I have a solemn prediction. Eventually it will be a "hate crime" to cancel your cable for the wrong reason, and as the Justice Department's OSI division winds down from hunting NAZI's, they will be assigned the new mission of amassing proof of animus toward multiculturalism in cancelling your cable. Five years hard time if they can get your soccer mom neighbors to buy it! Playing soon at a U.S. Attorney's office near you!

Best commit the "crime" early and beat the rush to lock in your protection against ex-post-facto application!

So while the TV sets sit around the Ygg house in a new primary role as decorative furniture, nevertheless occasionally and unpredictably all activity in the Ygg house outside the study will cease and I will hear sounds emanating from the upstairs family room.

Come to find out, the females bought a small antenna for a few bucks and actually watch some

of the WB network shows broadcast over the airwaves the old fashioned way.

Oh well! At least I'm no longer paying for the toxins and strengthening my enemies by so doing.

So from time to time I will wander upstairs to see what they are watching. Typically, I will watch one or two minutes of a scene until I detect one of the familiar toxic themes and then slink away without analyzing the sub-text of the scene. While my wife attended the same magnet school that I attended, and is well aware of the players and agendas, she objects vehemently to my categorizing them in real time, as she wants to forget about the never ending conflict and be "entertained." Ditto for the younger females.

Two relatively new Hollywood themes seem to be gathering momentum and are of particular interest.

The first theme is that white males are stupid - a prejudice first conveyed by shows like the Simpsons, and Beavis & ButtHead but now with innumerable comedy knock offs echoing the same popular line.

It is incredible to me how the Fortune 500 CEOs who sponsor these shows with billions of advertising dollars could fail to understand the hurdles these shows will inevitably place in front of their own sons and grandsons in a multi-cultural society. We already earn far less than inner party, blacks and hispanics at the same IQ levels and we have have significantly less educational attainment and opportunity at each level of IQ than these competing groups.

Making white male stupidity a staple of the popular culture can only make those trends worse as we become minorities in our own country over the next 30 years. But maybe Fortune 500 CEOs don't have any sons for they obviously don't give a damn!

The second mestastasizing theme is more of academic interest - a fantasy of Hollywood inner party film moguls and screen writers that is unlikely to have any lasting effect - namely, the theme that every shiksa with blond hair or a Southern Accent will find romantic fulfilment only when she abandons the boorish, stupid and inconstant northern European males of her own kind and surrenders her body to an inner party type with curly black hair and hook nose - always portrayed as sensitive, thoughtful and very romantic. A classic of this genre is the movie "Where the Heart Is" - the one about the Wal Mart baby - which serves up a double dose of this imprinting in the same movie. The TV show "Felicity" also has a tendency to serve up this same theme. Predictably, the theme never appears in the reverse with shaygetzim finding happiness only when they shun the Aryan super model types in favor of inner party females.

So one evening, I wander upstairs and the ladies are watching the pilot of a new show called

"The Gilmore Girls."

Now the show is strictly a "chick flick", all about females and their relationships. But then it has a power and intensity far beyond anything I have ever seen on television before.

As much as I hate to admit it, the show is fantastic.

And this show is about the real us!!

I kid you not! I have become addicted to it!

If I were put in charge of culture after the revolution, this is exactly what I would produce with only very minor adjustments. I could not think of more fitting entertainment.

Now whenever Hollywood tries to make a show about us that will appeal to us, they invariably screw it up. We always end up with an image of us that doesn't ring true, because it is the imagining of someone who knows nothing about us, and might as well be an alien from outer space.

The WB network has tried a number of shows intended for the "outer suburban and small town market". A typical effort was "Dawson's Creek", largely about what some Hollywood inner party or drag-queen screenwriter imagines southern white kids might act like who keep their virginity through high school.

Trouble is, they got it wrong and end up with cardboard characters. Further, they cannot seem to resist belching up an endless stream of screen plays portraying the competitiveness and frustration that their Freudian imaginations tell them we must certainly suffer for our oddly puritanical ways. Sadly, the story line simply wasn't plausible and the ratings plunged, while my daughters lost interest.

Dragging a homosexual couple into the story line in desperation only made matters worse.

The show "Friends" also lost the females in the Ygg household, as no one they know acts or thinks like the characters in the show. Thus while at first the alienness of the behavior portrayed was funny, is lost its interest after a season. As my wife says, its always the same old sthick.

Amen!

In contrast, the Gilmore Girls is a home run. The pilots were obviously intended to appeal to that same "outer suburban and small town market", and somehow whoever produced this show got it exactly right.

As you may know, a major Hollywood theme is that while small towns might look peaceful on the surface, there is always a lurking, hidden evil waiting to bludgeon the brains out of funny looking outsiders who happen to wander in.

Typically, the local Sheriff and law enforcement is the focus of attention and anxiety in these shows, as the fate of the alien visitor hinges in whether the law is a true representative of the forces of universalism - there to curb the violent tendencies of the feared townspeople - or whether it is in cahoots with the locals and thus doubly dangerous to the visiting alien.

But there are no cops anywhere in sight in Gilmore girls. No sheriff, no deputies, nothing!

In fact, the town which the Gilmore girls inhabit is so safe and so wholesome that there is no law enforcement of any kind to be seen. Instead, the show portrays the small town as a place of refuge, where relationships are lifelong, real and dependable. Further, there ARE no funny looking outsiders wandering in!

It is a quite stunning contrast with what we have come to expect from Hollywood.

But the most significant feature of the show is its relentless and successful exploration and development of the characters in all their complexity.

The major male characters, Luke, Dean and the Grandfather are portrayed as anchors of stability and dependability. Dean, a young viking physically, is not only stable and dependable, but a profound romantic as well - surprisingly, he is far ahead of the females in this category.

As my wife noted on seeing the second pilot, while the show is about a 32 year old single mother and her 16 year old out-of-wedlock daughter, the themes are profoundly conservative.

One episode in particular, about Mother and Daughter watching old Donna Reed show reruns from the 1950s is a classic. It is one of the best and funniest tv episodes I have ever seen, with a profoundly conservative theme of modern liberated women struggling to understand the past and square their independence and freedom with the ability to create and sustain a permanent relationship and maintain a happy and loving home.

Powerful and forbidden stuff!

A second theme that recurs throughout the episodes is the "commitment issue" as both female protagonists find their inability to commit to men foreshortening their relationships and causing disruption and hardship in their lives. It is an issue that pervades our secular society, and one which elicits rapt attention from the young ladies in the Ygg household.

It is a show that has real and intense meaning for them.

A third theme is the extended family, as mother and grandmother gradually, fitfully get over their estrangement, repair their relationship and slowly rediscover their similarities. Grandmother even manages to build a close relationship with her granddaughter without threatening mom.

This is the first time in recent memory that I have seen relationships in an extended family portrayed with such sympathy and understanding by Hollywood.

In some respects, I hate to commend this work in progress to your attention for fear of jinxing it.

As soon as I say something favorable it is certain that some shriveled little Hollywood genius will begin to parade lesbian lovers and gay couples before us, as the male leads all turn out to be klansmen and child molesters, and as a third world horde descends on the town to protest its unthinkable lack of diversity while a small army of cops camps into the story line.

The people who manage this business have deliberately overpaid for media properties and accepted below average returns for the past 70 years because they sensed the leverage and power of using advertising budgets from the business community to finance their hostile propaganda.

So why should they change their stripes now?

What's a small matter of queering the ratings and losing a little money when you have all of these potentially hostile descendants of European Christendom to reeducate and remold into New Socialist Man?

In any event I strongly urge you to watch this show before the inevitable shoes begin to drop.

It airs on Thursday evenings in my part of the world with re-runs of prior episodes on Mondays.

And the best part is, you can watch the show and still cancel the cable and refuse to finance your own destruction.

Watch a few episodes and let me know what you think.

Enjoy it while you can, and we can all chronicle its decay and collapse if that is what eventually comes to pass.

Yggdrasil-

---

[BACK](#)

Design © 1999 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



---

## At The Crest of the Tidal Wave

June 16, 2002

My last three posts have doubtless depressed many readers, as they set forth a case for an evolutionary psychology in Euro-Americans that is uniquely unsuited for survival when we mingle with alien races.

But in this post I have good news.

Robert Prechter's book, "At the Crest of the Tidal Wave" argues that we are at the crest of a tidal wave of change in the public mood that will stall or reverse a 200 year cycle of rising Western European prosperity, and along with that stalled prosperity, cause increased ethnocentrism, intolerance and anger. Based on current trends, I agree with the author.

It is a tidal wave which ultimately will destroy our European delusion of human equality and our deeply ingrained secular religion centered on the Universal Brotherhood of Man. It is a tidal wave that can very easily lead us to independence and self determination if we recognize the signposts and respond appropriately.

The author, Robert Prechter, is a genius with a habit of being four years early.

In 1978, with the Dow around 800, he predicted the start of a massive bull market that would carry the Dow above 3000 - a market call that sounded wildly improbable at the time - but a forecast which began to bear fruit in 1982. His prediction was set forth in his first book "The Elliott Wave Principle."

In 1996, he published "At the Crest of the Tidal Wave" predicting a grand supercycle bear market falling much further and lasting much longer than the bear market experienced during the great depression of 1929 through 1940.

Once again he was four years early.

In essence, Prechter argues that major price movements in the market are driven by the

dynamics of crowd psychology and that the underlying changes in psychology have a predictable form. There are two types of price moves, an impulsive wave and corrective wave. The impulse wave consists of 5 smaller sub-waves - three in the primary direction interrupted by two corrective waves in the opposite direction. The corrective move is a three wave structure - two waves in the corrective direction and one in the direction of the primary trend. A complete cycle consists of 8 waves, a five wave impulse followed by a 3 wave correction.

For those of you interested in using the Elliott wave in your investing, I would suggest that you read his earlier work "The Elliott Wave Principle." It has a more rigorous exposition of the "rules" and "guidelines" which I find are useful primarily for picking entries and exits, there being more reliable methods of identifying and staying with trends.

But "At the Crest of the Tidal Wave" is about much more than just investing. In Prechter's words:

"Investors form a crowd whose collective action reflects a key aspect of man's nature as a social animal: He is strongly induced to adopt the feelings and convictions of the group. In a realm such as investing, in which so few are knowledgeable, the tendency toward dependence is virtually impulsive. As a result, market trends are steered not by rational decisions of individual minds but by the peculiar collective sensibilities of the herd. The pervasive dependence among its members produces an emotional interpersonal dynamic that, like all feedback systems, has form.

"One clear message of the wave principle is that collective man will enjoy the same successes and repeat the same mistakes over and over, with minor differences in specifics, throughout eternity, although each time from a higher level of advancement. Mistakes are repeated not because people fail to learn from history, as many contend, but precisely because they do learn from history, from recent history, their own experience. Home buyers from 1949 to 1989, for instance, learned that house prices only go up. This was a mistaken conclusion, but it was due to learning not badly, but well. The problem is that the data was limited mostly to personal experience. Social Patterns result partly from the fact that life span, and therefore the depth and breadth of individual knowledge, is limited."

Thus, Prechter argues that changes in the collective mood will produce price changes that necessarily conform to the basic 8 wave structure. But this insight is merely a repetition of R.N. Elliott's theories set forth in 1941. Far more important for our purposes is Prechter's own original insight, namely, **that economic variables or "fundamentals" do not determine the direction of the market. Changes in the collective social mood occur first, and these cyclical changes in the social mood then drive the direction of the market, the direction of**



**the underlying economy or "fundamentals," and finally, produce sweeping social and political change:**

"The essential problem with conventional forecasts is the premise behind them. Almost everyone thinks that extramarket conditions control the future of the stock market and that the best way to forecast the market is to extrapolate such conditions indefinitely into the future. This approach never works for long, because it is the psychology behind the markets that creates the bottoms and tops. It is also the psychology behind the markets that creates economic and social conditions. These points are crystal clear once you grasp them, but they elude, and will always elude, the vast majority of investors, both public and professional. For instance, while the times today are historically positive, upbeat and optimistic, these facts are not harbingers of trends; they are the result of the trends forecast in the Elliott Wave Principle seventeen years ago. The reason there is a dearth of "gloom and doomers" today is that the future just feels too promising for most people to bet against, which is exactly why markets must be fully valued, and therefor approaching a top."

Finally, Prechter observes that the darkening of the social mood produces a falling stock market and ultimately, social upheaval:

"These data are of utmost importance in forming conclusions about the financial, social and political health of the United States. Much looks fine on the outside, but on the inside, a cancer has taken hold. The outward symptoms will become increasingly manifest as the Grand Supercycle bear market wears on, and dramatically manifest at the bottom of wave "C".

"Today's market patterns say that this debt buildup is about to resolve into a debt liquidation that will wreak havoc on the nation. "C" waves always expose at long last the weaknesses in the market's foundation, many of which are set in place at the pattern's outset but remain substantially hidden during the "B" wave. Besides the financial implications, which are the main focus of this book, the market's second concern ultimately will be social upheaval, which always accompanies "C" waves of this degree. Social psychology at the bottom will be the opposite of what it was at the top, and this change will have implications. For instance, the social programs that were put in place in the mid-1960's will undoubtedly be repealed at the end of the bear market.

"[T]he effects that a change in market trend will have on society are not in evidence at the start of the trend. They become intensely manifest by the time of its termination. . . . The coming trend of negative social psychology will be characterized primarily by polarization between and among various perceived

groups, whether political, ideological, religious, geographical, racial or economic. The result will be a net trend toward anger, fear, intolerance, disagreement and exclusion, as opposed to the bull market years, whose net trend has been toward benevolence, confidence, tolerance, agreement and inclusion."

As you can see, Prechter's theory has tremendous explanatory value. It explains why Pat Buchanan's political popularity hit a peak during the 1991 recession and steadily withered away to almost nothing as the euphoria of the late 1990's wore on. It also explains why the issue of anti Euro-American racial quotas cannot be used successfully for direct mail fund drives or other organizational efforts. It explains why racism among Euro-Americans is so unpopular.

The Grand Supercycle bear market began in April of 2000. Thus far, it has been largely confined to the technology sector, and more recently to large cap blue chips. However, the Small Cap 600 and the Mid Cap 400 set all time record highs within the past two months and have now started to decline. So the bear market has barely begun, and thus far has hit only certain selected sectors of the market.

But it is time to put Prechter's theory into its historical or long term perspective, for while investors typically are concerned about waves that last a few months or years, the greatest social upheavals come at the end of the longer waves lasting several decades or several centuries, and thus the timing of the longer waves is much more important to us.

Because of our limited life spans, the longest wave of interest to an individual investor will be the wave of "cycle degree" consisting of an impulse wave up lasting from 16 to 21 years and a corrective wave down which may last from 3 to 5 years. A "supercycle" consists of three cycle degree impulses of about 16 years each with two intervening corrections of cycle degree consuming another 20 years total. Thus, a 5 wave impulse of supercycle degree will typically last from 55 to 89 years, to be followed by a correction of supercycle degree lasting from 13 to 21 years.

Thus, an 8 wave supercycle (consisting of impulse and correction both of supercycle degree) will last about 70 to 89 years. Our last correction of supercycle degree began with the crash of 1929 and was followed by the great Depression.

Five supercycle degree waves - three up and two corrective - comprise the a grand supercycle degree wave. The last correction of grand supercycle degree occurred with the near simultaneous crashes of the South Sea Bubble of 1720 in Britain and the Mississippi scheme in France (The tulip mania capped a supercycle advance that ended 80 years earlier). Stock markets essentially ceased to exist for 50 years following 1720. The first supercycle impulse wave up thereafter began in 1784.

Thus, the idealized grand supercycle wave will include an impulse wave lasting about 210 years

and a correction of about 55 years, for a total of about 265 years.

The darkening of the social mood which occurs during each bear market of cycle, supercycle and grand supercycle degree governs, according to Prechter, far more than just stock prices. You will note that the American and French revolutions occurred at the end of the grand supercycle down wave extending from 1720 to 1784. Wars to enforce the secular religion of equality against dissenting nations seeking to abandon that religion occurred in 1860, following a very severe depression in the 1850's (the U.S. Civil War) and again in 1939, at the end of the depression of the 1930's (World War II).

Rebellions against the secular religion of human equality are cyclical and occur in conjunction with a darkening of the social mood and with economic contraction.

At a minimum, we are due for a grand supercycle downturn, meaning that the social unrest and political upheaval over the next 70 years will be orders of magnitude greater than those which provoked the U.S. Civil War or World War II.

Of even greater potential importance to us is the millennial wave, lasting from 800 to 900 years. For you mathematicians,  $3 \times 265 = 795$  years. Throw in an extra 89 years or so for the millennial degree down wave which overlaps the third and final grand supercycle down wave, and we have an idealized duration for the millennial cycle of 800 to 900 years. Organized securities markets with published data did not exist 900 years ago, so we must date millennial cycles by monumental social and institutional changes. The collapse of the paradigm of centralized power during the fall of the Roman Empire and the collapse of the paradigm of decentralized local power with the weakening and disappearance of baronial armies during the Crusades (1100 to 1300) certainly qualify as logical end points of millennial waves. During this period from 1100 to 1300, Sir Arthur Keith's process of European tribal amalgamation began in earnest with the development of centralized state bureaucracies. The baronial rebellion at Runnimeade (Magna Carta) and the ethnic rebellion of Sir William Wallace (braveheart) were early examples of counter-trend reactions.

But more important, the military elite of barons and knights was transformed or replaced by an elite of rentiers, a trend that has accelerated exponentially over the last 800 years. At first they were rentiers of lands, but later became rentiers of money and risk.

This trend has accelerated to such an extent that by the end of the 20th Century, the lone superpower has banished manufacturing from its shores and based the bulk of its economy on "financial services," collecting fees, commissions and rents on a rapidly growing mountain of some thirty trillions in debt and 16 trillions in stocks, and charging premiums for insuring risks and collecting bid-ask "spreads" for issuing a hundred trillion in financial derivatives.

This rentier elite has become so confident of its power and so secure in its ability to extract

continued rents, that in 1973 this elite rewrote all of the obligations it creates and accumulates so that they are no longer payable in gold or silver, but are pegged to an entirely imaginary unit of value that depends entirely upon the confidence of the buyers of the obligations they create. While there may be some tangible or physical collateral behind some of the obligations, those obligations are payable in an infinitely elastic unit of value capable, in times of systemic crisis, of infinite depreciation and triflingly easy repayment.

It is John Law's Mississippi scheme writ large and on a global scale. And appropriately, it is called "globalization".

I should point out that we nationalists need only a down wave of supercycle degree to produce the systemic risks that will unwind this fantastical bubble. But like Prechter, I believe that the downtrend that is now upon us will be of far larger dimensions. I should also note that from a purely economic perspective, grand supercycle corrections are probably indistinguishable from and just as destructive as millennial wave corrections.

Organized securities markets can lose 90% or more of their value very quickly - typically in a few years. Thus, logically, a stock market cannot keep crashing for 70 years (grand supercycle) or 144 years (millennial cycle). Rather, it is the social transformations - the correction of delusional beliefs and the sweeping away of institutions which embody those beliefs and excesses that mark the end of longer wave corrections.

One must keep in mind that the social upheavals which most graphically mark the end of a down wave in the social mood of supercycle or grand supercycle degree often occur at the beginning of an upturn. For example, the French Revolution extended from 1789 through 1795, after the financial markets began to revive in 1784. Similarly, one might be tempted to conclude that a millennial cycle ended in the 20 years following 455 AD, as the Roman Army disintegrated. However, the disintegration of the Roman Army represented the largest and most important tax cut in the history of the planet. I would argue that this marked the middle of a grand supercycle advance following a down wave of Millennial degree. That final disintegration of the Western Roman Empire precipitated a "dark age" only in the sense that nobody was being taxed to support a class of scribblers, architects and sculptors extolling the greatness of the tax collecting elites.

Joseph Tainter sets forth an excellent discussion of the economics of the collapse of the Roman Empire in his classic "The Collapse of Complex Societies." He describes how expansion of the army and the empire was profitable and self financing during the Republic as new kingdoms were conquered and their treasuries were seized. This process ended with Octavian's (later, Emperor Augustus) conquest of Egypt. However, under the Principate (27 BC through 284 AD - Augustus through Diocletian) expansion stopped, and imperial resources were devoted to holding the empire together.

I would mark the Millennial degree down wave as beginning with visible signs of economic stress. Although Nero first debased the silver denarius by raising its base metal content to 10% in AD 64, I would date the beginning of the Millennial degree down wave with Marcus Aurelius in AD 161. During his reign, a devastating plague hit Europe which lasted 15 years and killed as much as a third of the population in some areas. Like Julius Caesar and Octavian before him, Marcus Aurelius began a series of wars against the Germanic tribes at enormous cost and failed to subdue them. Aurelius debased the denarius to 70% silver. He faced a shortage of recruits for the army and a shortage of agricultural labor to tax.

Following Aurelius' reign, things went from bad to worse. In the words of Tainter:

"The half century from 235 to 284 AD was a period of unparalleled crisis, during which the Roman empire nearly came to an end. The chief features of this time were foreign and civil wars, barbarian incursions, devastation of many provinces, increases in the size of the army and the bureaucracy, financial exigency and increased taxes, debasement of the currency, and unparalleled inflation.

"Central control over many provinces waned, and successful independent empires were temporarily established in several areas. Gaul (France), Britain, and Spain, for example, were independent from 260-74. Semi successful revolts included those of Carausius and Allectus in the northwest (287-96), Domitianus and Achilleus in Egypt (279) and Zenobia in the east (267-73).

"This was a time of local disintegration. Lawlessness and banditry increased in places such as Sicily. Tenant farmers left the land, and there were numerous bands of brigands. Farmers in Egypt fled to the swamps of the Delta. In Gaul, rebellious bands formed called the Bagaudae.

"The population of the Empire, under the effects of ravaging of the countryside by both foreign and friendly forces, rampant inflation, and changing leadership, cannot have recovered from the plague outbreak of 165/166 to 180. The catastrophes of 235-84 fell on a declining population, which suffered further when the plague returned from 250 to 270 AD. The agricultural population of a province so essential as Gaul declined, either killed or captured by barbarians, or having deserted fields to join the bands of brigands. Town populations fell before and during the crisis, due to plague, pillage by armies engaged in civil wars or by barbarians, and the declining rural population."

Declining population is a sure sign of a Millennial wave, and is a subject to which will return shortly.

In all probability, a new but relatively weak supercycle upwave began shortly after the reign of

Diocletian (284-305). We get a powerful hint of this in the final sentence of the following paragraph from Tainter:

"It was the coinage of everyday commerce that was debased, for this was the currency that the government used to meet its military obligations. In the 150 years prior to Diocletian's edict of 301, the value of Gold rose 45 times, the value of silver 86 times. The silver that once went into one denarius could now produce 150. The result was hyperinflation that must have disrupted local level commerce. In Diocletian's edict a pound of pork was fixed at 12 denarii. By 412 it cost 90 denarii. In Egypt, from which the best documentation has survived, a measure of wheat that in the first century A.D. sold for six drachmae had increased to 200 drachmae in 276 A.D., 9000 in 314, 78,000 in 324, and to more than 2,000,000 in 334 A.D. . . . Gradually, though, more and more gold solidi came into circulation, and the copper output was reduced. By the fifth century, the inflation was largely spent."

The Western Empire was doomed by 284 AD.

The devolution of power from the centralized state to local barons and war lords had begun.

The reforms and tax cuts by Diocletian and Constantine (288-337 AD), and particularly the issuance by Constantine of the gold solidus, which held its value for seven centuries, almost certainly mark the beginning of the first supercycle advance of a millennial wave which ended during the Crusades. The key point to understand was that this millennial wave of economic progress was characterized by the transfer of political power to local leaders, low taxation, and an almost complete absence of bureaucrats, scribblers, pundits and propagandists.

It has been 1800 years since economic catastrophe struck the Roman Empire, and 900 years since the beginning of the Crusades. Odds are that we are due for another down wave of millennial degree.

In many respects the stage has already been set, with the demographic and cultural drivers of impending collapse already firmly in place.

Prechter talks about the economic "cancer" of debt creation and the bundling of systemic financial risks which have accumulated during the past 60 years. But the most remarkable and unique aspect of the current supercycle advance is the obvious and catastrophic cultural decline that has accompanied it - a cancer with far more profound implications than the various financial bubbles he identifies in his book.

Those of us who are over age 50 have witnessed this cultural collapse first hand. Those younger than age 50 will have to read the chilling litany of statistics set forth in "The Bell Curve" which

chronicles the current cultural collapse.

People follow moral codes which demand that they restrain selfish individual behavior not because such moral codes are just or fair according to abstract reason, but because of social pressure from members of a broader kinship group whose strength and survival depend upon that moral code being followed. Such standards of behavior are selected because individual self-restraint is always necessary in order for the group to perpetuate itself over time. Likewise a degree of freedom is necessary within the group so that the group may adopt practices that allow it to adapt to changed circumstances. After all, the group's leaders are not always right, and individual freedom must exist to give substance to accepted patterns for challenging and occasionally replacing the group's leadership. Finally, belief in a supernatural god who codifies and enforces those self-restraining rules is useful to cut off endless debate about the proper limits of the group's coercive power over the individual and the proper scope of unrestrained individual action and behavior.

Culture is the public expression of group continuity.

Destroy group identity and you get hedonistic behavior, falling birth rates and precipitous cultural decline, precisely what we have witnessed over the past supercycle advance since 1940.

During the collapse of the Roman Empire, the population decline was caused by disease and economic hardship imposed by imperial tax collectors. As soon as the pressure of disease, taxation and marauding bands eased, European population growth resumed. In contrast, the catastrophic decline in European and Euro American birth rates is entirely self-imposed, and entirely a product of cultural decline.

Thus, there is no force visible on the horizon that could reverse the trend, other than a dramatic political and social response to economic collapse. And in this sense, it becomes clear that economic collapse and sweeping social change are both inevitable. There is simply no other way to stem the declining populations throughout the developed world.

The critical point here is that a millennial degree down cycle is consistent with the already existing trend of cultural collapse. One need not expect or await a new trend that does not yet exist.

Similarly, during the final half of the Twentieth century the World has experienced a dramatic expansion in ethnic nationalism and ethnic self-determination and secession movements. Multi-racial and multi-ethnic states are splitting asunder. The most visible examples are the collapse of the Soviet Union and the splits and secessions in Eastern Europe. Ironically, the most extreme example of this trend is the expansionist racial state of Israel, with its highly successful program of ethnic cleansing as a means of gaining additional territory, its announced policy of "first use" of its large nuclear arsenal, and its prohibitions against gentiles purchasing land within Israel.

It is an example that is certain to be followed by others, especially its innovative program for preventing public discussion of its aims and actions throughout the Western world.

Once again, the shape and direction of the millennial social changes can be determined with reference to a clearly existing trend which began in the final supercycle advance.

Very few in our modern world appreciate the extent of the economic and social threat posed by our declining populations. Again, this is a trend that is already in place, and nothing can be done about it in the next 30 years as all of the players in this unfolding drama have already been born. The Third World won't save us, as U.N. demographers predict that working age populations in Latin America, and the Indian subcontinent will level off and being declining in about 30 years.

We all seem to recognize that the state run retirement systems - Social Security in the U.S. - will be in deep trouble over the next 30 years because of demographics. This recognition is easy in part because the taxes are unpopular, and percentage pay replacement in retirement falls as career earnings rise. We understand that these programs are undergoing gradual repeal as governments falsify the inflation measures to which benefits are indexed. Since half the population of the G-8 is entirely dependent upon these programs for retirement and old age medical care, they are bound to be a source of immense political strain.

But the middle classes of the G-8 stubbornly refuse to recognize that the same demographics doom their beloved stock markets.

Falling populations mean fewer new houses, fewer cars, and thus much less steel, glass, rubber, plastic, and concrete. Falling populations mean less construction and less manufacturing. The United States is in a particularly precarious position, as it is dependent upon a huge financial services industry that is highly leveraged to growth in the capital and financing needs of these basic industries, many of which are overseas. The housing industry will contract to a very tiny shadow of its present self, for obvious reasons. There will be a chronic oversupply of existing houses unless the government begins purchasing and destroying them. In contrast, manufacturing - most of which we have exported to Asia - will contract much more slowly, with the decline in real output broadly matching the percentage decline in the population. However, with chronic excess capacity in manufacturing, the demand for financial services will collapse, as will employment in the financial industries which are so heavily concentrated in the U.S.

Declining production from a fixed investment base means declining profits and declining yields on invested capital as far as the eye can see. One can readily imagine that there will be demand for new technologies that make life easier for this declining population, all of which will require new investment. However, each capital project required to finance technological innovation will necessarily confront the certainty of falling demand in the future. There will be no long term trend of population growth to bail out bad or imprudent investments or absorb excess capacity.



Thus, far less innovation is likely.

The population demographics will produce real deflation of massive proportions. Of course we are likely to experience nominal (dollar denominated) inflation of equal proportions as the government works to conceal the truth by printing more dollars.

Most severely impacted will be governments themselves, as tax revenues - depending as they do upon profits and income which are both highly leveraged to economic growth - fall precipitously. Joseph Tainter theorizes, in his book "The Collapse of Complex Societies," that collapse to a lower order of complexity typically will not occur if the consequence of collapse is conquest and subjugation by a competing society that is willing to continue to suffer the costs and diminishing returns associated with increasing complexity. Given competing societies of nearly equal power, collapse is unlikely as those competitors will continue to invest in increasing complexity to stave off the threat conquest and subjugation.

However, absent an expansionist competitor, collapse becomes the probable and sensible response to the excessive cost of government. Now that the U.S. is the sole superpower, it is free to collapse to a lower order of complexity and cost without fear of conquest, just as the old Soviet Union has done.

It is all so obvious, but we just do not want to see it.

The truly remarkable aspect of the grand supercycle corrective phase we have entered is how quickly the social mood is darkening.

Prechter notes that major wars and revolutions - the symptoms of the darkening of the social mood - tend to show themselves at the end of the down cycle, often just as the economy and the markets are beginning to improve. A particularly ominous aspect of this downturn is that the symptoms of a darkening social mood seem to be showing up very quickly - indeed they are showing up at a time when stock market valuations, home prices and other asset values are still at historically lofty levels.

The darkening social mood shows up most clearly in the adoption of genocide and ethnic cleansing by the inner party against their impoverished and weak Palestinian neighbors (a group from whom peace could be bought at an incredibly low price). The negative social mood deepens with Palestinian and Arab retaliation, including the 9-11 attack on the U.S. Most significantly, the inner party is rapidly losing its "sacred cow" status throughout those parts of the World they do not control, as European nations boycott Israeli goods and begin to reject Holocaust reparation claims.

At the same time, the corporate accounting scandals and the revelations that Wall Street analysts were issuing public "buy" recommendations on stocks they described in e-mails to one another

as "pieces of crap" is beginning to shatter the confidence of the American outer party elites in our economic and governmental institutions.

And this is just the beginning.

Indeed, Bill Pierce has detected this dramatic shift in the social mood, and has become much more optimistic about the possibility of positive social change in his weekly radio broadcasts. And, of course, Bill is right. His "thinking people" will increasingly become more willing to listen to alternative views as the years pass.

The suddenness with which the public mood is changing alerts us to the possibility of a much more serious "correction" in the social landscape than most are capable of imagining.

The economic catastrophe confronting us has a simple root cause, and that is falling birthrates throughout the developed world. Reversing that decline will require an uprooting of the unnatural existing culture of hedonistic consumerism.

That is unlikely to be a frictionless process.

Sir Arthur Keith notes that parents are slaves to the raising of their children. Having raised four myself, I am compelled to agree.

It has become clear that in the aggregate, the reproductive impulse in European men and women is far too weak for our collective survival if reinforced only by the individual emotional satisfactions that come with having a child. One child is enough to absorb the nurturing impulse of a deracinated and atomized nuclear family, and for many a dog or cat will do quite nicely.

Men and women will make the sacrifice of raising children at or above the level of population replacement only when they have a strong commitment to the survival of their race and understand that self restraint and economic sacrifice are necessary to ensure group survival. Ultimately a social consensus must be forged in which the survival of our race becomes a paramount objective. At that point, having and raising children at or above replacement will be seen as a duty, and can be enforced with appropriate amounts of social pressure and moderate governmental incentives. Remarkably, the solution is broadly consistent with the already existing World wide trend toward ethnic separatism and self determination. All we need do is to harness that trend to remake (or restore, depending on your perspective) our culture and morality in ways that ensure our collective survival, and then the solution to the demographic problem should follow naturally, and without much debate or stress.

But we nationalists should not wait for economic catastrophe.

Our most important task at the moment is for us to connect socially in our local communities and build congregations of people who reject hedonistic consumerism in their everyday lives. These need to be congregations that share information, encourage large families, restrict their charity to fellow congregants, avoid doing business with our culture destroying enemies, and generally confer practical economic advantages during the hard times to come.

We need viable communities of orderly and relatively prosperous nationalists we can point to as examples to overcome the incredulousness of our own people who, though recognizing the problem as they inevitably must, will be reluctant to embrace radical change without first seeing an existing working model.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to the Culture Wars Page](#)

(c) 2002 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

## The Posen Speech

March 31, 2002 [Posen Speech Full Text](#) Relevant passages are quoted below.

As I prepared this book list, I searched diligently for some worthwhile writings from the Third Reich. Alas, it was not to be. The Third Reich left few intellectual guideposts for understanding our plight and mapping future courses of action.

The lack of any meaningful intellectual analysis of racial interactions from the Third Reich is stunning and surprising.

Mein Kampf is a dreadful tome. Rosenberg's Myth of the Twentieth Century is too.

Houston Stewart Chamberlain's stuff is interesting, but ultimately not very satisfying pound for pound and page for page.

The cruel irony is that the best explanation of National Socialism was written by an American long after the collapse of the Third Reich. It is a marvelously insightful book with the dreadfully humiliating title of "White Power", authored by George Lincoln Rockwell (see <http://www.americannaziparty.com/WP/WPcont.htm> and also <http://www.americannaziparty.com/TTTW/TTTWcont.htm>

Probably the best and most engaging discussion of Fascism and National Socialism is set forth in the biography of Sir Oswald Moseley by Robert Skidelsky see [http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v05/v05p134\\_Stimely.html](http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v05/v05p134_Stimely.html)).

However there is one relatively short text produced during the Third Reich that stands out like a brilliant exploding star in the heavens. It stands out not because of its complexity of conceptual analysis but for the dead on accuracy of its observation. Those observations have clear contemporary relevance.

I had some difficulty deciding whether to place this text under Popular Delusions, or under the Dispossessed Majority. But it seems clear that the Posen speech sets forth a series of factual and attitudinal observations that bear on two very important long cycle delusions of Western

Europeans. First and most important is our inability to recognize the dual code that seems so obviously a part of the basic mental equipment of the rest of humanity. The consequence of our inability to understand the dual code is our powerful tendency to sacrifice ourselves in the name of theoretical abstractions or for the interests of some competing group. A second long cycle delusion is the idea that we may escape our competitive defects as a people by using the power of the state.

The truth is that we are going to have to reform ourselves from the bottom up, individual by individual - to take the vaccine, so to speak, at our own pace - or be subjected to a rapid, forced and very painful administration of the vaccine at the hands of our competitors in the gulag of multi-cultural violence and cultural decline they are creating for us.

One of the great unexplained mysteries of the universe is the utter lack of resistance by the German people to the propaganda of the Allies following WW-2. When I say "resistance," I do not mean armed resistance. Rather, I mean passive cultural and economic resistance that would have nominally accepted the Allied agenda and institutions, but would have automatically and reflexively subverted those imposed forms and institutions in such a manner as to leave the German people in control of their own evolutionary destiny.

After all, Japan went through a similar occupation but remained a racial nation very much in control of its own culture and evolutionary destiny. The contrast is striking.

Following the War, Germany had a mere 20,000 members of the inner party. Even today, they number a mere 80,000 or so, far too few to police behavior within the German elites as they do in the United States.

But following the war, the German people warmly embraced Allied propaganda about their collective guilt, and the uniqueness of their crimes against humanity. Germany now pays the equivalent of our Social Security old age benefits to nearly 4 million inner party "holocaust victims", a staggering and wildly implausible number given their age, the normal decrease due to mortality, and the fact that no more than 3.5 million inner party ever came under the control of Germany during WW-2.

In addition, Germany pays approximately 10 billion dollars per year in foreign aid to one of the richest nations on earth - Israel - so that the Inner Party can do to the Palestinians what it accuses Germany of doing to them over 60 years ago.

This collective behavior is all the more bizarre, as it would have been relatively easy for Germans to discover the truth simply by asking the tens of thousands of guards and other low level functionaries who staffed the various chambers of horror claimed by the Allies about their experiences. The 5 year jail sentences that the puppet government adopted at the command of the Allies to prevent these survivors from contradicting Allied propaganda could never have

stopped a widespread underground effort at compiling, preserving and propagating the truth.

But remarkably, the German people seemed to adopt the Allied war propaganda of massive collective guilt for unspeakable crime as its core collective identity and as its central and unifying national mythos.

The Germans had no functional equivalent of Nathan Bedford Forrest following WW-2.

It is no accident that the Protestant Reformation/Revolution began in Germany.

The Catholic notion of forgiveness was insupportable. Sin was immortal and could not be forgiven - ever!

Salvation could come only if each German nailed himself to a cross and perished for his sins.

Religions spread and flourish not because of their historical or theological truth, but because they are consistent with the pre-existing evolutionary psychology of the adopting group.

As Christianity drifted northward from the Mediterranean it changed in fundamental ways.

The dual code - amity and forbearance toward ones own kind and enmity towards competing groups was a given among all of Christ's contemporaries in the Eastern Mediterranean.

In Matthew 5, the Sermon on the Mount, Christ is speaking to his followers and announces a very stringent moral code of turning the other cheek and walking the extra mile. He uses the word "brother" throughout to make clear that this code of amity is to be applied to within-group relations. It is a code of amity so demanding that only the most committed would join, thus reinforcing group boundaries. He announced a code of sexual morality so stringent as to guarantee the genetic separation of the group for generations.

In contrast to the mosaic law with its jealous god and collective guilt and punishment, the concept of sin announced by Christ was purely individual, for violation of the rules of amity that govern within-group relationships.

Central to this notion of individual sin for breach of an exacting code of in-group amity was the expansive and generous notion of forgiveness, allowing a group member to remain within the group despite breaches of that exacting code.

Christ's code for dealing with the competing out-groups - the Pharisees (followers of the Babylonian Talmud) and Levites - both of which are attempting to kill him and his followers - is equally clear.

In Matthew 23 he calls them the "sons of hell" - the very personification of evil. When he encounters them in public Christ is deceptive and evasive, answering them with riddles and questions - ever mindful of the boundaries between speech that will allow him to continue his mission and speech that might get him killed prematurely - before he was ready to sacrifice himself for the individual sins of his followers and to reinforce their group identity.

Christ inhabits a multi-cultural world, a world of competing tribal groups seeking to displace and kill their rivals.

All of this was clearly understood by Christians for the first three centuries following Christ's death. The stringency of the moral code applicable to within-group relations was carefully balanced by the generous notions of forgiveness - all isolating mechanisms which conferred a practical survival advantage upon being Christian during the decline of the Roman Empire.

But as Christianity moved North, Matthew 23 became utterly incomprehensible.

The conspicuous lack of any reference by Christ to forgiveness of Pharisees and Levites would have been interpreted by any native of the Levant as compelling evidence that they were competing and hostile tribes at war with Christ and his followers. But as Christianity moved North, Pharisees and Levites were transformed from permanently hostile racial enemies into temporary aggregations of individuals possessed of erroneous thoughts.

And as individual states of mind are transitory, the existence of Pharisees and Levites hundreds or thousands of years earlier could have no contemporary relevance.

Christ's rants about Pharisees and Levites came to appear as inconsistent with the Sermon on the Mount, and Christianity became obsessed with translation to attempt to shed light on these inconsistencies.

The critical words "neighbor" "alien" "sojourner" and "brother" are used hundreds of times and their meaning is absolutely clear from the context, if one is willing to see it. Accurate translation is not the problem.

Similarly, the extent to which Christ was repudiating vast tracts of the Old Testament as "laws of men" in his testy and evasive exchanges with his tribal enemies became incomprehensible to the linear thought patterns of the northern European.

The Christ who advocated turning the other cheek in Matthew 5 became completely inconsistent with the violent and aggressive Christ who grabbed a whip and drove the money changers from the temple by force in John 2, 15. Once you understand that Christ operated

under the dual code, then the inconsistency disappears.

But once you recognize that Christ lived according to the dual code, then if you are a Christian, you must adopt the dual code yourself, and that is a difficult stretch for our Northern Europeans.

Sin and forgiveness also changed as Christianity moved North.

Sin was no longer the violation of rules that applied to relations within an extended group based on blood relations, but became violations of an abstract and universal code similar in its reach and operation to Newtonian laws of physics.

Sin was not conditional and local but cosmic and eternal, with the scream of its offense extending to the very edges of the universe - and the memory of violation of Christ's law surviving in the vast and expansive universe for an eternity.

Likewise forgiveness became problematic and irrational. It was transformed from the emotional reaction one would expect from an uncle or cousin, anxious to reaffirm the values of the group and strengthen that group by rehabilitating a valuable member, into something unbounded by any human experience.

How could one atone for violation of an abstract and universal truth without eternal and boundless suffering and sacrifice? What Catholicism had taken for granted for centuries became ever so problematic to the Northern European mind.

The problem we face is not with Christianity, but with our own evolutionary psychology.

And with that as background, it is time to transport ourselves back to October 4, 1943 and join the annual conference of SS officers, listening to their chief, Heinrich Himmler.

Himmler's Posen speech represents the **MOMENT OF RECOGNITION** - that unique point in European history when a major leader clearly looks in the mirror and recognizes the problematic evolutionary psychology of the German people (including himself).

Everyone who cares about the survival of our race needs to internalize the lessons which Himmler began to grasp too late.

Professor Ginzberg in "The Fatal Embrace" correctly notes that the policy of Germany towards the inner party was something of a disorganized "CF" (a military term). On one side were Goebbels and Ernst Rohm, who advocated direct and violent mob action by the people of Germany. On the other were Himmler and Goering, who were conscious of international opinion and wished to avoid encouraging habits of street violence and uncivilized behavior



among the German people, preferring instead to let the state handle the problem with asset confiscations, anti-miscegenation laws, disenfranchisement and, ultimately, resettlement of the inner party to some other part of the World.

Following Bismark's example, Himmler believed in the power of the centralized state to solve all problems. The bureaucracy would handle the problem quietly, in as humane a manner as possible given the nature of the mission, and keep the solution largely out of the view of the German population.

By 1943 it was clear that Germany might lose the war, and Himmler had this to say to his SS officers:

"The domestic front

"I now come to another aspect of this war, the domestic front. Some of the German people, namely the older men drafted, are now doing their second four-year world war. The German people were already very tense \*gespannt\*, years before the war, because of the armaments, the Four Year Plan, the recovery of Austria, the Sudetenland, and the occupation of Bohemia and Moravia.

"There can be no doubt that hostile propaganda is now streaming and trickling into the German people from many sides. We are unfortunately unable to screen off hostile broadcasters entirely, or in any manner worth mentioning. The temptation has grown to listen to hostile broadcasters, who achieve better psychological effects than we do, sometimes, unfortunately, very good ones.

"As in all cases in which a prohibition or law cannot be given the emphasis of enforcement by executive authority and punishment, the effect of the prohibition is harmful to authority; that is true in this case as well. We have, of course, prohibited listening to hostile broadcasters, but we were not, and are not, able to punish violations of this prohibition in any meaningful way. Today we pay somewhat more attention to it to some extent, since, when Mr. Badoglio committed his piece of piggery, when treason ran amuck in Europe, the result was naturally a wave of defeatism in Germany. Shortly before, after the air attacks on Hamburg, a mood of crisis prevailed in many cities, which were, particularly our beloved capital of Berlin, almost panicky for days, until the mood calmed down and leveled off again.

"As a result of listening to foreign broadcasters, talk then circulated through the channels which always exist, even in a great people, "Oh God, we can no longer win the war. Wouldn't it be better therefore", etc. etc. Then came this highly interesting remark: "Ah, a Duce can be arrested, how interesting". When the Duce was arrested I said to myself, now we've really got to watch it. The people who think that's so interesting, they interest me.

"Since that time, as you may note from the reports from the Reichsministry of Justice, and you will continue to note over the coming few weeks, Mr. Administrative Advisor so and so, and Mr. Factory Owner so and so, and Mr. Waiter, and Mr. Chauffeur, and Mr. Plumber, and Mr. Employee, have all had their pretty little heads cut off and placed between their feet for damaging the morale of the German people as defeatists, for disintegrating the powers of resistance of the German people, and for treason. It's really not important for us to kill anyone. If we really had to shoot as many people as all that, or as many as I'd have to, it would get increasingly difficult to sign a death sentence.

"When I was appointed Reichsminister of the Interior, everybody said (since it's so awfully easy to say), "Mister, hit hard, stay tough. The German people expect terrible severity from you". I'm already severe, I don't need any admonitions. It's very easy to say something like that, but a death sentence means eternal misery for a whole family; it means bringing shame on a name which was once honorable. Imagine for a moment what it will mean to the children and grandchildren of that family, when it is later said (you must always visualize these things as they will look 10 or 15 years after the war): "The father of this family was beheaded for high treason during the Great War, which involved the fate of the Germanic nation". (In the distant future, everything we do today will look heroic. Human weaknesses will then be forgotten. All the cowards will have died off in the meantime, and in the end everybody will be considered a hero). Such a family will be shamed for all time.

"I know all that. I know how hard it is; and I therefore try to restrict the necessary educational measures.

"I know that there's a great deal of theft in Germany, that the concept of private property has been much weakened by suffering, and by the relaxation of all moral standards such as always happens in war, or due to a poor upbringing of the German people in this regard. I can't catch every thief, I'll never catch them all. I don't even want to catch them all, otherwise I'd have to arrest too many thousands of people. I'll never catch every defeatist. I'm perfectly well aware that, in one or two years, when the divisions and regiments withdraw into their garrisons -- some of the older veterans having been wounded up to 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 times, while the rest no longer march with us because they lie under the grass; when, I hope, a still decent part of the old SS once again marches back to Germany, I know that many thousands will applaud us then, and perhaps feel themselves to have been much more heroic than we were, or -- we don't think of ourselves as heroic -- more decent than we were.

"It will always be like that. I don't mind. We shouldn't mind either. We should never lose our sense of humor. It is, however, necessary to set an example for the number of cowards who can be found among every people. It is, God knows, unfortunately true that these cowards are always found in the upper, rather than the lower or middle, ranks of a people. Intellect obviously ruins the character in some manner, at least as regards the formation of will and energy. It's enough for me, for such education, if I always grab one out of 100 of the defeatists

who later cry "hurrah", and lay his head between his feet. Then the others will shut up for a quarter of a year. Then all the little mommies will say, "For God's sake, don't get yourself killed, don't make us unhappy. Somebody we know was recently beheaded. It's in the newspapers. So just keep quiet, cry 'hurrah' very loud".

"Good, let him; we've achieved our objective. We could never storm a fort or a front line position with a person like that anyway. We know that anyway. But the main thing is to keep them from hurting our decent people. Insofar as is necessary, action will be taken brutally and mercilessly. None of us enjoys that. Although we don't like it, you must act mercilessly, gentlemen, without regard to family relationships, or acquaintance, or class, or possible previous earlier service; without regard to whether he is a party comrade or not, when the fate of the nation so requires. Always go after a big fish rather than a little one who's stupid and has been fooled. The domestic front will always be in order if we have the nerve to keep it in order, although it gives us no pleasure to take action personally.

"The evacuation of the Jews

"I want to mention another very difficult matter here before you in all frankness. Among ourselves, it ought to be spoken of quite openly for once; yet we shall never speak of it in public. Just as little as we hesitated to do our duty as ordered on 30 June 1934, and place comrades who had failed against the wall and shoot them, just as little did we ever speak of it, and we shall never speak of it. It was a matter of course, of tact, for us, thank God, never to speak of it, never to talk of it. It made everybody shudder; yet everyone was clear in his mind that he would do it again if ordered to do so, and if it was necessary.

"I am thinking now of the evacuation of the Jews, the wiping out \*Ausrottung\* of the Jewish people. It is one of those things that's easy to say: "The Jewish people will be wiped out" \*wird ausgerottet\*, says every Party comrade, "that's quite clear, it's in our programme: elimination \*Ausschaltung\* of the Jews, wiping out \*Ausrottung\*; that's what we're doing." And then they all come along, these 80 million good Germans, and every one of them has his decent Jew. Of course, it's quite clear that the others are pigs, but this one is one first-class Jew. Of all those who speak this way, not one has looked on; not one has lived through it. Most of you know what it means when 100 bodies lie together, when 500 lie there, or if 1,000 lie there. To have gone through this, and at the same time, apart from exceptions caused by human weaknesses, to have remained decent, that has made us hard. This is a chapter of glory in our history which has never been written, and which never shall be written; since we know how hard it would be for us if we still had the Jews, as secret saboteurs, agitators, and slander-mongers, among us now, in every city -- during the bombing raids, with the suffering and deprivations of the war. We would probably already be in the same situation as in 1916/17 if we still had the Jews in the body of the German people.

"The riches they had, we've taken away from them. I have given a strict order, which SS Group

Leader Pohl has carried out, that these riches shall, of course, be diverted to the Reich without exception. We have taken none of it. Individuals who failed were punished according to an order given by me at the beginning, which threatened: he who takes even one mark of it, that's his death. A number of SS men -- not very many -- have violated that order, and that will be their death, without mercy. We had the moral right, we had the duty to our own people, to kill this people which wanted to kill us \*dieses Volk, dass uns umbringen wollte, umzubringen\*

"But we don't have the right to enrich ourselves even with one fur, one watch, one mark, one cigarette, or anything else. Just because we uprooted \*ausgerottet\* a bacillus, after all, doesn't mean we want to be infected by the bacillus and die. I will never permit even one little spot of corruption to arise or become established here. Wherever it may form, we shall burn it out together. In general, however, we can say that we have carried out this most difficult task out of love for our own people. And we have suffered no harm to our inner self, our soul, our character in so doing."

It would appear from the above two passages that the Third Reich has a serious problem.

Its people seem to be lacking some very basic survival skills. First, a unified race equipped with the dual code would not only ask the obvious question "why is this wartime propaganda being directed at me - who financed it and who benefits?," but they would also enforce the consensus prohibition against listening to the broadcasts by exerting massive social pressure on their errant comrades to stop. The state should not need to take an active role at all.

Indeed, even if the Germans were to decide to surrender and then commence passive resistance thereafter, this decision should not be subject to the influence of enemy propaganda. Indeed, it should have been obvious to every German in the land that no matter how bad things were, they could never be "better off" under the domination of an alien, and so the temptation to listen to the alien's propaganda should not even arise. Such a temptation could only arise if there were no social or other costs associated with selling out to the alien.

The powerful impression left by Himmler is that the German people are in fact an atomized de-tribalized, de-racinated group of individuals, similar to our own beloved Euro-American sheeple, and not a nation at all.

This impression becomes overwhelming in the second passage concerning the uprooting of the inner party.

Himmler complains that while "80 million good Germans" (a number equal to their entire population) may agree with ethnic cleansing as an abstract or conceptual proposition, once the SS or police start rounding them up, it seems that all "80 million good Germans" have a personal relationship with at least one inner party member and will complain and cry for an exemption for him.

Himmler goes on to note that even in wartime, when the SS has to see 500 or 1000 corpses of their fallen comrades and stand firm in their resolve, the average German sees none of that and would just as soon have a "fifth column" in their midst making the problem worse. That is the matter about which Himmler would "never speak publicly."

Himmler is saying that the German people are utterly incapable of imagining that neighbors who smile in their faces from day to day as they meet in public, nevertheless work tirelessly in private to ensure their subordination and demise as soon as the last German leaves the room.

In other words they were incapable of defending themselves in a multi-cultural society.

It follows that they are helpless against aggression from aliens among them without the State to intervene defend them. It is left to the state to enforce the essential tribal values of internal cohesion and separation from the alien.

And therein lies the central problem confronting all Euro-American nationalists.

As Himmler is beginning to recognize in the passages above, the state is poor substitute for group survival instincts in the people themselves.

Otherwise, the state is forced to meddle in every aspect of peoples lives, as it must concern itself to supply all the deficiencies of their behavior. Thus the state is forced to become "totalitarian," becoming bogged down in endless trivia which it cannot, as Himmler admits, effectively police.

I would suggest that the state is much better at preparing and administering the cultural vaccine for its people than it is at regulating the minutiae of behavior necessary to avoid displacement and subjugation at the hands of aliens. If the people have all taken the vaccine and know what to do, then the government is free to concentrate on what it does best, namely carefully shaping the external environment in such a way as to provide the vaccine to related nations as well, a task which becomes much easier if the government does not always need to be on a war footing.

I am hard on Hitler and the Third Reich. After all, the Second World War made a generation of Euros from around the world fight a war in the name of human equality and to protect the alien communist murderers of our European kinsmen in Russia and the Ukraine. Forced to risk their lives for that particular delusion, the WW-2 generation naturally adopted it as their own. It was the American WW-2 vets who started minority hiring preferences, and all sorts of integration schemes as soon as they returned from combat, and it was they who refused to purge our communist racial enemies and their sympathizers from the American government, entertainment industry, and academia - thus transforming America's institutions into alien

infested towers of babel committed to the displacement and disintegration of the Euro-American people.

WW-2 was not only a disaster for Germany but a disaster for all of European civilization. Sadly, its deleterious effects are still with us, accreting mass and power even as a new millenium dawns.

With all of the new research coming from Russia to the effect that Stalin was planning his own invasion, perhaps my condemnation is too harsh. Indeed, Himmler and the rest had very little time or space for maneuver.

But damn it, they had seen this movie before and they didn't prepare any vaccine!

I cannot understand how any literate human could read Pakenham's history of the Boer War and yet fail to deduce some incredibly important geopolitical conclusions.

First was the clear lesson of just how murderous a supposedly civilized army could behave once enlisted to defend the interests of a handfull of inner party mine owners and financiers living in Southern Africa.

Once Britain encountered the Boers in combat, they discovered not a national or imperial army of conscripts - an army who's commander would give up after it was clear that his resources were overmatched, but rather bands of soldiers fighting for the self determination of their people - bands of soldiers who would never give up.

So very quickly, the British began burning the Boer farms and herding Boer women and children into concentration camps. More women and children died than Boer soldiers. Boer solders who were captured in battle were shot. None survived.

Now in this particular case, the survival of England wasn't threatened in the slightest. The stakes for Britain were entirely financial and relatively modest. Nevertheless, when the British encountered this small, fiercely independent European Protestant tribe, and found them fighting as a people to preserve that independence, all the rules of civilized warfare and humanity went right out the window. On the spot, Britain invented concentration camps for a civilian population, and resorted to a savagery which including murdering prisoners of war - all carefully calculated to keep the cost of the war commensurate with its modest benefits.

This case history from 1898 should have set off alarm bells throughout Germany and, indeed, throughout the NSDAP long before it came to power.

The first lesson is that nothing so informs the rage of a universalist egalitarian than a European

self determination movement.

All the rules of civilization go out the window. And this makes perfect sense, if you stop and think about it. Egalitarian universalists seek world domination. The ultimate threat to that dream and to their sense of self worth is a particularist revolt by their native populations, insisting that the egalitarian universalists represent the interests of their own people. In that event, the dream of world domination goes right out the window.

Himmler had a clear duty not only to the German people, but to the rest of us as well, to understand the full implications of the Boer War.

And indeed, the Boer War shatters forever the illusion of historical determinism - the notion that wars are the inevitable consequence of economic interests.

The Boer War was provoked by no more than a dozen men.

The few individuals who wanted war, Barnato (Issacs) , Beit, Wertheim and the rest of the IP gang were well known to the Boers. They lobbied the legislatures of the Boer Republics and certainly disclosed exactly what they wanted and why.

They then staged an armed coup, which the Boers easily defeated. But then the Boers set the conspirators free and did absolutely nothing to the IP gang of sponsors.

Being thus encouraged by the lack of any personal costs associated with plotting violence against the Boers, Issacs, Beit, Wertheim and the rest of the IP gang lobbied Britain to conquer the Boers.

It was all so predictable.

What the Boers failed to realize is that these international capitalists are the most risk sensitive and risk averse people on earth. They are the most powerfully motivated by reward and punishment, constantly calculating odds and payoffs from various courses of action. Their behavior is thus easier to change than that of any other group or class of citizen.

Once it is made clear that they will be the very first casualties of any effort to foment war, they will become pacifists. Life for them is about opportunities and costs, profit and loss. It is not about sacrificing one's life.

Economists and historians argue that the economic and cultural differences between the North and South in the U.S. made civil war inevitable in 1860.

Not so. The economic and cultural difference made disagreement inevitable, but such disagreement had several possible outcomes, including allowing the South to secede and go its own way. War was far from inevitable. It was not popular with the voters.

Rather, it was approximately 25 railroad barons, four war governor politicians and one very famous president who they financed that made war "inevitable". Once the confederacy surrendered and the long lines of the railroad barons were secured, the carpetbaggers were withdrawn and Nathan Bedford Forrest and his followers were left free to organize the Southern States in pretty much any fashion they desired.

Had one or more of the Southern states had the foresight to figure out precisely who had a compelling interest to lobby for war prior to 1860, and to form an intelligence service capable of imposing the ultimate cost on those lobbying for war, others of a like mind would have adopted less aggressive methods of doing business.

Same with the Boer War. The untimely deaths of five or six international capitalists would have had a powerful demonstrative effect on anyone else inclined to lobby for war.

War is only inevitable if those who profit from it are allowed to avoid the same kinds of personal costs imposed on the typical infantry rifleman. If those who stand to profit know they will become the first casualties, war becomes a highly improbable last resort.

The world of 1933 was more complex than that of 1860 or 1898, with many more players and more moving parts.

But Germany in 1933 was a far more capable nation with vastly greater resources. It could have found ways to match the political contributions of the inner party dollar for dollar throughout Britain and the U.S. It could have identified, encouraged and subsidized allies in the U.S. radio and film industries. It could have identified and eliminated particularly dangerous and deceptive wirepullers, including Roosevelt, before they could manipulate the United States into joining a war which 70% of the voters opposed.

I would be less hard on the failure of the Third Reich had Hitler and Himmler begun to prepare and distribute the vaccine.

Alas they did not.

But ultimately, the issue of blame is largely irrelevant and our duties at this point in time are quite clear.

We must recognize that our 250 year delusion of the universal brotherhood of man, coupled



with the secularization of Christianity following the Enlightenment has provided the inner party with two opportunities which they have exploited with consummate skill and craft.

On our own initiative, we replaced explicitly Christian notions of individual sin and guilt with a new secular notion of collective sin arising from human inequality, an offense against the universal brotherhood of man.

Next, we transformed forgiveness from something the individual must earn into something which the modern state must purchase, through symbolic gestures or payment of tribute. It is all now beyond our individual control and beyond our individual responsibility, except for the duty to cavil at our fellow citizens for their insufficient devotion to the ideal of human equality.

What the inner party has done is to lever this secularized and thoroughly modern ritual required by our innate evolutionary psychology into a source of endless and costly tribute to themselves. We can expiate our sin and attain forgiveness only by ceding control of our inherently sinful society to the inner party and then paying them very generous amounts of tribute.

It is a stable system only so long as the industrial economy of the West can generate a surplus sufficient to satisfy the inner party while still providing tangible benefits to the outer party, and only so long as our subordination to their power and authority does not become too crudely visible.

The system of tribute is the price of their participation in our "religion of civility," a unique inner party contribution undetected or unremarked by John Murray Cuddihy in his work "No Offense; Civil Religion and Protestant Taste".

Second, the secularization of sin into offenses against human equality has given the inner party the opportunity to degrade the culture, thereby creating a void which we have an opportunity to fill.

We have a European evolutionary psychology in search of a belief system.

It will be far easier to make our people feel guilty about the consequences to our less fortunate brethren of this inner party degradation of our culture, than it will be to motivate them to stand up for their own collective self interest. Indeed, by ceding control of our society to those Christ clearly identified as the "sons of hell" we are guilty and responsible for the misery and degradation of Euro-American culture that follows and for any economic catastrophe caused by the inner party.

And for this insight we are, at least in part, indebted to Heinrich Himmler. He was the first to take that belated look in the mirror.

He was the very first to observe that acceptance of racial nationalism as an abstract theory had little practical effect on the German people. Acceptance of the ideology of racial nationalism did nothing to make his job of administering internal security easier. The German people behaved like an atomized de-racinated collection of individuals.

After defeat, they would abandon the ideology of racial nationalism and would lack the basic capacity to defend themselves in the face of Allied propaganda - lacking also the basic ability to compete effectively for survival in a multi-cultural society.

Heinrich Himmler belatedly came to recognize that the power of the modern state and its bureaucracy was limited. It is merely one tool among many.

Survival of a people depends upon endless successive triumphs of the collective will of the people themselves. It does not depend upon the will of any particular leader or the survival of any particular state.

Yggdrasil-

---


[Back to the Culture Wars Page](#)

(c) 2002 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

Below, courtesy of the U.S. Census Bureau, is a racial map of the United States by concentration of Euro-Americans using 1990 data.

## U.S. Population (White)



---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

## YGGDRASIL

Here is an advertisement the Anti-Defamation League published on the op-ed page (p A31) of the New York Times on June 4, 1997.

It is the notorious "Jail - A Place for Everyone" ad.

The ad is grim and crude - hamfisted in the extreme. It is so crude one wonders about the intended audience. Indeed, the Hollywood moguls are smoother. When they want to promote "tolerance" they produce propaganda pieces like "Pocahontas" in which blond white males are portrayed succumbing to the lure of light skinned mulattoes, Aryan in form and stature, but with fuller lips, a moderate tan and large breasts.

Say what you like about the Hollywood moguls, they know how to come up with propaganda that white men will watch.

The advertisement below is another thing entirely. One can only hope that the ADL did not run this ad in Peoria or Dubuke. A recent poll run by the Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University found that fear of crime had doubled in the last 20 years, but that fear of "hate crimes" was at the bottom of the list, below fear of children getting porn on the Internet. Only the severely paranoid believe that "hate crimes" are a serious problem in America.

The headline in effect says, we create places for all of you in America, and if you don't like your place, we have jails, lots of jails. Message understood Rabbi Foxman!

This is the kind of ad that can only appeal to the Stalinist, totalitarian mindset of the ADL's own contributors. But at least we now have clear identification of the constituency that favors the police state, suppression of free speech, and the abolition of traditional freedoms in the U.S.

[Click here to see Ad!](#)

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



## There's A Place In America For Everyone – Including Those Who Act Out Their Hate.

Too often, those ignorant of the value of diversity have been moved by words of hatred to violence... to crimes of hate. Today such crimes are taken very seriously.

Hate crimes defy our American belief that each of us has the right to live a secure and peaceful life without fear of being victimized because of our race, ethnicity, religion or sexual orientation.

The Anti-Defamation League was founded in 1913 to protect Jewish Americans from hatred, bigotry and persecution. But our mission also directs us "to secure justice and fair treatment to all citizens alike."

This is why we address the problem of all hate-motivated crimes. Not just anti-Semitic crimes. In a landmark 1993 decision, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld our model legislation. Thirty-eight states have specific legislation to punish bias-motivated crimes. Today, ADL has grown into one of the largest and most respected civil rights and human relations

organizations in the nation. We are dedicated and committed to the protection of our traditional American values of pluralism and tolerance... to the values of diversity and equality for Americans of every racial, ethnic and religious description... to exposing and condemning hatred and extremism of every sort and to educating and sensitizing every American to the rights, beliefs and contributions of others of good will.

Abraham Lincoln said, "Let us have faith that right makes might and in that faith, let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it." Join us in doing our duty as good citizens.



For these pamphlets and a materials brochure, call 212-835-7774 or check [www.adl.org](http://www.adl.org)



823 United Nations Plaza, New York, NY 10017  
David H. Strassler, National Chairman  
Abraham H. Foxman, National Director

Fighting Anti-Semitism • Combating Hate & Bigotry • Civil Rights Litigation • Hate Crimes Legislation  
Combating Terrorism • Protecting Religious Freedom • Victim Support  
Anti-Prejudice Training • Supporting Middle East Peace • Interfaith Dialogue • Holocaust Education

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Social Control and the Stock Market

As I begin this, on the morning of (10/28/97) the largest 100 companies in America commenced massive stock buy-backs to reverse yesterday's 554 point market slide, and to convince the baby boomers not to redeem their mutual funds. (Confession time: with the market rising the Muse fled, and as I finish this on 10/29/97 the markets are heading South again and the Muse returned at the sight of smiling Joe Granville on CNBC talking about individual investors being the "smart money".)

OK class, lets talk about "critical thinking skills." You know, that's the buzz word you hear constantly from our public schools and our Colleges. Is the baby boom generation full of "critical, independent thinkers" as advertised, or are they over-stuffed woolly sheep with an intense desire to accept wildly implausible belief systems?

Montgomery Securities surveyed their customers about their attitudes toward the stock market in August. They found that 65% of their customers believed that the stock market would appreciate 34% per year, compounded, over the next 10 years!

Folks, that is not Dow 10,000 or 12,000 or even Dow 15,000 as some bullish analysts have suggested. it is Dow 151,000!

You cannot make money in any investment unless you understand the motives and beliefs of the other market participants that surround you.

And we all know that this notion of Dow 151,000 ten years from now is not even remotely possible.

The problem is that every one of these baby boomers wants to retire early with lots of money. Among boomers, it is a sign of failure if you cannot hit the links at age 55. Working beyond that age is declassé in the extreme (unless you are a CEO with lots of "power" which of course you may want to keep until you die).

The problem with stocks and the U.S. stock market is simple and obvious. The dividend yield on the S&P 500 is 1.6%. What does that mean for our typical baby boomer nearing retirement? It means that if they have a 401(k) account with a value of \$500,000, the annual dividend income is \$8000.

Now you cannot hit the links on \$8000 per year!

Even if your retirement fund is an impressive \$1,000,000, your dividend income is only \$16,000 per year. Enough for a modest trailer somewhere along the Texas-Mexico border, but nowhere near enough to allow you to hit those links!

All of those retiring baby boomers are going to have to sell!

They can sell their stocks as soon as they retire and buy a bond that yields, in the case of our \$500,000 retirement account, \$30,000 per year, or they can buy an annuity (in effect, a bond that also refunds principal over your life based on the life expectancy of a pool of investors) that will pay almost \$50,000 per year depending on when they retire.

They also have the choice of holding on to those stocks, collecting their dividends and then selling in dribs and drabs every year in order to get that income up above \$30,000 per year.

The lead edge of the baby boom is now age 52.

The baby boom generation (born in years 1945 through 1964) numbers 70 million workers out of a total of 122 million. The youngest boomers are age 35. For the next 12 years, there will be far fewer workers hitting age 35 (the age at which people begin to save and invest) than there will be people retiring. In about 4 years, about 4.1 million boomers will retire each year. By law, the contributions of the new 35 year olds are limited to about \$10,000 per year, while the larger number of retirees will have large account values, and stock to sell, worth around \$200,000 on average.

There have been a few articles in the financial press admitting that the lead edge of the baby boom will reach age 65 in about 14 years. This is, of course, propaganda. You have a public disclosure room at the Department of Labor in which the actuarial schedules of every pension plan in the country are filed. And every large plan out there assumes the truth, which is that on average, pension liabilities walk out the door at age 57, not age 65.

Beginning no later than about 7 years, we will be faced with the reverse of the bull market that began in August of 1982. We will have 30 years of uninterrupted net selling, as the baby boom attempts to pull money OUT of the stock market.

So then the question becomes; "What are the odds that the George Soros's of the world will allow any substantial number of boomers to cash out at these high valuations in effect now?"

In other words, what are the odds that the hedge funds, the arbs and the Wall Street pros won't sell first, in advance of the certainty ahead, and administer a "haircut" to the great herds of

woolly sheep who want to believe?

Or to put it in the vernacular of the Street, "Is the market an anticipatory mechanism?"

All of our "critical independent thinkers" out there went to college and understand the PV function on their spreadsheets. They use it often. But folks, that is the bosses' function and the corporation's function, not yours! The PV function presupposes that you have millions of dollars NOW to invest NOW. The corporation you work for wants to understand the present value of the future revenue streams from deployment of its millions.

Right next to the PV function is the FV function. Like the legendary Maytag repairman, it sits there largely unused. Now folks, the FV function is YOUR function. It is the one that all you "critical thinkers" out there can use to calculate the term of your own freeway commuting servitude.

And once you do a few "what ifs" with that FV function, you will figure out that high yields and high rates are good for YOU (but not for the corporation that employs you), and low interest rates and low yields are very bad, because they extend the period of your serfdom and lower your living standard in retirement.

Indeed 7 years is an eternity for the investor, so lets talk about what is happening right now, and what is likely to happen over the next couple of years.

The pundits on CNBC prattle endlessly about the fact that the currency turmoil now occurring in Asia will export "deflation" to the U.S. This is supposed to be comforting to the great herd of woolly sheep. After all "deflation" means that financial assets are "the only place to be" right?

Well folks, that depends!

A critically important article was published in the Wall Street Journal on October 17, 1997 and had the following to say:

"Most of the news from this week's 23rd General Population Conference in Beijing has focused on the threat of overpopulation. But this danger may be a myth. Over the past several years, some of the world's best demographers have begun a dramatic reassessment of the world's demographic future. They are now seriously considering the possibility that the world's population will peak in our lifetimes, and then commence an indefinite decline."

But for investors, what happens to World's population is nowhere near as important as what is happening right now to the populations of the countries with the largest investment markets.



The U.S. stock market represents more than 50% of the value of all stock markets on earth. Add in Japan and Europe, and it is well over 80%. Birth rates in Russia, all of Europe, North America and Australia declined by 1995 to 1.5 births per woman. This means that the European populations of the world are shrinking by 30% with each generation. This population decline is not confined to white Europeans. Japan also has about 1.5 births per woman, as has China (although the data from the countryside is a little less reliable) with its draconian "one child per couple" policy backed by abortion and infanticide.

Birth rates are still high in Latin America and the Indian subcontinent, but are projected under the U.N.'s "low variant" model (following conquest by Coke, Pepsi, MTV and the pill) to decline to less than 2 per woman by 2020, at which time their populations begin to decline. Sub-Saharan Africa is expected to follow by 2040.

The populations of Latin America, the Indian subcontinent and Sub-Saharan Africa have very little impact on the economies of the developed world. The parts of the world with real economies and real demand have falling populations right NOW. We don't have to project, assume or speculate. Falling population in all of the world's major economies is a present unarguable fact!

What does this fact mean?

First, all economists are the progeny of Thomas Malthus, (1766-1834) the famous English economist who believed that there was no point in pursuing general prosperity through economic growth because people would quickly breed themselves back into poverty and the edge of starvation.

We all think of a business cycle, in which population is rising and temporary excesses of investment produce temporary "deflationary" periods in which demand from the rising population must be allowed to catch up with supply.

Falling population is a brand new thing. Unique in Human History at least since the last Ice Age about 35,000 years ago!

Economists have never had to sit down and think about what would happen in the face of declining population. The first symptom of a falling population is that the workforce gets older. As the workforce ages, its productivity increases, and its savings increase as well. Thus, in this first stage, you have a "virtuous circle" for investment markets in which interest rates fall and stock prices rise in parabolic fashion.

But as the population keeps aging and falling in numbers, the ratio of retirees to workers rises, and you get dramatically falling demand all across the developed world. This produces a vicious

circle of economic contraction, excess capacity, falling profits and falling stock prices as far as the eye can see. A falling population is wildly deflationary, but that is not the kind of "deflation" that Wall Street is thinking about when it uses the term.

Wall Street loves "deflation", because "deflation" is one of their belief systems that sustains high stock prices and allows them to peddle paper to the baby boomer public with a straight face.

The belief system or "Wall Street deflation" includes moderate economic growth, falling real wages, and rising corporate profits.

Problem is, that with a falling population, you need rapidly rising real wages all across the economic spectrum in order to have any economic growth at all. Given stable wage rates and stable prices, you will have perpetual recession and perpetual business contraction as far as the eye can see.

For investors, it will feel like a nuclear winter of falling demand, falling real interest rates and rising credit risk, as companies default and go bankrupt in the general contraction of demand.

Governments will attempt to reverse the effects of contracting demand through two devices, the first is easy money - more units of currency chasing fewer goods, and the second is immigration.

Easy money is the classic prescription for price inflation. Given what we know about modern Liberal Democracies, a falling population will mean perpetual stagflation.

We have already seen the "easy money" response to falling demand in Japan. Japan is about 7 years ahead of us, with a population that is about 6 years older. Their stock market began its slide from 39,000 in 1990 bottoming at 14,000 a couple years later. It was a decline of 64%. Individuals owned 40% of the Japanese market at the top through mutual funds. That percentage sank to less than 5% where it remains now.

In the years since, Japan has been growing its money supply at double digit rates in an effort to counteract the contraction in demand. Easy money has led to zero or negative real rates of interest in Japan, but there are few borrowers because there are not many investment projects in Japan that can make a profit in the face of this declining population and falling demand.

Rapid money supply growth has occurred in Europe as well. In the face of a falling population and falling demand, businesses will not have the ability to raise prices of goods and services. So indicators like the CPI (which is riddled with phony "quality improvement" adjustments and is heavily influenced by falling import prices) will not pick up the excesses. Rather, the excess

money finds its way into securities markets which inflate in parabolic bubbles and then collapse in wild panics precipitated by currency attacks and devaluations.

Easy money will be the tonic all governments in the developed world administer. During 1990 through 1994, annual growth rates of our broadest money measure, M-3 slowed to less than 2%, hitting 0% in 1993 (a disinflationary number under any definition). To counter this decline, the Fed leaned against the wind and grew Monetary Base (a very narrow measure of money that the Fed directly controls) at double digit rates. In 1995, M-3 began to grow, crossing the 6% annual growth level in October of 1995 and rising gently from that point to its present rate of 8.5 % annual growth.

Inflation follows M-3 with a two year lag. And right on schedule we had a producer price index increase of .5% for September (which, if continued in each of the next 12 months, equals a 6.1% annual rate of increase). On 10/28/97 the employment cost index (wages and benefits) for the third quarter showed an increase of .8% or a 3.2% annual rate of increase.

Stagflation is coming back!

With this backdrop of falling population, it is no wonder that our elites have quietly opened the borders despite 75% disapproval in public opinion polls.

By opening up their borders, the developed economies are likely to ingather disproportionate numbers of new welfare recipients who add to the tax burden and the deficit. The young, the talented and the productive are unlikely to come, for the simple reason that they can make more money by staying in their countries of origin which will have expanding populations and expanding demand for the next 20 years. The World wide acceptance of free markets following the collapse of communism means that a child in Mexico or India with an IQ above 130 can remain in his land of birth where his talent is relatively scarce and make more money than he can make by moving to the U.S. and overcoming its language and cultural hurdles.

The European world will discover that immigration will attract primarily more low wage workers not wanted in their country of origin. At minimum wage levels, these immigrants will not produce enough to finance the education of their children, medical care for their family, nor old age pensions to be provided by the government. To the deflationary burden of falling populations, immigration will only add the additional burden of higher taxes - unless - the liberal democracies are willing to administer IQ tests and deny admission based on the results.

But we all know that Western Democracies are incapable of upholding standards of any sort.

The declines in the foreign markets you have witnessed over the past few days, and the volatility in the U.S. market, are the very first overt symptoms of a trend that will gather

strength and power over the next 30 years starting now.

It is profits and stock prices that will deflate.

In fact, declining populations and falling demand are likely to produce a kind of nuclear winter for investors where there is little place to hide. Falling populations mean falling housing prices, as high real estate taxes put pressure on the growing numbers of retirees to sell and move to smaller quarters.

Collectibles (coins and stamps) will benefit initially from the reappearance of stagflation because collectibles are not taxed. Loose money will drive down interest rates, keeping real interest rates and living standards in retirement low, while falling profits and falling demand will drive down stocks and increase the risk of default on bonds that pay above average rates.

Easy money will mean a succession of currency crises which will profit only professionals with an eye on their screens at all times. As long as the arbs precipitate the crisis, politicians can engage in competitive devaluations (belligerent acts of aggression in international trade) and blame "speculators." Despite falling demand, goods prices measured in those units of belief we call currencies are likely to rise dramatically.

But the real fallout of falling populations in the developed world will be political.

In America there are 70 million taxpayers. 3.5 million of them, the top 5%, pay 50% of the income tax. It is impossible to provide a meaningful tax cut to the average citizen because the bottom 35 million of those returns pay only 5% of the tax. Back in 1955, Corporations paid 40% of all income taxes collected. Now they pay only 9%. Our society is being financed by a smaller and smaller group of very productive and highly compensated people. Approximately 15 million families finance 80% of the costs of the welfare state. Understandably, these are the very people who so eagerly look forward to early retirement.

Folks, there is no way our government can allow these people to retire early!

In 1961, there were 19,000 students who scored above 700 on the verbal portion of the SAT test. In 1995 (the last year before "recentering") there were 8000. The productive, taxpaying sector of our economy cannot be replaced!

National wealth is now dependent not on capital, but on the efforts of highly trained and highly motivated knowledge workers - software engineers. The decimated ranks of our youth can replace only one out of 2 at comparable levels of ability and talent. Ultimately wealth creation and tax payment will decline.

Our woolly sheep will discover that they have accepted a belief system under which they, individually, would forgo the expense and bother of having capable children, firm in the faith that someone else would certainly have them, pay the \$120,000 it costs to educate each one, and speed them into the economy to pay taxes to finance social security.

The problem is that about 60% of our "critical thinkers" had the same dumb idea at the same time.

In truth, the government need not worry. Greenspan and Rubin know perfectly well that the Wall Street pros have a plan to keep you baby boomers from retiring.

The plan is called "Buy the Dips".

You see, unlike a bond, which pays you interest, and then on maturity repays your principal, issuers of common stocks make no promise to you at all.

The NYSE and the NASDAQ lists together have a market value of 11 trillion dollars. Mutual funds hold 4 trillions of this total.

But there is not one dollar on deposit to pay back investors from either of these systems. In order to get money out of the stock market, you have to find a NEW buyer willing to pay for your stock.

And that is why all the propaganda reinforcing the belief system we all know as "Buy the Dips" is so very important. This belief system guarantees that the Wall Street pros will have someone to sell to all the way down.

Each time the Dow goes down 200 points, the boomers will think it's another "dip" and will supply more money to the pros who know better.

When the scales fall from the eyes of a significant fraction of the boomers, the mechanism for the final triumph of the pros is already built. Up until the mid-1980's most retirement and 401(k) plans used to have quarterly or monthly fund switching. This meant that the retirement saver had to wait until the end of the quarter to sell his mutual funds and duck into the fixed income fund.

But now, all 4 trillion can switch daily.

But remember that mutual fund sales orders flow in all day long, but the actual sales or redemptions occur only at the end of the day based on closing prices.

Now what do you suppose the Wall Street pros will do when they find out, mid-day, that a small fraction of the boomers have picked up the phone and ordered the sale of a relatively modest amount, say 300 billions?

The system is rigged in such a way that the Wall Street pros get this information in advance, and have time to act on it. They will pull their bids, and the market will go into a free fall until the dividend yield on the S&P 500 hits the treasury bill rate. (Dow 2500) at which time the Pros will be compensated, once again, for the risk of owning stocks.

80% of individual investors arrived in the markets after 1990. They have never seen a 10% correction, much less a bear market.

Our woolly sheep baby boomers desperately want to believe in the "win-win" transaction. They want to believe in a nicey-nicey world in which the mutual fund managers and Wall Street pros will somehow protect them from harm.

But companies go through a cycle of growth, maturity, and death.

Our woolly sheep baby boomers are going to learn that the purpose of a stock market is to have a place to hang the paper of contracting companies - those in their death cycle of decline. And the ideal place to hang that paper is on the individual investor.

And in the face of declining populations all over the world, virtually all companies are going to be in decline.

Alan Greenspan, our Fed chairman, knows this, and so does our Treasury Secretary, Robert Rubin. So does every actuary in the Social Security Administration and every statistician at the Census Department.

But they don't want you to think about it because nothing can be done to change the situation.

Ultimately our woolly sheep baby boomers will discover the Darwinian truth about markets, so aptly summed up by Carl von Clausewitz in his treatise "On War."

"We say therefore War belongs not to the province of Arts and Sciences, but to the province of social life. It is a conflict of great interests which is settled by bloodshed, and only in that is it different from others. It would be better, instead of comparing it with any art, to liken it to business competition, which is also a conflict of human interests and activities, and is still more like State policy, which again, on its part, may be looked upon as a kind of business competition on a great scale"

I live under a dual code of amity toward my fellow white nationalists, hopeful patience toward my fellow Europeans, and enmity toward all others.

My purpose in writing this is to ensure that white nationalists reading this understand the risks they face when they buy stocks.

Ironically, the best strategy to ensure a comfortable retirement may be to have 4 intelligent children capable of solving problems.

May you all prosper!

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Main Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Slavery and The Federal Reserve

It amazes me that successful Euro-Americans do not instantly recognize that our tax system is very carefully tailored not only to raise revenue, but to keep people like you and I working.

Reagan's 28 percent top marginal rate was intolerable because we all would have quit (or worked for free as I do) years earlier without the Bush increases.

We live under an inverse pyramid where 3.5 million families defray 50% of the costs, and 14 million families pay 80%. The endless propaganda about equality and the sins of slavery are designed to keep us from seeing the obvious - how few of us field hands are out in the fields! Successful, productive people have become the slaves.

I can tell from some of my feedback that many readers have a tough time grasping the reality of demand deflation coupled with loose money at the same time.

What central banks have learned from the 90's is that you can gun the money supply without having the effects show up in goods prices or the CPI, and thus without increasing the government's old age pension liabilities.

This means that the monetary authorities are free to create interest rate arbitrage opportunities to prop up the banking system, and confer benefits on the financial elites without "adverse effects on main street".

Alan Greenspan started worrying about "irrational exuberance" only after hearing reports that thousands of people were quitting their jobs to trade stocks.

Greenspan isn't the slightest bit concerned about elevated markets increasing consumer demand. What he is worried about is that elevated markets will confer freedom on some of the serfs and that this new-found freedom will depress government revenues and increase pressures on wage rates by making labor scarce.

The central bank isn't threatened by stagflation because it moves people into higher tax brackets.

They do not yet fully understand that their easy money policy coupled with falling population creates opportunities for speculative currency attacks, and for extreme market volatility (and not



just in the upward direction!).

---

[Back to New Additions Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

## Gold and Silver Update

01/13/98

As I pick up Tuesday's paper, I am looking at an Associated Press Photo of a crowd of Indonesian peasants with wads of paper Rupiah - the local currency - desperately trying to buy cooking oil.

The accompanying article explains that the Rupiah has lost 66% of its value. On this same day, gold, platinum and silver all went up. Is there a connection?

In truth, the 5% rise in the gold stocks today, and the rises in the metals, probably involve short covering. It would be prudent to wait for a "higher low" before jumping in.

But for the masses of Asian peasants, a lesson is being seared into their brains that will last for a generation.

You cannot trust paper currencies!

And because of that lesson, I would suggest that Gold, and especially platinum and silver, are at lows which will not be seen again for thirty years.

The local currencies of the countries involved in the crisis have fallen from 40% to 70% against the dollar. The price of gold has fallen in dollar terms only about 15% since the crisis became acute in early October. Thus, any Asian saver lucky enough to have put his money into gold can convert it into 41% to 183% more units of local currency than he could in early October.

If he had been lucky enough to hold silver, he would have done better than the elites in his country who hold dollars.

But let us examine, once again, the politics of gold - and the social control of debt.

We begin with a definition: A "liberal" is a white man who denies that what happens to Indonesian peasants could ever happen to him.

You see, unlike a nationalist, a liberal thinks he is so superior that his currency could never

come under attack. He denies the essential universality of the human condition. The Asian peasants will buy gold. Our liberal will keep buying stocks and bonds denominated in dollars. Eventually, the markets will yield their own justice.

And indeed, you cannot attack the Dollar - the world's reserve currency - until you have a competing currency big enough to carry the load. But beginning next year, the international currency predators will have the Euro - a very large new currency designed to protect individual European states from attack while at the same time providing competition to the Dollar for the role of the World's reserve currency.

Look at these quotes from David Mullins, a former Federal Reserve vice chairman quoted in a Jan. 15, 1998 Reuters bulletin:

"An important benefit for governments, brought by the introduction of the Euro, will be a reduced cost of government financing," Mullins said in the latest issue of "euro times," a publication of Matif, the French futures and options exchange.

"If a government can tighten its spread to within 10 basis points, it will achieve a considerable decrease in funding costs. This bodes well for the euro achieving the status of a reserve currency," Mullins wrote.

Once the nations of the World begin to diversify their reserves out of the dollar, the slide will begin. As those dollars are repatriated back to the U.S., inflation will rise and the dollar will fall. The attacks of the international currency predators will intensify.

You see, one disadvantage of being the world's "reserve" currency is that by definition, you hold very small reserves of other currencies to sell in defense of your own. The only defense the U.S. will have is to raise interest rates high enough to attract foreign capital.

And the U.S. is a perfect target. We are debt ridden in the extreme, with nations like Japan and the elites of most Asian countries holding trillions in Dollar denominated debt. Once the Euro is in place and the dollar starts to fall, the foreign holders will bail out of our bonds, driving their price down and their yields (interest rates) up, while placing additional downward pressure on the Dollar.

It will be a time for us peasants here in the U.S. to sell our gold dear and buy those bonds cheap, when they are yielding 15 or 20%, just as debt instruments in Malasia, Indonesia and Hong Kong do now.

The lesson of the Asian crisis will be learned by Asians, but not by our own liberal yuppies. It will take an attack on the Dollar to teach them not to trust government and its computer-cypher

currency. They do not understand just how dangerous their belief systems can be.

Meanwhile the Asian story has classic lessons that will barely be noticed in the West. The Asian elites have participated in a speculative orgy, creating highly leveraged real estate and banking institutions while investing the profits from these ventures overseas in dollars.

The IMF insists on its usual medicine intended to protect U.S. and European lenders to these leveraged institutions, namely, that each troubled country devalue its currency. With a cheaper currency, exports will rise, and most of the leveraged institutions will survive and be able to repay their bank debts.

Of course, devaluing the local currency means protecting U.S. and European lenders by shifting the losses to the peasants who have their life savings wiped out! No bailout package for them!

In the bad old colonial days, European nations paid their armies to extract resources and production from foreign peasants at the point of a gun. Very expensive! Very inefficient!

Now the European financial elites force the colonies - affectionately referred to as "developing countries" - to produce more goods for less pay by getting them deeply into debt. Instead of paying soldiers, they earn interest on their loans. They can also earn capital gains on their loans if they lend in strong currencies and lend enough to induce excessive investment with its attendant overproduction, falling goods prices, and falling interest rates.

Thus, the first mission of the IMF is to ensure that the international volume of debt (and the international social control that indebtedness produces) never contracts.

Secondly, the IMF always insists upon "reforms" by which they mean opening up the local game to foreign internationalists who then can enjoy a greater share the spoils (if not utterly displacing the locals) when the wild rumpus starts up again.

So instead of carrying guns, you gain control by extending credit, and in every emergency demanding "concessions" in exchange for extending that credit.

While our domestic liberals in the U.S. firmly believe that the international financial elites exist to benefit and protect them, perhaps as "kinsmen," the international financial elites believe no such thing. To them, the great herd of Euro-American cattle are due for a rapid and painful milking in their own time, just like the Asians.

In the long run, bet on Platinum and Silver, or Gold if Platinum or Silver become too expensive!

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to New Items Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

## YGGDRASIL

### It's Different This Time!

For most of this century, the stock market has peaked shortly after the dividend on the S&P 500 fell to 3%. It typically bottomed and turned up shortly after dividends exceeded 5%. Likewise, stocks were a bargain when priced at or below book value and expensive and risky when priced above 2.5 times book. Similarly, the market was expensive when stocks sold for 20 times earnings and cheap at 10 times earnings.

As I write this (12/18/98), the S&P 500 sports a 1.3% dividend yield, sells at 4.5 times book and at 30 times trailing earnings.

These measures of overvaluation have continued for years, roughly since 1993 (although not at the extremes achieved in 1998). Thus, valuation measures seem to have lost their predictive value for the purpose of making investment decisions.

From the pundits and Wall Street pros on the sell side, the argument is that "it's different this time."

And so it is!

However, none of the pundits or Wall Street pros are going to be candid about why it is different. And yet it is clear from their market behavior last summer that they know the reason perfectly well.

In late 1992, Congress enacted Internal Revenue Code section 162(m) to make corporate salaries above \$1,000,000 non-deductible, effective in 1994. There was an exemption for "performance based" compensation based on objectives disclosed to and approved by shareholders in advance. Thus, beginning in 1994 most of a corporate executive's compensation would be dependent on the performance of his stock options.

In many ways this tax legislation merely reinforced a trend in executive compensation that had been underway since 1986 (wave 3 of III up), when corporate America began to realize that we were in a major bull market, and that options were the most valuable form of compensation because of the election of long term capital gain treatment available under Section 83(b) in the year of grant.

At about the same time that Section 162(m) was being drafted, the compensation consultants all

began marketing to the fortune 500 what they euphemistically call "investment education" programs. At that time, employees were being "too conservative" with their 401(k) money by keeping 80% of it (on average) in the fixed income fund. The message of these "investment education" programs was that stocks always go up faster than any other investment, and that you had to own stocks or you would not be able to retire. Hence, you must shift your 401(k) balances from the guaranteed fund into one or more of the stock funds.

Now corporate CEOs are not fools. Beginning in 1993 these programs became wildly popular. With the help of the consulting firms (the same ones which were hired to structure executive stock option programs) the fortune 500 began circulating propaganda among their employees urging them to switch their 401(k) funds into stocks and keep it there.

Inflows into mutual funds began to rise in 1991 and then accelerated dramatically through July of 1998.

At the same time, investment bankers had little trouble convincing corporate CEOs that shareholders were better served by using profits to buy back shares rather than paying dividends. A simultaneous trend toward greater corporate stock buy backs ushered in a 5 year era of the lowest volatility on record as S&P 500 companies bought back their stock whenever it dipped in price.

With the employee investment education programs, the corporate CEOs produced generalized market demand for stocks in the form of increasing mutual fund inflows. With corporate buy backs, they produced specific demand for their own shares and convinced the investing public that buying shares was riskless.

These are the twin flows of money that have propelled the stock market higher throughout the 1990's.

There is no money standing on deposit behind a share of stock in a corporation. The share has value only if someone is willing to come up with new money to buy it. Thus stock prices are, by their very nature, dependent on new buyers.

Now before you can take an intelligent position contrary to this market, you have to know what might shake these twin sources of new money that have driven the market higher over the last 7 years.

In his volume "The Tidal Wave" Robert Prechter correctly notes that:

"Investors form a crowd whose collective action reflects a key aspect of man's nature as a social animal: He is strongly induced to adopt the feelings and convictions of the group. In a realm

such as investing, in which so few are knowledgeable, the tendency toward dependence is virtually impulsive. As a result, market decisions are steered not by the rational decisions of individual minds, but by the peculiar collective sensibilities of the herd. The pervasive dependence among its members produces an emotional interpersonal dynamic that, like all feedback mechanisms, has form."

I would suggest that one of the two sources of fuel for the rally, mutual fund inflows, has already cracked, and that corporate buy-backs will also crack in stages, worsening with each new downturn in the market.

If you have not already sold your mutual funds, now is the time.

Prechter's book is a masterpiece. It belongs in the pantheon of WN greats under the umbrella of McKay's classic "Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds." However, I find Prechter's timing in the release of his classic in early 1996 somewhat strange. Mutual fund inflows were then rocketing upwards from the 6 to 7 billion per month level that persisted from 1993 through 1995 to a four month average exceeding 20 billions per month by February of 1996. Fund inflows demonstrated quite conclusively that the bullish psychology of the herd was accelerating dramatically in early 1996.

There is no way the professionals on Wall street would let those inflows go untapped. They promptly went out and showed their corporate clients these mutual fund inflows and sold a lot of corporate buy-back programs to reinforce the trend and keep prices and executive option values rising. At the same time, they ramped up their underwriting and new issues activity to rake in hefty fees from both investment streams.

And that, folks, is how Wall Street works!

You see, the largest source of funds for stock purchases, corporate buy-backs, has no relation to investment value at all, but is merely a compensation expense that happens to benefit all shareholders in the short term. As long as most shareholders approve, the activity will continue regardless of price and regardless of fundamentals.

But unlike 1996, the mutual fund inflows are now a disaster. The monthly data from the Investment Company Institute (ICI) for August, September and October 1998 show that the 12 month average has fallen to about 15 billions, a level that we have not seen since May, 1996. The 4 month average has fallen to 4.11 billions, a level we haven't seen since Sept., 1991. And it is not just the outflow in August, but the unusually weak inflows during the powerful rally of Sept. and Oct. that are causing the problem. Based on the AMG weekly numbers for November and December, it looks like the November ICI number will be weak and December, negative.



Here is what caused this shift among individual investors. First, the gold stock funds began falling in June of 1996 due to deflation, falling gold prices and falling profits. The gold funds lost 75% of their value. Next, emerging market funds took a pounding beginning in August of 1997 and ultimately lost 50 to 75% of their value. Emerging market funds were heavily touted to employees by the "investment education" programs sponsored by employers. About 40% of 401(k) plans make them available. Next, the forces of deflation started to reduce profits of small cap stocks, and pension funds and general equity funds began to sell these under-performers. This caused the price of small cap funds to lose 30 to 40% of their value beginning in May of 1998. The individual investor began to sell them as well.

The nasty price action in these three categories of funds has made the individual investor much more cautious. Mutual Fund Investing is no longer an easy way to make money. Finally, August's spill intimated that large cap funds could be subject to a similar pattern, and the huge inflows of 1996 through June 1998 simply stopped in August, September and October.

Now it is possible that the inflows might start up again in January. However, we have not seen four month average inflows this low since 1991. The only reliable evidence of a change in investor psychology is their actions. Because this caution is the result of price action over a period of 15 months and has persisted despite the most powerful rally in history from October 8 through November 11, it is hard to see why a modest rally here at year end is likely to restore confidence lost over the last 15 months.

Two or three bad reports from AMG in January will convince the Wall Street Pros to start betting against further price rises. They are likely to rattle the cages of their corporate clients to increase their authorized buy backs. At the same time, the Wall Street Pros are likely to cut back on their huge leveraged long trading positions, pay back the bank debt that finances those positions, and unwind their long derivative exposure and their highly leveraged spread trades that depend on a rising market.

Corporate buy-backs are tougher to analyze. The problem is that these buy backs are not based on investment fundamentals or values, but are intended to maintain price momentum in the short term. According to the Federal Reserve's flow of funds statistics, corporate buy backs totaled 266.7 billions in July, August and September of 1998, up from 117.7 billions in the previous two quarters, and 82 billions in 1997.

At the very time these corporate buy backs were being made in August and September, we had massive call purchases of over one million calls per day (outside of expiration week). No investor would volunteer to "catch a falling knife" by spending hundreds of millions on call options unless he knew that the market was going to turn around. And who would know that other than the very investment bankers and brokers who run the corporate buy-back programs for their corporate clients.

The option desk buys the calls, and then the corporate buy-back desk executes the buy-back purchases. You see, to protect you individual investors from potential conflicts of interest and insider dealings by corporate executives, the SEC prevents corporations from operating these buy-back programs themselves. So the law gives a handful of brokerage houses and investment bankers in New York all this information as well as the right to trade on it for their own advantage.

Thus, the best tipoff to a weakening volume of corporate buy-backs will be weaker call volumes during the next market plunge. Once the million plus call days start, you will know that the corporate buy backs are imminent. If the market falls, and call volumes stay low, the market has further to run on the downside.

Over the longer run, falling profits will break the psychology of the herd of corporate CEOs and stop them from engaging in corporate buy backs.

CEO's manage corporations in such a way as to maximize their power.

First, when profits fall, cash becomes scarce. Instead of presentations from investment bankers on all of the myriad ways in which CEOs can use free cash flow to hype the stock price and increase its value in takeover battles, the CFO's start getting calls from their lenders and creditors. Calls from creditors mean that your power is slipping away.

Earnings have been deteriorating for 3 quarters, but so far, the buy-backs have only accelerated. But then the brokers know exactly which companies still have good enough profits to sponsor buy-backs, and that is why the market is narrowing. Institutions buy only those stocks that have growing profits and authorized buy backs, euphemistically referred to as "liquidity" in the trade.

Thus, once the institutional investors begin to sell a stock because of falling earnings and drive its price down to a point at which most executive options are under water, the compensatory aspect of further buy-backs for the executives themselves disappears. The executives themselves are better served by issuing new options at a lower price and then waiting for an earnings turnaround before committing cash to buy-backs. At some point, institutions stuck holding the stock realize that the only thing that will boost the stock price is an earnings turnaround. They too will realize that corporate cash is better used for investment in new projects than in buying back stock.

In a market where corporate buy-backs provide the largest share of investment funds flowing into stocks, market breadth is a very important indicator of changing psychology. A narrowing market means a narrowing group of companies with the incentive to aggressively use their cash to ramp their stock prices.

As I write this piece, only 32% of NYSE companies are trading above their 200 day moving average. The NYSE and NASD advance decline lines look terrible. From Oct. 8 through Nov. 7, the Russell 2000 outperformed the S&P 500 and the advance decline line improved dramatically. At that point, it looked like the start of a new bull market. But the Russell 2000 has under performed the S&P since then. The Advance decline line has turned south as has the percentage of issues above their 200 day moving average.

This is very important. There is a reliable 4 year stock market cycle which bottoms in 1998. In addition, there is an eight year cycle and a weaker 12 year cycle of relative performance of small stocks which should bottom in 1998 as well. The failure of the small stocks in November and December (as well as the failure of mutual fund inflows) is the first evidence that a longer, more powerful cycle is a work, thwarting the expected out-performance of small stocks.

It is the first evidence that Prechter is right, and that the Grand Super Cycle (the last one of which peaked with the collapse of the South Sea Bubble in 1720) is beginning to exert its force in the market, overruling the 8 and 12 year cycles of small stock out performance and calling into question the 4 year cycle as well.

It is true that the advance-decline line often lags at the beginning of new bull markets. However, it does not outperform and then reverse at the beginning of bull markets. Nor do mutual fund inflows fall to 7 year lows at the beginning of new bull markets.

Unlike January of 1996, evidence of a psychological change is clear and unmistakable now. If the current trend of under-performance of the small caps and the below trend mutual fund inflows continue in January, you must sell!

You will notice that to this point in the discussion, I have confined the analysis of the effects of the declines in the gold stocks, the emerging market stocks and the small stocks to their effects on the psychology of individual investors. Similarly, I have confined my discussion of the slowdown in earnings and the poor breadth of the latest advance, to its effect on the psychology of CEO's who authorize corporate stock buy- backs.

It is these psychological changes that have an effect on demand for stocks, and thus have some predictive value for those of us trying to make money in the markets.

However there is a background that is equally important for framing expectations of the contrarian, looking with a wary eye for a change in trend.

The problem is deflation. Where does it come from?

Over the past year, we have had three very powerful trends: - Falling commodity prices, falling

interest rates, and collapsing economies in the developing countries, the emerging markets.

In the presence of wildly accelerating monetary aggregates M-2 and M-3, we get falling commodity prices - both oil and copper are at multi-decade lows - while interest rates fall.

So why this disinflation or deflation? Where does it come from?

We have heard much discussion about the crisis in the developing Asian economies and the deflationary forces that have been unleashed in that part of the world.

But the truth about developing Asia is that American, European, and Japanese manufacturing jobs have been exported to those countries. American, European and Japanese money has been spent on factories in those countries for the purpose of satisfying demand in America, Europe and Japan.

If you look at the economies of Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia, and China you find a relatively small fraction of the population working in the transaction economy. Most work in the self-help and barter economy of the farm and village where money does not often change hands. You will read horrific statistics about average per capita incomes of \$700 or \$900 per annum (a figure that includes much higher middle class incomes) and wonder how the typical person in those countries survives. The truth is that they are nowhere near as poor as the statistics on the transaction economy would make them appear. They grow much of their own food, make much of their own clothing, and build their own houses.

Joseph Schumpeter noted that economic development is a matter of "culture." That is to say, the habits and attitudes that allow people to abandon farm and village, acquire a specialized set of skills and trust that some employer will provide a paycheck are required before development can take place.

The truth is that an entire nation of individuals is not going to transform its habits and expectations, learn marketable skills and migrate to the transaction economy in several years. It requires several generations. And the Americans, Europeans and Japanese building plants in these developing Asian countries know this perfectly well.

They build manufacturing plants in these countries to satisfy demand primarily in America, Europe and Japan. Indeed 80% of the market demand worldwide comes from the developed economies.

Thus the deflation in demand that crippled the developing economies of Asia was imported from America, Europe and Japan. A very small slowing in demand from these developed economies would easily trip the developing economies highly dependent on exports of

consumer goods into depression.

The source of the Asian contagion is a very gradual subsidence of consumer demand from America, Europe and Japan.

This very gradual fall in demand was felt first in the developing economies dependent on low margin consumer manufacturing. As demand from the developed world continues to subside, the malaise will spread to higher margin capital goods manufacturing, including communications, computers and telecom. Finally, the effects will spread to business services, the sector of the advanced economies that generate the most high paying jobs.

And the reason for this falling demand is falling birthrates and falling working age populations throughout the developed world.

The numbers are clear. The consuming populations of Europe and Japan are falling very rapidly - by 30% with each generation. The same is true of the Euro-American population of the U.S. [Birth Rate Table](#) The data are less clear for the U.S. because the statistics include the effects of immigration, 75% of which consists of individuals with an average IQ a full half a standard deviation below the European population of America and all of which has a much higher birthrate. This 75% works in the minimum wage economy, and does not generate enough value to finance the education of their children, their medical care and their old age retirement. Third world immigration generates only third world levels of consumer demand while generating first world social safety net expense.

The easily recognizable truth is that we have falling working age populations throughout the entire civilized world - and especially, falling middle class populations - the populations that generate real economic demand. The governments of the developed countries freely admit that aging populations, and falling populations of workers relative to retirees will tax government resources to the breaking point in about 25 years.

However, economists and the government are only beginning to recognize that these same demographics mean that the "stocks for retirement" investment boom of the nineties constitutes an inter-generational transfer as well. Baby boomers are going to be forced to sell stocks to support themselves in retirement, a trend that will begin in about 6 years, as the lead edge of the baby boom retires at age 57 to 58. Here is an excellent piece from Barrons on the [demographic problem](#).

Thus the demographic reality is widely recognized. What is not recognized is that about 10 years before retirement, people begin to cut back on consumption and repay debt.

Aging populations are poison for economic growth. Every advertising agency in the World

understands that the prime advertising audience is the 18 to 30 year olds. They aspire to status and material comforts they do not yet possess and are the most susceptible to the irrational (high margin) purchase. In contrast, people over age 45 become highly price conscious and impervious to status messages in ads as their career and consumption expectations have, for the most part, become fixed. It is awfully difficult to stimulate consumption in that growing portion of the population that, for the most part, no longer has status aspirations that can be sated with more material goods.

Oddly, these facts, so very well understood in advertising and marketing departments throughout the developed world are so stubbornly ignored by economists and Wall Street strategists. Within the economics profession, ever rising populations are simply assumed in all the forecasting models. It is assumed in the "natural rate of growth" which is always plugged in at the beginning of every forecasting model.

To an economist, falling demand is irrational and wrong. It can only exist as some sort of temporary mistake and must be corrected with government policy.

But there is a reason why economists cannot accept the notion that falling populations driving falling demand. If they plug in minus 1% as the natural rate of growth in their forecasting model, then the conclusions that flow out of the model yield socially unacceptable conclusions - economic depression and falling prices as far as the eye can see.

We have not had falling populations since the collapse of the Roman Empire. It is indeed Grand SuperCycle stuff, and therefore must be rejected. There isn't a client or customer anywhere who will accept and act upon such a conclusion.

Not only are the economic conclusions socially unacceptable: they threaten profoundly and strictly enforced sets of social beliefs that mandate low birthrates and confer status on childless yuppie couples and "alternative lifestyles". Such conclusions would threaten the notion that the purpose of modern life is to enable the individual to "do his own thing" and threaten the secular moral imperative that reproductive choices of individuals are of no consequence to their neighbors and fellow nationals.

Threatening indeed.

Deflation - falling demand - does not just fall from trees. It comes from an infertility that has been powerfully reinforced by social attitudes over the past 35 years.

In sum, European, Euro-American, and Japanese populations, representing about 80% of the world economic demand, are aging and falling faster than third-world populations can make the cultural transition from the self-help economy to the transaction economy.

That is what is different this time - the final consequence of modernity - falling populations world wide.

The cause of our modern deflation is irreversible. Everyone involved in this drama for the next 30 years has already been born.

Further, there is no force in sight that might reverse the chronic infertility in the developed world, short of some alarm which might cause armed horsemen of the apocalypse to assemble, adopt the ancient social pressures of farm and village in the name of racial survival and propagate those pressures through modern means.

Thus my background "fundamental" expectation is that the forces of deflation will gather strength steadily for the next 30 years, but at a very slow rate initially. In other words, the change in aggregate demand will not be rapid enough to cause alarms among economists and Wall Street analysts who believe the thesis of Thomas Malthus. They will be content to dismiss deflation as a temporary aberration for years to come.

Thus, all other things being equal, I would expect to see a prolonged sideways movement in the American stock market over the next seven or eight years until the boomers begin to retire in serious numbers.

However, all other things are never equal, and thus there are several trends that could seriously destabilize the market and produce extraordinary up and down moves over the next seven years.

Sixty percent of new bank lending during the 90s has gone toward securities purchases, both bonds and stocks. Thus the wild growth rates of M-2 and M-3 over the past two years no longer have the kind of implications they once had for economic growth and inflation. In the old days, banks used to lend to main-street businesses, who would invest in plant and inventory, boosting economic growth. The incomes thus generated from real economic activity on main street would gradually filter through to Wall Street in the form of rising demand for bonds and stocks.

But now the banks have discovered ways to bypass main street altogether and lend directly to Wall Street for the purpose of propping up prices.

In short, the securities markets have become enormously leveraged, and are subject to severe sell-offs as this bank debt contracts. Falling rates of growth in M-3 are the tip-off to this process.

This bank lending for the purchase of securities means that the Federal Reserve has no real choice but to prop up the securities markets in order to ensure the survival of America's banks. A quick 60% market crash would wipe out bank capital at our money center banks, as would a

300 basis point increase in interest rates.

Look for the Federal Reserve's working group on capital markets to intervene whenever the S&P falls by 20%.

In addition to the enormous positions that have been accumulated with borrowed money, we have an enormous volume of option and derivative exposure. As long as prices move down slowly (as long as prices are "continuous"), the writers of these instruments can rebalance their delta hedges so as to prevent bankruptcy. See [Courting Catastrophe](#) which argues that a 30% market crash would render the big brokerage houses insolvent. If markets start moving down rapidly, then expect the Fed's working group on capital markets to intervene directly to slow the progress.

The financial asset bubble has grown to such dimensions that it is now "too big to fail."

Irrational exuberance has captured the Federal Reserve and holds governmental policy hostage.

Given the damage that a market collapse would do to governmental resources and power, I would not expect a repeat of the collapse of 1720 in which the stock markets in Amsterdam, Paris and London fell 98% in two years. Rather, I would expect a zig zag market fluctuating in a broad trading range for the next 7 years, gradually sapping expectations of the public for positive returns. The government has too much at stake to allow a crash.

There is one final trend that might deprive governments of the power to prop up markets and that is the prospect of increasing currency volatility. As a result of high savings rates in Asia, and the aging of the European populations of the World, interest rates will be falling around the globe. As yields fall, more of the expected return from investment will involve expectations of appreciation from the currency in which the security is denominated and less from the coupon or dividend of the security itself. In an era of low yields, no investor can afford to rely on the coupon yield or dividend as he waits for prices to firm. In an era in which capital gains provide the only significant return, they will all be forced to shift out of securities denominated in falling currencies into securities in denominated in rising currencies.

Thus, in the low yield environment that is being produced by the forces of deflation, investors will be forced to move money around from one currency to another in order to achieve a yield that justifies the risk of holding low yielding securities.

Web investing has reduced costs to a point where individuals may participate in the international capital flight.

Ultimately, international capital flight will become so large that governments will be powerless



to prevent market melt-downs. In the post WW-2 world of a single reserve currency, the Dollar, it was impossible for a currency led panic to develop in the U.S. However, with the advent of the Euro, there will be a competing reserve currency to which the huge pools of international capital may flee in times of dollar weakness.

The only means available to defend a currency will be interest rate increases. Thus, it is computer cipher currencies that will deprive the Federal Reserve of its ability to prop up U.S. markets. I expect this trend to be in full force within 8 to ten years.

It is different this time. Very different!

May you all prosper!

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Money and Markets Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

# YGGDRASIL

## World Birthrates

Below is a table of average completed fertility in births per woman by country from Barron's , Dec. 8, 1997 p 37.

I should note that we know from the NLSY-79 studies that completed birth rates for white and asian women born in the U.S. between 1957 and 1964 is approximately 1.6.

---

### Birth Dearth

Country	1997 Population (Millions)	Fertility - 1990-95
Italy	57	1.24
Spain	40	1.27
Germany	82	1.30
Hong Kong	6	1.32
Slovenia	2	1.36
Greece	11	1.38
Austria	8	1.47
Japan	126	1.48
Bosnia/Herzegovina	4	1.50
Romania	23	1.50
Portugal	10	1.52
Switzerland	7	1.53
Russian Federation	148	1.53
Bulgaria	8	1.53
Estonia	1	1.58
Netherlands	16	1.59
Macau	0.5	1.60
Cuba	11	1.60
Belgium	10	1.62
Ukraine	51	1.64
Latvia	2	1.64

Republic of Korea	46	1.65
Croatia	4	1.65
Luxembourg	0.4	1.66
Belarus	10	1.67
Czech Republic	10	1.68
Hungary	10	1.69
France	59	1.70
Barbados	0.3	1.73
Canada	30	1.74
Denmark	5	1.75
Lithuania	4	1.78
United Kingdom	58	1.78
Singapore	3	1.79
Finland	5	1.83
Slovakia	5	1.85
Norway	4	1.88
Poland	39	1.89
Australia	18	1.89
China	1,244	1.92
Yugoslavia	10	1.93
Thailand	59	1.94
Bahamas	0.3	1.95
Sweden	9	2.01
United States	272	2.05
Malta	0.4	2.08
FYR of Macedonia	2	2.10
Georgia	5	2.10
N Korea	23	2.10

Source: United Nations

Countries for which the total fertility rate is equal to or less than the replacement level of 2.1 children per female

---

[Back to Article](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# BARRONS

## **Boomers' Time Bomb** **The stocks-for-retirement cycle has a fatal flaw**

November 16, 1998

By THORNTON PARKER

Engineers who design large structures must consider what their profession calls the "scale-effect" problem, or what may happen when a material, formula or a design technique is used to build a structure larger than whatever has been built before. As the size increases, factors that had not previously been considered may come into play that cause the structure to fail.

There is a scale-effect problem with the concept of relying on corporate stocks as the main source of funds for retirement plans. The formulas underlying this concept were developed for individual or organizational portfolios and are based on the assumption that, for all practical purposes, there will always be an infinite number of buyers when stocks must be sold. But these same formulas are now being applied to entire generations, a vastly greater scale than ever contemplated by those who originated them.

According to Richard Mahoney of the Center for the Study of American Business, more than two-thirds of all listed U.S. stocks are in retirement accounts. Millions of Baby Boomers are buying stocks, directly or through pension and mutual funds, in the front, or build-up half, of what has become a national stocks-for-retirement cycle. But no one has explained how the back, or liquidation half, of the cycle may work. There has not been a publicized engineering like system-failure analysis of how the cycle can handle its intended load.

The load is expected to reach a plateau in about 2030 and continue for decades. The Census Bureau projects that during this period, one of every three adults, including all Baby Boomers, will be over 65. Nothing that we know today explains how millions of people will be able to retire comfortably in their mid-60s on intergenerational transfer payments if the ratio of workers to retirees approaches 2-to-1. Because Social Security is based primarily on intergenerational transfers, there are proposals to use its receipts to buy stocks in hopes that price gains will put the program on a sounder financial basis.

There is a big unrecognized problem with this: Although stocks have helped pay for many retirements so far, the size of the national stocks-for-retirement cycle is unprecedented and its premise appears to be flawed. With most stocks now paying minimal dividends, if any, the only

reason to buy them for retirement accounts is to sell them eventually for gains. The gains, however, are not free -- they are costs to the next round of buyers. When Boomers sell stocks to pay for their retirement, the largest pool of domestic buyers will have to be workers with disposable incomes or workers' retirement plans.

## Pyramid Scheme

But when retirees sell stocks to workers, the gains are intergenerational transfers -- just what demographic projections show will not be sustainable because of the 2-to-1 ratio. Despite the assertions of privatization advocates, using Social Security funds to buy and then sell stocks to workers for gains cannot change the fact that the program will still be a levy on the next generation.

Unless this explanation is wrong, Social Security is just the tip of the retirement iceberg. It is a warning that most retirement programs that expect to sell stocks to workers for gains are at risk, and that includes pension plans, annuities and individual retirement accounts. The stocks-for-retirement cycle appears to have turned the U.S. stock market into an intergenerational pyramid scheme. It works for many retirees now, but it can be sustained only while workers' savings flow into the base faster than retirees' liquidations flow out from the top. Population projections indicate that this can't go on forever.

There is no precedent for a singularly large generation making a planned shift from saving and buying stocks to selling them, in order to finance consumption, to a pool of buyers that is growing more slowly. If the shift doesn't work, it may lead to disillusionment with the country's financial institutions and a prolonged depression.

Many financial planners advise people to convert part of their portfolios from stocks to income-producing investments as they approach retirement. At the individual level, this may be good advice. But it still requires selling stocks to make the conversion. From a national standpoint, the advice does not reduce the need for mass selling. It just starts the selling earlier.

Some advocates of stocks for retirement hope that foreign buyers will absorb the Boomers' stocks. But there has been no publicized explanation of who will be able to do it. The total value of U.S. stocks is about half of the world's total. Asia is no longer the economic powerhouse it once was. And the aging populations of Europe may face larger employment, retirement and investment problems than we do. Foreign buyers may be the answer, but so far there has not been enough sound analysis to bet the future on them.

The fundamental question is how millions of people will be supported during their later years. If they can't live on intergenerational transfers, either through the government or from stock sales, they will have to work or have other sources of income.

Sooner or later this question will call for a reassessment of how savings are invested, how companies are managed and even how the economy should work. The country has the choice of doing the reassessment in time to prevent a disaster or waiting until it is trying to recover from one. If it is done soon, business can lead it. If it is not done until there are serious troubles, these will become political problems and the government will lead the reassessment.

The reassessment will probably show that besides products and services, America's aging population will need two main things from companies and investments.

First, because many Boomers will not be able to retire in their mid-60s, they will have to work for more years than previous generations. They will need secure jobs with adequate benefits, even if their capabilities decline. This will require companies to reverse the practice of encouraging early retirements and offering part-time employment to minimize benefit costs.

Second, those who do retire will need investments that provide income from then-current earnings streams, not stocks to sell into declining markets. This is what utilities provided before deregulation. Meeting these needs may require major changes in the role of companies and the way they are managed. Stock prices will probably become much less important.

History is not much help for predicting unprecedented events, and retirement investment predictions based on how stocks have performed in the past are largely meaningless. We do know that there are risks in continuing to invest according to the old formulas. Until the risks are understood, stocks should be considered as dependable for Baby Boomers' retirement portfolios as a bicycle on ice.

THORNTON PARKER is a consultant in Washington.

---

[Back to Investment Commentary](#)



## Nationalist Market Commentary

---

Written Feb 1 for Feb 2, 2000

### The CitiGroup option trader.

- Action: Stand aside until Feb 3, then short above \$59 as soon as ovb turns down on the 30 min chart.
- Reason: C has formed a triangle on the chart over the past 10 trading days. It is unclear whether C will break to the upside or the downside. Ultimately, the downside is more likely, as the beginning of month inflows slow on or about Feb. 3. Also, it is hard to imagine a financial conglomerate such as C making serious upside progress while the Fed is raising interest rates.
- [Citigroup 30 min chart](#)
- Why CitiGroup? CitiGroup (Citibank, Travelers, Solomon Smith Barney) has volatility considerably greater than the S&P 500 and reasonably priced puts and calls. It responds well to RSI and Stochastic signals. In short, it may not be glamorous, but you can make money by taking swing positions based on its fairly predictable trading patterns and reasonably priced options. At-the-money options typically sell for less than \$200.

### Profiting from the NASDAQ mania.

- Action: Close out of any NDX inverse funds that trade only on the close. Go long the QQQ or BBH but close out intra-day on the first sign of weakness.
- Reason: The advice in the above paragraph is unchanged since I last updated this page on the evening of 01/19. We have had colossal volatility with a huge move down last week and a huge move up in the first two days of this week. January has been one of those months in which following the 3dma method would have involved you in some serious money losing whipsaws. However, the heavy inflows associated with the first of the month will slow by 02/03. Assuming the market rallies through Easy Al's 25 basis point fed funds rate increase on 02/02, then 02/03 should provide an excellent shorting opportunity.



## General Market Observations.

- Here is a link to a proportionate comparison of our Nasdaq now with Japan in 1989. [Nasdaq vs Japan in percent](#)
- The chart of the NDX for this year is tracking very closely the timing of ups and downs in the NDX last year. I expect that pattern to continue, with two downward waves in February, just as in Feb. of 1999.
- For Tues. Jan 18 - the Decisionpoint STVO indicator turned down on Friday. This is usually a very reliable indicator and it is risky to go against it in trading. The STO indicator has been heading south for two days now. The Rydex Ratio is at an all time low (most money in bull funds relative to bear funds ever) and a danger signal. If you subtract AII bears from bulls, the number hit an all time high last week. Also, max pain (that point at which option dealers maximize profits) is a bit lower on the S&P 500 and 100, and this is expiration week. Finally, and perhaps most important, the Fed Open Market Desk has been draining reserves recently even on days when Fed funds are trading slightly above the 5.5% target. We have not seen this in years. You do not get sustained rallies under these circumstances. Because of heavy mutual fund inflows this month, I expect a trading range for the rest of January, with continued heavy selling in the internet sector and the recent hot high-tech IPOs. The damage being done in these sectors will have a significant effect on investor psychology for the rest of the year. See AKAM as just one example. Once the inflows slow down at the end of the month, we go down hard.
- (01/11) I am particularly proud of my recommendation to cover any Intel (INTC) short on the open Monday. If you click on the CitiGroup 30 minute chart above you will notice that one of the indicators I selected is called "OBV," short for the "on balance volume" indicator developed by Joe Granville. It is surprisingly accurate when used in intra-day charts and tipped us off on Friday that INTC would probably head higher over the next few trading days. It reports earnings Thurs. at which time all bets are off, as the pros tend to sell the news, good or bad.
- (01/11) Less proud of the hold short call on AOL. Chart continued to look bad along with a healthy dose of Luck!
- (01/11) Wall Street experts reassure us that the money being taken from Tech and Internet stocks is being reallocated to cyclicals and other industry groups. Trouble is, as I look at the various industry sectors and their associated index, not much seems to be working right at the moment except perhaps the semiconductors. Looks like much of the list might be getting ready to follow Techs and Internets south.
- (01/09) Here is a very interesting article on market cycles that you should read: [Sandspring.com](#)
- (01/09) The question of the hour is whether the wild 13% decline in the NDX (intra-day) will continue following the partial recovery on Friday, or whether this was a dip that should be bought. After examining some of the charts, I think that last week has inflicted lasting damage on the psychology of the tech mania, and that the decline will continue in

a day or two. (Friday was the prime day for rolling over call contracts to the next expiration month in advance of next Friday's January expiration, and so upward pressure Friday was understandable.

- (01/09) However, when you look at a short list of the favorite high flyers, you can see that some terrific damage has been inflicted:
  - CMGI: from 325 to 243, with damage largely unrepaired at 275. Under some accumulation Wed thru Fri.
  - ICGE: from 200 to 155, with damage largely unrepaired at 174. Distribution on Fri.
  - AKAM: from 320 to 237, with damage largely unrepaired at 248. Ugly 15 min chart, still under distribution.
  - LNUX: disaster from 198 to 167 low at the close on Friday. Under distribution
  - FDRY: disaster from 330 to 260, closing at low Friday. Under distribution.
  - JWEB: disaster from 77 to 33.25, closing at low Friday.
  - CMRC: disaster from 320 to 192, closing at low Friday.
  - SILK: disaster from 172 to 110, closing near low Friday.
  - BLSW: disaster from 144 to 75, closing at low Friday. Heavy continuing distribution.
  - WCAP: disaster from 55 to 34, closing near low Friday.
  - HHGP: disaster from 19 to 11.12 closing near low Friday.
- (01/09) You can see the damage inflicted on these high flyers by typing in the ticker symbols on one of the free internet charting services bookmarked below. In many cases the losses have ranged from 30% to 40% from the 27th of Dec. or from last Monday. The first two, CMGI and ICGE are particularly important since they are publicly traded holding companies of various internet startups and stocks. Thus, they are a very accurate gauge of enthusiasm for internet stocks and the future of the internet IPO market.
- (01/09) Of course there are a few COUNTER EXAMPLES:
  - ACRI:
  - RHAT:
- Here is a 01/19 update on the stocks I listed as chart weaklings 01/03 with the price action since their highs on 01/04. The moral is to short the weaklings:
  - AMZN - Chart looks like hell, except that we have three completed waves down. Time to cover short and wait for a bounce into the end of Jan. Short again on any bounce beyond \$85.
  - AOL - Hold short.
  - CNET - Looks weak, hold short.
  - EBAY - Under accumulation, cover short.
  - LCOS - Headed down after completed 3 wave upward correction. Hold and add to short.
  - RNWK 127 TO 145.87 - Headed down after completed 3 wave upward correction. Daily OBV looks bad. Reenter shorts.
  - WCOM Death warmed over. Hold short.
  - MSFT Death warmed over. Enter new short on bounce to 110.

- INTC Death warmed over. Hold short
- (01/05) The scam of empire! We are on welfare from the rest of the world to the tune of \$350 billions per year. This welfare for the imperial mother ship is measured by our annual trade deficit. The provinces ship us goods made with cheap labor, and we send them pieces of paper - stocks and bonds. The elites of the provinces understand the scam perfectly well, but temporarily there is no one else to buy their goods. The action today in the bond, the dollar and the gold stocks tells us that the private institutions that must recycle the surplus dollars by buying our bonds are beginning to rebel. Fasten your seat belts, for if this trend accelerates, the crack up will be truly spectacular.
- (01/04) 1929 started with a slow roll in the first few days and weeks. In contrast, we had -3.83% in the S&P and -6.45% in the NDX just in the first day! This is it folks! The start of the big one! Catch the rhythm of the thing and plan for the snap-back rallies. During corrections, the NDX tends to go down hard for 3 days or 5 days in a row. After these short, sharp moves down, it is often prudent to step aside, anticipating a snap back rally.
- (01/03) In reflective moments, I put myself back in time when JDSU, to take just one example, was a split adjusted \$12 per share. Its appreciation to \$187 is stupendous; but would I have held on for anything like that increase even if I had the talent to select the stock? It is clear that I lack imagination. However, \$187 per share is money I can see! I don't need imagination! All I have to do is wait until the funds and insiders begin to sell more than Joe Bagholder is willing to buy. It is a certainty. the only question is timing. Once the bear market begins, this will seem obvious and prudent in retrospect, and those long from \$12 will appear wildly speculative. Its called waiting for the sure thing! A bear can only make one mistake - being early. The money is already on the table and growing as you read this!
- (01/02/00) Be sure to see my new post on short sale opportunities for the new year, for those of you who may not be comfortable staying long the QQQ, or may wish to hedge your long position, in this very dangerous mania. See [Weakest of the Weak - Short Sale Ideas for the New Millenium.](#)
- (12/31/99) The three month growth rate of adjusted monetary base is 36.2% - two month rate is at 48.1%. The friends of Easy Al who knew in advance that this was coming have made a fortune over the past two months. There has never been anything like it in our monetary history.
- (12/31/99) The expansion of reserves and credit began the first week of Sept. The market began its rocket blast about Oct. 10-18. It takes about a month or so for Wall Street to gain enough confidence in a monetary trend to begin leveraging its bets on the NDX carry trade.
- (12/31/99) The emerging market funds are all parabolic now. The correction/bear market looms. At the end of a manic move, you always find the emerging markets funds going parabolic. Eighty percent of the money that flows into these markets comes from New York.
- (12/29) Yesterday I mentioned that the Fed was flooding the banking system with liquidity. I have included a new permanent link in the link section below so that you can easily check on the flood and observe the whole sorry episode day by day as it unfolds.

Forward repos, System repos, Coupon Passes, the works! We have the most irresponsible Fed Chairman in history. Stay tuned.

- (12/29) The NDX carry trade! Forget borrowing in Japanese yen at 1% to buy dollar denominated notes yielding 5%. Why go through the trouble when you can borrow U.S. dollars and invest in the NDX? Indeed Maria Bartiromo is a financial genius. She said, "Who cares about interest rates when you can make 25% a year owning stocks?" And indeed, that is what the leveraged players, hedge funds, insurance companies and banks are doing. They do not care a fig about the cost of credit. But they do care about the momentum of the NDX and its components. It is obvious from the tape action over the last few days that this carry trade has frayed around the edges. The internets and the IPO moon shots have started to crumple. So is it a short correction or beginning of a new trend? That depends on how selling by the leveraged players is interpreted by the ultimate bag holders - buying opportunity or cause for fear. We shall know in the fullness of time.
- (12/28/99) In the next year, profit growth will be strongest in tech (where it is already over priced), oil service, and basic materials (papers, metals, chemicals). The latter two groups should be owned unless and until AG stops all of the system repos and coupon passes, and M-3 and Monetary base growth start to slow. If he starts actually tightening credit - as opposed to just raising its price - get into an inverse fund!

## The Three Day Moving Average Concept

1. Several months ago I set about to find a way that bears could be positioned to benefit from a bear market and increase their capital while they wait. The system involves buying the QQQ (a stock that tracks the NASDAQ 100 or "NDX") and shorting the QQQ (or switching between NDX and inverse NDX mutual funds, such as Rydex or Profunds). You buy the QQQ whenever the 3dma turns up and the 3dma is below the 50 dma. Sell and reverse short the QQQ when the 3dma turns down and the 3dma is more than 120 points above the 50dma. I backtested this system on data from NDX 913 on June 19, 1997 through 11/12/99 and the original \$5000 investment grew to \$11,180.55 for a 124% gain. The system used a 5% stop and no leverage. The performance would have improved dramatically by changing the stops into "stop and reverse" (something my old software cannot handle), thereby capturing virtually all of the Oct 98 through Feb. 1999 melt up. The Window on Wall Street code (which will also work in Metastock) is:

Enter long;  $\text{ref}(\text{mov}(c,3,s),-1) < \text{mov}(c,3,s)$  and  $\text{mov}(c,3,s) < \text{mov}(c,50,s)$

Exit long;  $\text{ref}(\text{mov}(c,3,s),-1) > \text{mov}(c,3,s)$  and  $\text{mov}(c,3,s) > (\text{mov}(c,50,s)+120)$

Enter short;  $\text{ref}(\text{mov}(c,3,s),-1) > \text{mov}(c,3,s)$  and  $\text{mov}(c,3,s) > (\text{mov}(c,50,s)+120)$

Exit short;  $\text{ref}(\text{mov}(c,3,s),-1) < \text{mov}(c,3,s)$  and  $\text{mov}(c,3,s) < \text{mov}(c,50,s)$ .

2. You would have done better to buy the NDX on June 19, 1997 and hold it through 11/12/99 (up 216%). However, by holding, you would have been risking a bear market. The above system

allows you to be bearish and yet make money even if you are wrong. You would have MORE capital to compound when the disaster strikes rather than less. The system above guaranteed you would be positioned to benefit from a bear market. Hence, on a risk adjusted basis (and I think the risk is huge) the above system compares very favorably to a buy and hold strategy in my view.

3. Once the 50dma starts to move down, you would need to adjust the system to entering long at a 3dma upturn 120 points or more below the 50dma and entering short on a 3dma downturn above the 50dma. Take a look at a chart of the 3 and 50 dma's from the period of July 1998 through October 1998 and you will see what I mean by this.

4. The value of the above system depends upon the notion that prices, at least at the very early stages of a bear market, are "continuous," or that the NDX will not fall 400 points the first day. If you examine the charts of the 1987 and the 1929 crashes in the historical charts section of Decisionpoint, you will see that each downturn starts slowly and then accelerates after several weeks to a point where prices became discontinuous. This is one reason why a 3dma turn is important as an entry point rather than a longer term moving average crossover, which is likely result in your getting short near the bottom of the downmove.

5. As of 12/23/99, the 3dma is now a staggering 675 points above the 50dma. Thus, any downturn in the 3dma should be a signal to sell your long QQQ position and short the QQQ (or reverse into the inverse funds). For those of you with intra-day data and charting, the 20 period ma of the hourly chart is the equivalent of the 3dma, but better in the sense that you will ordinarily have the signal before the fund switch deadline of the same day and not have to wait for the next day's closing price. However, make sure that the 20 period ma of the hourly chart is falling sharply to the downside before switching.

---

## Useful Links

- [Fed Follies](#) A list of the most recent Federal Reserve open market operations.
- [YAHOO FINANCE](#) The best place for market news and quotes!
- [MOORE RESEARCH CENTER](#) Check after hours futures quotes for indication of market direction the next morning, including after hours gold, oil, bond and currency prices!
- [WORLD DAILY STOCK MARKET CHARTS](#) Check Asian markets at night and European markets prior to the opening for clues as to direction of U.S. market.
- [NORTHERN TRUST'S DAILY ECONOMIC COMMENTARY](#) Great Analysis!
- [COLLECTION OF BEARISH ARTICLES](#) Great stuff!
- [TECHNICAL AND FUNDAMENTAL INDICATOR CHARTS](#) A superb collection!

- [DECISION POINT TECHNICAL CHARTS](#) Another superb collection! However it is now available only on a subscription basis at \$10 per month.
  - [GET INFO ON PHILADELPHIA EXCHANGE OPTIONS](#) The XAU Gold stock contracts trade here!
  - [GET INFO ON CBOE INDEX OPTION CONTRACTS](#) Most of the best known contracts trade here!
  - [Fleckenstein's Market Rap](#) - Great Stuff!
  - [Askresearch.com charts](#). This one has real-time updating QQQ charts and other indexes.
  - [IQC.com charts](#).
  - [Stockcharts.com](#)
  - [Bigcharts.com](#)
- 

## Disclaimer

The Ole Ygg is not a registered investment advisor. You are responsible for your own investment decisions. Do your own research, and if relying upon advice of others, seek counsel of a registered broker or investment advisor first. The above comments are intended as conceptual discussion of market direction and technical indicators only and are not a recommendation to purchase or sell any particular security.

---

**BACK**

Design © 1998 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

---

Weakest of the Weak - Short Sale Ideas for the New Millenium.

January 2, 2000

The weakest of the weak.

- AOL (AOL)
- Amazon.com (AMZN)
- EBAY (EBAY)
- CNET (CNET)
- Lycos (LCOS)
- Real Networks (RWNK)
- MCI Worldcom (WCOM)
- Intel (INTC)

A bear needs the discipline to wait until the institutions are obviously selling a stock before shorting it. As with any other investment, the idea is to identify a trend and then go with it. You don't short a stock just because it is overpriced.

All of the above stocks except AOL are in the NDX.

However, many of the NDX parabolics simply are not ready to short, even though they are completing picture perfect 5 wave Elliot impulse structures. Examples are CMGI, Yahoo (YHOO), JDS Uniphase (JDSU), Qualcomm (QCOM), Cisco Systems (CSCO) and a host of others. In addition to the parabolics, you have the "Spikers," Microsoft (MSFT) and Dell (DELL) which have very weak charts but spiked in the last two weeks of the year to new highs. They look like "pump and dump" plays by the institutions, but don't be lured into a premature short. Bet with proven weakness.

Shorting weakness is trickier than it looks. The problem is that falling stocks have a habit of doing so in three waves. First wave down, second wave up or sideways, and third wave (often the biggest) down. When this third wave (the second movement downward) loses momentum, it is a high probability bet that the correction is over and the stock will rise.

Thus, above all, you do not want to sell short at or near the end of the third wave. It is a bad bet.

The best place to short is during the second wave rebound just as the 3dma turns south for wave 3. That is the high probability bet. You have evidence of weakness in the first wave down and you sell as wave two fails to attain the old highs (or starts fading after a sideways move, as you will see in the LCOS chart).

You should log on to:

[IQC.COM Charts](#)

and look at the chart patterns for the above stocks. When you first log on you will see a plain line chart of the Dow Jones Industrials. I prefer to select 120 periods rather than 180 and candlesticks (which have more information than closing line). I then select volume as the first indicator, RSI as second indicator and OBV as the third.

Then I will type in the ticker for each of the above stocks and then select weekly to get the big picture, then daily, and then hourly charts to focus in on shorter time periods.

The key is to be careful "chasing" the stock downward. Look at the daily chart for AOL. You will notice that it looks like we might be at the bottom of a third wave down. However, when you go to the hourly chart you see a more complex picture. You see a first wave down and then a sideways pattern at the \$86 level. The ideal time to short it would have been on Dec. 22 or 23 at the \$87 level. Then a third wave down with a sideways pattern at the \$82 level, and then a continuation of the downside action. It looks like this is a five wave impulse down which projects to the \$68 level, or perhaps lower.

As always, this is a judgment call. But if you look at the weekly chart, you will see that AOL is forming an ugly double top extending back to April, and has lost momentum here. The institutions are likely to keep selling until the stock has retraced 50% of its rally from August 1988, or to the \$54 level. It could also reach the lows of July-August of 1999, or about \$39.

In any event, if AOL starts accelerating to the downside on heavy volume, you cover, whenever that may occur. Similarly, if you short in here, any movement through \$78 would mean the downward corrective wave is over for the time being.

The key is to keep your expectations modest and realize that the rest of the world thinks that AOL is a wonderful stock and will go up forever.

Given the plethora of weak stocks to pick from, the smart thing to do is to sell on any rallies rather than to chase them much beyond the beginning of wave 3.

EBAY presents the same dilemma. It has already fallen quite a ways, but is breaking down below the \$130 resistance level and is likely to carry all the way to the August lows around \$86. However, you must have the psychology in place to protect yourself against a snap-back rally.



The weekly chart for EBAY is worse than that of AOL. The Nov. high failed to reach the April high. Thus, on a longer timetable, wave 1 down was from the April highs, wave 2 up began in August and is a classic three wave corrective structure to the upside, failing to best the old highs. We are in the largest and meanest wave 3 down, and probably at a relatively early stage. Nevertheless, the short term snapback rallies can be scary in these stocks, so you must be ready for them.

Good luck and may you all prosper in the new year!

Ygg-

01/03/00 ADDENDUM - Well, sure enough, I write a post about the dangers of chasing falling e.tail stocks and AMZN rallies 17.41% while EBAY rallies 12.83%. AMZN has now retraced about 38% of its December drop measured from the lows of this morning, while EBAY has nearly retraced that amount. Actually, these snap-back rallies in falling stocks are manna from heaven, because they give you a lower risk entry point for shorting the stock. The fibonacci retracement numbers for AMZN are 90 (38.12%) and 95 (50%). AMZN closed at 89.375. For EBAY, the numbers are \$142 and \$150. EBAY closed at \$141.25. Given the power of the internet mania today, I expect the recovery rallies in these stocks to carry for a few more days. I will pay more attention to the hourly chart formations, looking for an end to a three wave upward corrective structure, than for the Fibonacci retracements. The fibonacci numbers influence only the urgency of that search.

---

[Back to Money and Markets Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

## BARRONS

### **Courting Catastrophe So You're Insuring Against Market Risk With Options? Think Again.**

November 24, 1997

By KATHRYN M. WELLING

An Interview With Andrew Smithers - There's no mistaking his current bias: bearish. After all, who else but a bear, one who last spring penned what none other than Morgan Stanley's Barton Biggs called the first "coherent, reasoned case for a secular bear market," would set about writing a series of reports exploring potential triggers for that most unhappy of investment events. But Andrew is no nattering nabob of negativitism, stubbornly, or with malice aforethought, committed to raining on the bulls' parade. He's far too cerebral for that.

Besides, as chairman of London's Smithers & Co., he has some 70 international fund-management companies depending on his economic consulting group for credible asset-allocation advice. So when he and his associates take up an issue, they do so with ferocious intellectual vigor -- and let the chips fall where they may.

It's no surprise, then, that when Andrew recently focused on the options markets, wondering if their phenomenal growth -- and the immense popularity among portfolio managers of using options to "insure" equity positions against market risk -- might not have a dark side, he enlisted the best and most disinterested help he could find: Mathematics don Stephen Wright, a member of the economics and politics faculty at Cambridge University. The report the two released last month, entitled "Stock Options: An Example of Catastrophe Myopia," not only argues cogently that most market participants don't recognize a number of risks inherent in their option activities, but also achieves the nearly impossible in quantifying, even roughly, the sorts of risks therefore being run.

Andrew was gracious enough to walk us through their conclusions when we rang him up recently.

Barron's: So you see catastrophe looming?

Smithers: Let's step back. I started working on our options report as part of a program to look at various ways that a stock-market crash could possibly be triggered.

Q: You began with a bearish bias, in other words.

A: Yes. The reasons for expecting a stock-market crash lie in its extreme overvaluation. But the reason and the occasion are always different. And we were not looking to do the relatively easy -- but not particularly helpful, from an investor's point of view -- thing, which is to simply say: "Nobody can predict the timing. All you can tell from the fact of the extreme overvaluation is that you are running massive risk. And people tend to consistently underrate those risks." That's fine, as far as it goes. But we wanted to try to do a little bit better. We're not pretending we can predict the top. But we clearly think it's worth looking at various possible triggers. And one of the trigger mechanisms we looked at was the growth in the options market.

Q: You do expect the worst for stocks, though.

A: That's always tricky to predict, especially because there have been so few instances in the past when the markets were as overvalued as they are currently. Only Wall Street in '29 and '37 and Japan in '89 were as overvalued as the present market. The next most overvalued was the '68-'72 market in the U.S. What happened after all of those, I'm afraid, was a decline that was not only large, but was fairly prolonged. In 1929, Wall Street took nearly three years to bottom. In '37, it took five years. And stocks lost 89% and 67%, or whatever, of their value in the process. So experience would suggest that we will have a crash both severe and fairly prolonged. Then again, we really don't have much experience, so people may react differently. But we certainly see the situation as very dangerous.

Q: That's comforting. And options only make it more so?

A: Our options study's broad conclusion is that the growth of the option market does indeed pose a very serious threat to the stock market. But more likely one of accelerating a crash and possibly bringing additional financial stress to the financial-services industry at a most inopportune time, than one of triggering a crash itself.

Q: Portfolio insurance redux?

A: Yes. Of course, no one today admits to using the sort of portfolio insurance which was employed in the mid-'Eighties. As you recall, portfolio insurance involved investors having a plan of how they would operate: They thought they could defend themselves from losing money by buying when the market went up and selling when it went down.

Q: By buying high and selling low!

A: It did defy common sense. But people became quite happy about it because the mathematicians could nicely show that, indeed, it would work. The rub was an implicit assumption in the mathematics that share prices are what's known as "continuous".

Q: Which was possible only because none of those mathematicians had ever walked the exchange floor or traded a stock.

A: Or else they'd forgotten the experience. There was a communications gap between mathematicians and practitioners -- one they discovered on Black Monday, October 19, 1987. A similar thing has happened today. Our message is that portfolio insurance hasn't gone away. Rather, it's being done today through the options market. If portfolio managers are nervous about the stock market, they say, "I'm scared stiff, but I don't want to be out, because who knows where the top is? I have to keep up with my colleagues to keep my job." So their rational response, under the circumstances, is to try to protect themselves to some extent against the worst -- a really big crash -- by hedging with options.

Q: What's wrong with that?

A: Nothing, in theory. Stock options can, of course, be used either for speculation or as a form of insurance. Investors in the stock market who want to limit their exposure to market declines can, for example, buy a put. If their fears are realized, the profit on that put will limit their losses. But like all insurance, that coverage comes at a price: The more the market price of the underlying asset exceeds the exercise price of the option, the less will be their insurance coverage and the lower the price of the put. The price of the option is the equivalent of the premium paid for insurance. So, as in any insurance market, the options market allows a risk-averse investor to limit the extent of his exposure to the market.

Q: Okay

A: The crucial difference is that unlike fire, life or auto insurance, the aggregate risk is not significantly less than the sum of the individual risks - because it is systemic risk, rather than specific. If a normal insurance market expands, this tends to reduce the impact of underlying risk, through the "law of large numbers," since most of the risks insured are specific.

Q: Meaning that most of the risk insurers usually cover is of individual accidents, not global catastrophes?

A: Yes, those are two very different types of insurance. We make an analogy to the housing stock in America. When people insure their houses in America, they're insuring against specific risk. There's little risk that all the houses will burn down at once -- which would be systemic risk. But a stock-market debacle is a systemic risk -- it would affect all insured portfolios at once -- and is in fact as uninsurable as, say, a major nuclear disaster, in many people's view. In any event, this means that any reduction in the risk of those taking out insurance must be matched by the increased risk assumed by those providing the insurance. What's more, as the options market expands, the total amount of risk involved in stock-market fluctuations rises by even more than the increase in the market's value.

Q: Why is that?

A: This is analogous to the increase in risk that accompanies an increase in debt. While there can be no increase in net debt, since every borrower must have an equal lender, the risk of default rises with the

expansion of gross debt. Likewise, the expansion of the options market involves increased risks, because of its inherent differences from other insurance markets. What's more, the trouble with the options market is that share-price movements are highly correlated -- and this is increasingly becoming true of markets worldwide. Thus, while it is unimaginable that 89% of the U.S. housing stock would suddenly be wiped out, the equivalent disaster happened to the U.S. stock market between 1929 and 1932.

Q: You're implying that all the options activity undertaken to mitigate market risk is actually increasing it by an awesome amount?

A: Well, by how much is the question. Because risk rises with amount of insurance being provided by the options market, it's important to be able to measure the size of that exposure -- and, unfortunately, the answer is far from simple.

Q: We were afraid of that.

A: For traded options, information is widely available on the volume of trading and on the open interest, which is the number of contracts outstanding. But those numbers don't readily translate into money values -- and for the far larger market in over-the-counter options, not even those numbers are widely available.

Q: So, how can you assess risk?

A: The ideal measure of the size of the options market would be an indication of the "insured value" it provides, which would be analogous to the value of the coverage provided by any other insurance market. In our report, we estimate that this insured value for just one relatively small, but important, sector of the options market -- the face value of all index put options traded on the Chicago Board Options Exchange -- amounted to \$132 billion at the end of May.

Q: Based on what?

A: We derived that measure of the insurance coverage provided by the CBOE market in stock-index options by multiplying the number of outstanding put contracts by the dollar value of each contract. Since the

number of puts is roughly equal to the number of calls, this is about equal to half of the notional value of the entire options market. But bear in mind that in principle some portion of the outstanding calls may also represent a form of insurance. What's more, the rapid growth in the market is illustrated by the fact that this insured value of the CBOE's index options has increased over 12-fold in the past decade. It has more than doubled in the past two and a half years.

Q: So you're saying the amount of insurance coverage being provided by the options markets in all their permutations is staggering?

A: It's really the problems involved in obtaining accurate data on the options markets that are staggering. As a consequence, as we stress in our report, the figures that we produced should be used carefully to indicate orders of magnitude, rather than taken as gospel. The most reliable statistic is the one I just referred to, which is taken from data published by the CBOE, and can be calculated fairly straightforwardly -- but even it may include an element of double-counting due to inter-dealer transactions. Beyond that, the data in the [accompanying] tables are listed in descending order of reliability. They're based on incomplete data compiled by the Bank for International Settlements, the Central Bank Survey of Foreign Exchange and Derivatives Market Activity and lots of heavy lifting by Stephen Wright, my colleague at Cambridge -- who, if anything, strove to err on the side of conservatism. In any event, our conclusion is that some \$1.4 trillion to \$2 trillion of insurance against market risk is currently being provided by global options markets.

Q: A big number.

A: Indeed. Even if considerably less than precise. Let me stress again that, given the sorry state of the available data, our estimates can only represent the order of magnitude of the insurance coverage currently being extended via options, whether traded index options, individual stock options, or OTC equity options in the U.S. or globally. Nonetheless, if our estimates are broadly correct, and the proportion of the U.S. equity market that is effectively insured approaches 10%, then the ultimate underwriters of this stock-market insurance are at risk to the extent of \$280 billion-\$400 billion -- should the stock market decline by 30%.

Q: But who are those ultimate underwriters -- the dealers? Every time

we've asked, we've been told not to worry, everybody's "delta hedged" -- whatever that means.

A: Well, that upwards of \$400 billion exposure compares with the \$33 billion of combined equity of the major dealers, Merrill Lynch, Morgan Stanley, J.P. Morgan, Bankers Trust and Goldman Sachs.

Q: You're implying they're how vulnerable?

A: Our data indicate that a 30% market decline could cause serious financial strain, among the dealers, if they were underwriting all that risk. In practice, however, much of that risk is being assumed by the owners of investment portfolios, because the dealers normally hedge their exposure to the market's directional movements -- which is known as "delta" exposure -- with offsetting positions. That's delta hedging.

Q: It sounds too good to be true.

A: It is -- in the sense that, while the market's directional risks can be hedged, there are two other risks involved, known as "gamma" and "vega" exposures, that can't be hedged by the dealer community collectively, even though a dealer, in principle, might hedge against them.

Q: Sorry we asked. Can you translate?

A: I'll try. Delta hedging underlies the whole principle of options pricing because it neutralizes the impact of changes in stock prices, in either direction, provided the price changes are small. The simplest example of delta hedging usually uses a transaction involving a single option and the underlying stock. In practice, of course, the underlying "stock" may be an index, which can't itself be bought and sold, but a futures contract on it can be. Anyway, if the stock price changes, the price of the option will also change, by an amount represented by the Greek letter delta -- and the relationship between those changes is stable for small fluctuations. Thus, the seller of an option can hedge himself against loss by taking a position in the stock opposite to the risk he's assumed in the option.

Q: You're saying that a dealer who would lose money on a call option



he's sold, if the stock price rises, can hedge against that risk by buying enough stock to produce an equal profit?

A: Exactly. And the amount of stock bought must equal delta times the exposure on the option, hence the term "delta hedging." The link between insurance and speculation becomes apparent, though, when you follow that relationship through.

Q: To you, perhaps.

A: It's simply that buyers of puts want to reduce their exposure to the market. And since the delta-hedging traders want to have zero exposure to the market, they have to find other investors who want to increase their exposure. What's crucial here is that a trader who sells both calls and puts will tend to hedge his delta exposure automatically, thereby reducing his need to engage in transactions in the underlying stock. For example, back on July 10, one-month put and call options on the S&P 500, with an exercise price of 920, had almost identical deltas, with opposite signs, and almost exactly the same prices -- \$20 and \$22, respectively. A dealer selling 1,000 of each would have had liabilities of around \$4 million -- the contracts are 100 times the index -- and would have been more or less "perfectly" delta hedged. If the market had then fallen 1%, the price of the put would have risen about \$5 and the price of the call would have fallen around \$4, leaving his liabilities little changed.

Q: So, what's the problem?

A: As I said, delta hedging only protects an options dealer from small changes in the market price. Because unlike the payoff on a bet with a bookmaker, for example, the payoff to a purchaser of an option is determined by the scale of the change in the price of the underlying stock -- and in a non-linear way. It is as if a bookie paid out more on a winning horse depending on the square of the winning distance. If, for instance, in the options situation I just outlined, the market had instead quickly fallen 10%, the call would have become essentially worthless, while the put would have soared to about \$90 -- roughly the difference between exercise price and the new stock price. So the dealer's liability would have swelled to \$9 million, assuming no change in underlying volatilities. This is what's known as "gamma exposure."

Q: Can't Wall Street's rocket scientists eliminate that risk, too?

A: Well, if prices move relatively slowly and smoothly, gamma exposure can be limited by "rebalancing" portfolios, which involves progressively

changing the degree of delta hedging as the delta itself changes. But it can never be entirely eliminated. This is a crucial difference between the actual practice of dealing in options and the textbook theories underlying the standard Black-Scholes pricing model. That model assumes that it's possible to rebalance portfolios on a continuous basis -- and therefore that writing options and delta hedging is a riskless activity. Which, of course -- Nobel Prize or not -- it can never be, in practice.

Q: Still, can't that risk be hedged?

A: Sure, but there's a crucial difference between delta hedging and gamma hedging. As I said, the activity of writing options has a tendency to be self-hedging against delta risk, which means that any systemic price risk is underwritten semi-automatically and in advance. But the only way to hedge gamma exposure is to buy as well as to sell options -- and that simply moves the gamma exposure from one dealer to another. So, while any individual dealer can be gamma hedged, the financial community as a whole can't avoid gamma exposure -- and in practice, this risk is largely borne by options dealers.

Q: There's no escape?

A: Let me put it this way: The only way the dealer community as a whole could avoid gamma exposure would be if long-term investors assumed equal exposure to both put and call options -- as both buyers and sellers. That would run against the natural tendencies of those investors and create credit-exposure problems. In fact, should such a situation occur, the primary *raison d'etre* of options dealers -- to act as intermediaries who remove credit risk -- would disappear.

Q: Okay, what do you figure this gamma risk amounts to?

A: Translating it into a figure for all equity options, comparable to the figure we produced on the value of the insurance coverage being provided by options and the potential payout, just can't be done with any precision. The gamma exposure of the market as a whole is almost certainly significantly lower, in relation to the market's overall size, because long-dated options have markedly lower gammas than short-dated ones. But it seems reasonable to assume that the exposure of the entire market to a rapid 10% price shock would be something on the order of 1% of the face value of all options, or around 2% of the

"insured values" shown in the table, given a rough equality in the number of puts and calls. This implies that aggregate losses to options dealers could run \$10-\$15 billion in the U.S. and up to \$40 billion worldwide, in a 10% correction, if other markets fell in sympathy. Furthermore, it should be noted that gamma exposure doesn't increase proportionately with the size of the market shock, but rather with its square.

Q: You mean a 20% drop in the market would increase the gamma risk by a factor of four -- to \$40-\$60 billion?

A: Yes, if it were a 1987-style decline. If prices decline slowly, as I said, the gamma risk can be reduced, but only at the expense of creating severe selling pressure on underlying stocks and in the futures market, as the writers of options struggle to rebalance their portfolios. And that institutional selling would inevitably imply an accentuation of any decline, once it starts in earnest. What's more, there's an additional risk that options dealers can't collectively hedge away, which is their exposure to the market's own estimate of volatility, or their vega exposure.

Q: Not more Greek!

A: Suffice it to say an increase of five points in assumed volatility, which is roughly comparable to the increase seen in the immediate aftermath of the '87 crash, would increase the collective liabilities of CBOE options dealers on short-dated options by around \$500 million. And vega, in contrast to gamma, increases with the maturity of the option, so the total exposure of the market as a whole would be larger, in relation to its face value. Nonetheless, it would probably be less than the 2% of face value we estimated for gamma exposure.

Q: Why bother with a mere trifle?

A: Because changes in gamma and vega can -- and almost certainly will -- be reinforcing. Thus, should the market plunge 10%, the gamma exposure will give rise to large losses. But it's also likely that the market's estimate of vega will also increase, giving rise to additional losses. The parallel here with the role of portfolio insurance in the '87 crash is obvious. One of the morals of the crash was that put options were preferable to portfolio insurance, which couldn't work when the market moved rapidly. But the subsequent shift to insuring against

market risk via the options market has merely passed the problem on to different risk takers, rather than eliminating it. The investors who took the hit in '87 were the owners of ordinary share portfolios, with capital equal to 100% of their exposure. Those at risk today include dealers, whose capital is a mere fraction of their exposure. And it seems to us very unlikely that they are reserving adequate capital against those risks.

Q: But aren't they being pretty well paid to take those risks?

A: In a word, no. While dealers' models for option pricing -- in sharp contrast to the old portfolio insurance model -- seek to allow for price discontinuity, the risks of price discontinuity depend on the size of the aggregate options exposure, relative to the size of the stock market. Thus, if discontinuity were truly allowed for, options prices would have grown over the last decade as the options market grew relative to the stock market. Options, like any form of insurance, should be priced in relation to the risks involved, including the increase in risk that accompanies an increase in the market's size. Instead, as Stephen's work demonstrated convincingly, options prices, in practice, have been almost solely determined by recent changes in actual market volatility. Indeed, the collective memory of the options market appears to be very short-term in nature, with implied volatility -- which should be based on risk assessment -- instead simply responding to events of the past six months.

Q: Then why haven't we seen more spectacular flame-outs, among dealers?

A: Because these are systemic risks, remember, to which the dealers are exposed. Even if the options are not correctly priced, the dealers will usually find the business profitable. Yet on rare but dramatic occasions it will be spectacularly unprofitable. Human nature being what it is, that sort of very rarely manifested risk habitually gives rise to what's known in insurance circles as "catastrophe myopia." And that, in turn, leads to underpricing and undercapitalization. Conditions which are also encouraged by what's endearingly known as "moral hazard," if the state is regarded as the lender of last resort. Meaning that the taxpayer will ultimately be on the hook for all that "insurance."

Q: We're beginning to get the idea that you think the options market may pose a serious threat to the old bull's health.

A: The risks to the stock market and the economy, not to mention options dealers, are considerable. If the market plunges, dealers will be obliged to rebalance their portfolios by selling stocks, just to reduce their exposure to further declines. This requirement to sell into a decline will tend to increase the volatility of the market and render it more liable to self-reinforcing spirals. And it's possible, though probably unlikely, that such a spiral could set off the crash to which the market's extreme overvaluation makes it vulnerable. What's more likely is that the phenomenal growth in the size of the options markets will accentuate the magnitude of any crash set off by other forces. It's also more likely to increase the size of the market's price discontinuities -- meaning the extent to which large price movements take place without permitting transactions at intermediate prices. As an aside, it may be that "circuit breaker" rules, which shut markets when prices move by more than a given amount, will intensify rather than limit the problems of price discontinuities -- they don't limit the dealers' risks, simply their ability to cover them. Finally, the undercapitalization of options dealers, relative to the risks they're assuming, vastly increases the risks of bankruptcies among the dealers, should the market suffer a sharp break. And that, in turn, would also reinforce the problems created by a stock-market crash.

Q: Gee, thanks, Andrew-we think.

---

[Back to Investment Commentary](#)

---

# YGGDRASIL

## The Demographics of Stock Investment

July 6, 1999

"Demographics support an ongoing Big Shift of household financial assets into equities - and does so for another dozen or more years."

Edward Kerschner, Paine Webber Investment strategist, WSJ 07/06/99 p C1

Hmm!

Wonder if he is right! Has he done his homework, or is he just eyeballing it?

I begin this statistical exercise with a bias that many of the things discussed in the financial media concerning stock valuations - things such as earnings, interest rates, etc - are not predictive of long term trends.

Rather, the critical element in determining stock prices is financial flows - money flowing into stocks versus money flowing out. The bull market of the 1980s and 1990s has been propelled by demographics. A huge cohort of "baby boomers" born between 1945 and 1964 began reaching age 35 - an age at which serious saving and investing typically begins - in 1980. Two years later, the great bull market began.

The demographics of the baby boom have driven the dividend yield on the S&P 500 down to 1.2%. A retiring boomer with a \$1,000,000 account will receive only \$12,000 per annum in dividends. For Boomer stockholders to live at anything like their current lifestyles, they are going to be net sellers throughout their retirement years.

The question is, when does this process begin?

In the past, I have speculated that selling pressure from retiring boomers will not be felt until about 2007. But is that accurate?

First, a few facts.

The typical corporate retirement plan allows early retirement at age 55 with full vesting. Defined benefit plans also typically allow early retirement at age 55 with significant subsidies for early retirement. Because of favorable reduction factors, the early pension has a greater

present value than the normal retirement benefit typically provided at age 65.

For purposes of funding, the typical corporate defined benefit plan assumes an average retirement age of about 58 years. This means that the average dollar of pension liability walks out the door at age 58.

The earliest age at which Social Security benefits are payable is age 62. The average age at which Social Security benefits actually commence is age 63.5.

So the question is, when does the ratio of Americans aged 60 through 64 begin rising relative to the working age population age 35 through age 60.

As a first stab at this, I gathered the Census Bureau 1999 population projections by age for 1996 and later years. Although the Census Bureau provided projections through 2010 for ages 60 to 64, the nearest to a working age population that they provided was the age 15 to 45 group.

As the table below demonstrates, the age 60 to 64 group grows relative to the 15 to 45 group in every year, with a marked acceleration beginning in 2001, and an even steeper acceleration starting in 2005, when the oldest baby boomers hit age 60.

**Retiree to Work Force Ratios  
Census Bureau 1999 Projections  
Age Groups in Thousands**

Year	Age 60-64	Age 15-44	Ratio
1996	10001	119626	0.0836
1997	10062	119854	0.0839
1998	10261	120022	0.0854
1999	10508	119998	0.0875
2000	10654	119969	0.0888
2001	10925	119915	0.0911
2002	11310	119691	0.0944
2003	11938	119501	0.0998
2004	12383	119417	0.1036
2005	12807	119428	0.1072
2006	13085	119453	0.1095

2007	14233	119463	0.1191
2008	14772	119490	0.1236
2009	15453	119551	0.1292
2010	16215	119728	0.1354

But I was disturbed by the fact that the Census projections in the above table showed the ratio growing even in 1996. I was expecting to see a decline in this ratio throughout the 1990s market rally.

I suspected that the 1999 Census projections might be distorted by immigration, and in particular, the addition of a million or more minimum wage persons each year who will not factor into the stock market investment equation over the next 10 years.

Further, I found the totals for the age 15 to 45 group puzzling given the low mortality of this group and the huge legal and illegal immigration of nearly 2 millions per annum. The stagnant number of from 119 to 120 millions each year implies huge out-migration from the United States or far higher mortality than any reasonable mortality table would show.

Therefore, I decided to obtain the raw 1990 census data by 5 year age groups, and then adjust that data forward for the next 20 years, reducing the number in each group each year by the healthy female mortality from the PBGC tables published under section 4062 of ERISA for the oldest year in the 5 year group. This amounts to a unisex mortality assumption of the female table set forward 2.5 years. It should be an excellent assumption for the portion of our population that invests in common stocks and mutual funds.

The table below presents the results of that study for each year from 1990 through 2010, providing the ratio of ages 60-64/35-59, 60+/35-59, and the ratio of 60+/25-59.

As I had guessed, all three ratios declined throughout the 1990s, indicating upward pressure on savings and stock prices. The low points for each ratio, 1999, 2000 and 2000, respectively, are marked with asterisks on the chart below.

### Retiree to Work Force Ratios - 1990 Census

YEAR	Ratio of ages 60-64 to 35-59	Ratio of ages 60+ to 35-59	Ratio of ages 60+ to 25-59	ICI Stock Mutual Fund Inflows
1990	0.1447	0.5707	0.3592	19



1991	0.1388	0.5610	0.3585	42.7
1992	0.1333	0.5507	0.3571	75.2
1993	0.1282	0.5399	0.3551	92.2
1994	0.1236	0.5288	0.3525	77.2
1995	0.1194	0.5172	0.3493	120.1
1996	0.1177	0.5096	0.3486	206.5
1997	0.1162	0.5017	0.3475	229
1998	0.1148	0.4934	0.3459	159.8
1999	0.1135*	0.4849	0.3439	
2000	0.1139	0.4761*	0.3416*	
2001	0.1158	0.4780	0.3449	
2002	0.1191	0.4794	0.3478	
2003	0.1224	0.4802	0.3503	
2004	0.1196	0.4804	0.3524	
2005	0.1227	0.4801	0.3541	
2006	0.1271	0.4928	0.3631	
2007	0.1339	0.5049	0.3717	
2008	0.1406	0.5163	0.3797	
2009	0.1472	0.5270	0.3873	
2010	0.1450	0.5368	0.3943	

So does this mean that the market will turn?

Absolutely, and no later than September of 2003.

The exact timing of when retiree selling will begin to effect price depends, in part, on the dynamic effects of today's high prices.

What happens when people win \$20 million in the lottery? Uniformly, they find a reason to quit their jobs within a few months after winning. Wealth makes people retire earlier.

Thus, the enormous wealth generated by this historic bull market could be provoking early retirements in sufficient number to affect cash flows into stocks right now.

In fact, the narrowing of the market signaled by the topping of the NYSE advance-decline line in July of 1998 might be the first indicator of declining liquidity. Despite the new record highs in the popular indices, fewer and fewer stocks are participating. The fall in mutual fund inflows in 1998 over 1997 might also be an indicator, but I would reserve judgment on this because of the August, September 1998 price decline.

The practical answer is that from now through May, 2002, each of you should be invested in stocks and mutual funds from Nov 1 through April 30, and out of the market entirely from May through October of each year. But beginning with May, 2002 onward, every time the market gives a 10-week rsi oversold reading and signals a momentum loss, you should invest in a short fund such as Prudent Bear (BEARX), Rydex Ursa (RYURX), Rydex Arktos (RYAIX) or Fleckenstein's fund. Before 2010, there will be 2 or more spectacular declines that will make you nearly as much money as you could have made riding the S&P up from 1990.

The question, then, is what could make cash flows into stocks slow down even before retirement selling begins in earnest?

To answer that question we must first explore what those flows are.

Below is a chart showing the sources of supply and demand for Corporate equities from the Federal Reserve's Z1 releases from 1990 through 1998.

First the demand:

**Sources of Demand for Stocks  
Federal Reserve Z-1  
Dollar Flows in Billions**

Year	Households	Purchases by Foreigners	Bank Trusts	Life Insurance	Private Pensions	Public Pensions	Mutual Funds	Other
1990	-26.3	-16	0.05	-5.7	-4.1	13.2	14.4	-13.7
1991	-33	10.4	-8.6	17	6.9	31.2	48.5	5.1
1992	24.8	-5.6	-37	24.4	30.8	17.7	59.8	0.4
1993	-57.5	20.9	-55.2	36.3	16.9	44.3	115.3	16.7
1994	-159.8	0.9	-8.8	61.8	-1.7	29.3	100.8	1.9
1995	-192	16.6	1.6	18.6	5.9	41.3	87.4	17.4
1996	-291.5	11	-17.3	46.7	-9.6	52.2	193	6.7

1997	-521.8	64.2	72.3	86.3	-16.1	53.5	166.8	1.3
1998	-527.1	42.5	39.1	107.4	-52.7	70.8	143.3	-15.5

Notice that the biggest source of expected demand, households, is in fact the biggest source of supply.

And now the traditional sources of supply:

**Sources of Supply for Stocks  
Federal Reserve Z-1  
Dollar Flows in Billions**

Year	Non-Financial Corporations	U.S. Purchase of Foreign	Financial Corporations
1990	-63	7.4	17.9
1991	18.3	30.7	28
1992	27	32.4	44
1993	21.3	63.4	53
1994	-44.9	48.1	21.4
1995	-58.3	50.4	4.8
1996	-69.5	60	0.8
1997	-114.4	41.3	-5.6
1998	-267	75.9	6.3

Notice once again that Corporations are the normal source of supply. Corporations are supposed to issue new stock and use the stock market as a source of capital. Now they are doing the opposite. They are buying back their stock, net of new issues, in record quantities at record high prices.

The two charts above scream at anyone willing to see and think. What we have is the household sector (consisting of founders, executives selling stock acquired on exercise of their stock options, and retirees selling long held stocks to support themselves in retirement) disposing of stock at unprecedented rates.

What you see above is a massive inter-generational transfer of cash from the Baby Boomers and the Corporations that employ them to founders, option eligible executives and to wealthy

retirees.

A cynic would argue that the executives are looting their corporations of cash to prop up the value of executive options. In the high tech sector, companies sell puts on their own stock and buy calls, all on inside information. They use the proceeds to finance stock buy-backs, thereby forcing the call writers to cover. Dell has raised over \$3 billions in the last two years playing this game. Microsoft does it too. All growth funds need do to out-perform the market is track option prices and volumes on these tech stocks and buy when puts are plentiful and cheap. After all, the biggest writer gets to peek at the company's order book!

It is unprecedented in human history.

I should note parenthetically, that the above tables should also make clear why new companies (less than 15 years of public trading) will outperform old ones heavily owned by 80 year old widows.

The \$500 billions of cash being pulled from the market each year is an enormous amount of money. Can it continue? Which sources of inflow are the least stable?

The answer is relatively obvious. The \$267 billions in corporate buy-backs are the least stable flow. These corporate buybacks of listed companies exceeded profits net of taxes and net of dividends for 1998 of all corporations by \$55 billions. Public corporations are borrowing money to buy back their stock. A recession would crumple the buy-backs. So will rising interest rates driven by rising inflation.

The increasing popularity of corporate buy-backs from 1994 through 1998, the truly manic phase of this bull market, tells us that the most manic and optimistic of all investors are the CEOs of public corporations.

In August and September of 1998, corporate CEOs stepped in massively and bought in the face of the sell off. In the Q3 they bought at a \$308 billion annual rate and in Q4, at a \$491 billion annual rate. They did it because their own businesses looked reasonably good and interest rates were plunging to record lows. Borrowing to finance buy-backs was cheap.

It was the CEOs of the fortune 500 who bailed out the stock market in 1998. Alan Greenspan was only a bit player who encouraged the banks to lend them the money to do it.

They are the wild optimists, and anything that sours their mood will cause a quick spill in the market. A rising dollar - rising interest rates - a serious economic slowdown - banks worried about declining credit quality, any of these could cause CEOs to become much more cautious about buy-backs.

The CEOs will continue this behaviour only if they think that it will produce a higher market and higher option values later. If they become convinced that the market is headed down, they are not about to throw good money after bad. Given the incentives, they buy high and sell low.

Recognize the enormous leverage in the flows. We have \$500 billions in supply at these prices. If demand from buy-backs disappears, we have a \$200 billion or so deficit in demand. Prices would have to fall a long way to bring the \$500 billion supply down to equal that lower demand.

Ultimately, the stagnant work force projected by the Census department, and the swelling number of retirees with stock to sell will put an end to the corporate buy back game. Once the corporate CEOs recognize the demographic reality, they will not even try to prop up their stocks. Instead, they will begin to respond to retirees calls for higher cash dividends, persuade their consultants to begin pushing cash bonus plans tied to dividend increases, and lobby to have cash salaries in excess of \$1,000,000 made deductible to the corporation once again.

Until then, investing is a game of guessing at how optimistic the corporate CEOs are.

Upon seeing the above two tables, I began to realize how anomalous the fund flows must be from a historical perspective. Markets simply could not function at all over the long term with the normal sources of supply and demand reversed in this way.

And the thought of asking corporate employees to put their retirement savings into stocks priced by such unsustainable flows seems criminal.

We have lots of excellent studies on the net analyzing the market in terms of PE ratios, price to book ratios, price to sales ratios and similar measures. For one of the best see [Alan M. Newman](#). We have excellent valuation models like the federal Reserve's own model which you can see at [Dr. Ed Yardeni's Economics Network](#). An excellent historical PE range chart can be seen at [Decision Point](#).

But excessive valuations have had no predictive value in this market.

This is a new era all right. But the newness has nothing to do with technology, the internet, valuations or inflation. It is a new era because money flows have been warped beyond recognition.

And to see how truly unique the 1990s have been, I prepared a similar chart of demand and supply from the nine years of 1954 to 1962, a period of dramatically rising stock prices.

First, a picture of typical bull market demand flows:

**Sources of Demand for Stocks**  
**Federal Reserve Z-1, 1954-1962**  
**Dollar Flows in Billions**

Date	Households	Purchases by Foreigners	S&Ls	Insurance Companies	Private Pensions	Public Pensions	Mutual Funds	Closed End Funds	Other
1954	0.3	0.5	0.1	0.5	0.7	0	0.3	-0.6	-0.1
1955	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.7	0	0.4	-0.3	0
1956	1	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.9	0	0.5	0.2	-0.2
1957	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.1	1.1	0.1	0.7	0.9	0.2
1958	0.3	-0.1	0.1	0.2	1.4	0.1	1.1	0.8	-0.5
1959	-1	0.4	0	0.5	1.7	0.1	1	0.1	0.1
1960	-1.2	0.2	0	0.7	1.9	0.1	0.8	0.6	0
1961	-1.1	0.3	0.1	0.8	2.3	0.2	1.3	-1.4	-0.4
1962	-2.7	0.1	0.1	0.6	2.2	0.2	0.9	0.1	0

And now a more typical picture of bull market supply.

**Sources of Supply of Stocks**  
**Federal Reserve Z-1, 1954-1962**  
**Dollar Flows in Billions**

Year	Non-Financial Corporations	U.S. Purchase of Foreign	Financial Corporations
1954	1.6	0.3	-0.3
1955	1.7	0.2	-0.2
1956	2.3	0.1	0.6
1957	2.4	0	1.3
1958	2	0.3	-0.4
1959	2.1	0.2	0.5

1960	1.4	0.7	1.1
1961	2.1	0.8	-0.9
1962	0.4	1	0.3

In the above charts, capital markets operate as we expect. Households buy stock and corporations issue it.

The truth is that the stock market can only operate as an inter-generational cash transfer mechanism during periods when we have a falling ratio of retirees to workers.

As soon as a static or declining pool of workers detects selling pressure from retirees in the form of flat or falling prices, they will stop investing until dividend yields compensate them for the risk of rising retiree sales. Once Joe SixPack goes on strike, the buy-back bravado of the CEOs in the face of market sell-offs will quickly disappear.

Don't expect foreign investment dollars to bail out our stock market. Indeed, the demographics for the G7 nations are worse than ours. See the graphs at the end of [Urban Institute Research Paper](#).

Protect yourselves!

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Money and Markets Page](#)

(c) 1996 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.

---

# YGGDRASIL

---

## Follow the Money!

July 18, 1999

Follow the Money and you will get to the truth.

In last week's post entitled "[The Demographics of Stock Investment](#)", I noted that the ratio of retirees to investing age workers stops falling in 1999 or 2000 and begins rising thereafter. At a minimum, we can expect investable down moves beginning no later that September 2003, and probably earlier.

I noted that the wealth effects of the stock market might prompt retirements at earlier ages than the demographics of age groups might suggest, perhaps accelerating the shift from baby boomer demand to baby boomer supply. I noted some evidence of that shift in the article, namely, the narrowing of the market, demonstrated by the poor performance of the advance decline line for the past 12 months, and a divergence in Joe Granville's on balance volume indicator for the past 6 months.

In addition, that earlier post set forth data on mutual fund stock purchases in two seprate tables that may appear, on first glance, to conflict. In the table below, I set those data side by side for comparison. The second column sets forth Federal Reserve data on equity purchases by mutual funds themselves, while the third sets forth the equity mutual fund inflows or purchases for each year published by the Investment Company Institute.

### **Stock Purchases by Mutual Funds and Stock Mutual Fund Purchases Dollar Flows in Billions**

Year	Mutual Fund Stock Purchases Fed. Reserve Z-1	ICI Stock Mutual Fund Inflows
1990	14.4	19



1991	48.5	42.7
1992	59.8	75.2
1993	115.3	92.2
1994	100.8	77.2
1995	87.4	120.1
1996	193	206.5
1997	166.8	229
1998	143.3	159.8

The federal Reserve data show that actual purchases of stock by mutual funds have been declining for the past two years from their peak in 1996. In contrast, mutual fund purchases have declined for only one year from their peak in 1997. One explanation for the difference between the figures is management fees and sales expenses. The Investment company institute values stock mutual funds at \$3.2 trillions. Assuming that the average expense load is 1% then the first \$32 billion of inflows each year goes toward fees and expenses. Thus, the higher the stock market goes, the larger the fixed management fee burden becomes. Inflows must grow to sustain management fees. Throw in another \$50 billions of fees for management of the \$5 trillion or so of stocks held by pension funds, bank trusts, and "financial planners" and you are talking about a net of \$80 billions to \$100 billions that must flow in each year just to meet management fees based on current prices.

Wall street doesn't like to talk about this, but very small flows at the margin can move prices a great deal.

A much more timely piece of evidence arrived this week. We had new all-time highs in the S&P 500 and the NASDAQ on July 16, but the 8 day moving average of volume crested a week earlier at a much lower level than during the April highs and the January highs as well.

In addition, the 8 day moving average of NYSE and Nasdaq volume was lower on June 15 than at the previous low on February 19, 1999.

In a healthy bull market, new highs in price are accompanied by new highs in volume. Corrections that occur on low volume should produce a series of higher lows in volume, just as in price.

New highs in price accompanied by lower highs in volume are a sign of imminent trend reversal. It is an irrefutable sign of flagging demand for stocks.

Here is a chart of the NYSE volume peaks and troughs that correspond to highs and lows in the

market:

**Volume Lows and Volume Peaks  
With Percentage increase from  
Previous Low or High:  
NYSE Volume in Millions**

Date	LOW	Percent Change	HIGH	Percent Change
09/04/96	310			
01/16/97			529	
04/16/97	456	47%		
07/24/97			586	11%
09/02/97	459	0.66%		
04/30/98			668	14%
06/11/98	576	25%		
01/06/99			977	46%
02/19/99	715	24%		
04/22/99			982	0.51%
06/15/99	678	-5%		.
07/09/99			794	-19%

Here is a similar table for the NASDAQ:

**Volume Lows and Volume Peaks  
With Percentage increase from  
Previous Low or High:  
NASD Volume in Millions**

Date	LOW	Percent Change	HIGH	Percent Change
09/10/96	425			
01/23/97			685	

04/16/97	541	27%		
07/18/97			707	3%
09/03/97	612	13%		
04/24/98			880	24%
06/08/98	675	10%		
01/15/99			1142	30%
03/01/99	862	28%		
04/15/99			1220	7%
06/08/99	823	-5%		
07/12/99			1050	-14%

In addition, three panic corrections produced peaks of volume higher than the previous peaks associated with rising prices. These occurred in July of 1996, October of 1997 and August of 1998 and are not listed in the above table. However, these climactic volume peaks merely confirmed the increasing bull market demand for "buying the dips".

Recently, Maria Bartiromo, a spokes-model for CNBC business news asked rhetorically why anyone should care what interest rates are as long as you can get 20% a year on stocks.

The short answer is in the charts above. Modest rises in interest rates mean that capital is migrating from Wall Street to Main Street. Falling demand makes it impossible to continue earning 20% a year on stocks.

I mentioned in the July 6th post that measures such as record high PE ratios, record low dividend yields, and record high price-to-book ratios are not predictive. Indeed, these measures are nearly certain to move higher as long as volume is increasing - that is, as long as we get higher peaks in volume with each new high in market prices.

So then the question becomes, when will this change in volume trend begin to affect the price trend?

To answer that question I decided to follow the money with a new study.

The Federal Reserve data set forth in my post of July 6, 1999 demonstrates that corporate stock buy-backs play a dominant role in demand for stocks. I also noted that the high tech sector companies write puts and buy calls based on inside information to finance these buy-backs.

Well folks, when do corporations usually have reliable inside information? When is it safe for

them to write naked puts and buy calls?

The answer is obviously in the last month of the quarter, when they have a good idea of what the quarterly results will be. If the non-public information looks reasonably good, the corporations will write their puts and buy their calls first. Then they start buying back their stock, driving its price higher and forcing the call writers (who are short the stock) to cover, thus driving the price up further.

Corporate executives have a short window in which to exercise options following the earnings release. This means that price ramps which begin in the final month of the quarter will run through expiration week of the month following the quarter, during the height of earnings announcement season. Thus, the executives benefit directly from the timing of this activity. Further, much of the option activity at the beginning of each ramp can be hidden in the fury of triple witching that occurs in the final month of each calendar quarter.

Given the obvious incentives at work, I decided to do a study. Using the 5 day stochastic oscillator I would buy the first oversold alert occurring any time between two trading days prior to final month of the calendar quarter and extending to the triple witch expiration as an entry point. I would then exit at the first break in the 5 day stochastic oscillator overbought reading occurring anytime within the 8 trading days prior to option expiration of the next month.

My what a surprise!

Here is a table with results for the S&P 500:

**Trading Corporate End-of-Quarter  
Stock Price Ramps:  
S&P 500 Index**

Date Ramp Begins	Date Ramp Ends	Index Price Begin	Index Price End	% During Ramp	% Between Ramps
12/16/96	01/17/97	720.98	776.17	7.65%	
03/04/97	04/18/97	790.95	766.34	-3.11%	1.90%
06/05/97	07/17/97	843.43	931.61	10.45%	10.06%
08/29/97	10/08/97	899.47	973.84	8.27%	-3.45%
12/12/97	01/16/98	953.39	961.51	0.85%	-2.10%
03/02/98	04/17/98	1047.7	1122.72	7.16%	8.96%

06/16/98	07/17/98	1087.59	1186.75	9.12%	-3.13%
09/04/98	10/16/98	973.89	1056.42	8.47%	-17.94%
12/14/98	01/11/99	1141.2	1263.88	10.75%	8.03%
03/02/99	04/12/99	1225.5	1358.63	10.86%	-3.04%
06/13/99	07/16/99	1293.64	1418.78	9.67%	-4.78%

One hundred dollars invested during the ramps compounded to \$215. One hundred dollars short between ramps compounded to \$109.

Below is a similar table for the NASDAQ 100 Index:

**Trading Corporate End-of-Quarter  
Stock Price Ramps:  
NASDAQ 100 Index**

Date Ramp Begins	Date Ramp Ends	Index Price Begin	Index Price End	% During Ramp	% Between Ramps
06/05/97	07/17/97	930.61	1094.95	17.66%	
08/29/97	10/09/97	1074.17	1148.21	6.89%	-1.90%
12/15/97	01/16/98	984.38	1005.87	2.18%	-14.27%
03/05/98	04/17/98	1126.83	1231.25	9.27%	12.03%
06/04/98	07/17/98	1195.19	1463.97	22.49%	-2.93%
09/04/98	10/16/98	1205.41	1293.91	7.34%	-17.66%
12/16/98	01/11/99	1656.28	2000.18	20.76%	28.01%
03/03/99	04/08/99	1899.81	2224.75	17.10%	-5.02%
06/15/99	07/16/99	2058.17	2459.58	19.50%	-7.49%

One hundred dollars invested during the ramps compounded to \$312. One hundred dollars short between ramps compounded to \$118.

Given the trend in mutual fund inflows, as well as the half trillion dollar per year supply of stock from "households" at these prices, I would expect corporate speculation in options on their own stock, and stock buy-backs to continue to dominate the investment landscape until the demographic reality finally sinks in. That moment of recognition is years away. Thus, I expect the quarterly pattern to remain in force.

Between July 19 and August 31, I will be looking for a mild downmove in both the S&P500 and the NDX with several 3-5 day trading opportunities in both directions. It will be a "data sensitive" period, leading off with Greenspan's speech on July 22, and ending with the PPI and CPI numbers for July to be announced in August, followed by the August Federal Reserve meeting. Once earnings are out of the way, the market will be on Fed watch. Most important for our trend recognition will be whether volume makes a lower low towards the end of August. If it does, then we have even more reason to expect a Bear market.

Stress is building in the financial system in Latin America. Currency values are a problem in China. Thus, an unexpected calamity could turn an ordinary gentle downdraft into a crash. But I wouldn't bet against the end-of-quarter ramp in hopes of an unexpected catastrophe.

The critical event will be the next quarterly ramp beginning in September. A failed ramp with a lower high in volume would be a sign that the bear market has arrived. The September 1999 ramp will depend on PC sales. Many large companies have announced that they will freeze spending on computers during the last 6 months of the year so that no new changeovers will draw resources away from Y2k monitoring.

The Y2k problem has been an enormous bonanza for the tech industry over the past 2 years. So far in 1999, it looks like the bonanza continues as the small businesses are getting scared that their older pentiums are not Y2k compliant (every pentium motherboard built in the last 5 years is Y2k compliant) and are buying them like there is no tomorrow. The marketing arms at Dell, HP and others seem to be able to find many smaller businesses with weak internal IS departments who they can scare into buying more machines at premium prices. In addition, individuals keep snapping up the latest high-end machines (with expensive CPUs hopelessly IO bound to slower components in the system) as if they were status-laden foreign sports cars, with little thought to the economics of the purchase.

I will be short in August, waiting to pull the trigger and switch to long in early September. The longer we go with no pre-announcement of bad news from Intel, the more I will feel pressured to switch to long. If we get a serious tech pre-announcement, a failed ramp will follow which I expect to take 30% off the NDX.

The failure of the volume trend casts doubt upon the ability of corporate CEOs to continue having their way with this market. Unless the volume trend changes within the next three months, a bear market is imminent.

Occasionally, my correspondents ask me why I am willing to post this sort of information in public. The reason is simple. The bullish psychology is so deeply ingrained that very few will believe the facts. Thus, publication is harmless.

And it fulfills the first requirement of Sir Arthur Keith's dual code, the sharing of valuable information within the group.

It is a start.

Yggdrasil-

---

[Back to Money and Markets Page](#)

(c) 1999 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute Freely.



---

## **An Introduction to Sir Arthur Keith**

**by Yggdrasil**

---

I would like to introduce you to Sir Arthur Keith, father of modern Nationalism and the single most important thinker of the Twentieth Century.

Keith (1866-1955) was born in Scotland, the son of a modest farmer. Trained as a medical doctor, he became one of the first structural anthropologists, dissecting modern primates and analyzing fossil primate finds. He was made president of the Royal Anthropological Institute, and was knighted by King George for his work in 1921.

Keith's lasting contribution to Western Civilization was performed between 1943 and 1947, in the years surrounding his 80th birthday.

These contributions are, in order of importance, *Evolution and Ethics*, originally published in 1945 (hereafter "Ethics") and *A New Theory of Human Evolution*, first published in 1947 (hereafter "New Theory"). Both books are exceptionally rare. A quick internet search of university and public library catalogs in 1998 indicates that these works are accessible, at considerable inconvenience, in fewer than 25 locations in the U.S.

However, both books are in the public domain and may be downloaded free from the Yggdrasil University page of Yggdrasil's Nationalist Library:  
<http://www.ddc.net/ygg/etext>.

Arthur Hooton, chairman of the Anthropology Department at Harvard, wrote the introduction to "Evolution and Ethics" in 1945 by stating; "THE name of Sir Arthur Keith deserves to be associated with those of Charles Darwin and Thomas Huxley in the study of the evolution of man."

Indeed, as I reflect on Keith's obscurity, I am reminded of the obscurity of Johann Sebastian Bach until Mozart first heard his music, or the obscurity of the works of William Shakespeare until Goethe resurrected them.

Significantly, it is not the force of a single individual who now resurrects Keith, but



rather the actions of humanity in the final quarter of the twentieth century which vindicate his theories.

While his ideas about the details of anthropology are now somewhat dated, the predictive and explanatory power of the political and philosophical principles derived from his anthropological studies surpass those of Aristotle or Plato.

Sir Arthur observed that the evolutionary heritage of modern Man has given him an inherent tendency to form groups and to apply one code of morals, that of amity, to his own group, and a completely different set of morals, that of enmity, to outsiders.

He observed that this behavior serves an evolutionary purpose. Races and tribes with a high degree of group awareness and who follow this "dual code" have a distinct survival advantage over those which lack this awareness.

He also believed that this evolutionary heritage, when properly understood and openly admitted, would enable man to tailor his political institutions and national boundaries in such a way as to reduce the probability of the enormously destructive conflicts - made possible by modern industrial technology - that have, in the recent past, been waged under the equally destructive universalist masks of "equality," "liberal democracy" and "universal brotherhood".

And for this offense against the modern and universal, he has been consigned to obscurity.

But the final quarter of the Twentieth Century finds a world marching very much to Sir Arthur's tune.

Within the three years between 1989 through 1992, the World witnessed violent conflicts between ethnic or racial groups in 82 different areas, of which 79 involved conflicts between different ethnic groups within single states. Virtually all continue to rage in 1998. Political boundaries established by European empire builders over the last several hundred years are being re-drawn so that internal political processes can operate more in accordance with to the code of amity - avoiding the inevitable internal demands, conflicts and increased costs prompted by the codes of enmity that so stubbornly and persistently arise in the politics of multi-ethnic states.

Our collective living arrangements must be tailored to conform to human nature.

## **I. THE "DUAL CODE" AND THE TRIBE.**

Sir Arthur's thesis begins with a description of the tribal mind on page 7 of Ethics:

"[H]e (Darwin) supposed that man, before he even emerged from apedom, was

already a social being, living in small scattered communities. Evolution in his eyes was carried out mainly as a struggle between communities - team against team, tribe against tribe. Inside each team or tribe the 'ethical cosmos' [the code of 'Amity'] was at work, forging and strengthening the social bonds which made the members of such a team a co-operative whole. These mental bonds, Darwin supposed, had been evolved from those inborn ties that link members of a family together - the love of parents for their children, of children for parents, and of children for each other. Thus in the early stages of human evolution we find competition and co-operation as constituent elements of the evolutionary process; Huxley's 'cosmic process' [the code of Enmity] and "ethical process" working not in opposition, but in harmony, to produce the races of the modern world.

"Co-operation and unity give strength to a team or tribe; but why did neighboring tribes refuse so stubbornly to amalgamate? If united, they would have got rid of competition and struggle. Why do human tribes instinctively repel every thought of amalgamation, and prize above all things independence, the control of their destiny, their sovereignty? Here we have to look beneath the surface of things and formulate a theory to explain tribal behavior. How does a tribe fulfill an evolutionary purpose? A tribe is a 'corporate body,' which Nature has entrusted with an assortment of human seed or genes, the assortment differing in some degree from that entrusted to every other tribe. If the genes are to work out their evolutionary effects, then it is necessary that the tribe or corporation should maintain its integrity through an infinity of generations. If a tribe loses its integrity by a slackening of social bonds, or by disintegration of the parental instincts, or by lack of courage or of skill to defend itself from the aggression of neighboring tribes, or by free interbreeding with neighbors and thus scattering its genes, then that tribe as an evolutionary venture has come to an untimely end. For evolutionary purposes it has proved a failure."

And continuing on page 25 of Ethics:

"A good tribesman clings to his fellows and tells them the truth; he repels men of neighboring tribes and tells them lies. The real problem which faces us is this: How can the duality of human nature be explained? The evolutionist can offer an explanation which is agreeable to reason; the theologian has to appeal to superstition for an answer.

"It is only when we realize the conditions under which the later stages of the evolution of man were carried out that we come by a clue to the duality of his mental nature. Conceive, for a moment, what these conditions were. Throughout all the final stages of our evolution, mankind throughout the whole earth was segregated into small local communities or tribes. This was certainly so during the entire Pleistocene period, which at a moderate estimate endured for half a million years - perhaps a million. Tribalism was everywhere down to the beginnings of the fifth millennium B.C., when somewhere in southwest Asia agriculture was discovered, town-building and detribalization set in, and the era of civilization began. Tribalism was Nature's method in bringing about the evolution of man. I have already explained what a tribe really is - a corporation of human beings entrusted with a certain capital of genes. The business of such a corporation is to

nurse and develop its stock of genes - to bring them to an evolutionary fruition. To reach such an end a tribal corporation had to comply with two conditions: (1) it had to endure for a long age; (2) it had to remain intact and separate from all neighboring and competing tribes. Human nature was fashioned or evolved just to secure these two conditions - continuity through time and separation in space. Hence the duality of man's nature - the good, social, or virtuous traits serving intratribal economy; the evil, vicious, or antisocial qualities serving the intertribal economy and the policy of keeping its genes apart. Human nature is the basal part of the machinery used for the evolution of man. When you know the history of our basal mentality - one fitted for tribal life - do you wonder at the disorder and turmoil which now afflict the detribalized part of the world?"

## **II. FROM TRIBE TO NATION**

Keith goes on to note that with the advent of agriculture and civilization, tribes were expanded into nations through a process of conquest and subjugation. These wars of tribal amalgamation in Europe, with their relatively low casualty rates, were accompanied by values of "fair play" and "chivalry" intended to minimize continuing conflict with the loser following battle so as to ease the fusion of his identity into the larger tribe, and ultimately into the nation.

From page 9 of Ethics:

"When history raises the curtain on Germany, in the century which preceded the dawn of Christianity, we find her population divided into some forty independent tribes, warring with each other and with the outside world. No doubt the tribes which the Romans met with, or heard of, represented federations or compulsory amalgamations of earlier smaller tribes. If Germany had been like the rest of Europe before the practice of agriculture reached her, which was late in the fourth millennium B.C., her territory must have been divided among some 150 or 200 small local tribes or communities. Thus, when our historical record begins, modern evolutionary progress, as indicated by reduction in number and increase in size of tribal units, had made a very considerable advance. In the centuries which followed the Roman period local self-determination must have flourished, for by the seventeenth century there were 250 independent states established within the frontiers of what is now modern Germany. In the eighteenth century, under the sword of Frederick the Great, the number was reduced, mainly by the absorptive power and capacity of Prussia, so that in 1814 they numbered thirty-nine. By 1871, under Bismarck, only twenty-five states retained their independence. With the coming of Hitler and the establishment of the Third Reich, in 1933, Germany suddenly emerged as a unitary state - a single tribe or nation numbering over eighty millions, with a single leader and a central government;"

He notes that the tribal mentality, and the dual code by which mankind operates, was transferred to nations as a result of the amalgamation of tribes. As he states on page vii of his preface to Ethics:

"My second theme relates to the current conception of race and of nation. Most of my colleagues regard a nation as a political unit, with which anthropologists have no concern; whereas I regard a nation as an "evolutionary unit," with which anthropologists ought to be greatly concerned. The only live races in Europe today are its nations."

He uses as a modern example the case of Finnish resistance to Russia in 1939-1940 to illustrate the dual code and its meaning in the context of modern European nations. Beginning on page 32:

"Let us see if we can obtain a reasonable explanation of the state of mind which had been roused in the people of Finland by certain demands made on their country by powerful Russia. At first there was no threat against the corporate life of the Finns; they were requested to surrender certain strong points which were coveted by Russia for defensive purposes. Now, suppose the ultimate purpose of human existence had been such as we have passed in review - the development of personality, the provision of greatest happiness to the greatest number, the growth of the soul, glorification of the Creator, security, peace, prosperity; then the Finns ought gratefully to have accepted the demands of Russia. Could not all of these objectives in life have been developed more freely and fully under the protection of Russia than under the weaker power of the smaller state? We receive no explanation from the accepted theories of life. But if we turn to the theory that I have put forward - namely, that human nature has been fashioned to advance the cause of evolution - then we obtain a ready and sufficient explanation. An evolutionary unit, be it a community, tribe, or a nation, must, to fulfill its destiny, maintain not only its organization and its continuity, but also its independence - its right to work out its own destiny. If a nation loses its independence, then it has no longer the power to develop its separate destiny or to pursue the policy of self-determination. Thus I regard the spirit of independence which we have seen roused in the hearts of the Finnish people as a fundamental part of the machinery of human evolution."

### **III. THE ARRIVAL OF FIERCE, GENOCIDAL WARS IN EUROPE**

Sir Arthur contrasts the European Wars of Tribal and National amalgamation with the fierce and genocidal conflicts of the ancient Hebrews, the Huns, the Mongols, and Tamerlane. Indeed, the first indication that modern European war was itself evolving into something much nastier than the earlier wars of tribal and national amalgamation were the high casualty rates willingly suffered by Napoleon. Such losses did not bode well for the future of Europe. I should mention, parenthetically, a second characteristic of truly modern European wars which supports Keith's thesis. This characteristic had its genesis in the U.S. Civil war. The history books will tell you that General Sherman was the first "modern" general because he was the first to wage economic war on a civilian population. But far more important is the fact that modern wars do not end when the fighting stops. The essential conflict continues on in the "peace." The impulse toward amalgamation is gone.

While there was much talk following 1865 in the Northern states of the U.S. about "binding up the wounds," as if our Civil War had been of the older "nation building" variety, the minions who went South to implement the peace had entirely different objectives in mind. And this highlights another characteristic of modern "liberal democracies," namely the disconnect between the publicly stated purposes of a government program that are used to round up political support, and the collective policy preferences of the people who seek jobs implementing the program. Nathan Bedford Forrest understood this instinctively and responded in a way that preserved the independent evolutionary destiny of his people. No other Confederate general understood.

The Treaty of Versailles following WW-I expanded this modern trend of continuing the conflict in peace with punitive measures that plunged post-war Germany into poverty and deprived her of the means of national self defense. At the end of WW-II we had the Morgenthau plan which included (1) the killing of Germany's civilian and military leaders, (2) the largest ethnic cleansing in human history with the forced migration of over 14 million ethnic Germans from Russia, Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia to East Germany, followed by (3) the reduction of German POW and civilian food rations to starvation levels for 3 years following the War as faceless bureaucrats watched an estimated 9 to 12 million Germans starve to death (including 900,000 POWs deliberately starved to death by General Eisenhower in the 3 years following the war). The only thing that saved Germany from more extensive post-war genocide was the onset of the Cold War between Russia and the United States.

Arthur Keith could not have known anything about the Aftermath of WW-II when he wrote his books. Thus, this pattern of peacetime conflict continuation would have been much harder to spot. (Indeed none of us knew this until a Canadian researcher named James Bacque published his research under the title of "Other Losses" in 1989, and a more comprehensive work entitled "Crimes and Mercies" in 1997.) Nevertheless, Sir Arthur sensed the development of a very ugly trend in the fierce and destructive conflicts into which modern war had evolved.

Modern European wars place us all on a clear path towards accelerating the pace of evolution. Ironically, at a time when we have discarded the values of chivalry and fairness toward our fellow Europeans, the suicide of the West has been accelerated by our collective extension and expansion of these values and the exclusive application of them to the more distant and unassimilable non-European races of the World, all of whom read our humanitarian outreach (correctly) as a threat to their own evolutionary destinies.

The tribal mind had no reason to apply its rules of exclusion and separation to distant lands, but rather reserved its hostility and applied it almost exclusively to its nearest neighbors. This is the source of the Euro-American predicament. In the absence of traditional tribal enemies, Euro-American elites are re-tribalizing in chaotic and unplanned ways, frantically distancing themselves from "trailer trash" while enlisting as allies in this effort Blacks and imported Browns. We have not escaped the evolutionary heritage uncovered by Sir Arthur - we just commit evolutionary suicide much more

quickly than in the past.

#### **IV. UNIVERSALISM AND THE MASKS OF CIVILIZATION**

Sir Arthur associates the viciousness of modern wars with the destructive ideal of Universalism. At this point Sir Arthur sets forth several concepts that provide us with an exceptionally accurate map for analyzing the second half of the 20th century.

Sir Arthur describes the Universalist vision on page 52 of Ethics as follows:

"What a world to look out on! The frontiers behind which sixty nations, tribes beyond number, and races are now entrenched have vanished; the earth below is as free as the sky above; among the peoples there is no longer any color bar; a common tongue has swept through the earth as in the palmy days of Babel. Tariff walls have been overthrown; there are no passports, no dues, no patriotism, for every living soul is a citizen of the world, free to come and go, free to trade as needs compel or moods suggest. There are no armies, no navies, for there is no longer any warlike spirit in human nature. Only a central airborne police to see that the one universal code of law is observed. There will be no competition, no rivalry, and hence no malice, envy, or evil ambition. Jerusalem shall take her place as the world's capital - a center of power and uplift, in touch with all communities. One state, one government, one law, and one God."

His prescient reference to the "central airborne police" captures the essence of it - and this was written in 1943, before the U.N. was created. He develops his theme further on page 56 of Ethics:

"Universalism as an ideal is as old as - nay, is probably much more ancient than - the Christian ideal. Yet see how different they are in penetrating power. Christianity has a momentum of its own which has carried it over a large part of the earth's surface; Universalism has no drive, no momentum; it is not contagious; it has behind it no missionary enthusiasm. And yet this strange fact remains: Universalism, not as an ideal but as a political practice, has been and is at work in all parts of the earth. Nowhere is Universalism welcomed and encouraged by a people; everywhere governments have forced and are forcing Universalism upon unwilling and resistant subjects. There is something in the Universalist ideal which runs against the grain of human nature. Force and fear are the driving power behind this regional kind of Universalism. Love and brotherhood have had no part in its spread."

Indeed, the essence of Universalism is force and fear, and it is here that we get the first intimation that while hidden tribal/ethnic agendas may not be the central driving force, at the very least, Universalism is an easily manipulated mask behind which to conceal such agendas from unsuspecting racial or ethnic enemies in order to rob them of independence and control of their own evolutionary destinies. Indeed, who else but the alienated and hostile would want such a job?"

Further to that point we find this on page 78 of Ethics:

"And yet as I make this statement I recall Von Luschan's aphorism: 'There are no savages, only people whose cultures differ from ours.' It will be nearer to stark reality to say: In the world of humanity there are only savages, who differ in the degree to which they have masked their original nature in the cloak of civilization."

And, of course, the World's political elites are the very most aggressive, deceptive and savage of us all.

From page 59 of Ethics we read:

"Huxley condemned Universalism; it was an illusion. More than a century earlier J. J. Rousseau gave an equally unsparing verdict; 'it was a veritable chimera.' But the reasons they gave for their condemnation were not the same. Huxley's judgment was founded on the belief that no sooner would Universalism be established than evolution would again raise her hoary head, pitting local group against local group, and that soon mankind would reassume its evil evolutionary ways. Rousseau's reason was very different. For him nationalism was the source of all that is good: If people would be virtuous ... let them love their own country ... If it is a home for everyone ... It is a home for no one.' \* \* \* A uniform Universalist system of schools could do much in the attaining of such ideals, but the old instincts would be merely suppressed, not eliminated. To eliminate them, and so secure stability for the Universalist State, breeding and marriage must be controlled everywhere so that individuals of a warlike spirit, individuals who are evolutionary - minded - that is, competitive, combative, strong-willed, ambitious, or jealous - are prevented from handing on their qualities to the coming generation. In this way mankind could be domesticated, tamed, and made suitable subjects for a Universal state. If we desire universal peace we must be prepared to surrender our evolutionary birthright. I for one would prefer to keep my birthright and use the gifts which Nature has given me for its maintenance, the chief of which is courage - courage and self-sacrifice."

Amen! Brother Arthur!

And that is exactly the program that has consistently been attempted by all forms of 20th Century Communism, including the Othodox variety practiced in the Soviet Union as well as the Reform varieties practiced in virtually all "liberal democracies" of the West at the close of the Twentieth Century.

## **V. HEDONISTIC INDIVIDUALISM AND CULTURAL COLLAPSE**

Back in 1947, Arthur Keith could not have imagined the "disorder and turmoil" that afflicts "the detribalized part of the world" (confined almost exclusively to the

descendants of European Christendom) at the close of the 20th century.

Back then, the population of the civilized world was growing. Education and learning were advancing.

In 1998, birthrates throughout the entire civilized world (all of the European world plus Japan and China) have fallen to well below replacement with no force visible anywhere that might reverse the trend. In 1962, before the birth control pill was invented, we had 19,000 American students who scored above 700 on the verbal portion of the SAT. In 1995, we had only 8,000. At work are wildly dysgenic trends in which intelligent women are pressured to carefully medicate their wombs and become childless investment bankers while our social safety net subsidizes births to women with IQs a full standard deviation below the national average. Not surprisingly, the birthrate for successful career women with IQs above 130 is close to zero, while that of welfare mothers with IQs below 90 is over 3.

The world of 1998 would have been unimaginable to a British Anthropologist writing in 1947. He could not have conceived of a music industry which fabricates "entertainment" out of angry rhythmic rants - endlessly repeating lyrics that glorify killing and bloody sex. Equally unimaginable would have been a television industry which "entertains" us with an endless stream of self-indulgent confessions of deviant behavior from those who can communicate feelings but are incapable of communicating a thought in a complete sentence. Gone entirely from the public discourse is any effort to uphold civility or community life.

When Sir Arthur wrote his great works, Western Civilization had publicly repudiated only the last of his three commandments of nature (from page 116 of *New Theory*):

"Social animals have within their natures a Mount Sinai which issues commandments as they are required; human nature issues, not commands, but requests, and these are of varying degrees of urgency. Some are imperative, such as, 'Thou shalt preserve thy life'; 'Thou shalt mate'; 'Thou shalt not treat thy friends as thou dost thine enemies.'"

By 1998, the organs of mass popular culture in the West have caused many Euro-Americans to abandon commandments 2 and 3, thereby putting at risk the only time tested strategy for fulfilling the first.

Indeed Arthur Keith's greatest intellectual achievement, that which surpasses Aristotle, is his recognition of the fundamental principle of individualistic hedonism that guides and organizes all public manifestations of modern Western Civilization, including its politics and its theology.

On page 19 of *Ethics* we find:

"Since the days of ancient Greece until now there have been philosophers who



maintain that the purpose of human life is to develop personality to its fullest possible degree; that every child is born to bring to full stature the potentialities of its mind and body. If it fails, then the purpose of life has failed or been misused. We may go to the writings of the late Professor L. T. Hobhouse for a modern statement of the personality theory' of life: 'The good for each man lies in the realization of what is in him ... but only as far as the common good makes this possible ... the rights of each are such as it is good for all to maintain.'"

Following on page 20 of Ethics:

"Carlyle's statement is more emphatic and no doubt reflects his acquaintance with German philosophy: The meaning of Life here on earth might be defined as consisting in this: 'to unfold your self, to work what thing you have a faculty for. It is a necessity for the human being, the first law of our existence.'

"Huxley was of opinion that the mystery of life lay beyond the reach of the human intellect, but nevertheless in his Romanes Lecture touches on the matter with which we are now dealing. The passage runs: 'Creation of conditions more favorable than those of the state of Nature... to the end of facilitating the free expansion of the innate faculties of the citizen so far as it is consistent with the general good.'"

From page 21 of Ethics:

"Let me give, as briefly as I may, the names of famous men who have regarded the development of personality as the purpose of existence. Aristotle: 'Now with us reason and intelligence are the end of Nature.' Dante: 'Right constitutions work for freedom in order that men may exist for their own sakes.' Kant: ... 'not happiness ... but the evolution of all the germs God has implanted in man's nature.' The Marquis of Halifax (1633-95): 'The free development of human personality is the purpose of earthly existence.... Free-will is the method deliberately chosen by God.' Herbert Spencer: 'Social life will have no other end than to maintain the completest sphere for individual life.' 'Man exists in order that he may develop his soul' is a theological explanation of life's purpose. As 'soul' is a component of personality, the theological explanation falls within the present category."

Sir Arthur has a response on page 25 of Ethics:

"What, then, is the explanation which the student of human evolution has to offer as a final purpose for man's existence? It is not, as the Victorian scientists thought, to permit the individual man or woman to develop his latent potentialities; but to permit a closed society, be it tribe or nation, to develop its collective potentialities of brain and of body as an evolutionary unit. It is only when we make the assumption that evolution aims at the production of societies - not of individuals that we come by a satisfying explanation of man's dual mentality, and the constituent elements of human nature."

Indeed, our modern Christian Churches have succumbed utterly to this hedonistic

philosophy. Go to a fundamentalist Baptist Church and the minister will declare that to be a member you must have a "personal relationship with Christ." The personal relationship is all that matters. Gone are the (Calvinist) communitarian requirements of thrift, industry, probity and success. Gone is the (Catholic) communitarian obligation to protect innocent life with force if necessary. Gone is the obligation to sacrifice for the future. We are left with an atomized, highly individualized "feel good" Christianity catering solely to the spiritual needs of atomized and disconnected individuals.

The first obligation of any church in our multicultural society is to minister to the tribal or group needs of its own congregation and to ensure its long term survival. The second purpose is to minister to the spiritual needs of individual congregants as a means of enhancing this first purpose. But instead of this, our churches behave like governments, extracting resources from their congregants and shipping these resources off to some remote bureaucracy that busies itself buying souls in Africa and, when that fails, buying guns for groups whose mission is to ethnically cleanse Africa of anyone who happens to look like the congregants who supplied the money.

When is the last time you heard of a Christian Church that identified exceptionally intelligent children from their own congregations, mentored those children in their studies and then provided financial aid for college?

When was the last time you entered a Christian Church and found the pastor encouraging the successful parishioners to share information with fellow parishioners that might have a practical value, such as job availability, and careers and fields that are growing? On the contrary, our modern clergymen assume class divisions among their flock will make parishioners uncomfortable discussing opportunities and strategies with one another. They assume, and thus perpetuate, the very sin they should work to eliminate.

Until individual clergymen wake up to the fact that churches must fulfill a tribal as well as an individual spiritual role, they will continue to lose members, particularly among the disciplined, strong and successful, who would like to help those most like themselves but do not need a soft shoulder to whine on.

An undated article by George F. Will notes the social decay and the danger that our society of atomized and detribalized individuals has become (as of 1995) in his review of Robert Putnam's lament over the demise of bowling leagues:

"Putnam, a Harvard professor of international affairs, says solo bowling is a sign of the erosion of social capital.' More Americans than ever are bowling. Almost 80 million bowled at least once in 1993, nearly a third more than voted in the 1994 congressional elections. But although the number of bowlers is up 10% since 1980, participation in leagues is down 40%. Putnam calls 'whimsical' this evidence of 'social decapitalization,' but there is nothing trivial about the cumulative weight of his evidence of declining civic engagement and social connectedness. Since 1973, the number of Americans who report having attended in the past year a public meeting on town or school affairs has declined from 22% to 13%. Union membership has fallen from 32.5% of the non-agricultural work force in 1953 to

about 15% today. Participation in parent-teacher associations has declined from 12 million in 1964 to 7 million today.

\* \* \*

"The technological transformation of leisure--the movement, as it were, from vaudeville to the VCR--has had an isolating effect. So have some demographic changes--more divorces, fewer children. But these factors do not fully explain the broad decline in organizational memberships in recent decades. This has happened, Putnam notes, at a time when the personal attributes that used to correlate with group involvements--higher education, middle age--have increased.

"The repotting hypothesis' blames mobility. Frequent repotting of plants damages roots, and frequent changes of residence--blame economic dynamism, the automobile, suburbanization--produce a deracinated population. But residential stability and home ownership are higher today than in the 1950s, when voting and membership in voluntary associations were higher than today.

"America has been well-served by the individualism of its political philosophy and economic practice. Liberty and prosperity are individualism's fruits. And American individualism has traditionally been compatible with the joining impulse that produced a rich broth of private intermediary institutions that mediate between the individual and government. 'Such networks of attachments breed habits of trust that are part of the social capital' that makes possible cooperation for mutual benefits. Such cooperation sustains a free society. Social trust and civic engagement are strongly correlated. Therefore, given the decline of engagement, the following is not surprising: The percentage of Americans saying that most people are trustworthy fell from 58% to 37% between 1960 and 1993."

Without Sir Arthur's insights, conservatism is powerless to change the course of human events.

## **VI. SUBURBAN WHITE KIDS NO LONGER HOLD HANDS**

The tribal mind reasserts itself in unexpected ways in our detribalized and mobile world.

Signs of decay are everywhere. Back when I was growing up (in the decade following Arthur Keith's death) boys and girls used to walk arm-in-arm in the halls of our junior high and high schools. In predominantly white suburban schools in 1998, you never see any overt signs of affection between male and female students. This rule applies across the nation, except in small towns where, I understand, overt signs and deeds of affection are quite common indeed.

Sir Arthur's theory explains this decline. Young ladies carry with them an

evolutionary inheritance that includes a powerful aversion to strangers. This evolutionary inheritance makes it quite difficult for them to interact or flirt with anyone other than a recognized member of the "tribe." In our de-tribalized modern society, females instinctively apply this prohibition to all comers. They do it unconsciously. They cannot help it.

Indeed, a requirement for access to the young ladies in high school is to crash the boundaries of her circle of female friends who will constantly reinforce her aversion to strangers, is in the tribal days of old. As a friend of mine used to say years ago - "Get them laughing and you're in!"

Sir Arthur alludes to the fact that there was (at the time he wrote) no evidence of border wars reinforcing tribal exclusiveness among chimpanzees as there is among primitive modern human tribes. He would marvel at the sight of footage frequently aired in the 1990s on the Nature Channel of a group of young male chimps patrolling the border zone of their territory in perfect squad drill, maintaining silence, crawling low to the ground to avoid visual detection, spotting a young female intruder with her baby, brutally killing her and the baby, and eating the intruder's flesh in a final cannibalistic act that reinforces the importance of tribal boundaries and genetic isolation.

So much for free love and promiscuous sex among strangers in the world of primate behavior!

Indeed, this evolutionary inheritance may frustrate and alienate most young ladies, but it will be abandoned by very few.

Overcoming this mistrust is a herculean and profoundly alienating task for all but a small minority of exceptionally gregarious and socially aggressive kids. Tribes created mandatory places and encouraged relationships for all members. Tribal life did not select for special social or "group crashing" skills necessary for interaction with strangers. In the modern sea of strangers that our suburban high schools have become, life for shy kids seems like endless torture. For those with average social skills, it is merely profoundly alienating.

In small towns where all of the kids have known each other since early childhood, the normal romantic activities of youth continue on as in ancient times.

Indeed, the low fertility rates of the final half of the Twentieth Century may be due as much to a loss of tribal association, and the mental insecurity that such a loss entails, as to the invention of the pill.

Perhaps the most important lesson of Sir Arthur's work for modern Nationalists is two-fold. First, detribalization and Universalism fail to secure the long run survival of the group. Second, to secure long run survival for ourselves, we must rebuild our own tribal communities on a local basis first, before worrying over-much about political power. We must adopt the dual code, becoming good and helpful neighbors, while quietly but persistently excluding those not of our tribe.

Survival in ways that are consistent with our evolutionary inheritance cannot be guaranteed by application of governmental power.

## **VII. TRIBAL MENTALITIES BEHIND THE THRONE OF REASON**

I remember those balmy years as an undergraduate at Johns Hopkins quite well. It was a time when my portly classmate, Sam Francis, was completely non-political and could with considerable assurance be found holding court in the snack bar. The air was full of pacifism - intense, revolutionary pacifism in opposition to the war in Viet Nam. There were campus demonstrations. There were bearded "outside agitators." There were books by Bertrand Russell. There were escapes to Canada. The SDS staged meetings and held animated arguments laced with code words I did not understand. Many of the pacifists were Jews, and all Jews I met were pacifists. Earlier, I had attended a Jewish high school and had been bombarded with pacifism in the years before college as well.

All of the Jews I knew were intensely pacifist with only one exception. During a career counseling day in high school health class, a little 17 year old Jewish kid on stage crew admitted he wasn't going to college and that he was going to move to Israel and join the Israeli Army. It was a stunningly absurd revelation. First, none of my Jewish friends ever hinted at any similar sentiment. Second, I could not imagine how he could get along with his fellow Jews who were so intensely anti-war and anti-military. Third, such a blood loyalty to a foreign nation was profoundly un-American. And fourth, I could not imagine any army wanting this kid in its ranks.

It was just one of those incidents that was so bizarre I put it completely out of mind until my Sophomore year at Hopkins in the spring of 1967. Suddenly war erupted in Israel, and all Jews immediately became fervent militarists, publicly praying for military victory in Israel.

I was stunned. At the time I regarded this reaction as simple hypocrisy. It seemed clear that they were not pacifists at all. Rather, they opposed any war in which Euro-Americans fought against brown people, particularly if Jews were required to put themselves at risk.

It was only many years later (after I read John Murray Cuddihy's masterpiece, "The Ordeal of Civility") that I began to understand the true significance of this event. This uniform emotional reaction to war in Israel was immediate, passionate and completely unplanned. There was no discussion, calculation or other debate. There wasn't the slightest concern for public appearances. Bertrand Russell was cast aside without so much as a moment's reflection.

All modern liberal democracies share a common characteristic with Sir Arthur's Universalist state. They make a massive and prolonged propaganda investment in demonizing an enemy and whipping up public support before they go to war. This happened in the United States in World Wars I and II, in the "Domino" wars of Korea and

Viet Nam, as well as in The Gulf war against Sadam Hussein. It happens in all wars in which the very survival and independence of the U.S. is not directly threatened.

But the Jews in the U.S. (whose lives were not threatened by war in Israel) did not need to be propagandized into wanting war with the Arabs. The reaction was entirely spontaneous and uncontrolled. It was quintessential racial behavior. The minds of all Jews seemed automatically programed to react in the same way to the news of war in Israel. It wasn't hypocrisy in the conscious sense. It was a deeper reaction of the lower brain - that part which preserves humans over multiple generations without having to rely upon the weaker impulses of reason, logic, and planning.

Multi-ethnic democracies require an enormous amount of physical energy and capital to whip the public into a war frenzy. But in the case of the Six Day War, the communication among Jews was absolutely effortless and free. The mental response spread with an instantaneous impulse, much like waves of gravity that penetrate instantly throughout the universe with no resistance whatsoever.

These mental reactions are a primal force we do not yet fully understand. They are quintessential racial phenomena which are immune to censorship and will trump propaganda every time.

They are, of course, a prime example of the operation of Sir Arthur Keith's dual code of tribal mentality. The signal event in this drama of pacifism followed by instant conversion to militarism is not Jewish sympathy for Israel nor Jewish support for Israel's military. That sympathy is easy to understand. The signal event is the immense effort Jews invested in creating a Universalist logic of pacifism to place before us Gentiles in public - a pacifism which their lower brains commanded for us, but rejected when applied to themselves. It is this elaborate public staging - signifying that we who were opposing a communist regime are a "them" - aliens from a different tribe - that has evolutionary import. Like good tribesmen, they stuck with one another and told each other the truth, while they told us - whom they see as aliens - Universalist lies.

If only Sir Arthur had been there to watch!

A second example of a similar phenomenon occurred on the day of the O. J. Simpson verdict. Blacks uniformly and instantly celebrated the acquittal of O. J. in a visible display of emotion that stunned all Euro-Americans watching the same event. Once again, there was no planning, no debate and no propaganda campaign to teach blacks how to "feel" or behave should a innocent verdict be rendered.

They just did it, instantly, exuberantly and without any thought to the public relations costs of the reaction among the majority Euro-Americans. Jay Leno's jokes week in and week out for the next 6 years about "finding the real killer" reinforced the Euro-American reaction which was equally instantaneous, untutored and uniform. The races see events differently, and there is nothing the government or a thousand Episcopal Priests can do to change it!

And indeed, the oncoming evidence from these events indicates that there are

aspects of the operation of the tribal mentality that cannot be anticipated, controlled nor guided through central planning or propaganda campaigns. Sir Arthur's dual code will pop up and assert itself in unexpected ways at defining moments of a multi-ethnic state's existence, tearing the mask off the face of unity.

Indeed, media interviews displayed Blacks professing a fervent belief in O.J.'s innocence and an equally fervent belief that the ordeal of his trial was a Euro-American conspiracy to humiliate a successful black man.

Similarly there is a widespread belief in the Black community that AIDS is a Euro-American conspiracy to exterminate the Black Man. Universalists hold these up as examples of "delusional thinking," which, in a logical sense, they clearly are. However, delusions - modern descendant of the impulse to worship the spirits of beloved streams and mountains - serve to reinforce the internal cohesion of the group and to define the boundaries between groups. After all, delusions will not be accepted or believed by outsiders, and thus they serve to reinforce the barriers that separate groups in modern societies and to relieve the tensions in individual members who must interact daily with members of different groups as a matter of economic necessity.

Delusional belief is an adaptation of the tribal mind described by Sir Arthur to the new circumstance of extensive but unwanted inter-tribal contact mandated by the Universalist state. They are a classic example of tribal mentality reasserting itself in new and unpredictable ways.

A more richly textured example of delusional thinking among our elites comes from the Holocaust Story. On one level, it makes perfect sense that the German program of ethnic cleansing undertaken to extract Jews from their communities in Germany and the captured territories and move them to transit camps and labor camps with the intention of relocating them to the eastern provinces of Russia would morph itself into a program of homicide once access to those Eastern territories in Russia became wildly improbable in 1942.

Nothing delusional at all on this "macro" level. But on the micro level of the detail - the "eyewitness accounts" of the survivors and the structures they point to as homicidal devices - the story of "industrial strength extermination" collapses.

Indeed, we are treated to standard crematory ovens no different than those in civilian mortuaries of that day, and in numbers reasonable planners would install to handle deaths from typhus. As evidence of mass gassings, we are pointed to underground structures with narrow entry ways that violate every rule in the standard military manuals governing prison construction and prisoner control if used for homicidal gassings. They are structures in which one or two stout-hearted individuals among each batch of the condemned could easily have delayed or disrupted the operation for hours. The mind of the engineer recoils at such a logistical nightmare. We are treated to the confession extracted from captive Hoess, an early commandant of Auschwitz, admitting to the extermination of 2.5 millions at a time before the ovens at Auschwitz-Birkenau were built and placed into service. We are treated to the equally puzzling confession extracted from Gerstein, an SS officer murdered in Allied captivity, who describes

gassings in camps other than Auschwitz with relatively harmless diesel exhaust, in wooden chambers of a size that could not hold a fifth the number of victims he claims to have seen processed. On the micro level we have nothing but doubt and uncertainty.

But the most certain evidence of delusional thinking arises from the fact that 25 years after Yad Vashem, the holocaust memorial center in Israel, announced that there were no homicidal gas chambers in any of the camps within Germany proper, tour guides at the camps of Buchenwald, Dachau, and approximately ten other camps inside Germany and Austria still dutifully parade tourists and school children through gas chambers at these camps built or modified after the War. Similarly, long after Jewish Holocaust experts such as Deborah Lipstadt announced that the Germans made neither soap nor lampshades from Jews or anyone else at the camps, we get fervent defenses of the soap and lampshade stories on internet discussion groups, at conventions of Holocaust survivors and in updated Haggadah prayers and readings for the Seder celebration at Passover.

From the perspective of the Gentile Nations which defeated the Germans in battle, the production of the delusional propaganda films of corpses at Dachau and the show trials at Nuremberg serve a recognizable function. From an evolutionary perspective they serve the same purpose as the rituals of mutilation and cannibalism inflicted on the dead bodies of the defeated by primitive tribesmen in Paupua-New Guinea. Such rituals reinforce the importance of the victory, and the reasons for which the battle was fought. A cannibal is the most sincere killer - he really means it! His descendants in the propaganda organs of our modern "liberal democracies" are a close second. After all, who else would want such a job?

For the Jews, however, the nether reaches of the Holocaust story powerfully reinforce and define the psychological boundaries that separate their race from others. And the more improbable the detail, the greater its value in separating the chosen from the unbelieving alien. To cling tenaciously to the extreme and admittedly false stories of human soap, human lampshades, and gas chambers with fake showers at Dachau and Buchenwald bears a functional resemblance to the "AIDS conspiracy" theories which circulate so enduringly in the black ghettos of North America. The very implausibility of the tale prevents belief by outsiders, thus reinforcing the isolation of the believing tribe or race.

Indeed, when we apply Sir Arthur's theory, we see considerable justice in the claim of Deborah Lipstadt that for a Gentile to question any detail of the Holocaust story is to "deny" the reality of the Holocaust. Any claim of inaccuracy of detail, while not threatening the lives, property or security of individual Jews in any way, does threaten the web of belief that holds them together and holds them apart from us. Thus, in Arthur Keith's anthropological sense, questioning details of the Holocaust "threatens" the existence of Jews. More importantly, questioning gas chamber details threatens to drag the wild and disorderly defense of the Holocaust Story into public view, thereby jeopardizing the considerable investment Jews have made in constructing before the rest of Euro-America an elaborate mask of indistinguishable and non-hostile "whiteness." The danger for Jews is that Euro-America will react to that defense the same way it reacted to the Black celebration following the O. J. Simpson verdict. There are certain rain-dances of tribal affirmation you just don't want seen in public.



Arthur Keith spent much of his life imposing linear thinking or "logic" on phenomenon that have proven, with fifty years of hindsight, to be chaotic and non-linear. Nevertheless, this heir to wits sharpened over generations of life in the march zone of conflict between England and Scotland has come up with a central descriptor of human reality.

A central message of Keith for modern Nationalists is that plausible and Universalist belief systems (pacifism being but one example) propounded by intelligent tribes and dominant elites are often delusional (when not deliberately and consciously malevolent in their intent.) They serve the same function of reinforcing the boundaries between tribes as do more primitive and obviously false delusions, but have the additional effect of causing considerable damage when implemented as policy. Examples are the modern welfare system in the U.S. and "womens' liberation," both of which threaten to deprive differing targets of control over their own evolutionary destinies in different ways.

These delusions cannot be countered effectively in the political arena with logic or linear argument.

In the political sphere, they can only be countered with a tribal response. A people operating under the dual code can see past the masks and will have a considerable survival advantage. A people lacking that dual code in a multi-racial state is doomed to extinction.

## **VIII. OUR DE-RACINATED ELITES - PREDATOR OR PREY?**

It is time now to pose a fundamental question: Is it a smart survival strategy for Euro-American Elites to form themselves into a social class, disdain their racial fellows and ally themselves with tribes and races that cling tenaciously to the dual code?

On page 208 of *Ethics*, Sir Arthur explains the fatal flaw in social class as a strategy for survival:

"There is one point about the constitution of Hindu castes and tribes which is particularly worthy of note: they are destitute of the means of offering a physical defense; they are not clad in a robe of enmity. Now, a tribe or caste which is not organized for defense could not survive unless it is protected by an overlord or governing power. We may conclude, therefore, that castes did not come into existence in India until large areas of that country were under the dominion of an invading power which brought with it a new religion."

Here is how Sir Arthur describes the effects of Roman imperialism on the Celtic populations of Britain:

"The presence of four legions ensured the conditions necessary for the growth of civilization -viz., security of life and property and a code of laws was maintained and administered by governors and magistrates. Roads were made; cities, built on the Roman pattern, replaced ramshackle tribal towns; arts and crafts were introduced; trade flourished; native produce was carried to the Continent; luxuries, literature, and vice came back in exchange. Native youths of promise were taught in Latin; they learned to wear the toga, acquired with zest the Roman ways of life, and merged their British nativity in the wider fraternity of the Empire.

"Thus for three centuries and a half England basked in the sun of Roman civilization. We must note, however, that civilization may come to a people in two ways, which give different results. A people may import a civilization, as the Japanese did in the last half of the nineteenth century, or it may have a civilization thrust on it by a superior power. It was in the latter way that Roman civilization came to England; it was offered to her on the point of the sword. She was civilized not for the benefit of her inhabitants, numbering some two millions before the debacle set in, early in the fifth decade, but for the aggrandizement of Rome. We must note with the eye of an anthropologist the chief effect which was produced on the mentality of the inhabitants of England by these centuries of Roman civilization. The people were detribalized and disarmed; they had come to depend, for the safety of their lives and the maintenance of their civilization, not on their own right arm, but on the armed power of foreign legionaires. Hence, when the legions were recalled (A.D. 406), they were left a helpless prey to any tribal people who had the will and power to attack them. And they were attacked, in a way which will be described in another essay. We may assert, then, that if civilization unified and domesticated the Celtic inhabitants of England, it also led them to their doom and brought their evolutionary career to a disastrous end.

\* \* \*

"At the time of the Roman departure there lived on the opposite shorelands of the Continent, from Jutland in the north to the estuary of the Rhine in the south, a fighting, pagan, farming people, of strong build of body and of a resolute, courageous spirit. Their organization was tribal; each local group had its township; the township within a definite tract of territory recognized an overlord or leader. These were the people who, sword in hand, began to colonize England in the year 449; they continued to land on the eastern and southern coasts for at least a century and a half, feeding settlements already planted and held; they annexed native lands, farmed them, established townships and tribal territories, each with its own leader or overlord. Some twelve centuries later the Christianized descendants of these pagan colonists repeated the process in America."

The Latium tribe (the Romans) disappeared as well. Sir Arthur writes of them on pages 96-97 of Ethics:

"Gibbon was content, like Plato, to look upon peasant, artisan, and laborer as existing to form a mighty plinth on which a minority is superimposed in order that it might enjoy the blessings of civilization. Look at the size and composition of the

Roman plinth in the time of the Emperor Claudius. Gibbon estimates that the population of the Empire was then 120 million; Over 100 millions should go to form the plinth, and probably one-third of these were slaves representing races alien to Italy. Now, a social pyramid such as that erected by the Romans may serve as an excellent structure for the growth of civilization, but as a structure designed to carry a great people onward in its evolutionary journey, it is as badly constructed as is anthropologically possible. It is not top-heavy; it is worse - it is bottom-heavy. A social pyramid which is to endure must be made up of individual human units, preferably of common racial origin, who, from bottom to top of the pyramid, are conscious of a common evolutionary destiny and work together to attain it. The Roman Empire may now provide scholars with a harvest; it provides only warning to the evolutionary-minded anthropologist."

It is Sir Arthur's bottom-heavy crime against evolution which Herrenstein and Murray decry in "The Bell Curve." It is this same issue that Peter Brimelow decries in "Alien Nation."

Our elites don't listen. Universalism is "received truth," a delusional belief system far too powerful to be overcome by mere facts. So then what of our Euro-American elites? Are they slated for extinction?

Are they predators, or prey?

Our elites have created an "inverse pyramid" of tax and cost burdens which inflict damage primarily on themselves.

Fifty percent of the income tax is paid by the top 5% of income earners, 3.5 million families. Twelve million families pay approximately 80% of the income taxes. In the 1950's corporations paid 40% of all income taxes. Now they only pay 9%.

While the cost of the Social Security safety-net is imposed more heavily on the middle class, the benefits of that system are heavily skewed towards the bottom 50% of wage earners. It is a second resource shift toward a large and growing plurality of our population that cannot produce enough economic value to pay for the education of their children, their medical care and the cost of their old age support.

Thus, the burden of financing our multi-cultural empire falls disproportionately on our elites. They are the supporting layer at the bottom of Sir Arthur's plinth. Instead of erecting an economic edifice in the shape of a pyramid with a large strata of laborers at the bottom supporting the leisure and culture of the elites at the top, we have an upside-down pyramid with a tiny elite scrambling frantically to support the leisure of a huge under-class that amuses itself watching daytime TV.

It is hard to conceive of a more unstable system.

Our elites have created a system of higher learning that imposes a capital cost of \$120,000 per child for college education at a private university and \$60,000 for a similar

education at a state-supported institution. In contrast, if you expect your children to complete only high-school before taking a job, then the cost of having children is dramatically less. This set of economic disincentives is so massive that it guarantees birth rates well below replacement for our elites. The more successful our educational and economic system is at identifying high IQ and rewarding it, the worse the dysgenic trend becomes. These perverse incentives created by our elites guarantee their extinction. Their numbers decrease by at least 30% with each generation. After four generations, each 100 of them leave fewer than 24 descendants.

Admittedly, these burdens were first conceived in a more tribal era, when the architects of the tax system viewed themselves as an "oppressed minority." It was a time when the designers of the tax reasoned that "their people" who owned retail stores were in a better position to skim cash from the till and avoid the tax than were managers at the large "white shoe" corporations who would be subject to the iron discipline of the W-2 Form. It was a time when Franklin Roosevelt, a political dependent of those tribes, used to review the tax returns of his political enemies and laugh at their loss of wealth and power. It was a time when the architects of this system thought that the tax would fall primarily on "rich WASPs" even as contemporary surveys showed that WASPs had the very lowest average income among all European ethnic groups in America. It was a system born of delusion and ethnic paranoia.

The question then becomes: Why did the Gentile Euro-American elites put up with it? In truth, their class consciousness deprived them of the opportunity to stage any defense. They had become so remote from the average Euro-American worker that they did not believe a tribal defense would work. They feared that the rest of the tribe would not respond. Thus, they acquiesced with hardly a peep in a system of burdens that would guarantee their extinction.

As I look back on the McCarthy era in the U.S., I am shocked at the timidity and utter impotence of the response to the clear and obvious threat presented by the entry of hundreds of thousands of intensely tribalized minds into the studios of Hollywood and the Federal bureaucracy behind the thin disguise of Marxism's Universalist mask.

The best that the Gentile elites could come up with was an appeal to reason, an argument that the egalitarian policies were destructive to general prosperity - if the pie gets larger, we can all take larger slices. It was the defense of the universalized Economic Man - Gingrich-Kemp Republicanism - universally ridiculed by the tribalized elements of the Racial Extortion Coalition as "trickle down economics."

The tribal mind thinks only of its relative position among groups, not the "size of the pie" available for all groups.

In the 1990's we are faced with conservative politicians like Bob Dornan, who make statements such as: "I want to see America stay a nation of immigrants... and if we lose our Northern European stock - your coloring and mine, blue eyes and fair hair - tough!"

The leadership of the Republican Party seems to have accepted the notion that the

marginalization of Euro-America under a political system administered by Blacks, Mexicans, Asians, and Jews is inevitable. To accommodate this vision they have already put in place laws that codify collective guilt and create remedies that ensure perpetual demands for compensation. Slavery for Euro-America seems to be the accepted wisdom.

But what does this mean for the White Gentile elites themselves. Where do their children fit in?

Charles Manson articulated a vision for America in "Helter Skelter." He and his followers thought that their killings would provoke a race war in America, that the Blacks would win the war, but that the Blacks would be so disorganized following their victory that they would have to come to Manson and his band (who would hide out in the mountains) for leadership in order to hold this new non-white nation together.

Is Charlie Manson's delusional thinking significantly different from that of our modern White Gentile elites?

What are the odds that the children of our White Gentile elites will see "reason" prevail when they are a racial minority? Is there any objective evidence that a majority Mexican-Black-Asian political coalition will feel they need the skills of the children of this elite? That they will allow them admission to universities, allow them to be compensated fairly in market based systems, and will refrain from confiscating their earnings in punitive and discriminatory taxation schemes?

Do we have evidence of this, or do we have wishful and delusional thinking?

These White Gentile elites also have a strong belief in the new-age "information economy" and that their skills and the skills of their children will be needed in that economy even as that economy comes to be dominated by Chinese, Japanese and Hindus.

They apparently think that as Chinese and Japanese companies buy out our large U.S. corporations (as their huge domestic savings rates eventually ensure) their new owners will not "downsize" the White Gentile CEOs just as those CEOs downsized White Gentile middle management in the 1980s and 1990s.

But isn't it much more likely that the Chinese and Japanese cultures will produce ample intellectual leadership to satisfy the needs of world commerce without any American Whites?

Isn't it clear that those who have the most to lose are the children of America's White elites? Are they not next in line to have their wages and life styles scaled back to subsistence levels?

And what of those 180 million Euro-Americans in the fly-over areas of the country? What are they likely to think when the practical consequence of the aging of the Baby Boom generation begins to sink in?

Then we have the other half of the White Gentile political elite - the one fronting for the Racial Extortion Coalition. Does this fraction of the elite really believe that there will be a demand for White "front men" once Blacks, Mexicans and Asians become a majority?

For a political strategy, this elite hires consultants with Southern Accents who talk about "trailer trash" and affirm that "you never know what you will get when you drag a hundred dollar bill through the trailer parks!"

Most of those 180 million Euro-Americans harbor the illusion that in referring to "trailer trash", the elites mean someone else. They have no idea that it includes virtually all 180 million of us living outside the D.C Beltway, New York, and Beverly Hills.

What will happen when these 180 millions tie the practical economic consequences of the aging of the baby boom with the cultural consequence of the open contempt and hostility toward average Whites that is so freely and carelessly displayed by this elite?

How do these elites imagine they can continue to indulge these sorts of conceits without a consequence?

What happens when the residents of that great trailer park that has become Western Civilization find out that the only thing standing between themselves and survival and independence for their children is our own openly hostile and contemptuous elites?

How many Whites does it take to unscrew a defective light bulb?

Sir Arthur Keith has several illuminating and profound essays in his "New Theory" on incipient races and race forming behaviors. He asserts that with the proliferation of specialized occupations, and the isolation of persons performing those occupations in civilized societies, there is a tendency for economic and social classes to "retribalize" thus forming new "incipient nations" within pre-existing nations.

According to Sir Arthur Keith, the pace of evolution is accelerating.

As tantalizing evidence in support of Sir Arthur's theory, I quote from page 51 of "The Vanishing American Jew," by Alan Dershowitz:

"Even America, which has had a significant Jewish presence for only the last century, has been enormously influenced by Jews. The theater critic Walter Kerr, writing as early as 1968, demonstrated the integration of Jews into the mainstream American life by describing not Jewish acculturation to gentile culture, but rather gentile adaptation to Jewish patterns of thought: 'What has happened since World War II is that the American sensibility itself has become part Jewish, perhaps nearly as much Jewish as it is anything else. ... The literate American mind has come in some measure to think Jewishly, to respond Jewishly. It has been

taught to, and its was ready to. After the entertainers and novelists came the Jewish critics, politicians, theologians. Critics and politicians and theologians are by profession molders: they form ways of seeing.' Today this influence is even more apparent, as individual Jews dominate television, film, book publishing, newspapers, magazine advertising, public relations, and other opinion-shaping businesses. Professor Sylvia Barack Fishman of Brandeis University titled a November 1996 article U.S. 'Culture Has Been Judaized, and Vice Versa.' She calls this process the 'coalescence of two cultures.'"

And Dershowitz points out that more than 50% of Jews marry non-Jews, meaning that the odds that a secularized or Reform Jew (80% of the present total) will have Jewish grandchildren is close to nil. The class of White Gentile that has assimilated to Jewish patterns of thought is selecting Jewish marriage partners and vice versa. Herrenstein and Murray warn in the "The Bell Curve" that this new elite of Jews and those assimilated to Jewishness (our "Central Elite") is more isolated from the mainstream of its host culture than any elite in history. But this real message of "The Bell Curve" has been summarily rejected by its intended audience.

And this Central Elite, as must be the case for one with such a low birth-rate, is a rapidly moving target.

Paradoxically, this elite is in a headlong rush to "Aryanize" itself. For fifty years the organs of popular culture controlled (as Dershowitz claims) by Jews have projected and popularized an image of beauty that requires a certain look to be taken seriously on television. In the highly encoded language of mathematics and print literature, appearance does not matter. But as the organs of popular culture drag us backwards to more primitive and less encoded graphic and visual communication, appearance becomes critical. This is another unanticipated effect of Sir Arthur's tribal mentality. To be employable at the highest and most profitable (and least demanding) occupations in our society, one must look like the cast of Baywatch or Beverly Hills 90210.

And indeed we have a new race of blond haired, blue eyed Jewish half-breeds - Alicia Silverstone and Tori Spelling come to mind. The psychic stamp of this new "incipient race" is its powerful, obvious and yet unremarked Aryanizing process. Even the black upper middle class is in on the act, transforming itself into the "high-yellows" - producing the tall, slender Aryanized models and actresses of the kind who embrace white boys on daytime TV. They bring to the party a mild tan, slightly thicker lips, flatter noses, bigger breasts and, presumably, larger genitals but in all other respects are Nordic in appearance.

No-one in this Central Elite wants their children to look like Alan Greenspan or Robert Reich. And the pure-bred trio of Heidi Fleiss, Faye Resnick and Monica Lewinsky have smashed forever three generations of "Jewish American Princess" jokes with their public displays of heat and ease of access, thereby crippling a stereotype that previously slowed down the Aryanizing process. No one wants to be left at the station. Everyone in this newly forming Central Elite wants onto the Aryan train.

And if you think about it, the wistful daydreams of racial amalgamation we hear

constantly in the media make perfect sense to this new elite. After all, these dreams accurately reflect the reality of their own lives!

But unbeknownst to our isolated Central Elites, the images of Aryan beauty they have broadcast have had an even more powerful effect on the typical Euro-American male in the flyover zones of the U.S. It has introduced a rigidity and desperation into his mating behavior that will never be undone.

It is the reason why these males now migrate en-masse to the Pacific Northwest, Utah, Northern Arizona, Denver, Dallas, Nashville and similar locales with relatively high concentrations of the type (but without the elaborate plumage, long claws and desire to be the childless playthings of older men that you find along the California coast).

To oblige the daydreams of our Central Elite, the average White guy would, after all 1000 or so of the Aryanized high-yellow mulattos are taken, be left with an Ebonics speaking creature of the welfare state, the likes of which can be found in Downtown Oakland or Detroit. No gratuitous offense intended, but to the average White male these creatures look like monsters.

The dream of a uniform light-tan race in America will never happen. It is delusional thinking. The same aesthetic imprinting that has had such a powerful effect on the minorities that now comprise our Central Elite has had an equal effect on Euro-America in the flyover zones, but in the opposite direction.

The problem for our Central Elite is compounded by the large (if yet unaware) regional Euro-American elite that resides outside of New York and Los Angeles and has not "assimilated to Jewishness." This "Regional Elite" is shocked at what it sees on the TV. They are as shocked and alienated by the waste gasses from our organs of popular culture as are their millions of marginalized cousins living in trailer parks. This Regional Elite does not feel compelled to Aryanize themselves because they are the genuine article.

So what is the likely result from an evolutionary standpoint?

One obvious consequence is that this new Aryanizing Central Elite will rapidly lose its ability to use race and victimhood as an excuse for the failure of their policies. If they fail, they can be replaced by perfectly competent Regional Elites.

Further, they will have to face the relentless competition from the elites of Japan and China, supported by populations ideally suited to win the financial war as well as the evolutionary struggle over the long run.

In a series of brilliant essays in *New Theory*, Sir Arthur sets forth the preconditions for survival over the long term. A tribe or nation must have a balanced mix of leaders and followers - a range of mental and physical talents suited to the division of labor within the land they occupy - coupled with a sense of trust and mutual commitment to their common evolutionary purpose extending from top to bottom.



On page 233 of New Theory we read:

"Of all the peoples engaged in the present war the Japanese are the most consistent exponents of the doctrine of evolution as applied to human affairs. Their national organization is that of a single tribe; they represent the perfect evolutionary unit. They regard their emperor as divine; they worship by offering him their loyalty; their religion and patriotism are one. They are both ambitious and exclusive. No people give their lives so resolutely in their country's cause."

So how are we to rate this new emerging race - this Central Elite? Can it last?

Sir Arthur would conclude that it has none of the qualities required for long term survival. It will surely perish. But in the meantime, the lack of these qualities guarantees that their policies for the government of the rest of us will be wildly destructive.

It is the first governing elite in Human history with no care whatsoever for the future!

## **IX. SURVIVAL STRATEGIES: EARLY TECTONIC SHIFTS**

Before the 1996 elections I took an extended drive through the countryside and small towns of Central Texas. At each intersection of these rural highways, I could see a dense crop of political campaign signs. For the first two or three of these, I turned my eyes and refused to look. Texas was Democrat country and I did not want to spoil my mood and transition from the code of amity to that of enmity in front of my family members. But finally, my curiosity got the better of me and I looked. I was stunned at what I had seen. All of the signs were Republican.

And I began to wonder what sort of force could have caused all the county commissioners, local sheriffs, school board members and dog catchers in these tiny and isolated communities to reject the Democratic party of their birth and migrate to Republicanism.

There was no elaborate media campaign costing billions, no heated commentary, no public statements of the rationale or reasons. Just a slow, quiet, but inexorable process of change responding to signals running underneath the surface of our public life.

Shades of the O. J. Simpson verdict.

But this phenomenon is much more interesting because it has taken place over a relatively long period of time, and has institutional consequences on the local level. It is another one of those examples of seemingly effortless communication, without words, coming from the lower brain. Is it a manifestation of Sir Arthur's tribal mentality? Could it be the first stirring of a collective tribal or national self-defense?

Indeed, over the last 30 years, the voting base of the Republican Party has become progressively whiter. Politics in the U.S. is becoming more and more racial. By default, the Democratic party has become the "minority" party through white flight to the Republicans. Throughout the entire period, the Party leadership has consistently and publicly repudiated any desire to represent the interests of these voters as a group. Yet they come anyway. The party leadership ducks with embarrassment.

My new neighborhood votes 80% Republican, and my daughters tell me that everyone owns guns. But my neighborhood is a result of white flight. Concentration of this sort is an inevitable and obvious consequence of new suburbs. But the conversion of small town central Texas around Lyndon Johnson's ranch is another matter entirely. Nobody moved, and presumably nothing in the local communities changed much.

So how do they know? What are the unspoken signals that could account for this movement?

In New Theory, Sir Arthur Keith claims that there is no British race, but rather four separate and very similar races, having dual loyalties, confederating for mutual aid and convenience. The same is true, he says of Belgium and Switzerland.

He notes, however, that a British race has been created in Australia, New Zealand, and perhaps, Canada.

The United States is producing an incipient European race (in the sense of an evolutionary unit) - a race unique in the World. And if Sir Arthur were alive today, he would see that the tribal mentality of this race is being forged by aggression from the other races within the Racial Extortion Coalition. In the past, we Euro-Americans have had each other as tribal enemies. It has taken years of collective experience for us to slowly recognize that we are one, and that new tribal and racial enemies have gathered to define the borders of our collective identity.

For the last 30 years the Euro-American race has been driven from its cities in the largest ethnic cleansing in history, larger than the ethnic cleansing of Germans following WW-II. We do not attach that label to it, because we do not want to think of ourselves as fleeing. But we did flee.

We fled the crime, the threats, and the declining schools that the members of the Racial Extortion Coalition imposed on us. We rationalized it by thinking we weren't really driven away by alien peoples, but that we really wanted those nice new houses in suburbia. We steadfastly denied any racial motive in this flight and we tried hard not to think about the effects on our less fortunate Euro-American neighbors who we left behind.

Indeed, we have our own little holocaust to feel guilty about. It continues on a daily basis in those relatively narrow bands of inter-racial contact surrounding our urban ghettos.

Those who attended integrated schools are the most eager to spare their children a similar "enriching" experience.

The racial gangs and criminals produced, for their more law abiding neighbors, zones of racial concentration and comfort free of us. Crime was tolerated and jury nullification emerged as the tool to keep the ethnic cleansers in business.

As a race, the Euro-American is watchful and wary. Our racial identity it is not fully articulated on the conscious level. It is completely unclear whether this incipient race really believes the Universalism and individualistic hedonism they espouse on a conscious level, or whether this is a mask of civilization covering a capacity or predisposition toward collective self-defense.

A great deal rests in the balance!

## **X. SURVIVAL STRATEGIES: HEAR THE CRADLE SONG!**

On page 98 of *New Theory*, Sir Arthur Keith says the following:

"The care and upbringing of children has been safeguarded by one of the strongest of inborn emotions—that of maternal love. Maternal care is supplemented by the inborn partiality a father has for his own children. So omnipotent are the parental impulses that they may be said to enslave mothers and fathers for the best part of their lives in the service of their children. Child-rearing may be regarded as the chief industry of every social community; if this industry fails in a group, then that group passes out of existence. The process of evolution permits no balking of the reproductive instincts; the infertile groups are rigorously eliminated, and the fertile perpetuated. The parental duties which prevail among human beings are particularly onerous, owing to the prolonged period during which children must be cared for and fed. Just for that reason human parental impulses have a compelling potency.

"A group of primitive humanity may be regarded as a cradle for the young; the cradle is filled by the working of those elements of human nature just specified. The sole duty of group government is to protect the cradle; to this duty a group is always on the alert. Nothing rallies the fighting spirit of a human group with such impetuosity as a threat to its women and children - to its cradle. The duty of protecting the young by a parent or parents is a very ancient ordinance of Nature, but in the human kind this ordinance is carried out by the whole parental group. The cradle is also safeguarded by group opinion, which regards every act that legitimately fills the cradle as good, and therefore a virtue, while every form of conduct which tends to make the cradle empty as bad, and therefore a vice."

As Sir Arthur Keith was writing his books, Menachem Begin was writing the book

on terrorism and its uses in Israel. For terrorism and violence to work, a clear majority of your race must understand what you are doing and sympathize. If you cannot count on jury nullification, then terrorism and violence are wildly counter-productive.

The survival of our Euro-American race will not be secured by any sort of quick blitzkrieg. Indeed, our biggest challenge by far is keeping the cradle full. This is a struggle that will take generations. If we are lucky, it will go on for ever.

The tribal or racial mentality is DUAL in nature. We must work to revive a racially conscious "amity" portion of that complex. Everything having to do with that complex is completely legal. But even better, it slides effortlessly beneath the radar of the disconnected elites and culture destroyers.

I say this because up until the early 1990's the nationalist movements have been dominated by "rogue males" who concern themselves only with the "enmity" portion of the equation.

The first order of business is to learn to compartmentalize both aspects of the mentality required for our long run survival, and to display each at appropriate times. The natural reaction of any female who encounters a courting male venting racial anger is to assume that he will display anger at other inappropriate times and will be unable to hold a job.

He will not be able to help her keep that cradle full without a job.

Our long run mission is to be good neighbors.

We must take back our churches from the hedonists and bureaucrats and redirect their resources toward our tribal mission (as both Christ and Saint Paul commanded). The modern clergy does not attract intellectual giants or risk-takers. The best among them are successful salesmen and fundraisers - marketers - very conscious of status and place - and reluctant to take risks.

Your best bet is to get together with a newly ordained divinity student and acquire a small church. We must also isolate ourselves from the popular culture. The best method is to cancel your cable TV - it isolates you from the worst toxins, while hitting the economic elites in the pocket book.

Here is a quote from an article in the Wall Street Journal of Nov. 22, 1996:

"Have millions of Americans suddenly lost interest in television?

"If the numbers from ratings provider Nielsen Media Research are to be believed millions of viewers have stopped watching TV this fall in favor of other pursuits, like computer on-line services. According to Nielsen, there are 1.2 million fewer 18-to-34-year-olds watching prime time in any given minute this season than a year ago.

"As a result, the six commercial-broadcast networks could wind up owing advertisers \$100 million in airtime in the fourth quarter alone for not delivering the viewership they had pledged."

This is the best news I had received in years. The prime audience of the culture destroyers is shrinking. And it is costing them a lot of money.

We must also vaccinate our children against the hedonism and Universalism that dominate our society. Make your children read Sir Arthur's books. When they do, they will understand for the first time that they already have a civilization and a culture. After they read Arthur Keith, they will have found a reason to study Western history and literature in school. Without him, they do not have a chance! They will be lost to the chaos of rap and the gloss of Cosmo magazine.

Finally, you must lead your neighbors by example to the conclusion that they can adopt the dual code required for Euro-American survival without being gratuitously offensive to neighbors and co-workers not of our race. Concealment is part of the dual code, and is natural and healthy in a multi-racial society.

## **XI. SURVIVAL STRATEGIES - THE MILITIAS**

The militia movement has a clear message. They have lost their freedom!

Now that is a very interesting charge. They make other charges as well; that the U.S. Government has scrapped the Constitution, that national sovereignty is being forfeited to the U.N. and that the internationalist and Universalist elites want to disarm them and deprive them of their right of self defense. True enough - no delusions there!

But the truth of the militiamen's description of the Universalist State is a mere recapitulation of the what Sir Arthur so eloquently described 50 years earlier. Because of the obvious truth of their historical charges, these are much less interesting than the charge that they, in Anno Domini 1998, have lost their "freedom."

When you read or listen to the Militiamen, two things become clear; (1) they are scrapping for a fight to replace the U.S. Government, and (2) they are utterly silent about the exact details of what it is they wish to see in its place.

They adamantly adhere in public to the Universalist mythos of racial equality, and protest that their movement is non-racist and that they welcome all comers. In addition, they profess respect for modern Universalism and hedonistic individualism by advocating a libertarian state. Individual liberty is all that matters. Government should be reduced to a shadow of its present self - weakened to a point that it can no longer threaten the militias.

But in what sense exactly have the Militiamen been deprived of freedom?

They can seduce as many women as they wish, get drunk, smoke dope and pop amphetamines to their hearts' content. They can move around unmolested, work where they please, and succeed or fail in accordance with their talents and determination. The modern Universalist state is quite careful to provide a great deal of this sort of individual freedom. In fact, the modern Universalist state quite artfully provides sufficient individual freedom so that a de-tribalized people will have ample means available to procure its own extinction over several generations and to amuse itself with creature comforts in the process.

Now the Anti-Defamation League doesn't believe a word of it. They view militias as a very dangerous "them" to be suppressed by the "central airborne police" of Sir Arthur's quaint and prescient phrase.

And indeed, it was only after I read Sir Arthur several months ago that I understood the militias.

For Sir Arthur states that there are two definitions of "freedom" - one is the classic Enlightenment (18th Century) notion of individual freedom that the Universalist state is so careful to provide, and the second is a more basic and powerful form of "freedom" which means independence of the group and control of its evolutionary destiny.

It is this second form of "freedom" which the militiamen have most assuredly lost.

And it is the yearning for this second form of freedom, and the intense anger that its loss provokes, that defines the militia movement as an incipient tribal behavior or potentially "race forming behavior" in Arthur Keith's terms. Now I say incipient for an important reason. Unlike the instantaneous and unanimous reaction of all Euro-Americans to the celebratory reaction of Blacks to the O.J. Simpson verdict, the reaction of Euro-Americans to the Militiamen is far from unanimous.

Indeed, the Militiamen are well aware that they are a minority. That is why I do not classify their profession of faith in Universalism and hedonistic individualism as a classic delusional belief system. The motive of these professions of faith is not to create or to reinforce boundaries between groups, but rather to avoid creating a boundary that might isolate them from the rest of their fellow Euro-Americans.

But the basal part of the militia program, picking up rifles and heading for the hills to practice squad drill is indeed the most profound sort of racial or tribal response to a threat. Once again, it is unplanned, spontaneous and unthinking.

The stratagem of hiding this response behind the Universalist and hedonistic nostrums so as not to alarm suburban Euro-America is hardly delusional. It makes sense. It buys time until those suburbanites perceive the same threat, at which time they will all presumably grab their rifles and head for the hills as well.

And that is exactly how the Anti-Defamation League perceives it!

And that is why the militia groups are listed as "hate" groups.

The Anti-defamation League operates under an intense tribal mentality. They have followed Sir Arthur's teachings all along, even as they have attacked him in their organs of public opinion and buried his works.

But the work of Sir Arthur Keith offers many insights to the Militiamen and all others that are angered by their loss of "freedom" in the U.S.

But I would caution again, that this struggle will be multi-generational. We must first isolate our families from the poisons of popular culture. Mock military exercises are clear threat gestures. At this point, much of the middle class is unsure who, exactly, this threat is directed against. Thus, militia activity gives our elites a free propaganda theme to round up support for Sir Arthur's "central airborne police."

## **XII. CLOSING NOTES**

I should say a few words about Sir Arthur's group theory of selection. Phillippe Rushton, in his new volume "Race, Evolution, and Behavior" observes on page 88 (without necessarily endorsing the view he quotes) that "Indeed in recent times group selection has rivaled Larmarkianism as the most thoroughly repudiated idea in evolutionary theory ... Mathematical models ... show that group selection could override individual selection only under extreme conditions such as small intergroup migration rate, small group size, and large differences in fitness among groups."

A mathematician friend took one look at this and chuckled: "Social scientists tripping over the law of large numbers again!" In any grouping of similar objects the standard deviation between the individual extremes within each group will be greater than the difference between the mean of the two groups being compared. Math proves nothing about the historical process by which groups were, in fact, selected. Indeed, Sir Arthur's own calculations in New Theory show that individuals were selected against thousands of times more frequently than groups. But we know that thousands of tribes and races have disappeared as well. You must first understand a theory before you can disprove it, and in any event, you cannot disprove a theory with another theory.

But on a broader note, Sir Arthur's point is precisely that the dual code produces very "large differences in fitness among groups."

A word also on the Piltdown hoax. Carbon dating was not invented until 1955, the year of Sir Arthur's death. Thus, there was no way to conclusively prove that the Piltdown find was a fraud during his life. Piltdown caused Sir Arthur difficulties. He admits he has to modify his theories to accommodate it, and he shows that unlike other finds, Piltdown leaves no progeny and goes nowhere. He quotes the conclusions of his

contemporaries that Piltdown was a hoax. But Sir Arthur's rejection of Piltdown would have had institutional as well as intellectual consequences. As president of the Royal Anthropological society and conservator of the Museum at the Royal Institute, his rejection of the remains would have removed them to the trash bin, making them unavailable for further study. Sir Arthur was not the type of man to do this in the absence of clear proof.

I should say a few words of thanks.

First to Sir Arthur himself. From a personal perspective, publishing these works could not have been more ill-timed. It guaranteed that his final years would be filled with calumny and condemnation. And indeed they were. He was even attacked posthumously after his death in 1955 in the New York Times.

For this personal sacrifice, we of the West owe Sir Arthur an eternal debt. May we be worthy and repay it!

To the heirs of Sir Arthur we owe thanks for not renewing his copyright, and thus giving his work - as he clearly would have wanted - freely to the Western World.

And finally thanks to that collector in northern Virginia who has made it his life's avocation to sift through the volumes produced by our civilization prior to WW-II and who brought Sir Arthur to our attention. At the end of your journey, may your name rest in Valhalla.

**Yggdrasil**

---

**BACK**

© 1998 Yggdrasil. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



September 5, 1996



Name omitted.

Arlington, VA 22201

Our reference: 96004937

LIBRARY  
OF  
CONGRESS

This refers to your letter of August 1, 1996.

EVOLUTION AND ETHICS; by Sir Arthur Keith, with a preface by Earnest A. Hooton. Prev. reg. AI 159. Registered in the name of Sir Arthur Keith, under A 12436 following publication April 25, 1947. No renewal found.

Facts of registration for AI 159 mentioned in the above work are as follows.

Washington  
D.C.  
20559

ESSAYS ON HUMAN EVOLUTION; by Sir Arthur Keith. Registered in the name of Sir Arthur Keith, for ad interim copyright, under AI 159 following publication February 21, 1946. No renewal found.

A NEW THEORY OF HUMAN EVOLUTION; by Sir Arthur Keith. Registered in the name of Arthur Keith, for ad interim copyright, under AI 1829 following publication July 8, 1948. No renewal found.

Your remittance of \$20.00 has been applied in payment for this search and report.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Tracie C. Maupin".

Tracie C. Maupin  
Senior Copyright Research Specialist  
Reference and Bibliography Section



---

# **The Culture Industry**

**by Theodor W. Adorno (1903-1969)**

## **Table of Contents**

[\[Introduction\]](#) [\[The Culture Industry\]](#) [\[The Culture Industry Reconsidered\]](#)

---

## **Introduction**

These two essays, first published in the late 1940's, are the most prophetic works ever written on the subject of mass culture—the agglomeration of television, radio, film, and advertising concerns that Adorno terms "the culture industry". His prediction of the fusion of all forms of art into one (MTV's music videos), the indistinguishability of advertising and entertainment, and the contrived catharsis (emotional purging) of talk shows such as Oprah and Jerry Springer is one that stands on its own merit. I will not try to paraphrase his arguments, nor summarize his theses, but give the reader a brief insight into Adorno's curious place in the development of the American entertainment industry.

Theodor Wiesengrund Adorno was born to Jewish parents in Frankfurt, Germany. His academic career took off while involved with the Frankfurt School—an extension of COMINTERN, the Communist International. Adorno's collaboration with Walter Benjamin at the Frankfurt School from 1928-1932 had a tremendous impact on Jewish intellectual movements of the time. Benjamin is given credit for developing the theory of modern opinion-polling, as well as theories in brainwashing and the effects of social isolation. Benjamin's hypothesis that the mechanical reproduction of art belonged as a cornerstone of Marxist theory became quickly accepted in international circles (even by those who had never heard of his name). Adorno, however, rose to international acclaim while Benjamin remained forgotten for several decades. After his exile to America in 1934, Adorno became one of the most eminent figures of the neo-Marxist movement, enlisted by the American Jewish Committee and the U.S. War Department to fight "Fascism" and

other perceived threats to Jewish interests.

One must first understand Marxism as displayed in *Capital* and *The Communist Manifesto* before one can understand those such as Adorno who labor under Marx's ideology. From its inception Marxism has been not a strict ideology, but a means to an end. What Jewish intellectuals of the 19th century desired was an overthrow of bourgeois "Capitalism" (run by non-Jews) and a replacement of it with a kosher form of government (run by Jews). Despite the fierce rhetoric of overthrowing the nobility and empowering the proletariat, the fact remains that there has never been a single Jewish noble or peasant in Western Europe outside of Moorish Spain. The only social positions Jews could possibly fill would be those in the emerging Middle Class of artisans, merchants, and shop-owners. In appearance, Marx developed an ideology that directly attacked the class to which every Jew in Western Europe necessarily belonged. In reality, Marxism was carefully designed as a weapon to be employed specifically against the Goy (i.e non-Jewish) middle-class.

Unarmed peasants did not provide any direct threat to Jews (despite continuous howls of anti-Semitism), and noblemen generally welcomed them with open arms. In the class rivalries of industrial societies, Marx saw a weak spot in the side of Western Civilization and he attacked. Every Jewish intellectual movement since (including the Frankfurt School) has been obsessed with the weaknesses of our industrial-technological society—yet none of them wish to destroy the implements of that society. The dual goal that drives them is the destruction of the Goy middle-class by the enraged masses coupled with the replacement of the prevailing Goy intelligentsia by a policy of intermarriage and low birth-rates. Our technology, our capitalism, and our labor are merely implements in this war, not combatants. Marx himself saw capitalism as an integral part of his scheme (there could be no *true* Communist Revolution without a preceding capitalist buildup)—just as his "worker's paradise" would be not the destruction and devolution of the industrial-technological system but the perfection of it!

The years of the Third Reich and the war in Europe gave followers of the Frankfurt School new motivation to appropriate any and all elements of the culture industry in their continuing struggle against the Goyim. Where Marx had enlisted the idea of class struggle from intellectuals such as Robespierre during the French Revolution, neo-Marxists quickly realized the tremendous power of propaganda once it was placed on display following Germany's defeat. Marxism's "New Deal" was appropriated right from Adolph Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, [Chapter 6](#)! Despite the obvious historical ironies involved, the perfection of the culture industry was the aim of the Frankfurt School, as much as Adorno speaks of constant rebellion against it. Where previous Marxists relied almost solely on organized labor as their ammunition, Adorno quickly perceived the tremendous power of mass media as an organizing force—not during work hours—but during one's leisure hours; if I may coin a term: "organized leisure." This may help explain the ease with which traditional Marxists have been able to "embrace" capitalism despite massive investments in making the spirit of free-enterprise a *faux pas* in academic circles.

The author's motives are hardly clear in writing the following essays. Adorno takes up a mask of fighting "Fascism" much like the one displayed in his landmark *Authoritarian Personality*. But he was not fighting fascism when the first essay was

published in 1947—there were simply no fascists anywhere near the centers of power in America. As detailed in Neal Gabler's [An Empire of Their Own](#) and Ben Stein's *The View from Sunset Boulevard*, Jews have not just been an integral part of the advertising and entertainment industries in the United States—they were the sole founders. One might well ask why Adorno would attack his own tribesmen (i.e. fellow Jews) in public?

Although I can give no definitive answer to the above question, I wish to point out that Adorno was bred in a multilingual Europe and like many "upper-crust" Jews, he abhorred the Jewish Mafia "scene" in Los Angeles—the seedy home of Bugsy Seigel and Sam Goldwyn. As much as the culture industry in New York, Hollywood, and Las Vegas was a creation of Jews, Adorno obviously felt they lacked the proper "manners" of the Old World and was shocked at their violence, lack of religious devotion, and the amazing quickness with which successful Jewish businessmen married attractive Goy women. Again, I can merely speculate that Theodor Adorno may be one of the founding fathers of "neo-conservatism"—the ideology of the passive (and loyal) opposition; ardent supporters of capitalism when their interests dictated that support, but fierce tribalists on issues concerning Israel and "minority rights".

In closing I would like to emphasize the historical importance of this work as a critique of mass media as well as Adorno's questionable role in promoting opinion-polling and modern mind-control techniques. His analysis of capitalism is among the most brilliant of the century, even if he does take an unique view of the business of "business". I regard Adorno as second only to Joseph Schumpeter in his ability to explain the society in which we live. As much as George Orwell's *1984* is hailed as a picture of society ordered by authoritarianism and mind-control, I think Adorno's negative utopia has been more prescient and tangible in every way. But I suppose I should let the reader judge for himself!

**SIEGFRIED**

---

## **The Culture Industry**

### **THEODOR ADORNO AND MAX HORKHEIMER**

THE CULTURE INDUSTRY: ENLIGHTENMENT AS MASS DECEPTION (from *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, New York: Continuum, 1993. Originally published as *Dialektik der Aufklärung*, 1944)

THE sociological theory that the loss of the support of objectively established religion, the dissolution of the last remnants of precapitalism, together with technological and social differentiation or specialization, have led to cultural chaos is disproved every day; for culture now impresses the same stamp on everything. Films, radio and magazines make up a system which is uniform as a whole and in every part. Even the

aesthetic activities of political opposites are one in their enthusiastic obedience to the rhythm of the iron system. The decorative industrial management buildings and exhibition centers in authoritarian countries are much the same as anywhere else. The huge gleaming towers that shoot up everywhere are outward signs of the ingenious planning of international concerns, toward which the unleashed entrepreneurial system (whose monuments are a mass of gloomy houses and business premises in grimy, spiritless cities) was already hastening. Even now the older houses just outside the concrete city centers look like slums, and the new bungalows on the outskirts are at one with the flimsy structures of world fairs in their praise of technical progress and their built-in demand to be discarded after a short while like empty food cans. Yet the city housing projects designed to perpetuate the individual as a supposedly independent unit in a small hygienic dwelling make him all the more subservient to his adversary - the absolute power of capitalism. Because the inhabitants, as producers and as consumers, are drawn into the center in search of work and pleasure, all the living units crystallize into well-organized complexes. The striking unity of microcosm and macrocosm presents men with a model of their culture: the false identity of the general and the particular. Under monopoly all mass culture is identical, and the lines of its artificial framework begin to show through. The people at the top are no longer so interested in concealing monopoly: as its violence becomes more open, so its power grows. Movies and radio need no longer pretend to be art. The truth that they are just business is made into an ideology in order to justify the rubbish they deliberately produce. They call themselves industries; and when their directors' incomes are published, any doubt about the social utility of the finished products is removed.

Interested parties explain the culture industry in technological terms. It is alleged that because millions participate in it, certain reproduction processes are necessary that inevitably require identical needs in innumerable places to be satisfied with identical goods. The technical contrast between the few production centers and the large number of widely dispersed consumption points is said to demand organization and planning by management. Furthermore, it is claimed that standards were based in the first place on consumers' needs, and for that reason were accepted with so little resistance. The result is the circle of manipulation and retroactive need in which the unity of the system grows ever stronger. No mention is made of the fact that the basis on which technology acquires power over society is the power of those whose economic hold over society is greatest. A technological rationale is the rationale of domination itself. It is the coercive nature of society alienated from itself. Automobiles, bombs, and movies keep the whole thing together until their leveling element shows its strength in the very wrong which it furthered.

It has made the technology of the culture industry no more than the achievement of standardization and mass production, sacrificing whatever involved a distinction between the logic of the work and that of the social system. This is the result not of a law of movement in technology as such but of its function in today's economy. The need which might resist central control has already been suppressed by the control of the individual consciousness. The step from the telephone to the radio has clearly distinguished the roles. The former still allowed the subscriber to play the role of subject, and was liberal. The latter is democratic: it turns all participants into listeners and authoritatively subjects them to broadcast programs which are all exactly the same. No machinery of rejoinder has been devised, and private broadcasters are denied any

freedom. They are confined to the apocryphal field of the "amateur," and also have to accept organization from above. But any trace of spontaneity from the public in official broadcasting is controlled and absorbed by talent scouts, studio competitions and official programs of every kind selected by professionals. Talented performers belong to the industry long before it displays them; otherwise they would not be so eager to fit in. The attitude of the public, which ostensibly and actually favors the system of the culture industry, is a part of the system and not an excuse for it. If one branch of art follows the same formula as one with a very different medium and content; if the dramatic intrigue of broadcast soap operas becomes no more than useful material for showing how to master technical problems at both ends of the scale of musical experience—real jazz or a cheap imitation; or if a movement from a Beethoven symphony is crudely "adapted" for a film sound-track in the same way as a Tolstoy novel is garbled in a film script: then the claim that this is done to satisfy the spontaneous wishes of the public is no more than hot air. We are closer to the facts if we explain these phenomena as inherent in the technical and personnel apparatus which, down to its last cog, itself forms part of the economic mechanism of selection. In addition there is the agreement—or at least the determination—of all executive authorities not to produce or sanction anything that in any way differs from their own rules, their own ideas about consumers, or above all themselves.

In our age the objective social tendency is incarnate in the hidden subjective purposes of company directors, the foremost among whom are in the most powerful sectors of industry—steel, petroleum, electricity, and chemicals. Culture monopolies are weak and dependent in comparison. They cannot afford to neglect their appeasement of the real holders of power if their sphere of activity in mass society (a sphere producing a specific type of commodity which anyhow is still too closely bound up with easygoing liberalism and Jewish intellectuals) is not to undergo a series of purges. The dependence of the most powerful broadcasting company on the electrical industry, or of the motion picture industry on the banks, is characteristic of the whole sphere, whose individual branches are themselves economically interwoven. All are in such close contact that the extreme concentration of mental forces allows demarcation lines between different firms and technical branches to be ignored. The ruthless unity in the culture industry is evidence of what will happen in politics. Marked differentiations such as those of A and B films, or of stories in magazines in different price ranges, depend not so much on subject matter as on classifying, organizing, and labeling consumers. Something is provided for all so that none may escape; the distinctions are emphasized and extended. The public is catered for with a hierarchical range of mass-produced products of varying quality, thus advancing the rule of complete quantification. Everybody must behave (as if spontaneously) in accordance with his previously determined and indexed level, and choose the category of mass product turned out for his type. Consumers appear as statistics on research organization charts, and are divided by income groups into red, green, and blue areas; the technique is that used for any type of propaganda.

How formalized the procedure is can be seen when the mechanically differentiated products prove to be all alike in the end. That the difference between the Chrysler range and General Motors products is basically illusory strikes every child with a keen interest in varieties. What connoisseurs discuss as good or bad points serve only to perpetuate the semblance of competition and range of choice. The same applies to the Warner Brothers and Metro Goldwyn Mayer productions. But even the differences between the

more expensive and cheaper models put out by the same firm steadily diminish: for automobiles, there are such differences as the number of cylinders, cubic capacity, details of patented gadgets; and for films there are the number of stars, the extravagant use of technology, labor, and equipment, and the introduction of the latest psychological formulas. The universal criterion of merit is the amount of "conspicuous production," of blatant cash investment. The varying budgets in the culture industry do not bear the slightest relation to factual values, to the meaning of the products themselves. Even the technical media are relentlessly forced into uniformity. Television aims at a synthesis of radio and film, and is held up only because the interested parties have not yet reached agreement, but its consequences will be quite enormous and promise to intensify the impoverishment of aesthetic matter so drastically, that by tomorrow the thinly veiled identity of all industrial culture products can come triumphantly out into the open, derisively fulfilling the Wagnerian dream of the Gesamtkunstwerk—the fusion of all the arts in one work. The alliance of word, image, and music is all the more perfect than in Tristan because the sensuous elements which all approvingly reflect the surface of social reality are in principle embodied in the same technical process, the unity of which becomes its distinctive content. This process integrates all the elements of the production, from the novel (shaped with an eye to the film) to the last sound effect. It is the triumph of invested capital, whose title as absolute master is etched deep into the hearts of the dispossessed in the employment line; it is the meaningful content of every film, whatever plot the production team may have selected.

The man with leisure has to accept what the culture manufacturers offer him. Kant's formalism still expected a contribution from the individual, who was thought to relate the varied experiences of the senses to fundamental concepts; but industry robs the individual of his function. Its prime service to the customer is to do his schematizing for him. Kant said that there was a secret mechanism in the soul which prepared direct intuitions in such a way that they could be fitted into the system of pure reason. But today that secret has been deciphered. While the mechanism is to all appearances planned by those who serve up the data of experience, that is, by the culture industry, it is in fact forced upon the latter by the power of society, which remains irrational, however we may try to rationalize it; and this inescapable force is processed by commercial agencies so that they give an artificial impression of being in command. There is nothing left for the consumer to classify. Producers have done it for him. Art for the masses has destroyed the dream but still conforms to the tenets of that dreaming idealism which critical idealism balked at. Everything derives from consciousness: for Malebranche and Berkeley, from the consciousness of God; in mass art, from the consciousness of the production team. Not only are the hit songs, stars, and soap operas cyclically recurrent and rigidly invariable types, but the specific content of the entertainment itself is derived from them and only appears to change. The details are interchangeable. The short interval sequence which was effective in a hit song, the hero's momentary fall from grace (which he accepts as good sport), the rough treatment which the beloved gets from the male star, the latter's rugged defiance of the spoilt heiress, are, like all the other details, ready-made clichés to be slotted in anywhere; they never do anything more than fulfill the purpose allotted them in the overall plan. Their whole *raison d'être* is to confirm it by being its constituent parts. As soon as the film begins, it is quite clear how it will end, and who will be rewarded, punished, or forgotten. In light music, once the trained ear has heard the first notes of the hit song, it can guess what is coming and feel flattered when it does come. The average length of the short story has to be rigidly adhered to. Even gags, effects, and jokes are calculated

like the setting in which they are placed. They are the responsibility of special experts and their narrow range makes it easy for them to be apportioned in the office. The development of the culture industry has led to the predominance of the effect, the obvious touch, and the technical detail over the work itself—which once expressed an idea, but was liquidated together with the idea. When the detail won its freedom, it became rebellious and, in the period from Romanticism to Expressionism, asserted itself as free expression, as a vehicle of protest against the organization. In music the single harmonic effect obliterated the awareness of form as a whole; in painting the individual color was stressed at the expense of pictorial composition; and in the novel psychology became more important than structure. The totality of the culture industry has put an end to this. Though concerned exclusively with effects, it crushes their insubordination and makes them subserve the formula, which replaces the work. The same fate is inflicted on whole and parts alike. The whole inevitably bears no relation to the details—just like the career of a successful man into which everything is made to fit as an illustration or a proof, whereas it is nothing more than the sum of all those idiotic events. The so-called dominant idea is like a file which ensures order but not coherence. The whole and the parts are alike; there is no antithesis and no connection. Their prearranged harmony is a mockery of what had to be striven after in the great bourgeois works of art. In Germany the graveyard stillness of the dictatorship already hung over the gayest films of the democratic era.

The whole world is made to pass through the filter of the culture industry. The old experience of the movie-goer, who sees the world outside as an extension of the film he has just left (because the latter is intent upon reproducing the world of everyday perceptions), is now the producer's guideline. The more intensely and flawlessly his techniques duplicate empirical objects, the easier it is today for the illusion to prevail that the outside world is the straightforward continuation of that presented on the screen. This purpose has been furthered by mechanical reproduction since the lightning takeover by the sound film.

Real life is becoming indistinguishable from the movies. The sound film, far surpassing the theater of illusion, leaves no room for imagination or reflection on the part of the audience, who is unable to respond within the structure of the film, yet deviate from its precise detail without losing the thread of the story; hence the film forces its victims to equate it directly with reality. The stunting of the mass-media consumer's powers of imagination and spontaneity does not have to be traced back to any psychological mechanisms; he must ascribe the loss of those attributes to the objective nature of the products themselves, especially to the most characteristic of them, the sound film. They are so designed that quickness, powers of observation, and experience are undeniably needed to apprehend them at all; yet sustained thought is out of the question if the spectator is not to miss the relentless rush of facts. Even though the effort required for his response is semi-automatic, no scope is left for the imagination. Those who are so absorbed by the world of the movie—by its images, gestures, and words—that they are unable to supply what really makes it a world, do not have to dwell on particular points of its mechanics during a screening. All the other films and products of the entertainment industry which they have seen have taught them what to expect; they react automatically. The might of industrial society is lodged in men's minds. The entertainments' manufacturers know that their products will be consumed with alertness even when the customer is distraught, for each of them is a



model of the huge economic machinery which has always sustained the masses, whether at work or at leisure—which is akin to work. From every sound film and every broadcast program the social effect can be inferred which is exclusive to none but is shared by all alike. The culture industry as a whole has molded men as a type unfailingly reproduced in every product. All the agents of this process, from the producer to the women's clubs, take good care that the simple reproduction of this mental state is not nuanced or extended in any way.

The art historians and guardians of culture who complain of the extinction in the West of a basic style-determining power are wrong. The stereotyped appropriation of everything, even the inchoate, for the purposes of mechanical reproduction surpasses the rigor and general currency of any "real style," in the sense in which cultural cognoscenti celebrate the organic precapitalist past. No Palestrina could be more of a purist in eliminating every unprepared and unresolved discord than the jazz arranger in suppressing any development which does not conform to the jargon. When jazzing up Mozart he changes him not only when he is too serious or too difficult but when he harmonizes the melody in a different way, perhaps more simply, than is customary now. No medieval builder can have scrutinized the subjects for church windows and sculptures more suspiciously than the studio hierarchy scrutinizes a work by Balzac or Hugo before finally approving it. No medieval theologian could have determined the degree of the torment to be suffered by the damned in accordance with the *ordo* of divine love more meticulously than the producers of shoddy epics calculate the torture to be undergone by the hero or the exact point to which the leading lady's hemline shall be raised. The explicit and implicit, exoteric and esoteric catalog of the forbidden and tolerated is so extensive that it not only defines the area of freedom but is all-powerful inside it. Everything down to the last detail is shaped accordingly. Like its counterpart, avant-garde art, the entertainment industry determines its own language, down to its very syntax and vocabulary, by the use of anathema. The constant pressure to produce new effects (which must conform to the old pattern) serves merely as another rule to increase the power of the conventions when any single effect threatens to slip through the net. Every detail is so firmly stamped with sameness that nothing can appear which is not marked at birth, or does not meet with approval at first sight. And the star performers, whether they produce or reproduce, use this jargon as freely and fluently and with as much gusto as if it were the very language which it silenced long ago. Such is the ideal of what is natural in this field of activity, and its influence becomes all the more powerful, the more technique is perfected and diminishes the tension between the finished product and everyday life. The paradox of this routine, which is essentially travesty, can be detected and is often predominant in everything that the culture industry turns out. A jazz musician who is playing a piece of serious music, one of Beethoven's simplest minuets, syncopates it involuntarily and will smile superciliously when asked to follow the normal divisions of the beat. This is the "nature" which, complicated by the ever-present and extravagant demands of the specific medium, constitutes the new style and is a "system of non-culture, to which one might even concede a certain 'unity of style' if it really made any sense to speak of stylized barbarity."<sup>1</sup>

The universal imposition of this stylized mode can even go beyond what is quasi-officially sanctioned or forbidden; today a hit song is more readily forgiven for not observing the 32 beats or the compass of the ninth than for containing even the most

clandestine melodic or harmonic detail which does not conform to the idiom. Whenever Orson Welles offends against the tricks of the trade, he is forgiven because his departures from the norm are regarded as calculated mutations which serve all the more strongly to confirm the validity of the system. The constraint of the technically-conditioned idiom which stars and directors have to produce as "nature" so that the people can appropriate it, extends to such fine nuances that they almost attain the subtlety of the devices of an avant-garde work as against those of truth. The rare capacity minutely to fulfill the obligations of the natural idiom in all branches of the culture industry becomes the criterion of efficiency. What and how they say it must be measurable by everyday language, as in logical positivism. The producers are experts. The idiom demands an astounding productive power, which it absorbs and squanders. In a diabolical way it has overreached the culturally conservative distinction between genuine and artificial style. A style might be called artificial which is imposed from without on the refractory impulses of a form. But in the culture industry every element of the subject matter has its origin in the same apparatus as that jargon whose stamp it bears. The quarrels in which the artistic experts become involved with sponsor and censor about a lie going beyond the bounds of credibility are evidence not so much of an inner aesthetic tension as of a divergence of interests. The reputation of the specialist, in which a last remnant of objective independence sometimes finds refuge, conflicts with the business politics of the Church, or the concern which is manufacturing the cultural commodity. But the thing itself has been essentially objectified and made viable before the established authorities began to argue about it. Even before Zanuck acquired her, Saint Bernadette was regarded by her latter-day hagiographer as brilliant propaganda for all interested parties. That is what became of the emotions of the character. Hence the style of the culture industry, which no longer has to test itself against any refractory material, is also the negation of style. The reconciliation of the general and particular, of the rule and the specific demands of the subject matter, the achievement of which alone gives essential, meaningful content to style, is futile because there has ceased to be the slightest tension between opposite poles: these concordant extremes are dismally identical; the general can replace the particular, and vice versa.

Nevertheless, this caricature of style does not amount to something beyond the genuine style of the past. In the culture industry the notion of genuine style is seen to be the aesthetic equivalent of domination. Style considered as mere aesthetic regularity is a romantic dream of the past. The unity of style not only of the Christian Middle Ages but of the Renaissance expresses in each case the different structure of social power, and not the obscure experience of the oppressed in which the general was enclosed. The great artists were never those who embodied a wholly flawless and perfect style, but those who used style as a way of hardening themselves against the chaotic expression of suffering, as a negative truth. The style of their works gave what was expressed that force without which life flows away unheard. Those very art forms which are known as classical, such as Mozart's music, contain objective trends which represent something different to the style which they [incubate?]. As late as Schönberg and Picasso, the great artists have retained a mistrust of style, and at crucial points have subordinated it to the logic of the matter. What Dadaists and Expressionists called the untruth of style as such triumphs today in the sung jargon of a crooner, in the carefully contrived elegance of a film star, and even in the admirable expertise of a photograph of a peasant's squalid hut. Style represents a promise in every work of art.

That which is expressed is subsumed through style into the dominant forms of generality, into the language of music, painting, or words, in the hope that it will be reconciled thus with the idea of true generality. This promise held out by the work of art that it will create truth by lending new shape to the conventional social forms is as necessary as it is hypocritical. It unconditionally posits the real forms of life as it is by suggesting that fulfillment lies in their aesthetic derivatives. To this extent the claim of art is always ideology too. However, only in this confrontation with tradition of which style is the record can art express suffering. That factor in a work of art which enables it to transcend reality certainly cannot be detached from style; but it does not consist of the harmony actually realized, of any doubtful unity of form and content, within and without, of individual and society; it is to be found in those features in which discrepancy appears: in the necessary failure of the passionate striving for identity. Instead of exposing itself to this failure in which the style of the great work of art has always achieved self-negation, the inferior work has always relied on its similarity with others—on a surrogate identity.

In the culture industry this imitation finally becomes absolute. Having ceased to be anything but style, it reveals the latter's secret: obedience to the social hierarchy. Today aesthetic barbarity completes what has threatened the creations of the spirit since they were gathered together as culture and neutralized. To speak of culture was always contrary to culture. Culture as a common denominator already contains in embryo that schematization and process of cataloging and classification which bring culture within the sphere of administration. And it is precisely the industrialized, the consequent, subsumption which entirely accords with this notion of culture. By subordinating in the same way and to the same end all areas of intellectual creation, by occupying men's senses from the time they leave the factory in the evening to the time they clock in again the next morning with matter that bears the impress of the labor process they themselves have to sustain throughout the day, this subsumption mockingly satisfies the concept of a unified culture which the philosophers of personality contrasted with mass culture.

And so the culture industry, the most rigid of all styles, proves to be the goal of liberalism, which is reproached for its lack of style. Not only do its categories and contents derive from liberalism—domesticated naturalism as well as operetta and revue—but the modern culture monopolies form the economic area in which, together with the corresponding entrepreneurial types, for the time being some part of its sphere of operation survives, despite the process of disintegration elsewhere. It is still possible to make one's way in entertainment, if one is not too obstinate about one's own concerns, and proves appropriately pliable. Anyone who resists can only survive by fitting in. Once his particular brand of deviation from the norm has been noted by the industry, he belongs to it as does the land-reformer to capitalism. Realistic dissidence is the trademark of anyone who has a new idea in business. In the public voice of modern society accusations are seldom audible; if they are, the perceptive can already detect signs that the dissident will soon be reconciled. The more immeasurable the gap between chorus and leaders, the more certainly there is room at the top for everybody who demonstrates his superiority by well-planned originality. Hence, in the culture industry, too, the liberal tendency to give full scope to its able men survives. To do this for the efficient today is still the function of the market, which is otherwise proficiently controlled; as for the market's freedom, in the high period of art as elsewhere, it was

freedom for the stupid to starve.

Significantly, the system of the culture industry comes from the more liberal industrial nations, and all its characteristic media, such as movies, radio, jazz, and magazines, flourish there. Its progress, to be sure, had its origin in the general laws of capital. Gaumont and Pathe, Ullstein and Hugenberg followed the international trend with some success; Europe's economic dependence on the United States after war and inflation was a contributory factor. The belief that the barbarity of the culture industry is a result of "cultural lag," of the fact that the American consciousness did not keep up with the growth of technology, is quite wrong. It was pre-Fascist Europe which did not keep up with the trend toward the culture monopoly. But it was this very lag which left intellect and creativity some degree of independence and enabled its last representatives to exist—however dimly. In Germany the failure of democratic control to permeate life had led to a paradoxical situation. Many things were exempt from the market mechanism which had invaded the Western countries. The German educational system, universities, theaters with artistic standards, great orchestras, and museums enjoyed protection. The political powers, state and municipalities, which had inherited such institutions from absolutism, had left them with a measure of the freedom from the forces of power which dominates the market, just as princes and feudal lords had done up to the nineteenth century. This strengthened art in this late phase against the verdict of supply and demand, and increased its resistance far beyond the actual degree of protection. In the market itself the tribute of a quality for which no use had been found was turned into purchasing power; in this way, respectable literary and music publishers could help authors who yielded little more in the way of profit than the respect of the connoisseur. But what completely fettered the artist was the pressure (and the accompanying drastic threats), always to fit into business life as an aesthetic expert. Formerly, like Kant and Hume, they signed their letters "Your most humble and obedient servant," and underlined the foundations of throne and altar. Today they address heads of government by their first names, yet in every artistic activity they are subject to their illiterate masters. The analysis Tocqueville offered a century ago has in the meantime proved wholly accurate. Under the private culture monopoly it is a fact that "tyranny leaves the body free and directs its attack at the soul. The ruler no longer says: You must think as I do or die. He says: You are free not to think as I do; your life, your property, everything shall remain yours, but from this day on you are a stranger among us."<sup>2</sup> Not to conform means to be rendered powerless, economically and therefore spiritually—to be "self-employed." When the outsider is excluded from the concern, he can only too easily be accused of incompetence. Whereas today in material production the mechanism of supply and demand is disintegrating, in the superstructure it still operates as a check in the rulers' favor. The consumers are the workers and employees, the farmers and lower middle class. Capitalist production so confines them, body and soul, that they fall helpless victims to what is offered them. As naturally as the ruled always took the morality imposed upon them more seriously than did the rulers themselves, the deceived masses are today captivated by the myth of success even more than the successful are. Immovably, they insist on the very ideology which enslaves them. The misplaced love of the common people for the wrong which is done them is a greater force than the cunning of the authorities. It is stronger even than the rigorism of the Hays Office, just as in certain great times in history it has inflamed greater forces that were turned against it, namely, the terror of the tribunals. It calls for Mickey Rooney in preference to the tragic Garbo, for Donald Duck instead of Betty Boop.

The industry submits to the vote which it has itself inspired. What is a loss for the firm which cannot fully exploit a contract with a declining star is a legitimate expense for the system as a whole. By craftily sanctioning the demand for rubbish it inaugurates total harmony. The connoisseur and the expert are despised for their pretentious claim to know better than the others, even though culture is democratic and distributes its privileges to all. In view of the ideological truce, the conformism of the buyers and the effrontery of the producers who supply them prevail. The result is a constant reproduction of the same thing.

A constant sameness governs the relationship to the past as well. What is new about the phase of mass culture compared with the late liberal stage is the exclusion of the new. The machine rotates on the same spot. While determining consumption it excludes the untried as a risk. The movie-makers distrust any manuscript which is not reassuringly backed by a bestseller. Yet for this very reason there is never-ending talk of ideas, novelty, and surprise, of what is taken for granted but has never existed. Tempo and dynamics serve this trend. Nothing remains as of old; everything has to run incessantly, to keep moving. For only the universal triumph of the rhythm of mechanical production and reproduction promises that nothing changes, and nothing unsuitable will appear. Any additions to the well-proven culture inventory are too much of a speculation. The ossified forms—such as the sketch, short story, problem film, or hit song—are the standardized average of late liberal taste, dictated with threats from above. The people at the top in the culture agencies, who work in harmony as only one manager can with another, whether he comes from the rag trade or from college, have long since reorganized and rationalized the objective spirit. One might think that an omnipresent authority had sifted the material and drawn up an official catalog of cultural commodities to provide a smooth supply of available mass-produced lines. The ideas are written in the cultural firmament where they had already been numbered by Plato—and were indeed numbers, incapable of increase and immutable.

Amusement and all the elements of the culture industry existed long before the latter came into existence. Now they are taken over from above and brought up to date. The culture industry can pride itself on having energetically executed the previously clumsy transposition of art into the sphere of consumption, on making this a principle, on divesting amusement of its obtrusive naivetes and improving the type of commodities. The more absolute it became, the more ruthless it was in forcing every outsider either into bankruptcy or into a syndicate, and became more refined and elevated—until it ended up as a synthesis of Beethoven and the Casino de Paris. It enjoys a double victory: the truth it extinguishes without it can reproduce at will as a lie within. "Light" art as such, distraction, is not a decadent form. Anyone who complains that it is a betrayal of the ideal of pure expression is under an illusion about society. The purity of bourgeois art, which hypostasized itself as a world of freedom in contrast to what was happening in the material world, was from the beginning bought with the exclusion of the lower classes—with whose cause, the real universality, art keeps faith precisely by its freedom from the ends of the false universality. Serious art has been withheld from those for whom the hardship and oppression of life make a mockery of seriousness, and who must be glad if they can use time not spent at the production line just to keep going. Light art has been the shadow of autonomous art. It is the social bad conscience of serious art. The truth which the latter necessarily lacked because of its social premises gives the other the semblance of legitimacy. The division itself is the truth: it does at

least express the negativity of the culture which the different spheres constitute. Least of all can the antithesis be reconciled by absorbing light into serious art, or vice versa. But that is what the culture industry attempts.

The eccentricity of the circus, peepshow, and brothel is as embarrassing to it as that of Schönberg and Karl Kraus. And so the jazz musician Benny Goodman appears with the Budapest string quartet, more pedantic [rhythm?] than any philharmonic clarinetist, while the style of the Budapest players is as uniform and sugary as that of Guy Lombardo. But what is significant is not vulgarity, stupidity, and lack of polish. The culture industry did away with yesterday's rubbish by its own perfection, and by forbidding and domesticating the amateurish, although it constantly allows gross blunders without which the standard of the exalted style cannot be perceived. But what is new is that the irreconcilable elements of culture, art and distraction, are subordinated to one end and subsumed under one false formula: the totality of the culture industry. It consists of repetition. That its characteristic innovations are never anything more than improvements of mass reproduction is not external to the system. It is with good reason that the interest of innumerable consumers is directed to the technique, and not to the contents—which are stubbornly repeated, outworn, and by now half-discredited. The social power which the spectators worship shows itself more effectively in the omnipresence of the stereotype imposed by technical skill than in the stale ideologies for which the ephemeral contents stand in.

Nevertheless the culture industry remains the entertainment business. Its influence over the consumers is established by entertainment; that will ultimately be broken not by an outright decree, but by the hostility inherent in the principle of entertainment to what is greater than itself. Since all the trends of the culture industry are profoundly embedded in the public by the whole social process, they are encouraged by the survival of the market in this area. Demand has not yet been replaced by simple obedience. As is well known, the major reorganization of the film industry shortly before World War I, the material prerequisite of its expansion, was precisely its deliberate acceptance of the public's needs as recorded at the box-office—a procedure which was hardly thought necessary in the pioneering days of the screen. The same opinion is held today by the captains of the film industry, who take as their criterion the more or less phenomenal song hits but wisely never have recourse to the judgment of truth, the opposite criterion. Business is their ideology. It is quite correct that the power of the culture industry resides in its identification with a manufactured need, and not in simple contrast to it, even if this contrast were one of complete power and complete powerlessness. Amusement under late capitalism is the prolongation of work. It is sought after as an escape from the mechanized work process, and to recruit strength in order to be able to cope with it again. But at the same time mechanization has such power over a man's leisure and happiness, and so profoundly determines the manufacture of amusement goods, that his experiences are inevitably after-images of the work process itself. The ostensible content is merely a faded foreground; what sinks in is the automatic succession of standardized operations. What happens at work, in the factory, or in the office can only be escaped from by approximation to it in one's leisure time. All amusement suffers from this incurable malady. Pleasure hardens into boredom because, if it is to remain pleasure, it must not demand any effort and therefore moves rigorously in the worn grooves of association. No independent thinking must be expected from the audience: the product prescribes every reaction: not by its natural structure

(which collapses under reflection), but by signals. Any logical connection calling for mental effort is painstakingly avoided. As far as possible, developments must follow from the immediately preceding situation and never from the idea of the whole. For the attentive movie-goer any individual scene will give him the whole thing. Even the set pattern itself still seems dangerous, offering some meaning—wretched as it might be—where only meaninglessness is acceptable. Often the plot is maliciously deprived of the development demanded by characters and matter according to the old pattern. Instead, the next step is what the script writer takes to be the most striking effect in the particular situation. Banal though elaborate surprise interrupts the story-line. The tendency mischievously to fall back on pure nonsense, which was a legitimate part of popular art, farce and clowning, right up to Chaplin and the Marx Brothers, is most obvious in the unpretentious kinds. This tendency has completely asserted itself in the text of the novelty song, in the thriller movie, and in cartoons, although in films starring Greer Garson and Bette Davis the unity of the sociopsychological case study provides something approximating a claim to a consistent plot. The idea itself, together with the objects of comedy and terror, is massacred and fragmented. Novelty songs have always existed on a contempt for meaning which, as predecessors and successors of psychoanalysis, they reduce to the monotony of sexual symbolism. Today detective and adventure films no longer give the audience the opportunity to experience the resolution. In the non-ironic varieties of the genre, it has also to rest content with the simple horror of situations which have almost ceased to be linked in any way.

Cartoons were once exponents of fantasy as opposed to rationalism. They ensured that justice was done to the creatures and objects they electrified, by giving the maimed specimens a second life. All they do today is to confirm the victory of technological reason over truth. A few years ago they had a consistent plot which only broke up in the final moments in a crazy chase, and thus resembled the old slapstick comedy. Now, however, time relations have shifted. In the very first sequence a motive is stated so that in the course of the action destruction can get to work on it: with the audience in pursuit, the protagonist becomes the worthless object of general violence. The quantity of organized amusement changes into the quality of organized cruelty. The self-elected censors of the film industry (with whom it enjoys a close relationship) watch over the unfolding of the crime, which is as drawn-out as a hunt. Fun replaces the pleasure which the sight of an embrace would allegedly afford, and postpones satisfaction [until] the day of the pogrom. Insofar as cartoons do any more than accustom the senses to the new tempo, they hammer into every brain the old lesson that continuous friction, the breaking down of all individual resistance, is the condition of life in this society. Donald Duck in the cartoons and the unfortunate in real life get their thrashing so that the audience can learn to take their own punishment.

The enjoyment of the violence suffered by the movie character turns into violence against the spectator, and distraction into exertion. Nothing that the experts have devised as a stimulant must escape the weary eye; no stupidity is allowed in the face of all the trickery; one has to follow everything and even display the smart responses shown and recommended in the film. This raises the question whether the culture industry fulfills the function of diverting minds which it boasts about so loudly. If most of the radio stations and movie theaters were closed down, the consumers would probably not lose so very much. To walk from the street into the movie theater is no longer to enter a world of dream; as soon as the very existence of these institutions no longer



made it obligatory to use them, there would be no great urge to do so. Such closures would not be reactionary machine wrecking. The disappointment would be felt not so much by the enthusiasts as by the slow-witted, who are the ones who suffer for everything anyhow. In spite of the films which are intended to complete her integration, the housewife finds in the darkness of the movie theater a place of refuge where she can sit for a few hours with nobody watching, just as she used to look out of the window when there were still homes and rest in the evening. The unemployed in the great cities find coolness in summer and warmth in winter in these temperature-controlled locations. Otherwise, despite its size, this bloated pleasure apparatus adds no dignity to man's lives. The idea of "fully exploiting" available technical resources and the facilities for aesthetic mass consumption is part of the economic system which refuses to exploit resources to abolish hunger.

The culture industry perpetually cheats its consumers of what it perpetually promises. The promissory note which, with its plots and staging, it draws on pleasure is endlessly prolonged; the promise, which is actually all the spectacle consists of, is illusory: all it actually confirms is that the real point will never be reached, that the diner must be satisfied with the menu. In front of the appetite stimulated by all those brilliant names and images there is finally set no more than a commendation of the depressing everyday world it sought to escape. Of course works of art were not sexual exhibitions either. However, by representing deprivation as negative, they retracted, as it were, the prostitution of the impulse and rescued by mediation what was denied. The secret of aesthetic sublimation is its representation of fulfillment as a broken promise. The culture industry does not sublimate; it represses. By repeatedly exposing the objects of desire, breasts in a clinging sweater or the naked torso of the athletic hero, it only stimulates the unsublimated forepleasure which habitual deprivation has long since reduced to a masochistic semblance. There is no erotic situation which, while insinuating and exciting, does not fail to indicate unmistakably that things can never go that far. The Hays Office merely confirms the ritual of Tantalus that the culture industry has established anyway. Works of art are ascetic and unashamed; the culture industry is pornographic and prudish. Love is downgraded to romance. And, after the descent, much is permitted; even license as a marketable speciality has its quota bearing the trade description "daring." The mass production of the sexual automatically achieves its repression. Because of his ubiquity, the film star with whom one is meant to fall in love is from the outset a copy of himself. Every tenor voice comes to sound like a Caruso record, and the "natural" faces of Texas girls are like the successful models by whom Hollywood has typecast them. The mechanical reproduction of beauty, which reactionary cultural fanaticism wholeheartedly serves in its methodical idolization of individuality, leaves no room for that unconscious idolatry which was once essential to beauty. The triumph over beauty is celebrated by humor—the Schadenfreude that every successful deprivation calls forth. There is laughter because there is nothing to laugh at. Laughter, whether conciliatory or terrible, always occurs when some fear passes. It indicates liberation either from physical danger or from the grip of logic. Conciliatory laughter is heard as the echo of an escape from power; the wrong kind overcomes fear by capitulating to the forces which are to be feared. It is the echo of power as something inescapable. Fun is a medicinal bath. The pleasure industry never fails to prescribe it. It makes laughter the instrument of the fraud practised on happiness. Moments of happiness are without laughter; only operettas and films portray sex to the accompaniment of resounding laughter. But Baudelaire is as devoid of humour as Holderlin. In the false society laughter is a disease which has attacked happiness and is drawing it into its worthless



totality. To laugh at something is always to deride it, and the life which, according to Bergson, in laughter breaks through the barrier, is actually an invading barbaric life, self-assertion prepared to parade its liberation from any scruple when the social occasion arises. Such a laughing audience is a parody of humanity. Its members are monads, all dedicated to the pleasure of being ready for anything at the expense of everyone else. Their harmony is a caricature of solidarity. What is fiendish about this false laughter is that it is a compelling parody of the best, which is conciliatory. Delight is austere: *res severa verum gaudium*. The monastic theory that not asceticism but the sexual act denotes the renunciation of attainable bliss receives negative confirmation in the gravity of the lover who with foreboding commits his life to the fleeting moment. In the culture industry, jovial denial takes the place of the pain found in ecstasy and in asceticism. The supreme law is that they shall not satisfy their desires at any price; they must laugh and be content with laughter. In every product of the culture industry, the permanent denial imposed by civilization is once again unmistakably demonstrated and inflicted on its victims. To offer and to deprive them of something is one and the same. This is what happens in erotic films. Precisely because it must never take place, everything centers upon copulation. In films it is more strictly forbidden for an illegitimate relationship to be admitted without the parties being punished than for a millionaire's future son-in-law to be active in the labor movement. In contrast to the liberal era, industrialized as well as popular culture may wax indignant at capitalism, but it cannot renounce the threat of castration. This is fundamental. It outlasts the organized acceptance of the uniformed seen in the films which are produced to that end, and in reality. What is decisive today is no longer puritanism, although it still asserts itself in the form of women's organizations, but the necessity inherent in the system not to leave the customer alone, not for a moment to allow him any suspicion that resistance is possible.

The principle dictates that he should be shown all his needs as capable-of-fulfillment, but that those needs should be so predetermined that he feels himself to be the eternal consumer, the object of the culture industry. Not only does it make him believe that the deception it practices is satisfaction, but it goes further and implies that, whatever the state of affairs, he must put up with what is offered. The escape from everyday drudgery which the whole culture industry promises may be compared to the daughter's abduction in the cartoon: the father is holding the ladder in the dark. The paradise offered by the culture industry is the same old drudgery. Both escape and elopement are predesigned to lead back to the starting point. Pleasure promotes the resignation which it ought to help to forget.

Amusement, if released from every restraint, would not only be the antithesis of art but its extreme role. The Mark Twain absurdity with which the American culture industry flirts at times might be a corrective of art. The more seriously the latter regards the incompatibility with life, the more it resembles the seriousness of life, its antithesis; the more effort it devotes to developing wholly from its own formal law, the more effort it demands from the intelligence to neutralize its burden. In some revue films, and especially in the grotesque and the funnies, the possibility of this negation does glimmer for a few moments. But of course it cannot happen. Pure amusement in its consequence, relaxed self-surrender to all kinds of associations and happy nonsense, is cut short by the amusement on the market: instead, it is interrupted by a surrogate overall meaning which the culture industry insists on giving to its products, and yet misuses as a mere pretext for bringing in the stars. Biographies and other simple stories patch the

fragments of nonsense into an idiotic plot. We do not have the cap and bells of the jester but the bunch of keys of capitalist reason, which even screens the pleasure of achieving success. Every kiss in the revue film has to contribute to the career of the boxer, or some hit song expert or other whose rise to fame is being glorified. The deception is not that the culture industry supplies amusement but that it ruins the fun by allowing business considerations to involve it in the ideological clichés of a culture in the process of self-liquidation. Ethics and taste cut short unrestrained amusement as "naive"—naivete is thought to be as bad as intellectualism—and even restrict technical possibilities. The culture industry is corrupt; not because it is a sinful Babylon but because it is a cathedral dedicated to elevated pleasure. On all levels, from Hemingway to Emil Ludwig, from Mrs. Miniver to the Lone Ranger, from Toscanini to Guy Lombardo, there is untruth in the intellectual content taken ready-made from art and science. The culture industry does retain a trace of something better in those features which bring it close to the circus, in the self-justifying and nonsensical skill of riders, acrobats and clowns, in the "defense and justification of physical as against intellectual art."<sup>3</sup> But the refuges of a mindless artistry which represents what is human as opposed to the social mechanism are being relentlessly hunted down by a schematic reason which compels everything to prove its significance and effect. The consequence is that the nonsensical at the bottom disappears as utterly as the sense in works of art at the top.

The fusion of culture and entertainment that is taking place today leads not only to a depravation of culture, but inevitably to an intellectualization of amusement. This is evident from the fact that only the copy appears: in the movie theater, the photograph; on the radio, the recording. In the age of liberal expansion, amusement lived on the unshaken belief in the future: things would remain as they were and even improve. Today this belief is once more intellectualized; it becomes so faint that it loses sight of any goal and is little more than a magic-lantern show for those with their backs to reality. It consists of the meaningful emphases which, parallel to life itself, the screen play puts on the smart fellow, the engineer, the capable girl, ruthlessness disguised as character, interest in sport, and finally automobiles and cigarettes, even where the entertainment is not put down to the advertising account of the immediate producers but to that of the system as a whole. Amusement itself becomes an ideal, taking the place of the higher things of which it completely deprives the masses by repeating them in a manner even more stereotyped than the slogans paid for by advertising interests. Inwardness, the subjectively restricted form of truth, was always more at the mercy of the outwardly powerful than they imagined. The culture industry turns it into an open lie. It has now become mere twaddle which is acceptable in religious bestsellers, psychological films, and women's serials as an embarrassingly agreeable garnish, so that genuine personal emotion in real life can be all the more reliably controlled. In this sense amusement carries out that purgation of the emotions which Aristotle once attributed to tragedy and Mortimer Adler now allows to movies. The culture industry reveals the truth about catharsis as it did about style.

The stronger the positions of the culture industry become, the more summarily it can deal with consumers' needs, producing them, controlling them, disciplining them, and even withdrawing amusement: no limits are set to cultural progress of this kind. But the tendency is immanent in the principle of amusement itself, which is enlightened in a bourgeois sense. If the need for amusement was in large measure the creation of industry, which used the subject as a means of recommending the work to the

masses—the oleograph [imitation oil painting] by the dainty morsel it depicted, or the cake mix by a picture of a cake—amusement always reveals the influence of business, the sales talk, the quack's spiel. But the original affinity of business and amusement is shown in the latter's specific significance: to defend society. To be pleased means to say Yes. It is possible only by insulation from the totality of the social process, by desensitization and, from the first, by senselessly sacrificing the inescapable claim of every work, however inane, within its limits to reflect the whole. Pleasure always means not to think about anything, to forget suffering even where it is shown. Basically it is helplessness. It is flight; not, as is asserted, flight from a wretched reality, but from the last remaining thought of resistance. The liberation which amusement promises is freedom from thought and from negation. The effrontery of the rhetorical question, "What do people want?" lies in the fact that it is addressed—as if to reflective individuals—to those very people who are deliberately to be deprived of this individuality. Even when the public does—exceptionally—rebel against the pleasure industry, all it can muster is that feeble resistance which that very industry has inculcated in it. Nevertheless, it has become increasingly difficult to keep people in this condition.

The rate at which they are reduced to stupidity must not fall behind the rate at which their intelligence is increasing. In this age of statistics the masses are too sharp to identify themselves with the millionaire on the screen, and too slow-witted to ignore the law of the largest number. Ideology conceals itself in the calculation of probabilities. Not everyone will be lucky one day—but the person who draws the winning ticket, or rather the one who is marked out to do so by a higher power—usually by the pleasure industry itself, which is represented as unceasingly in search of talent. Those discovered by talent scouts and then publicized on a vast scale by the studio are ideal types of the new dependent average. Of course, the starlet is meant to symbolize the typist in such a way that the splendid evening dress seems meant for the actress as distinct from the real girl. The girls in the audience not only feel that they could be on the screen, but realize the great gulf separating them from it. Only one girl can draw the lucky ticket, only one man can win the prize, and if, mathematically, all have the same chance, yet this is so infinitesimal for each one that he or she will do best to write it off and rejoice in the other's success, which might just as well have been his or hers, and somehow never is. Whenever the culture industry still issues an invitation naively to identify, it is immediately withdrawn. No one can escape from himself any more. Once a member of the audience could see his own wedding in the one shown in the film. Now the lucky actors on the screen are copies of the same category as every member of the public, but such equality only demonstrates the insurmountable separation of the human elements.

The perfect similarity is the absolute difference. The identity of the category forbids that of the individual cases. Ironically, man as a member of a species has been made a reality by the culture industry. Now any person signifies only those attributes by which he can replace everybody else: he is interchangeable, a copy. As an individual he is completely expendable and utterly insignificant, and this is just what he finds out when time deprives him of this similarity. This changes the inner structure of the religion of success—otherwise strictly maintained. Increasing emphasis is laid not on the path *per aspera ad astra* (which presupposes hardship and effort), but on winning a prize. The element of blind chance in the routine decision about which song deserves to be a hit and which extra a heroine is stressed by the ideology. Movies emphasize chance. By stopping at nothing to ensure that all the characters are essentially alike, with the

exception of the villain, and by excluding non-conforming faces (for example, those which, like Garbo's, do not look as if you could say "Hello sister!" to them), life is made easier for movie-goers at first. They are assured that they are all right as they are, that they could do just as well and that nothing beyond their powers will be asked of them. But at the same time they are given a hint that any effort would be useless because even bourgeois luck no longer has any connection with the calculable effect of their own work. They take the hint. Fundamentally they all recognize chance (by which one occasionally makes his fortune) as the other side of planning. Precisely because the forces of society are so deployed in the direction of rationality that anyone might become an engineer or manager, it has ceased entirely to be a rational matter who the one will be in whom society will invest training or confidence for such functions. Chance and planning become one and the same thing, because, given men's equality, individual success and failure—right up to the top—lose any economic meaning. Chance itself is planned, not because it affects any particular individual but precisely because it is believed to play a vital part. It serves the planners as an alibi, and makes it seem that the complex of transactions and measures into which life has been transformed leaves scope for spontaneous and direct relations between man. This freedom is symbolized in the various media of the culture industry by the arbitrary selection of average individuals. In a magazine's detailed accounts of the modestly magnificent pleasure-trips it has arranged for the lucky person, preferably a stenotypist (who has probably won the competition because of her contacts with local bigwigs), the powerlessness of all is reflected. They are mere matter—so much so that those in control can take someone up into their heaven and throw him out again: his rights and his work count for nothing. Industry is interested in people merely as customers and employees, and has in fact reduced mankind as a whole and each of its elements to this all-embracing formula. According to the ruling aspect at the time, ideology emphasizes plan or chance, technology or life, civilization or nature. As employees, men are reminded of the rational organization and urged to fit in like sensible people. As customers, the freedom of choice, the charm of novelty, is demonstrated to them on the screen or in the press by means of the human and personal anecdote. In either case they remain objects.

The less the culture industry has to promise, the less it can offer a meaningful explanation of life, and the emptier is the ideology it disseminates. Even the abstract ideals of the harmony and beneficence of society are too concrete in this age of universal publicity. We have even learned how to identify abstract concepts as sales propaganda. Language based entirely on truth simply arouses impatience to get on with the business deal it is probably advancing. The words that are not means appear senseless; the others seem to be fiction, untrue. Value judgments are taken either as advertising or as empty talk. Accordingly ideology has been made vague and noncommittal, and thus neither clearer nor weaker. Its very vagueness, its almost scientific aversion from committing itself to anything which cannot be verified, acts as an instrument of domination. It becomes a vigorous and prearranged promulgation of the status quo. The culture industry tends to make itself the embodiment of authoritative pronouncements, and thus the irrefutable prophet of the prevailing order. It skilfully steers a winding course between the cliffs of demonstrable misinformation and manifest truth, faithfully reproducing the phenomenon whose opaqueness blocks any insight and installs the ubiquitous and intact phenomenon as ideal. Ideology is split into the photograph of stubborn life and the naked lie about its meaning—which is not expressed but suggested and yet drummed in. To demonstrate its divine nature, reality is always repeated in a purely cynical way. Such a photological proof is of course not stringent, but it is

overpowering. Anyone who doubts the power of monotony is a fool. The culture industry refutes the objection made against it just as well as that against the world which it impartially duplicates. The only choice is either to join in or to be left behind: those provincials who have recourse to eternal beauty and the amateur stage in preference to the cinema and the radio are already—politically—at the point to which mass culture drives its supporters. It is sufficiently hardened to deride as ideology, if need be, the old wish-fulfillments, the father-ideal and absolute feeling. The new ideology has as its objects the world as such. It makes use of the worship of facts by no more than elevating a disagreeable existence into the world of facts in representing it meticulously. This transference makes existence itself a substitute for meaning and right. Whatever the camera reproduces is beautiful. The disappointment of the prospect that one might be the typist who wins the world trip is matched by the disappointing appearance of the accurately photographed areas which the voyage might include. Not Italy is offered, but evidence that it exists. A film can even go so far as to show the Paris in which the American girl thinks she will still her desire as a hopelessly desolate place, thus driving her the more inexorably into the arms of the smart American boy she could have met at home anyhow. That this goes on, that, in its most recent phase, the system itself reproduces the life of those of whom it consists instead of immediately doing away with them, is even put down to its credit as giving it meaning and worth. Continuing and continuing to join in are given as justification for the blind persistence of the system and even for its immutability. What repeats itself is healthy, like the natural or industrial cycle. The same babies grin eternally out of the magazines; the jazz machine will pound away for ever. In spite of all the progress in reproduction techniques, in controls and the specialities, and in spite of all the restless industry, the bread which the culture industry offers man is the stone of the stereotype. It draws on the life cycle, on the well-founded amazement that mothers, in spite of everything, still go on bearing children and that the wheels still do not grind to a halt. This serves to confirm the immutability of circumstances. The ears of corn blowing in the wind at the end of Chaplin's *The Great Dictator* give the lie to the anti-Fascist plea for freedom. They are like the blond hair of the German girl whose camp life is photographed by the Nazi film company in the summer breeze. Nature is viewed by the mechanism of social domination as a healthy contrast to society, and is therefore denatured. Pictures showing green trees, a blue sky, and moving clouds make these aspects of nature into so many cryptograms for factory chimneys and service stations. On the other hand, wheels and machine components must seem expressive, having been degraded to the status of agents of the spirit of trees and clouds. Nature and technology are mobilized against all opposition; and we have a falsified memento of liberal society, in which people supposedly wallowed in erotic plush-lined bedrooms instead of taking open-air baths as in the case today, or experiencing breakdowns in prehistoric Benz models instead of shooting off with the speed of a rocket from A (where one is anyhow) to B (where everything is just the same). The triumph of the gigantic concern over the initiative of the entrepreneur is praised by the culture industry as the persistence of entrepreneurial initiative. The enemy who is already defeated, the thinking individual, is the enemy fought. The resurrection in Germany of the anti-bourgeois "Haus Sonnenstosser," and the pleasure felt when watching *Life with Father*, have one and the same meaning.

In one respect, admittedly, this hollow ideology is in deadly earnest: everyone is provided for. "No one must go hungry or thirsty; if anyone does, he's for the concentration camp!" This joke from Hitler's Germany might shine forth as a maxim from

above all the portals of the culture industry. With sly naivete, it presupposes the most recent characteristic of society: that it can easily find out who its supporters are. Everybody is guaranteed formal freedom. No one is officially responsible for what he thinks. Instead everyone is enclosed at an early age in a system of churches, clubs, professional associations, and other such concerns, which constitute the most sensitive instrument of social control. Anyone who wants to avoid ruin must see that he is not found wanting when weighed in the scales of this apparatus. Otherwise he will lag behind in life, and finally perish. In every career, and especially in the liberal professions, expert knowledge is linked with prescribed standards of conduct; this can easily lead to the illusion that expert knowledge is the only thing that counts. In fact, it is part of the irrational planning of this society that it reproduces to a certain degree only the lives of its faithful members. The standard of life enjoyed corresponds very closely to the degree to which classes and individuals are essentially bound up with the system. The manager can be relied upon, as can the lesser employee Dagwood—as he is in the comic pages or in real life. Anyone who goes cold and hungry, even if his prospects were once good, is branded. He is an outsider; and, apart from certain capital crimes, the most mortal of sins is to be an outsider. In films he sometimes, and as an exception, becomes an original, the object of maliciously indulgent humor; but usually he is the villain, and is identified as such at first appearance, long before the action really gets going: hence avoiding any suspicion that society would turn on those of good will. Higher up the scale, in fact, a kind of welfare state is coming into being today. In order to keep their own positions, men in top posts maintain the economy in which a highly-developed technology has in principle made the masses redundant as producers. The workers, the real bread-winners, are fed (if we are to believe the ideology) by the managers of the economy, the Fed. Hence the individual's position becomes precarious. Under liberalism the poor were thought to be lazy; now they are automatically objects of suspicion. Anybody who is not provided for outside should be in a concentration camp, or at any rate in the hell of the most degrading work and the slums. The culture industry, however, reflects positive and negative welfare for those under the administrators' control as direct human solidarity of men in a world of the efficient. No one is forgotten; everywhere there are neighbors and welfare workers, Dr. Gillespies and parlor philosophers whose hearts are in the right place and who, by their kind intervention as of man to man, cure individual cases of socially-perpetuated distress—always provided that there is no obstacle in the personal depravity of the unfortunate. The promotion of a friendly atmosphere as advised by management experts and adopted by every factory to increase output, brings even the last private impulse under social control precisely because it seems to relate men's circumstances directly to production, and to reprivatize them. Such spiritual charity casts a conciliatory shadow onto the products of the culture industry long before it emerges from the factory to invade society as a whole. Yet the great benefactors of mankind, whose scientific achievements have to be written up as acts of sympathy to give them an artificial human interest, are substitutes for the national leaders, who finally decree the abolition of sympathy and think they can prevent any recurrence when the last invalid has been exterminated.

By emphasizing the "heart of gold," society admits the suffering it has created: everyone knows that he is now helpless in the system, and ideology has to take this into account. Far from concealing suffering under the cloak of improvised fellowship, the culture industry takes pride in looking it in the face like a man, however great the strain on self-control. The pathos of composure justifies the world which makes it necessary. That is very hard, but just because of that so wonderful and so healthy. This lie does not

shrink from tragedy. Mass culture deals with it, in the same way as centralized society does not abolish the suffering of its members but records and plans it. That it is why it borrows so persistently from art. This provides the tragic substance which pure amusement cannot itself supply, but which it needs if it is somehow to remain faithful to the principle of the exact reproduction of phenomena. Tragedy made into a carefully calculated and accepted aspect of the world is a blessing. It is a safeguard against the reproach that truth is not respected, whereas it is really being adopted with cynical regret. To the consumer who—culturally—has seen better days it offers a substitute for long-discarded profundities. It provides the regular movie-goer with the scraps of culture he must have for prestige. It comforts all with the thought that a tough, genuine human fate is still possible, and that it must at all costs be represented uncompromisingly. Life in all the aspects which ideology today sets out to duplicate shows up all the more gloriously, powerfully and magnificently, the more it is redolent of necessary suffering. It begins to resemble fate. Tragedy is reduced to the threat to destroy anyone who does not cooperate, whereas its paradoxical significance once lay in a hopeless resistance to mythic destiny. Tragic fate becomes just punishment, which is what bourgeois aesthetics always tried to turn it into. The morality of mass culture is the cheap form of yesterday's children's books. In a first-class production, for example, the villainous character appears as a hysterical woman who (with presumed clinical accuracy) tries to ruin the happiness of her opposite number, who is truer to reality, and herself suffers a quite untheatrical death. So much learning is of course found only at the top. Lower down less trouble is taken.

Tragedy is made harmless without recourse to social psychology. Just as every Viennese operetta worthy of the name had to have its tragic finale in the second act, which left nothing for the third except to clear up misunderstandings, the culture industry assigns tragedy a fixed place in the routine. The well-known existence of the recipe is enough to allay any fear that there is no restraint on tragedy. The description of the dramatic formula by the housewife as "getting into trouble and out again" embraces the whole of mass culture from the idiotic women's serial to the top production. Even the worst ending which began with good intentions confirms the order of things and corrupts the tragic force, either because the woman whose love runs counter to the laws of the game plays with her death for a brief spell of happiness, or because the sad ending in the film all the more clearly stresses the indestructibility of actual life. The tragic film becomes an institution for moral improvement. The masses, demoralized by their life under the pressure of the system, and who show signs of civilization only in modes of behavior which have been forced on them and through which fury and recalcitrance show everywhere, are to be kept in order by the sight of an inexorable life and exemplary behavior. Culture has always played its part in taming revolutionary and barbaric instincts. Industrial culture adds its contribution. It shows the condition under which this merciless life can be lived at all. The individual who is thoroughly weary must use his weariness as energy for his surrender to the collective power which wears him out. In films, those permanently desperate situations which crush the spectator in ordinary life somehow become a promise that one can go on living. One has only to become aware of one's own nothingness, only to recognize defeat and one is one with it all.

Society is full of desperate people and therefore a prey to rackets. In some of the most significant German novels of the pre-Fascist era such as Doblin's *Berlin Alexanderplatz* and Fallada's *Kleiner Mann, Was Nun*, this trend was as obvious as in the



average film and in the devices of jazz. What all these things have in common is the self-derision of man. The possibility of becoming a subject in the economy, an entrepreneur or a proprietor, has been completely liquidated. Right down to the humblest shop, the independent enterprise, on the management and inheritance of which the bourgeois family and the position of its head had rested, became hopelessly dependent. Everybody became an employee; and in this civilization of employees the dignity of the father (questionable anyhow) vanishes. The attitude of the individual to the racket, business, profession or party, before or after admission, the Fuhrer's gesticulations before the masses, or the suitor's before his sweetheart, assume specifically masochistic traits. The attitude into which everybody is forced in order to give repeated proof of his moral suitability for this society reminds one of the boys who, during tribal initiation, go round in a circle with a stereotyped smile on their faces while the priest strikes them. Life in the late capitalist era is a constant initiation rite. Everyone must show that he wholly identifies himself with the power which is belaboring him. This occurs in the principle of jazz syncopation, which simultaneously derides stumbling and makes it a rule. The eunuch-like voice of the crooner on the radio, the heiress's smooth suitor, who falls into the swimming pool in his dinner jacket, are models for those who must become whatever the system wants. Everyone can be like this omnipotent society; everyone can be happy, if only he will capitulate fully and sacrifice his claim to happiness. In his weakness society recognizes its strength, and gives him some of it. His defenselessness makes him reliable. Hence tragedy is discarded. Once the opposition of the individual to society was its substance. It glorified "the bravery and freedom of emotion before a powerful enemy, an exalted affliction, a dreadful problem."<sup>4</sup> Today tragedy has melted away into the nothingness of that false identity of society and individual, whose terror still shows for a moment in the empty semblance of the tragic. But the miracle of integration, the permanent act of grace by the authority who receives the defenseless person—once he has swallowed his rebelliousness—signifies Fascism. This can be seen in the humanitarianism which Doblin uses to let his Biberkopf find refuge, and again in socially-slanted films. The capacity to find refuge, to survive one's own ruin, by which tragedy is defeated, is found in the new generation; they can do any work because the work process does not let them become attached to any. This is reminiscent of the sad lack of conviction of the homecoming soldier with no interest in the war, or of the casual laborer who ends up by joining a paramilitary organization. This liquidation of tragedy confirms the abolition of the individual.

In the culture industry the individual is an illusion not merely because of the standardization of the means of production. He is tolerated only so long as his complete identification with the generality is unquestioned. Pseudo individuality is rife: from the standardized jazz improvisation to the exceptional film star whose hair curls over her eye to demonstrate her originality. What is individual is no more than the generality's power to stamp the accidental detail so firmly that it is accepted as such. The defiant reserve or elegant appearance of the individual on show is mass-produced like Yale locks, whose only difference can be measured in fractions of millimeters. The peculiarity of the self is a monopoly commodity determined by society; it is falsely represented as natural. It is no more than the moustache, the French accent, the deep voice of the woman of the world, the Lubitsch touch: finger prints on identity cards which are otherwise exactly the same, and into which the lives and faces of every single person are transformed by the power of the generality. Pseudo individuality is the prerequisite for comprehending tragedy and removing its poison: only because individuals have ceased to be themselves



and are now merely centers where the general tendencies meet, is it possible to receive them again, whole and entire, into the generality. In this way mass culture discloses the fictitious character of the "individual" in the bourgeois era, and is merely unjust in boasting on account of this dreary harmony of general and particular. The principle of individuality was always full of contradiction. Individuation has never really been achieved. Self-preservation in the shape of class has kept everyone at the stage of a mere species being. Every bourgeois characteristic, in spite of its deviation and indeed because of it, expressed the same thing: the harshness of the competitive society. The individual who supported society bore its disfiguring mark; seemingly free, he was actually the product of its economic and social apparatus. Power based itself on the prevailing conditions of power when it sought the approval of persons affected by it. As it progressed, bourgeois society did also develop the individual. Against the will of its leaders, technology has changed human beings from children into persons. However, every advance in individuation of this kind took place at the expense of the individuality in whose name it occurred, so that nothing was left but the resolve to pursue one's own particular purpose. The bourgeois whose existence is split into a business and a private life, whose private life is split into keeping up his public image and intimacy, whose intimacy is split into the surly partnership of marriage and the bitter comfort of being quite alone, at odds with himself and everybody else, is already virtually a Nazi, replete both with enthusiasm and abuse; or a modern city-dweller who can now only imagine friendship as a "social contact": that is, as being in social contact with others with whom he has no inward contact. The only reason why the culture industry can deal so successfully with individuality is that the latter has always reproduced the fragility of society. On the faces of private individuals and movie heroes put together according to the patterns on magazine covers vanishes a pretense in which no one now believes; the popularity of the hero models comes partly from a secret satisfaction that the effort to achieve individuation has at last been replaced by the effort to imitate, which is admittedly more breathless. It is idle to hope that this self-contradictory, disintegrating "person" will not last for generations, that the system must collapse because of such a psychological split, or that the deceitful substitution of the stereotype for the individual will of itself become unbearable for mankind. Since Shakespeare's Hamlet, the unity of the personality has been seen through as a pretense. Synthetically produced physiognomies show that the people of today have already forgotten that there was ever a notion of what human life was. For centuries society has been preparing for Victor Mature and Mickey Rooney. By destroying they come to fulfill.

The idolization of the cheap involves making the average the heroic. The highest-paid stars resemble pictures advertising unspecified proprietary articles. Not without good purpose are they often selected from the host of commercial models. The prevailing taste takes its ideal from advertising, the beauty in consumption. Hence the Socratic saying that the beautiful is the useful has now been fulfilled—ironically. The cinema makes propaganda for the culture combine as a whole; on radio, goods for whose sake the cultural commodity exists are also recommended individually. For a few coins one can see the film which cost millions, for even less one can buy the chewing gum whose manufacture involved immense riches—a hoard increased still further by sales. In absentia, but by universal suffrage, the treasure of armies is revealed, but prostitution is not allowed inside the country. The best orchestras in the world—clearly not so—are brought into your living room free of charge. It is all a parody of the never-never land, just as the national society is a parody of the human society. You name it, we supply it. A man up from the country remarked at the old Berlin Metropol theater that

it was astonishing what they could do for the money; his comment has long since been adopted by the culture industry and made the very substance of production. This is always coupled with the triumph that it is possible; but this, in large measure, is the very triumph. Putting on a show means showing everybody what there is, and what can be achieved.

Even today it is still a fair, but incurably sick with culture. Just as the people who had been attracted by the fairground barkers overcame their disappointment in the booths with a brave smile, because they really knew in advance what would happen, so the movie-goer sticks knowingly to the institution. With the cheapness of mass-produced luxury goods and its complement, the universal swindle, a change in the character of the art commodity itself is coming about. What is new is not that it is a commodity, but that today it deliberately admits it is one; that art renounces its own autonomy and proudly takes its place among consumption goods constitutes the charm of novelty. Art as a separate sphere was always possible only in a bourgeois society. Even as a negation of that social purposiveness which is spreading through the market, its freedom remains essentially bound up with the premise of a commodity economy. Pure works of art which deny the commodity society by the very fact that they obey their own law were always wares all the same. In so far as, until the eighteenth century, the buyer's patronage shielded the artist from the market, they were dependent on the buyer and his objectives. The purposelessness of the great modern work of art depends on the anonymity of the market. Its demands pass through so many intermediaries that the artist is exempt from any definite requirements—though admittedly only to a certain degree, for throughout the whole history of the bourgeoisie his autonomy was only tolerated, and thus contained an element of untruth which ultimately led to the social liquidation of art. When mortally sick, Beethoven hurled away a novel by Sir Walter Scott with the cry: "Why, the fellow writes for money," and yet proved a most experienced and stubborn businessman in disposing of the last quartets, which were a most extreme renunciation of the market; he is the most outstanding example of the unity of those opposites, market and independence, in bourgeois art. Those who succumb to the ideology are precisely those who cover up the contradiction instead of taking it into the consciousness of their own production as Beethoven did: he went on to express in music his anger at losing a few pence, and derived the metaphysical *Es Muss Sein* (which attempts an aesthetic banishment of the pressure of the world by taking it into itself) from the housekeeper's demand for her monthly wages. The principle of idealistic aesthetics—purposefulness without a purpose—reverses the scheme of things to which bourgeois art conforms socially: purposelessness for the purposes declared by the market. At last, in the demand for entertainment and relaxation, purpose has absorbed the realm of purposelessness. But as the insistence that art should be disposable in terms of money becomes absolute, a shift in the internal structure of cultural commodities begins to show itself. The use which men in this antagonistic society promise themselves from the work of art is itself, to a great extent, that very existence of the useless which is abolished by complete inclusion under use. The work of art, by completely assimilating itself to need, deceitfully deprives men of precisely that liberation from the principle of utility which it should inaugurate. What might be called use value in the reception of cultural commodities is replaced by exchange value; in place of enjoyment there are gallery-visiting and factual knowledge: the prestige seeker replaces the connoisseur. The consumer becomes the ideology of the pleasure industry, whose institutions he cannot escape. One simply "has to" have seen Mrs. Miniver, just as

one "has to" subscribe to Life and Time. Everything is looked at from only one aspect: that it can be used for something else, however vague the notion of this use may be. No object has an inherent value; it is valuable only to the extent that it can be exchanged. The use value of art, its mode of being, is treated as a fetish; and the fetish, the work's social rating (misinterpreted as its artistic status) becomes its use value—the only quality which is enjoyed. The commodity function of art disappears only to be wholly realized when art becomes a species of commodity instead, marketable and interchangeable like an industrial product. But art as a type of product which existed to be sold and yet to be unsaleable is wholly and hypocritically converted into "unsaleability" as soon as the transaction ceases to be the mere intention and becomes its sole principle. No tickets could be bought when Toscanini conducted over the radio; he was heard without charge, and every sound of the symphony was accompanied, as it were, by the sublime puff that the symphony was not interrupted by any advertising: "This concert is brought to you as a public service." The illusion was made possible by the profits of the united automobile and soap manufacturers, whose payments keep the radio stations going—and, of course, by the increased sales of the electrical industry, which manufactures the radio sets. Radio, the progressive latecomer of mass culture, draws all the consequences at present denied the film by its pseudomarket. The technical structure of the commercial radio system makes it immune from liberal deviations such as those the movie industrialists can still permit themselves in their own sphere. It is a private enterprise which really does represent the sovereign whole and is therefore some distance ahead of the other individual combines. Chesterfield is merely the nation's cigarette, but the radio is the voice of the nation. In bringing cultural products wholly into the sphere of commodities, radio does not try to dispose of its culture goods themselves as commodities straight to the consumer. In America it collects no fees from the public, and so has acquired the illusory form of disinterested, unbiased authority which suits Fascism admirably. The radio becomes the universal mouthpiece of the Fuhrer; his voice rises from street loudspeakers to resemble the howling of sirens announcing panic—from which modern propaganda can scarcely be distinguished anyway. The National Socialists knew that the wireless gave shape to their cause just as the printing press did to the Reformation. The metaphysical charisma of the Fuhrer invented by the sociology of religion has finally turned out to be no more than the omnipresence of his speeches on the radio, which are a demoniacal parody of the omnipresence of the divine spirit. The gigantic fact that the speech penetrates everywhere replaces its content, just as the benefaction of the Toscanini broadcast takes the place of the symphony. No listener can grasp its true meaning any longer, while the Fuhrer's speech is lies anyway. The inherent tendency of radio is to make the speaker's word, the false commandment, absolute. A recommendation becomes an order. The recommendation of the same commodities under different proprietary names, the scientifically based praise of the laxative in the announcer's smooth voice between the overture from La Traviata and that from Rienzi is the only thing that no longer works, because of its silliness. One day the edict of production, the actual advertisement (whose actuality is at present concealed by the pretense of a choice) can turn into the open command of the Fuehrer. In a society of huge Fascist rackets which agree among themselves what part of the social product should be allotted to the nation's needs, it would eventually seem anachronistic to recommend the use of a particular soap powder. The Fuehrer is more up-to-date in unceremoniously giving direct orders for both the holocaust and the supply of rubbish.

Even today the culture industry dresses works of art like political slogans and forces them upon a resistant public at reduced prices; they are as accessible for public

enjoyment as a park. But the disappearance of their genuine commodity character does not mean that they have been abolished in the life of a free society, but that the last defense against their reduction to culture goods has fallen. The abolition of educational privilege by the device of clearance sales does not open for the masses the spheres from which they were formerly excluded, but, given existing social conditions, contributes directly to the decay of education and the progress of barbaric meaninglessness. Those who spent their money in the nineteenth or the early twentieth century to see a play or to go to a concert respected the performance as much as the money they spent. The bourgeois who wanted to get something out of it tried occasionally to establish some rapport with the work. Evidence for this is to be found in the literary "introductions" to works, or in the commentaries on Faust. These were the first steps toward the biographical coating and other practices to which a work of art is subjected today. Even in the early, prosperous days of business, exchange-value did carry use value as a mere appendix but had developed it as a prerequisite for its own existence; this was socially helpful for works of art. Art exercised some restraint on the bourgeois as long as it cost money. That is now a thing of the past. Now that it has lost every restraint and there is no need to pay any money, the proximity of art to those who are exposed to it completes the alienation and assimilates one to the other under the banner of triumphant objectivity. Criticism and respect disappear in the culture industry; the former becomes a mechanical expertise, the latter is succeeded by a shallow cult of leading personalities. Consumers now find nothing expensive. Nevertheless, they suspect that the less anything costs, the less it is being given them. The double mistrust of traditional culture as ideology is combined with mistrust of industrialized culture as a swindle. When thrown in free, the now debased works of art, together with the rubbish to which the medium assimilates them, are secretly rejected by the fortunate recipients, who are supposed to be satisfied by the mere fact that there is so much to be seen and heard. Everything can be obtained. The screenos and vaudevilles in the movie theater, the competitions for guessing music, the free books, rewards and gifts offered on certain radio programs, are not mere accidents but a continuation of the practice obtaining with culture products. The symphony becomes a reward for listening to the radio, and—if technology had its way—the film would be delivered to people's homes as happens with the radio. It is moving toward the commercial system. Television points the way to a development which might easily enough force the Warner Brothers into what would certainly be the unwelcome position of serious musicians and cultural conservatives. But the gift system has already taken hold among consumers. As culture is represented as a bonus with undoubted private and social advantages, they have to seize the chance. They rush in lest they miss something. Exactly what, is not clear, but in any case the only ones with a chance are the participants. Fascism, however, hopes to use the training the culture industry has given these recipients of gifts, in order to organize them into its own forced battalions.

Culture is a paradoxical commodity. So completely is it subject to the law of exchange that it is no longer exchanged; it is so blindly consumed in use that it can no longer be used. Therefore it amalgamates with advertising. The more meaningless the latter seems to be under a monopoly, the more omnipotent it becomes. The motives are markedly economic. One could certainly live without the culture industry, therefore it necessarily creates too much satiation and apathy. In itself, it has few resources itself to correct this. Advertising is its elixir of life. But as its product never fails to reduce to a mere promise the enjoyment which it promises as a commodity, it eventually coincides

with publicity, which it needs because it cannot be enjoyed. In a competitive society, advertising performed the social service of informing the buyer about the market; it made choice easier and helped the unknown but more efficient supplier to dispose of his goods. Far from costing time, it saved it. Today, when the free market is coming to an end, those who control the system are entrenching themselves in it. It strengthens the firm bond between the consumers and the big combines. Only those who can pay the exorbitant rates charged by the advertising agencies, chief of which are the radio networks themselves; that is, only those who are already in a position to do so, or are co-opted by the decision of the banks and industrial capital, can enter the pseudo-market as sellers. The costs of advertising, which finally flow back into the pockets of the combines, make it unnecessary to defeat unwelcome outsiders by laborious competition. They guarantee that power will remain in the same hands—not unlike those economic decisions by which the establishment and running of undertakings is controlled in a totalitarian state. Advertising today is a negative principle, a blocking device: everything that does not bear its stamp is economically suspect. Universal publicity is in no way necessary for people to get to know the kinds of goods—whose supply is restricted anyway. It helps sales only indirectly. For a particular firm, to phase out a current advertising practice constitutes a loss of prestige, and a breach of the discipline imposed by the influential clique on its members. In wartime, goods which are unobtainable are still advertised, merely to keep industrial power in view. Subsidizing ideological media is more important than the repetition of the name. Because the system obliges every product to use advertising, it has permeated the idiom—the "style"—of the culture industry. Its victory is so complete that it is no longer evident in the key positions: the huge buildings of the top men, floodlit stone advertisements, are free of advertising; at most they exhibit on the rooftops, in monumental brilliance and without any self-glorification, the firm's initials. But, in contrast, the nineteenth-century houses, whose architecture still shamefully indicates that they can be used as a consumption commodity and are intended to be lived in, are covered with posters and inscriptions from the ground right up to and beyond the roof: until they become no more than backgrounds for bills and sign-boards. Advertising becomes art and nothing else, just as Goebbels—with foresight—combines them: *l'art pour l'art*, advertising for its own sake, a pure representation of social power. In the most influential American magazines, *Life* and *Fortune*, a quick glance can now scarcely distinguish advertising from editorial picture and text. The latter features an enthusiastic and gratuitous account of the great man (with illustrations of his life and grooming habits) which will bring him new fans, while the advertisement pages use so many factual photographs and details that they represent the ideal of information which the editorial part has only begun to try to achieve. The assembly-line character of the culture industry, the synthetic, planned method of turning out its products (factory-like not only in the studio but, more or less, in the compilation of cheap biographies, pseudodocumentary novels, and hit songs) is very suited to advertising: the important individual points, by becoming detachable, interchangeable, and even technically alienated from any connected meaning, lend themselves to ends external to the work. The effect, the trick, the isolated repeatable device, have always been used to exhibit goods for advertising purposes, and today every monster close-up of a star is an advertisement for her name, and every hit song a plug for its tune. Advertising and the culture industry merge technically as well as economically. In both cases the same thing can be seen in innumerable places, and the mechanical repetition of the same culture product has come to be the same as that of the propaganda slogan. In both cases the insistent demand for effectiveness makes technology into psycho-technology, into a procedure for manipulating men. In both

cases the standards are the striking yet familiar, the easy yet catchy, the skillful yet simple; the object is to overpower the customer, who is conceived as absent-minded or resistant.

By the language he speaks, he makes his own contribution to culture as publicity. The more completely language is lost in the announcement, the more words are debased as substantial vehicles of meaning and become signs devoid of quality; the more purely and transparently words communicate what is intended, the more impenetrable they become. The demythologization of language, taken as an element of the whole process of enlightenment, is a relapse into magic. Word and essential content were distinct yet inseparable from one another. Concepts like melancholy and history, even life, were recognized in the word, which separated them out and preserved them. Its form simultaneously constituted and reflected them. The absolute separation, which makes the moving accidental and its relation to the object arbitrary, puts an end to the superstitious fusion of word and thing. Anything in a determined literal sequence which goes beyond the correlation to the event is rejected as unclear and as verbal metaphysics. But the result is that the word, which can now be only a sign without any meaning, becomes so fixed to the thing that it is just a petrified formula. This affects language and object alike. Instead of making the object experiential, the purified word treats it as an abstract instance, and everything else (now excluded by the demand for ruthless clarity from expression—itsself now banished) fades away in reality. A left-half at football, a black-shirt, a member of the Hitler Youth, and so on, are no more than names. If before its rationalization the word had given rise to lies as well as to longing, now, after its rationalization, it is a straitjacket for longing more even than for lies. The blindness and dumbness of the data to which positivism reduces the world pass over into language itself, which restricts itself to recording those data. Terms themselves become impenetrable; they obtain a striking force, a power of adhesion and repulsion which makes them like their extreme opposite, incantations. They come to be a kind of trick, because the name of the prima donna is cooked up in the studio on a statistical basis, or because a welfare state is anathematized by using taboo terms such as "bureaucrats" or "intellectuals," or because base practice uses the name of the country as a charm. In general, the name—to which magic most easily attaches—is undergoing a chemical change: a metamorphosis into capricious, manipulable designations, whose effect is admittedly now calculable, but which for that very reason is just as despotic as that of the archaic name. First names, those archaic remnants, have been brought up to date either by stylization as advertising trade-marks (film stars' surnames have become first names), or by collective standardization. In comparison, the bourgeois family name which, instead of being a trade-mark, once individualized its bearer by relating him to his own past history, seems antiquated. It arouses a strange embarrassment in Americans. In order to hide the awkward distance between individuals, they call one another "Bob" and "Harry," as interchangeable team members. This practice reduces relations between human beings to the good fellowship of the sporting community and is a defense against the true kind of relationship. Signification, which is the only function of a word admitted by semantics, reaches perfection in the sign. Whether folksongs were rightly or wrongly called upper-class culture in decay, their elements have only acquired their popular form through a long process of repeated transmission. The spread of popular songs, on the other hand, takes place at lightning speed. The American expression "fad," used for fashions which appear like epidemics—that is, inflamed by highly-concentrated economic forces—designated this phenomenon long before totalitarian advertising bosses enforced the general lines of culture. When the German

Fascists decide one day to launch a word—say, "intolerable"—over the loudspeakers the next day the whole nation is saying "intolerable." By the same pattern, the nations against whom the weight of the German "blitzkrieg" was thrown took the word into their own jargon. The general repetition of names for measures to be taken by the authorities makes them, so to speak, familiar, just as the brand name on everybody's lips increased sales in the era of the free market.

The blind and rapidly spreading repetition of words with special designations links advertising with the totalitarian watchword. The layer of experience which created the words for their speakers has been removed; in this swift appropriation language acquires the coldness which until now it had only on billboards and in the advertisement columns of newspapers. Innumerable people use words and expressions which they have either ceased to understand or employ only because they trigger off conditioned reflexes; in this sense, words are trade-marks which are finally all the more firmly linked to the things they denote, the less their linguistic sense is grasped. The minister for mass education talks incomprehensibly of "dynamic forces," and the hit songs unceasingly celebrate "reverie" and "rhapsody," yet base their popularity precisely on the magic of the unintelligible as creating the thrill of a more exalted life. Other stereotypes, such as memory, are still partly comprehended, but escape from the experience which might allow them content. They appear like enclaves in the spoken language. On the radio of Flesch and Hitler they may be recognized from the affected pronunciation of the announcer when he says to the nation, "Good night, everybody!" or "This is the Hitler Youth," and even intones "the Fuhrer" in a way imitated by millions. In such clichés the last bond between sedimentary experience and language is severed which still had a reconciling effect in dialect in the nineteenth century. But in the prose of the journalist whose adaptable attitude led to his appointment as an all-German editor, the German words become petrified, alien terms. Every word shows how far it has been debased by the Fascist pseudo-folk community. By now, of course, this kind of language is already universal, totalitarian. All the violence done to words is so vile that one can hardly bear to hear them any longer. The announcer does not need to speak pompously; he would indeed be impossible if his inflection were different from that of his particular audience. But, as against that, the language and gestures of the audience and spectators are colored more strongly than ever before by the culture industry, even in fine nuances which cannot yet be explained experimentally. Today the culture industry has taken over the civilizing inheritance of the entrepreneurial and frontier democracy—whose appreciation of intellectual deviations was never very finely attuned. All are free to dance and enjoy themselves, just as they have been free, since the historical neutralization of religion, to join any of the innumerable sects. But freedom to choose an ideology—since ideology always reflects economic coercion—everywhere proves to be freedom to choose what is always the same. The way in which a girl accepts and keeps the obligatory date, the inflection on the telephone or in the most intimate situation, the choice of words in conversation, and the whole inner life as classified by the now somewhat devalued depth psychology, bear witness to man's attempt to make himself a proficient apparatus, similar (even in emotions) to the model served up by the culture industry. The most intimate reactions of human beings have been so thoroughly reified that the idea of anything specific to themselves now persists only as an utterly abstract notion: personality scarcely signifies anything more than shining white teeth and freedom from body odor and emotions. The triumph of advertising in the culture industry is that consumers feel compelled to buy and use its products even though they see through

them.

---

<sup>1</sup> Nietzsche, *Unzeitgemä ße Betrachtungen* [Untimely Meditations], Werke, Vol. I (Leipzig, 1917), p. 187.

<sup>2</sup> Alexis de Tocqueville, *De la Democratie en Amerique* [Democracy in America], Vol. II (Paris, 1864), p. 151.

<sup>3</sup> Frank Wedekind, *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. IX (Munich, 1921), p. 426.

<sup>4</sup> Nietzsche, *Götzendä mmerung* [Twilight of the Idols], Werke, Vol. VIII, p. 136.

---

## **The Culture Industry Reconsidered**

### **THEODOR ADORNO**

(From "The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture" London: Routledge, 1991.)

THE term culture industry was perhaps used for the first time in the book *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, which Horkheimer and I published in Amsterdam in 1947. In our drafts we spoke of 'mass culture'. We replaced that expression with 'culture industry' in order to exclude from the outset the interpretation agreeable to its advocates: that it is a matter of something like a culture that arises spontaneously from the masses themselves, the contemporary form of popular art. From the latter the culture industry must be distinguished in the extreme. The culture industry fuses the old and familiar into a new quality. In all its branches, products which are tailored for consumption by masses, and which to a great extent determine the nature of that consumption, are manufactured more or less according to plan. The individual branches are similar in structure or at least fit into each other, ordering themselves into a system almost without a gap. This is made possible by contemporary technical capabilities as well as by economic and administrative concentration. The culture industry intentionally integrates its consumers from above. To the detriment of both it forces together the spheres of high and low art, separated for thousands of years. The seriousness of high art is destroyed in speculation about its efficacy; the seriousness of the lower perishes with the civilizational constraints imposed on the rebellious resistance inherent within it as long as social control was not yet total. Thus, although the culture industry undeniably speculates on the conscious and unconscious state of the millions towards which it is directed, the masses are not primary, but secondary, they are an object of calculation; an appendage of the machinery. The customer is not king, as the culture industry would have us believe, not its subject but its object. The very word mass-media, specially



honed for the culture industry, already shifts the accent onto harmless terrain. Neither is it a question of primary concern for the masses, nor of the techniques of communication as such, but of the spirit which sufflates them, their master's voice. The culture industry misuses its concern for the masses in order to duplicate, reinforce and strengthen their mentality, which it presumes is given and unchangeable. How this mentality might be changed is excluded throughout. The masses are not the measure but the ideology of the culture industry, even though the culture industry itself could scarcely exist without adapting to the masses.

The cultural commodities of the industry are governed, as Brecht and Suhrkamp expressed it thirty years ago, by the principle of their realization as value, and not by their own specific content and harmonious formation. The entire practice of the culture industry transfers the profit motive naked onto cultural forms. Ever since these cultural forms first began to earn a living for their creators as commodities in the market-place they had already possessed something of this quality. But then they sought after profit only indirectly, over and above their autonomous essence. New on the part of the culture industry is the direct and undisguised primacy of a precisely and thoroughly calculated efficacy in its most typical products. The autonomy of works of art, which of course rarely ever predominated in an entirely pure form, and was always permeated by a constellation of effects, is tendentially eliminated by the culture industry, with or without the conscious will of those in control. The latter include both those who carry out directives as well as those who hold the power. In economic terms they are or were in search of new opportunities for the realization of capital in the most economically developed countries. The old opportunities became increasingly more precarious as a result of the same concentration process which alone makes the culture industry possible as an omnipresent phenomenon. Culture, in the true sense, did not simply accommodate itself to human beings; but it always simultaneously raised a protest against the petrified relations under which they lived, thereby honoring them. Insofar as culture becomes wholly assimilated to and integrated in those petrified relations, human beings are once more debased. Cultural entities typical of the culture industry are no longer also commodities, they are commodities through and through. This quantitative shift is so great that it calls forth entirely new phenomena. Ultimately, the culture industry no longer even needs to directly pursue everywhere the profit interests from which it originated. These interests have become objectified in its ideology and have even made themselves independent of the compulsion to sell the cultural commodities which must be swallowed anyway. The culture industry turns into public relations, the manufacturing of 'goodwill' per se, without regard for particular firms or saleable objects. Brought to bear is a general uncritical consensus, advertisements produced for the world, so that each product of the culture industry becomes its own advertisement.

Nevertheless, those characteristics which originally stamped the transformation of literature into a commodity are maintained in this process. More than anything in the world, the culture industry has its ontology, a scaffolding of rigidly conservative basic categories which can be gleaned, for example, from the commercial English novels of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. What parades as progress in the culture industry, as the incessantly new which it offers up, remains the disguise for an eternal sameness; everywhere the changes mask a skeleton which has changed just as little as the profit motive itself since the time it first gained its predominance over culture.

Thus, the expression 'industry' is not to be taken too literally. It refers to the standardization of the thing itself - such as that of the Western, familiar to every movie-goer - and to the rationalization of distribution techniques, but not strictly to the production process. Although in film, the central sector of the culture industry, the production process resembles technical modes of operation in the extensive division of labor, the employment of machines and the separation of the laborers from the means of production - expressed in the perennial conflict between artists active in the culture industry and those who control it - individual forms of production are nevertheless maintained. Each product affects an individual air; individuality itself serves to reinforce ideology, in so far as the illusion is conjured up that the completely reified and mediated is a sanctuary from immediacy and life. Now, as ever, the culture industry exists in the 'service' of third persons, maintaining its affinity to the declining circulation process of capital, to the commerce from which it came into being. Its ideology above all makes use of the star system, borrowed from individualistic art and its commercial exploitation. The more dehumanized its methods of operation and content, the more diligently and successfully the culture industry propagates supposedly great personalities and operates with heart-throbs. It is industrial more in a sociological sense, in the incorporation of industrial forms of organization even when nothing is manufactured - as in the rationalization of office work - rather than in the sense of anything really and actually produced by technological rationality. Accordingly, the misinvestments of the culture industry are considerable, throwing those branches rendered obsolete by new techniques into crises, which seldom lead to changes for the better.

The concept of technique in the culture industry is only in name identical with technique in works of art. In the latter, technique is concerned with the internal organization of the object itself, with its inner logic. In contrast, the technique of the culture industry is, from the beginning, one of distribution and mechanical reproduction, and therefore always remains external to its object. The culture industry finds ideological support precisely in so far as it carefully shields itself from the full potential of the techniques contained in its products. It lives parasitically from the extra-artistic technique of the material production of goods, without regard for the obligation to the internal artistic whole implied by its functionality (*Sachlichkeit*), but also without concern for the laws of form demanded by aesthetic autonomy. The result for the physiognomy of the culture industry is essentially a mixture of streamlining, photographic hardness and precision on the one hand, and individualistic residues, sentimentality and an already rationally disposed and adapted romanticism on the other. Adopting Benjamin's designation of the traditional work of art by the concept of aura, the presence of that which is not present, the culture industry is defined by the fact that it does not strictly counterpose another principle to that of aura, but rather by the fact that it conserves the decaying aura as a foggy mist. By this means the culture industry betrays its own ideological abuses.

It has recently become customary among cultural officials as well as sociologists to warn against underestimating the culture industry while pointing to its great importance for the development of the consciousness of its consumers. It is to be taken seriously, without cultured snobbism. In actuality the culture industry is important as a moment of the spirit which dominates today. Whoever ignores its influence out of skepticism for what it stuffs into people would be naive. Yet there is a deceptive glitter about the admonition to take it seriously. Because of its social role, disturbing questions

about its quality, about truth or untruth, and about the aesthetic niveau of the culture industry's emissions are repressed, or at least excluded from the so-called sociology of communications. The critic is accused of taking refuge in arrogant esoterica. It would be advisable first to indicate the double meaning of importance that slowly worms its way in unnoticed. Even if it touches the lives of innumerable people, the function of something is no guarantee of its particular quality. The blending of aesthetics with its residual communicative aspects leads art, as a social phenomenon, not to its rightful position in opposition to alleged artistic snobbism, but rather in a variety of ways to the defense of its baneful social consequences. The importance of the culture industry in the spiritual constitution of the masses is no dispensation for reflection on its objective legitimation, its essential being, least of all by a science which thinks itself pragmatic. On the contrary: such reflection becomes necessary precisely for this reason. To take the culture industry as seriously as its unquestioned role demands, means to take it seriously critically, and not to cower in the face of its monopolistic character.

Among those intellectuals anxious to reconcile themselves with the phenomenon and eager to find a common formula to express both their reservations against it and their respect for its power, a tone of ironic toleration prevails unless they have already created a new mythos of the twentieth century from the imposed regression. After all, those intellectuals maintain, everyone knows what pocket novels, films off the rack, family television shows rolled out into serials and hit parades, advice to the lovelorn and horoscope columns are all about. All of this, however, is harmless and, according to them, even democratic since it responds to a demand, albeit a stimulated one. It also bestows all kinds of blessings, they point out, for example, through the dissemination of information, advice and stress reducing patterns of behavior. Of course, as every sociological study measuring something as elementary as how politically informed the public is has proven, the information is meager or indifferent. Moreover, the advice to be gained from manifestations of the culture industry is vacuous, banal or worse, and the behavior patterns are shamelessly conformist.

The two-faced irony in the relationship of servile intellectuals to the culture industry is not restricted to them alone. It may also be supposed that the consciousness of the consumers themselves is split between the prescribed fun which is supplied to them by the culture industry and a not particularly well-hidden doubt about its blessings. The phrase, the world wants to be deceived, has become truer than had ever been intended. People are not only, as the saying goes, falling for the swindle; if it guarantees them even the most fleeting gratification they desire a deception which is nonetheless transparent to them. They force their eyes shut and voice approval, in a kind of self-loathing, for what is meted out to them, knowing fully the purpose for which it is manufactured. Without admitting it they sense that their lives would be completely intolerable as soon as they no longer clung to satisfactions which are none at all.

The most ambitious defense of the culture industry today celebrates its spirit, which might be safely called ideology, as an ordering factor. In a supposedly chaotic world it provides human beings with something like standards for orientation, and that alone seems worthy of approval. However, what its defenders imagine is preserved by the culture industry is in fact all the more thoroughly destroyed by it. The color film demolishes the genial old tavern to a greater extent than bombs ever could: the film exterminates its image. No homeland can survive being processed by the films which

celebrate it, and which thereby turn the unique character on which it thrives into an interchangeable sameness.

That which legitimately could be called culture attempted, as an expression of suffering and contradiction, to maintain a grasp on the idea of the good life. Culture cannot represent either that which merely exists or the conventional and no longer binding categories of order which the culture industry drapes over the idea of the good life as if existing reality were the good life, and as if those categories were its true measure. If the response of the culture industry's representatives is that it does not deliver art at all, this is itself the ideology with which they evade responsibility for that from which the business lives. No misdeed is ever righted by explaining it as such.

The appeal to order alone, without concrete specificity, is futile; the appeal to the dissemination of norms, without these ever proving themselves in reality or before consciousness, is equally futile. The idea of an objectively binding order, huckstered to people because it is so lacking for them, has no claim if it does not prove itself internally and in confrontation with human beings. But this is precisely what no product of the culture industry would engage in. The concepts of order which it hammers into human beings are always those of the status quo. They remain unquestioned, unanalyzed and undialectically presupposed, even if they no longer have any substance for those who accept them. In contrast to the Kantian, the categorical imperative of the culture industry no longer has anything in common with freedom. It proclaims: you shall conform, without instruction as to what; conform to that which exists anyway, and to that which everyone thinks anyway as a reflex of its power and omnipresence. The power of the culture industry's ideology is such that conformity has replaced consciousness. The order that springs from it is never confronted with what it claims to be or with the real interests of human beings. Order, however, is not good in itself. It would be so only as a good order. The fact that the culture industry is oblivious to this and extols order in abstracto, bears witness to the impotence and untruth of the messages it conveys. While it claims to lead the perplexed, it deludes them with false conflicts which they are to exchange for their own. It solves conflicts for them only in appearance, in a way that they can hardly be solved in their real lives. In the products of the culture industry human beings get into trouble only so that they can be rescued unharmed, usually by representatives of a benevolent collective; and then in empty harmony, they are reconciled with the general, whose demands they had experienced at the outset as irreconcilable with their interests. For this purpose the culture industry has developed formulas which even reach into such non-conceptual areas as light musical entertainment. Here too one gets into a 'jam', into rhythmic problems, which can be instantly disentangled by the triumph of the basic beat.

Even its defenders, however, would hardly contradict Plato openly who maintained that what is objectively and intrinsically untrue cannot also be subjectively good and true for human beings. The concoctions of the culture industry are neither guides for a blissful life, nor a new art of moral responsibility, but rather exhortations to toe the line, behind which stand the most powerful interests. The consensus which it propagates strengthens blind, opaque authority. If the culture industry is measured not by its own substance and logic, but by its efficacy, by its position in reality and its explicit pretensions; if the focus of serious concern is with the efficacy to which it always appeals, the potential of its effect becomes twice as weighty. This potential, however,

lies in the promotion and exploitation of the ego-weakness to which the powerless members of contemporary society, with its concentration of power, are condemned. Their consciousness is further developed retrogressively. It is no coincidence that cynical American film producers are heard to say that their pictures must take into consideration the level of eleven-year-olds. In doing so they would very much like to make adults into eleven-year-olds.

It is true that thorough research has not, for the time being, produced an airtight case proving the regressive effects of particular products of the culture industry. No doubt an imaginatively designed experiment could achieve this more successfully than the powerful financial interests concerned would find comfortable. In any case, it can be assumed without hesitation that steady drops hollow the stone, especially since the system of the culture industry that surrounds the masses tolerates hardly any deviation and incessantly drills the same formulas on behavior. Only their deep unconscious mistrust, the last residue of the difference between art and empirical reality in the spiritual make-up of the masses explains why they have not, to a person, long since perceived and accepted the world as it is constructed for them by the culture industry. Even if its messages were as harmless as they are made out to be - on countless occasions they are obviously not harmless, like the movies which chime in with currently popular hate campaigns against intellectuals by portraying them with the usual stereotypes - the attitudes which the culture industry calls forth are anything but harmless. If an astrologer urges his readers to drive carefully on a particular day, that certainly hurts no one; they will, however, be harmed indeed by the stupefaction which lies in the claim that advice which is valid every day and which is therefore idiotic, needs the approval of the stars.

Human dependence and servitude, the vanishing point of the culture industry, could scarcely be more faithfully described than by the American interviewee who was of the opinion that the dilemmas of the contemporary epoch would end if people would simply follow the lead of prominent personalities. In so far as the culture industry arouses a feeling of well-being that the world is precisely in that order suggested by the culture industry, the substitute gratification which it prepares for human beings cheats them out of the same happiness which it deceitfully projects. The total effect of the culture industry is one of anti-enlightenment, in which, as Horkheimer and I have noted, enlightenment, that is the progressive technical domination of nature, becomes mass deception and is turned into a means for fettering consciousness. It impedes the development of autonomous, independent individuals who judge and decide consciously for themselves. These, however, would be the precondition for a democratic society which needs adults who have come of age in order to sustain itself and develop. If the masses have been unjustly reviled from above as masses, the culture industry is not among the least responsible for making them into masses and then despising them, while obstructing the emancipation for which human beings are as ripe as the productive forces of the epoch permit.

---

BACK

Version 0.9 – May 1998.

Design and editing © 1998 Siegfried. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.



# Gödel's Theorem<sup>†</sup>

An HMTL Presentation by Siegfried

*Kurt Gödel (1906-1978)*



## Table of Contents

- I. [Meltzer's Preface](#)
- II. [Braithwaite's Introduction](#)
- III. [On Formally Undecidable Propositions](#)

## Note on Logical Systems

For those of you with an introduction to logic, formal mathematics or computer science, you will undoubtedly have heard of Kurt Gödel. The Austrian mathematician indelibly left his mark on 20th-century science and philosophy with his 1931 paper "**On Formally Undecidable Propositions Of Principia Mathematica And Related Systems**". His proof of the Undecidability Theorem, summarized and translated herein, is much spoken of but little read. My goal is to make this work available for personal and academic use to all who are interested. The author frequently refers to [\*Principia Mathematica\*](#) by Alfred North Whitehead and Bertrand Russell. The major contribution of *Principia Mathematica* is its notation and rules of inference, which can be grasped with a little effort.

Even if the reader has only had high-school Geometry or Algebra II, if persistent he or she should be able to make sense of the logical formulas in the proof. Every statement in logic can be represented by a letter: **A**, **B**, **C**, etc. A single statement **A** may be attached to a phrase such as "Socrates is a man". **A** when used in a formula represents the *truth-value* of the statement behind **A**. A statement may be determined true or false by observation - or it may also be deduced from an initial set of *axioms* within a system. *Theorems* are simply statements deduced from the initial axioms, or any theorems already proven.

The operators in logical notation are not very numerous:  $\sim$  is the *NOT* operator;  $\dot{\cup}$  is the *OR* operator (disjunction);  $\dot{\cup}$  or  $\&$  is the *AND* operator (conjunction);  $\overset{\circ}{\sim}$  means "equivalent to";  $\overset{\circ}{\supset}$  means "follows from" or "implies"; " $\forall \mathbf{x}$ " means "for all  $\mathbf{x}$ ";  $\exists \mathbf{x}$  means "there exists  $\mathbf{x}$  such that". Some elements from set theory are also used by the author:  $\dot{\subset}$  means "subset of" (subsethood);  $\dot{\in}$  means "element of" (membership). And finally, the author sometimes uses the operators  $\overset{\circ}{\supset}$  and  $\overset{\circ}{\supset}$  interchangeably.

Given below are examples of laws (or tautologies) in a 'consistent' system:

Double Negative:  $\sim(\sim\mathbf{A}) \overset{\circ}{\sim} \mathbf{A}$

Law of Noncontradiction:  $\sim(\mathbf{A} \dot{\cup} \sim\mathbf{A}) \overset{\circ}{\sim} \mathbf{TRUE}$

Law of Excluded Middle:  $\mathbf{A} \dot{\cup} \sim\mathbf{A} \overset{\circ}{\sim} \mathbf{TRUE}$

Also given is an a common rule of inference (termed by Gödel the 'immediate consequence of'):

*Modus Ponens*:  $(\mathbf{A} \dot{\cup} (\mathbf{A} \overset{\circ}{\supset} \mathbf{B})) \overset{\circ}{\supset} \mathbf{B}$

## Note on Typography

- You must have the Symbol Truetype font properly installed;
- And your internet connection must handle 8-bit transmissions properly --
- If you are using Navigator™ or Internet Explorer™, you should have no problems.

The actual proof is quite 'typographically complex' and I have formatted this document to utilize the Symbol Truetype font for the logical symbols needed to convey its meaning adequately. If the above logical statements are readable in your browser, then the proof will be also. I have made a tremendous effort to preserve the original look of the text in HTML format. All 'strings' and 'numerals' are in **bold** type, as the distinction is explicit in the [Introduction](#) and implicit in the context of [Gödel's paper](#). Every reference in the texts



has been replaced with a hyperlink to the appropriate location in the proof, if possible.

"The symbols Gödel uses for metamathematical concepts or their Gödel numbers are mainly abbreviations of German words. Although the concepts themselves are carefully defined in the text, the following alphabetical list of the more important of these symbols with their etymology may be helpful to the reader:

A	from 'Anzahl' = number
Aeq	from 'Aequivalenz' = equivalence
Ax	from 'Axiom' = axiom
B	from 'Beweis' = proof
Bew	from 'Beweisbar' = provable
Bw	from 'Beweisfigur' = proof-schema
Con	from 'Conjunktion' = conjunction
Dis	from 'Disjunktion' = disjunction
E	from 'Einklammern' = include in brackets
Elf	from 'Elementarformel' = elementary formula
Ex	from 'Existenz' = existence
Fl	from 'unmittelbare Folge' = immediate consequence
Flg	from 'Folgerungsmenge' = set of consequences
Form	from 'Formel' = formula
Fr	from 'frei' = free
FR	from 'Reihe von Formeln' = series of formulae
Geb	from 'gebunden' = bound
Gen	from 'Generalisation' = generalization
Gl	from 'Glied' = term
Imp	from 'Implikation' = implication
I	from 'Länge' = length
Neg	from 'Negation' = negation
Op	from 'Operation' = operation
Pr	from 'Primzahl' = prime number
Prim	from 'Primzahl' = prime number
R	from 'Zahlenreihe' = number series
Sb	from 'Substitution' = substitution
St	from 'Stelle' = place
Su	from 'Substitution' = substitution
Th	from 'Typenerhöhung' = type-lift
Typ	from 'Typ' = type
Var	from 'Variable' = variable
Wid	from 'Widerspruchsfreiheit' = consistency
Z	from 'Zahlzeichen' = number-sign

"The only way in which the translation deviates from Gödel's symbolism is that, from p. 57 onwards, **c** is used to stand for the class which Gödel denotes by **k**." - *Trans*.

## Conclusion

As you may have read in [\*Gödel, Escher, Bach\*](#) by Douglas Hofstadter, [\*The Emperor's New Mind\*](#) by Roger Penrose, or any number of other contemporary works, the conclusion of 'unprovability' that Gödel proves for a general arithmetic has broader consequences for humanity. One cannot reasonably expect a legal system, a set of physical laws, or a set of religious commandments to have the same rigor that characterizes a recursively enumerable arithmetic. Nevertheless, one can expect examples of logical statements (ex.: 'Is secession constitutional?') to arise that are neither provable, nor disprovable, within a complete logical framework.

Even more interesting, the reality of Platonic 'forms' - ideals contemplated by the human intellect - is questioned by some simple corollaries to Gödel's Theorem. His [Proposition XI](#) states that the consistency of any formal deductive system (if it is consistent) is neither provable nor disprovable within the system. A quick leap of logic interprets this corollary as such: 'Any sufficiently complex, consistent logical framework cannot be self-dependent' - i.e., it must rely on intuition, or some external confirmation of certain propositions (specifically, one that proves internal consistency).

I now leave to the interested reader the following exercise, attributed to Bertrand Russell<sup>‡</sup>:

You are trainee at a very formal library in London. Every book must be indexed in one of two giant catalogs. Catalog A contains the citation of every book that makes no reference to itself. Catalog B contains the citation of every book that does contain a reference to itself.

The elderly librarian, who is assigned to your group of trainees, now asks the group: "In which volume would you index catalog B?" A perceptive student suggests placing a reference for 'Catalog B' in volume A, since B does not make any reference to itself. The librarian asks again: "Then where would you index Catalog A?"

**SIEGFRIED**

---

† The copyright status of this work is indeterminate. Gödel's original German essay is in the public domain under U.S. Copyright laws. The copyright for the English translation and Braithwaite's Introduction may still be asserted, though there are no renewals on record at the [U.S. Copyright Office](#). Meltzer states in the Preface his desire to make this paper as widely read as possible, and I take this as license to distribute this electronic copy for personal and academic use (after all, this is an academic paper). A [paperbound volume](#) is available from Dover Publications (though they do not assert a copyright) and I encourage all who value this work to purchase a copy.

‡ His original paradox, or epistemological antinomy, is as follows:

**R** is the set of all sets which are not members of themselves.

Thus the statement: "Set **R** is a member of itself" is indeterminate.

---

BACK

Version 0.9 – April 1998.

Design and HTML Presentation © 1998 Siegfried. All rights reserved.



---

*On Formally Undecidable  
Propositions  
Of Principia Mathematica  
And Related Systems*

---

**KURT GÖDEL**

*Translated by*  
**B. MELTZER**

*Introduction by*  
**R. B. BRAITHWAITE**

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

Gödel, Kurt.

[Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme I. English]

On formally undecidable propositions of Principia Mathematica and related systems / Kurt Gödel; translated by B. Meltzer; introduction by R.B. Braithwaite.

Translation of a paper entitled Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme I, published 1931 in the Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik, v. 38, p. 173-198.

Reprint. Originally published: New York: Basic Books, c1962.

ISBN 0-486-66980-7 (pbk.)

1. Gödel's theorem. I. Title.

TO  
CHRISTOPHER FERNAU  
*in gratitude*

**PREFACE**

Kurt Gödel's astonishing discovery and proof, published in 1931, that even in elementary parts of arithmetic there exist propositions which cannot be proved or disproved within the system, is one of the most important contributions to logic since Aristotle. Any formal logical system which disposes of sufficient means to compass the addition and multiplication of positive integers and zero is subject to this limitation, so that one must consider this kind of incompleteness an inherent characteristic of formal mathematics as a whole, which was before this customarily considered *the* unequivocal intellectual discipline *par excellence*.

No English translation of [Gödel's paper](#), which occupied twenty-five pages of the *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik*, has been generally available, and even the original German text is not everywhere easily accessible. The argument, which used a notation adapted from that of Whitehead and Russell's *Principia Mathematica*, is a closely reasoned one and the present translation—besides being a long overdue act of piety—should make it more easily intelligible and much more widely read. In the former respect the reader will be greatly aided by the [Introduction](#) contributed by the Knightbridge Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Cambridge; for this is an excellent work of scholarship in its own right, not only pointing out the significance of Gödel's work, but illuminating it by a paraphrase of the major part of the whole great argument.

I proposed publishing a translation after a discussion meeting on "Gödel's Theorem and its bearing on the philosophy of science", held in 1959 by the Edinburgh Philosophy of Science Group. I wish to thank this society for providing the stimulus, the publishers for their ready co-operation on the proposal, and Professor Braithwaite not only for the [Introduction](#) but also for meticulous assistance in translation and proof-reading of a typographically intricate text. It may be noted here that the pagination of the original article is shown in the margins of the translation, while the footnotes retain their original numbers.

B. MELTZER

*University of Edinburgh*  
*January, 1962*

---

BACK

Design © 1998 Siegfried. All rights reserved.



[173]

**ON FORMALLY UNDECIDABLE PROPOSITIONS**

**OF PRINCIPIA MATHEMATICA AND RELATED**

**SYSTEMS [1](#)<sup>1</sup>**

*by Kurt Gödel, Vienna*

**1**

The development of mathematics in the direction of greater exactness has—as is well known—led to large tracts of it becoming formalized, so that proofs can be carried out according to a few mechanical rules. The most comprehensive formal systems yet set up are, on the one hand, the system of Principia Mathematica (**PM**)<sup>2</sup> and, on the other, the axiom system for set theory of

Zermelo-Fraenkel (later extended by J. v. Neumann).<sup>3</sup> These two systems are so extensive that all methods of proof used in mathematics today have been formalized in them, i.e. reduced to a few axioms and rules of inference. It may therefore be surmised that these axioms and rules of inference are also sufficient to decide *all* mathematical questions which can in any way at all be expressed formally in the systems concerned. It is shown below that this is not the case, and that in both the systems mentioned there are in fact relatively simple problems in the theory of ordinary whole numbers<sup>4</sup> which

[174]

cannot be decided from the axioms. This situation is not due in some way to the special nature of the systems set up, but holds for a very extensive class of formal systems, including, in particular, all those arising from the addition of a finite number of axioms to the two systems mentioned,<sup>5</sup> provided that thereby no false propositions of the kind described in footnote 4 become provable.

Before going into details, we shall first indicate the main lines of the proof, naturally without



laying claim to exactness. The formulae of a formal system—we restrict ourselves here to the system **PM**—are, looked at from outside, finite series of basic signs (variables, logical constants and brackets or separation points), and it is easy to state precisely just *which* series of basic signs are meaningful formulae and which are not.<sup>6</sup> Proofs, from the formal standpoint, are likewise nothing but finite series of formulae (with certain specifiable characteristics). For metamathematical purposes it is naturally immaterial what objects are taken as basic signs, and we propose to use natural numbers<sup>7</sup> for them. Accordingly, then, a formula is a finite series of natural numbers,<sup>8</sup> and a particular proof-schema is a finite series of finite series of natural numbers. Metamathematical concepts and propositions thereby become concepts and propositions concerning natural numbers, or series of them,<sup>9</sup> and therefore at least partially expressible in the symbols of the system **PM** itself. In particular, it can be shown that the concepts, "formula", "proof-schema", "provable formula" are definable in the system **PM**, i.e. one can give<sup>10</sup> a formula **F(v)** of **PM**—for example—with one free variable **v** (of the type of a series of numbers), such that **F(v)**—interpreted as to content—states: **v** is a provable formula. We now obtain an undecidable proposition of the

system **PM**, i.e. a proposition A, for which neither A nor *not-A* are provable, in the following

manner:

[175]

A formula of **PM** with just one free variable, and that of the type of the natural numbers (class of classes), we shall designate a **class-sign**. We think of the class-signs as being somehow arranged in a series,<sup>11</sup> and denote the **n**-th one by **R(n)**; and we note that the concept "class-sign" as well as the ordering relation **R** are definable in the system **PM**. Let a be any class-sign; by **[a; n]** we designate that formula which is derived on replacing the free variable in the class-sign a by the sign for the natural number **n**. The three-term relation **x = [y; z]** also proves to be definable in **PM**. We now define a class **K** of natural numbers, as follows:

$$n \hat{=} K \Leftrightarrow (\text{Bew } [R(n); n])^{11a} (1)$$

(where **Bew x** means: **x** is a provable formula). Since the concepts which appear in the definiens are all

definable in **PM**, so too is the concept **K** which is constituted from them, i.e. there is a class-sign S,<sup>12</sup> such

that the formula  $[S; n]$ —interpreted as to its content—states that the natural number  $n$  belongs to  $K$ .  $S$ , being a class-sign, is identical with some determinate  $R(q)$ , i.e.

$$S = R(q)$$

holds for some determinate natural number  $q$ . We now show that the proposition  $[R(q); q]$ <sup>13</sup> is undecidable in **PM**. For supposing the proposition  $[R(q); q]$  were provable, it would also be correct; but that means, as has been said, that  $q$  would belong to  $K$ , i.e. according to (1),  $\sim(\mathbf{Bew} [R(q); q])$  would hold good, in contradiction to our initial assumption. If, on the contrary, the negation of  $[R(q); q]$  were provable, then  $\sim(\mathbf{n} \hat{I} K)$ , i.e.  $\mathbf{Bew} [R(q); q]$  would hold good.  $[R(q); q]$  would thus be provable at the same time as its negation, which again is impossible.

The analogy between this result and Richard's antinomy leaps to the eye; there is also a close relationship with the "liar" antinomy,<sup>14</sup> since the undecidable proposition  $[R(q); q]$  states precisely that  $q$  belongs to  $K$ , i.e. according to (1), that  $[R(q); q]$  is not provable. We are therefore confronted with a proposition which asserts its own unprovability.<sup>15</sup> The method of proof just exhibited can clearly

be applied to every formal system having the following features: firstly, interpreted as to content, it disposes of sufficient means of expression to define the concepts occurring in the above argument (in particular the concept "provable formula"); secondly, every provable formula in it is also correct as regards content. The exact statement of the above proof, which now follows, will have among others the task of substituting for the second of these assumptions a purely formal and much weaker one.

From the remark that  $[R(q); q]$  asserts its own unprovability, it follows at once that  $[R(q); q]$  is correct, since  $[R(q); q]$  is certainly unprovable (because undecidable). So the proposition which is undecidable *in the system PM* yet turns out to be decided by metamathematical considerations. The close analysis of this remarkable circumstance leads to surprising results concerning proofs of consistency of formal systems, which are dealt with in more detail in Section 4 ([Proposition XI](#)).

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the summary of the results of this work, published in *Anzeiger der Akad. d. Wiss. in Wien* (math.-naturw. Kl.) 1930, No. 19.

<sup>2</sup> A. Whitehead and B. Russell, *Principia Mathematica*, 2nd edition, Cambridge 1925. In particular, we also reckon among the axioms of PM

the axiom of infinity (in the form: there exist denumerably many individuals), and the axioms of reducibility and of choice (for all types).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. A. Fraenkel, 'Zehn Vorlesungen über die Grundlegung der Mengenlehre', *Wissensch. u. Hyp.*, Vol. XXXI; J. v. Neumann, 'Die

Axiomatisierung der Mengenlehre', *Math. Zeitschr.* 27, 1928, *Journ. f. reine u. angew. Math.* 154 (1925), 160 (1929). We may note that in

order to complete the formalization, the axioms and rules of inference of the logical calculus must be added to the axioms of set-theory given

in the above-mentioned papers. The remarks that follow also apply to the formal systems presented in recent years by D. Hilbert and his

colleagues (so far as these have yet been published). Cf. D. Hilbert, *Math. Ann.* 88, *Abh. aus d. math. Sem. der Univ. Hamburg* I (1922), VI

(1928); P. Bernays, *Math. Ann.* 90; J. v. Neumann, *Math. Zeitschr.* 26 (1927); W. Ackermann, *Math. Ann.* 93.

<sup>4</sup> I.e., more precisely, there are undecidable propositions in which, besides the logical constants  $\sim$  (not),  $\dot{\cup}$  (or),  $(\mathbf{x})$  (for all) and  $=$  (identical

with), there are no other concepts beyond  $+$  (addition) and  $\cdot$  (multiplication), both referred to natural numbers, and where the prefixes  $(\mathbf{x})$  can

also refer only to natural numbers.

<sup>5</sup> In this connection, only such axioms in **PM** are counted as distinct as do not arise from each other purely by change of type.

<sup>6</sup> Here and in what follows, we shall always understand the term "formula of **PM**" to mean a formula written without abbreviations (i.e.

without use of definitions). Definitions serve only to abridge the written text and are therefore in principle superfluous.

<sup>7</sup> I.e. we map the basic signs in one-to-one fashion on the natural numbers (as is actually done on [179]).

<sup>8</sup> I.e. a covering of a section of the number series by natural numbers. (Numbers cannot in fact be put into a spatial order.)

<sup>9</sup> In other words, the above-described procedure provides an isomorphic image of the system **PM** in the domain of arithmetic, and all

metamathematical arguments can equally well be conducted in this isomorphic image. This occurs in the following outline proof, i.e.

"formula", "proposition", "variable", etc. **are always to be understood as the corresponding objects of the isomorphic image.**

<sup>10</sup> It would be very simple (though rather laborious) actually to write out this formula.

<sup>11</sup> Perhaps according to the increasing sums of their terms and, for equal sums, in alphabetical order.

<sup>11a</sup> The bar-sign indicates negation. [Replaced with ~.]

<sup>12</sup> Again there is not the slightest difficulty in actually writing out the formula **S**.

<sup>13</sup> Note that "**[R(q); q]**" (or—what comes to the same thing—"S; q") is merely a metamathematical description of the undecidable

proposition. But as soon as one has ascertained the formula **S**, one can naturally also determine the number **q**, and thereby effectively write

out the undecidable proposition itself.

<sup>14</sup> Every epistemological antinomy can likewise be used for a similar undecidability proof.

<sup>15</sup> In spite of appearances, there is nothing circular about such a proposition, since it begins by asserting the unprovability of a wholly determinate formula (namely the  $q$ -th in the alphabetical arrangement with a definite substitution), and only subsequently (and in some way by accident) does it emerge that this formula is precisely that by which the proposition was itself expressed.

---

## 2

We proceed now to the rigorous development of the proof sketched above, and begin by giving an exact description of the formal system  $\mathbf{P}$ , for which we seek to demonstrate the existence of undecidable propositions.  $\mathbf{P}$  is essentially the system obtained by superimposing on the Peano axioms the logic of  $\mathbf{PM}^{16}$  (numbers as individuals, relation of successor as undefined basic concept).

The basic signs of the system  $\mathbf{P}$  are the following:

I. Constants: " $\sim$ " (not), " $\dot{\cup}$ " (or), " $\forall$ " (for all), " $\mathbf{0}$ " (nought), " $'$ " (the successor of), " $($ ", " $)$ " (brackets).

II. Variables of first type (for individuals, i.e. natural numbers including 0): " $\mathbf{x}_1$ ", " $\mathbf{y}_1$ ", " $\mathbf{z}_1$ ", ...

Variables of second type (for classes of individuals): " $\mathbf{x}_2$ ", " $\mathbf{y}_2$ ", " $\mathbf{z}_2$ ", ...

Variables of third type (for classes of classes of individuals): " $\mathbf{x}_3$ ", " $\mathbf{y}_3$ ", " $\mathbf{z}_3$ ", ...

and so on for every natural number as type.<sup>17</sup>

Note: Variables for two-termed and many-termed functions (relations) are superfluous as basic signs,

since relations can be defined as classes of ordered pairs and ordered pairs again as classes of classes, e.g.

the ordered pair  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}$  by  $((\mathbf{a}), (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}))$ , where  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  means the class whose only elements are  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$ , and  $(\mathbf{x})$  the

class whose only element is  $\mathbf{x}$ .<sup>18</sup>

[177]

By a **sign of first type** we understand a combination of signs of the form:



$a, |a, ||a, |||a \dots$  etc.

where  $a$  is either 0 or a variable of first type. In the former case we call such a sign a **number-sign**. For  $n > 1$  we understand by a **sign of n-th type** the same as **variable of n-th type**. Combinations of signs of the form  $a(b)$ , where  $b$  is a sign of  $n$ -th and  $a$  a sign of  $(n+1)$ -th type, we call **elementary formulae**. The class of **formulae** we define as the smallest class<sup>19</sup> containing all elementary formulae and, also, along with any  $a$  and  $b$  the following:  $\sim(a)$ ,  $(a)\acute{U}(b)$ ,  $x" (a)$  (where  $x$  is any given variable).<sup>18a</sup> We term  $(a)\acute{U}(b)$  the **disjunction** of  $a$  and  $b$ ,  $\sim(a)$  the **negation** and  $(a)\acute{U}(b)$  a generalization of  $a$ . A formula in which there is no free variable is called a **propositional formula** (**free variable** being defined in the usual way). A formula with just  $n$  free individual variables (and otherwise no free variables) we call an **n-place relation-sign** and for  $n = 1$  also a **class-sign**.

By **Subst  $a(v|b)$**  (where  $a$  stands for a formula,  $v$  a variable and  $b$  a sign of the same type as  $v$ ) we understand the formula derived from  $a$ , when we replace  $v$  in it, wherever it is free, by  $b$ .<sup>20</sup> We say that a formula  $a$  is a **type-lift** of another one  $b$ , if  $a$  derives from  $b$ , when we increase by the same amount the type

of all variables appearing in **b**.

The following formulae (I-V) are called **axioms** (they are set out with the help of the customarily defined abbreviations:  $\cdot$ ,  $\dot{\exists}$ ,  $\dot{\forall}(\mathbf{Sx})$ ,  $\dot{=}$ ,<sup>21</sup> and subject to the usual conventions about omission of brackets)<sup>22</sup>:

I.

$$1. \sim(\dot{\exists} \mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{0})$$

$$2. \dot{\exists} \mathbf{x}_1 = \dot{\exists} \mathbf{y}_1 \dot{\exists} \mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{y}_1$$

$$3. \mathbf{x}_2(\mathbf{0}) \cdot \mathbf{x}_1 \dot{=} (\mathbf{x}_2(\mathbf{x}_1) \dot{\exists} \mathbf{x}_2(\mathbf{f}\mathbf{x}_1)) \dot{\exists} \mathbf{x}_1 \dot{=} (\mathbf{x}_2(\mathbf{x}_1))$$

[178]

II. Every formula derived from the following schemata by substitution of any formulae for **p**, **q** and **r**.

$$1. \mathbf{p} \dot{\cup} \mathbf{p} \dot{\exists} \mathbf{p}$$

$$2. \mathbf{p} \dot{\exists} \mathbf{p} \dot{\cup} \mathbf{q}$$

$$3. \mathbf{p} \dot{\cup} \mathbf{q} \dot{\exists} \mathbf{q} \dot{\cup} \mathbf{p}$$

$$4. (p \dot{\equiv} q) \dot{\equiv} (r \dot{\cup} p \dot{\equiv} r \dot{\cup} q)$$

III. Every formula derived from the two schemata

$$1. v \text{ " } (a) \dot{\cup} \text{Subst } a(v|c)$$

$$2. v \text{ " } (b \dot{\equiv} a) \dot{\cup} b \dot{\equiv} v \text{ " } (a)$$

by making the following substitutions for **a**, **v**, **b**, **c** (and carrying out in I the operation denoted by "**Subst**"):

for **a** any given formula, for **v** any variable, for **b** any formula in which **v** does not appear free, for **c** a sign

of the same type as **v**, provided that **c** contains no variable which is bound in **a** at a place where **v** is free.<sup>23</sup>

IV. Every formula derived from the schema

$$1. (\dot{\exists}u)(v \text{ " } (u(v) \dot{\mathfrak{A}}))$$

on substituting for **v** or **u** any variables of types  $n$  or  $n + 1$  respectively, and for **a** a formula which does not

contain **u** free. This axiom represents the axiom of reducibility (the axiom of comprehension of set theory).

V. Every formula derived from the following by type-lift (and this formula itself):

$$1. x_1 \in (x_2(x_1) \supset y_2(x_1)) \cup x_2 = y_2.$$

This axiom states that a class is completely determined by its elements.

A formula **c** is called an **immediate consequence** of **a** and **b**, if **a** is the formula  $(\sim(\mathbf{b})) \supset (\mathbf{c})$ , and an **immediate consequence** of **a**, if **c** is the formula  $\forall \mathbf{v} (\mathbf{a})$ , where **v** denotes any given variable. The class of **provable formulae** is defined as the smallest class of formulae which contains the axioms and is closed with respect to the relation "immediate consequence of".<sup>24</sup>

The basic signs of the system **P** are now ordered in one-to-one correspondence with natural numbers, as follows:

[179]

"0"...1

"|"...3

"~"...5

"Ú" ...7

" " " ...9

"(" ...11

")" ...13

Furthermore, variables of type  $\mathbf{n}$  are given numbers of the form  $\mathbf{p}^{\mathbf{n}}$  (where  $\mathbf{p}$  is a prime number  $> 13$ ).

Hence, to every finite series of basic signs (and so also to every formula) there corresponds, one-to-one, a finite series of natural numbers. These finite series of natural numbers we now map (again in one-to-one correspondence) on to natural numbers, by letting the number  $2^{\mathbf{n}_1}, 3^{\mathbf{n}_2} \dots \mathbf{p}_k^{\mathbf{n}_k}$  correspond to the series  $\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \dots, \mathbf{n}_k$ , where  $\mathbf{p}_k$  denotes the  $k$ -th prime number in order of magnitude. A natural number is thereby assigned in one-to-one correspondence, not only to every basic sign, but also to every finite series of such signs. We denote by  $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{a})$  the number corresponding to the basic sign or series of basic signs  $\mathbf{a}$ . Suppose now one is given a class or relation  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n)$  of basic signs or series of such. We assign to it that class (or relation)  $\mathbf{R}'(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)$  of natural numbers, which holds for  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$  when and only when there

exist  $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$  such that  $\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{a}_i)$  ( $i=1,2,\dots,n$ ) and  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n)$  holds. We represent by the same words in italics those classes and relations of natural numbers which have been assigned in this fashion to such previously defined metamathematical concepts as "variable", "formula", "propositional formula", "axiom", "provable formula", etc. The proposition that there are undecidable problems in the system  $\mathbf{P}$  would therefore read, for example, as follows: There exist *propositional formulae*  $\mathbf{a}$  such that neither  $\mathbf{a}$  nor the *negation* of  $\mathbf{a}$  are provable formulae.

We now introduce a parenthetic consideration having no immediate connection with the formal system  $\mathbf{P}$ , and first put forward the following definition: A number-theoretic function<sup>25</sup>  $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)$  is said to be **recursively defined** by the number-theoretic functions  $\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{n-1})$  and  $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{n+1})$ , if for all  $\mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ ,  $\mathbf{k}$ <sup>26</sup> the following hold:

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n) = \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)$$

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{k}+1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n) = \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n), \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n). \quad (2)$$

A number-theoretic function  $\mathbf{f}$  is called recursive, if there exists a finite series of number-theoretic

functions  $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n$  which ends in  $f$  and has the property that every function  $f_k$  of the series is either recursively defined

[180]

by two of the earlier ones, or is derived from any of the earlier ones by substitution,<sup>27</sup> or, finally, is a constant or the successor function  $x+1$ . The length of the shortest series of  $f_i$ , which belongs to a recursive function  $f$ , is termed its **degree**. A relation  $R(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  among natural numbers is called recursive,<sup>28</sup> if there exists a recursive function  $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  such that for all  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$

$$R(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \iff f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = 0 \quad \text{[29]}$$

The following propositions hold:

I. *Every function (or relation) derived from recursive functions (or relations) by the substitution of recursive functions in place of variables is recursive; so also is every function derived from recursive functions by recursive definition according to schema (2).*

II. If  $\mathbf{R}$  and  $\mathbf{S}$  are recursive relations, then so also are  $\sim\mathbf{R}$ ,  $\mathbf{R} \dot{\cup} \mathbf{S}$  (and therefore also  $\mathbf{R} \& \mathbf{S}$ ).

III. If the functions  $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{c})$  and  $\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{h})$  are recursive, so also is the relation:  $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{c}) = \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{h})$ .<sup>30</sup>

IV. If the function  $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{c})$  and the relation  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h})$  are recursive, so also then are the relations  $\mathbf{S}$ ,  $\mathbf{T}$

$$\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{h}) \sim (\exists \mathbf{x})[\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{c}) \& \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h})]$$

$$\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{h}) \sim (\mathbf{x})[\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{c}) \supset \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h})]$$

and likewise the function  $\mathbf{y}$

$$\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{h}) = \mathbf{ex} [\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{c}) \& \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h})]$$

where  $\mathbf{ex} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})$  means: the smallest number  $\mathbf{x}$  for which  $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})$  holds and 0 if there is no such number.

Proposition I follows immediately from the definition of "recursive". Propositions II and III are

based on the readily ascertainable fact that the number-theoretic functions corresponding to the logical

concepts  $\sim$ ,  $\dot{\cup}$ ,  $=$



$$a(x), b(x,y), g(x,y)$$

namely

$$a(0) = 1; a(x) = 0 \text{ for } x \neq 0$$

$$b(0,x) = b(x,0) = 0; b(x,y) = 1, \text{ if } x, y \text{ both } \neq 0$$

[181]

$$g(x,y) = 0, \text{ if } x = y; g(x,y) = 1, \text{ if } x \neq y$$

are recursive. The proof of Proposition IV is briefly as follows: According to the assumption there exists a

recursive  $r(x,h)$  such that

$$R(x,h) \equiv [r(x,h) = 0].$$

We now define, according to the recursion schema (2), a function  $X(x,\eta)$  in the following manner:

$$C(0,h) = 0$$

$$C(\mathbf{n}+1, \mathbf{h}) = (\mathbf{n}+1) \cdot \mathbf{a} + C(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{h}) \cdot \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{a})^{31}$$

where

$$\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}[\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{h}))] \cdot \mathbf{a}[\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{n}+1, \mathbf{h})] \cdot \mathbf{a}[C(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{h})].$$

$C(\mathbf{n}+1, \mathbf{h})$  is therefore either =  $\mathbf{n}+1$  (if  $\mathbf{a} = 1$ ) or =  $C(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{h})$  (if  $\mathbf{a} = 0$ ).<sup>32</sup> The first case clearly arises if

and only if all the constituent factors of  $\mathbf{a}$  are 1, i.e. if

$$\sim \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{h}) \ \& \ \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{n}+1, \mathbf{h}) \ \& \ [C(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{h}) = \mathbf{0}].$$

From this it follows that the function  $C(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{h})$  (considered as a function of  $\mathbf{n}$ ) remains 0 up to the smallest value of  $\mathbf{n}$  for which  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{h})$  holds, and from then on is equal to this value (if  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{h})$  is already the case, the corresponding  $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h})$  is constant and = 0). Therefore:

$$\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{h}) = C(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{c}), \mathbf{h})$$

$$\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{h}) \ \mathfrak{R}[\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{h}), \mathbf{h}]$$

The relation  $\mathbf{T}$  can be reduced by negation to a case analogous to  $\mathbf{S}$ , so that Proposition IV is proved.

The functions  $x+y$ ,  $x \cdot y$ ,  $x^y$ , and also the relations  $x < y$ ,  $x = y$  are readily found to be recursive; starting from these concepts, we now define a series of functions (and relations) 1-45, of which each is defined from the earlier ones by means of the operations named in Propositions I to IV. This procedure, generally speaking, puts together many of the definition steps permitted by Propositions I to IV. Each of the functions (relations) 1-45, containing, for example, the concepts "*formula*", "*axiom*", and "*immediate consequence*", is therefore recursive.

[182]

1.

$x/y \text{ } \exists(z)[z \text{ } \wedge \text{ } x \text{ } \& \text{ } x = y \cdot z]$ <sup>33</sup>

$x$  is divisible by  $y$ .<sup>34</sup>

2.

$\text{Prim}(x) \Leftrightarrow (\exists z)[z \mid x \wedge z \neq 1 \wedge z \neq x \wedge x/z \wedge x > 1]$

$x$  is a prime number.

3.

$\exists \text{Pr } x \exists \emptyset$

$(n+1) \text{ Pr } x \exists y [y \mid x \wedge \text{Prim}(y) \wedge x/y \wedge y > n \text{ Pr } x]$

$n \text{ Pr } x$  is the  $n$ -th (in order of magnitude) prime number contained in  $x$ .[34a](#)

4.

$\exists! \mathfrak{P}$

$(n+1)! \mathfrak{P}(n+1).n!$

5.

$\text{Pr}(0) = 0$

$\text{Pr}(n+1) = \min\{y \in \mathbb{N} \mid \{Pr(n)\}! + 1 \text{ \& Prim}(y) \text{ \& } y > \text{Pr}(n)\}$

$\text{Pr}(n)$  is the  $n$ -th prime number (in order of magnitude).

6.

$n \text{ Gl } x = \min\{y \in \mathbb{N} \mid y \leq x \text{ \& } x/(n \text{ Pr } x)^y \text{ \& not } x/(n \text{ Pr } x)^{y+1}\}$

$n \text{ Gl } x$  is the  $n$ -th term of the series of numbers assigned to the number  $x$  (for  $n > 0$  and  $n$  not greater than the length of this series).

7.

$l(x) = \min\{y \in \mathbb{N} \mid y \leq x \text{ \& } y \text{ Pr } x > 0 \text{ \& } (y+1) \text{ Pr } x = 0\}$

$l(x)$  is the length of the series of numbers assigned to  $x$ .

8.

$x * y \Leftrightarrow [z \in \{l(x)+l(y)\}^{x+y} \ \& \ (n)[n \in l(x) \Leftrightarrow n \in l(x)]] \ \&$

$(n)[0 < n \in l(y) \Leftrightarrow \{n+l(x)\} \in l(y)]$

$x * y$  corresponds to the operation of "joining together" two finite series of numbers.

9.

$R(x) \Leftrightarrow x$

$R(x)$  corresponds to the number-series consisting only of the number  $x$  (for  $x > 0$ ).

10.

$E(x) \Leftrightarrow R(11) * x * R(13)$

$E(x)$  corresponds to the operation of "bracketing" [11 and 13 are assigned to the basic signs "(" and ")"].

11.

$\forall x \exists z [13 < z \wedge \text{Prim}(z) \wedge x = z^n] \wedge n \neq 0$

$x$  is a variable of  $n$ -th type.

12.

$\forall x \exists n [n \wedge x \wedge \forall x]$

$x$  is a variable.

13.

$\text{Neg}(x) \text{R}(5) * E(x)$

**Neg(x)** is the *negation* of **x**.

[183]

14.

**x Dis y**  $\mathfrak{E}(x) * \mathbf{R}(7) * \mathfrak{E}(y)$

**x Dis y** is the *disjunction* of **x** and **y**.

15.

**x Gen y**  $\mathfrak{R}(x) * \mathbf{R}(9) * \mathfrak{E}(y)$

**x Gen y** is the *generalization* of **y** by means of the *variable x* (assuming **x** is a *variable*).

16.



$0 \mathbb{N} \times \mathfrak{R}$

$(n+1) \mathbb{N} \times \mathfrak{R}(3) * n \mathbb{N} \times$

$n \mathbb{N} \times$  corresponds to the operation: " $n$ -fold prefixing of the sign ' $'$ ' before  $x$ ."

17.

$Z(n) \mathfrak{h} \mathbb{N} [\mathfrak{R}(1)]$

$Z(n)$  is the *number-sign* for the number  $n$ .

18.

$\text{Typ}_1'(x) \mathfrak{S}(m,n)\{m,n \in \mathfrak{R} \ \& \ [m = 1 \cup 1 \text{ Var } m] \ \& \ x = n \mathbb{N} [\mathfrak{R}(m)]\}$ <sup>34b</sup>

$x$  is a *sign of first type*.

19.

$\text{Typ}_n(x) \text{ } \varphi [n = 1 \ \& \ \text{Typ}_1'(x)] \ \dot{\cup} \ [n > 1 \ \& \ (\$v)\{v \ \text{f} \ x \ \& \ n \ \text{Var} \ v \ \& \ x = \mathbf{R}(v)\}]$

$x$  is a *sign of  $n$ -th type*.

20.

$\text{Elf}(x) \ \varphi (\$y,z,n)[y,z,n \ \text{f} \ x \ \& \ \text{Typ}_n(y) \ \& \ \text{Typ}_{n+1}(z) \ \& \ x = z * \mathbf{E}(y)]$

$x$  is an *elementary formula*.

21.

$\text{Op}(x,y,z) \ \varphi x = \text{Neg}(y) \ \dot{\cup} \ x = y \ \text{Dis} \ z \ \dot{\cup} \ (\$v)[v \ \text{f} \ x \ \& \ \text{Var}(v) \ \& \ x = v \ \text{Gen} \ y]$

22.

$\text{FR}(x) \ \varphi (n)\{0 < n \ \text{f} \ \mathbf{l}(x) \ \textcircled{R} \ \text{Elf}(n \ \text{Gl} \ x) \ \dot{\cup} \ (\$p,q)[0 < p,q < n \ \& \ \text{Op}(n \ \text{Gl} \ x,p \ \text{Gl} \ x,q \ \text{Gl} \ x)]\} \ \& \ \mathbf{l}(x) > 0$

$x$  is a series of *formulae* of which each is either an *elementary formula* or arises from those preceding by the operations of *negation*, *disjunction* and *generalization*.

23.

$\text{Form}(x) \iff \exists n \{ n \in \mathbb{N} \wedge (\text{Pr}[l(x)^2] \wedge \text{FR}(n) \wedge x = [l(n)] \text{Gl } n) \}$ <sup>35</sup>

$x$  is a *formula* (i.e. last term of a *series of formulae*).

24.

$\forall \text{Gen } n, x \ \forall \text{Var}(v) \ \& \ \text{Form}(x) \ \& \ (\exists a, b, c) [a, b, c \in x \ \& \ x = a * (v \text{ Gen } b) * c$

$\& \ \text{Form}(b) \ \& \ l(a)+1 \in n \ \& \ l(a)+l(v \text{ Gen } b)]$

The *variable*  $v$  is *bound* at the  $n$ -th place in  $x$ .

[184]

25.

$\forall \text{Fr } n, x \forall \text{Var}(v) \& \text{Form}(x) \& v = n \text{ Gl } x \& n \in \text{l}(x) \& \text{not}(v \text{ Geb } n, x)$

The *variable* *is free* at the *n*-th place in *x*.

26.

$\forall \text{Fr } x \exists n [n \in \text{l}(x) \& v \text{ Fr } n, x]$

*v* occurs in *x* as a *free variable*.

27.

$\exists u \text{ x}(n|y) \exists z \{z \in [\text{Pr}(\text{l}(x)+\text{l}(y))]^{x+y} \&$

$[(\exists u, v) u, v \in x \& x = u * \text{R}(b \text{ Gl } x) * v \& z = u * y * v \& n = \text{l}(u)+1]\}$

**Su**  $x(n|y)$  derives from  $x$  on substituting  $y$  in place of the  $n$ -th term of  $x$  (it being assumed that

$$0 < n \leq l(x).$$

28.

$$0 \text{ St } v, x \Leftrightarrow \{n \leq l(x) \ \& \ v \text{ Fr } n, x \ \& \ \text{not } (\exists p)[n < p \leq l(x) \ \& \ v \text{ Fr } p, x]\}$$

$$(k+1) \text{ St } v, x \Leftrightarrow \{n < k \text{ St } v, x \ \& \ v \text{ Fr } n, x \ \& \ (\exists p)[n < p < k \text{ St } v, x \ \& \ v \text{ Fr } p, x]\}$$

$k \text{ St } v, x$  is the  $(k+1)$ -th place in  $x$  (numbering from the end of *formula*  $x$ ) at which  $v$  is free in  $x$  (and 0,

if there is no such place.)

29.

$$A(v, x) \Leftrightarrow \{n \leq l(x) \ \& \ n \text{ St } v = 0\}$$

$A(v, x)$  is the number of places at which  $v$  is *free* in  $x$ .

30.

$\mathbf{Sb}_0(x \ v|y) \ \&$

$\mathbf{Sb}_{k+1}(x \ v|y) \ \&\mathbf{Su}[\mathbf{Sb}_k(x \ v|y)][(k \ \text{St} \ v, \ x)|y]$

31.

$\mathbf{Sb}(x \ v|y) \ \&\mathbf{Sb}_{\Lambda(v,x)}(x \ v|y)$ <sup>36</sup>

$\mathbf{Sb}(x \ v|y)$  is the concept  $\mathbf{Subst} \ a(v|b)$ , defined above.<sup>37</sup>

32.

$x \ \mathbf{Imp} \ y \ \&[\mathbf{Neg}(x)] \ \mathbf{Dis} \ y$

$x \ \mathbf{Con} \ y \ \&\mathbf{Neg}\{[\mathbf{Neg}(x)] \ \mathbf{Dis} \ [\mathbf{Neg}(y)]\}$

$x \ \mathbf{Aeq} \ y \ \&(x \ \mathbf{Imp} \ y) \ \mathbf{Con} \ (y \ \mathbf{Imp} \ x)$

$\forall x \exists y \neg \text{Gen}[\text{Neg}(y)]$

33.

$\forall n \exists x \{ \exists y (x^{(n)} \& (k) \exists l(x) \otimes (k \text{ Gl } x \text{ f } 13 \& k \text{ Gl } y = k \text{ Gl } x) \dot{\cup}$

$(k \text{ Gl } x > 13 \& k \text{ Gl } y = k \text{ Gl } x.[1 \text{ Pr}(k \text{ Gl } x)]^n) \}$

$\forall n \exists x$  is the  $n$ -th *type-lift* of  $x$  (in the case when  $x$  and  $\forall n \exists x$  are formulae).

To the [axioms I](#), 1 to 3, there correspond three determinate numbers, which we denote by  $z_1, z_2, z_3$ ,

and we define:

34.

$Z \text{--} \text{Ax}(x) \text{ } \forall (x = z_1 \dot{\cup} x = z_2 \dot{\cup} x = z_3)$

[185]

35.

$A_1\text{-Ax}(x) \text{ } \forall (Sy)[y \text{ } \in \text{ } x \text{ } \& \text{ } \text{Form}(y) \text{ } \& \text{ } x = (y \text{ } \text{Dis } y) \text{ } \text{Imp } y]$

$x$  is a *formula* derived by substitution in the [axiom-schema II, 1](#). Similarly  $A_2\text{-Ax}$ ,  $A_3\text{-Ax}$ ,  $A_4\text{-Ax}$  are

defined in accordance with the axioms II, 2 to 4.

36.

$A\text{-Ax}(x) \text{ } \forall A_1\text{-Ax}(x) \text{ } \dot{\cup} \text{ } A_2\text{-Ax}(x) \text{ } \dot{\cup} \text{ } A_3\text{-Ax}(x) \text{ } \dot{\cup} \text{ } A_4\text{-Ax}(x)$

$x$  is a *formula* derived by substitution in an axiom of the sentential calculus.

37.

$Q(z,y,v) \text{ } \forall (\$n,m,w)[n \text{ } \in \text{ } l(y) \text{ } \& \text{ } m \text{ } \in \text{ } l(z) \text{ } \& \text{ } w \text{ } \in \text{ } z \text{ } \& \text{ } w = m \text{ } \text{Gl } x \text{ } \& \text{ } w \text{ } \text{Geb } n,y \text{ } \& \text{ } v \text{ } \text{Fr } n,y]$

$z$  contains no *variable bound* in  $y$  at a position where  $v$  is *free*.



38.

$L_1\text{-Ax}(x) \{ \exists v, y, z, n \{ v, y, z, n \in x \ \& \ n \text{ Var } v \ \& \ \text{Typ}_n(z) \ \&$

$\text{Form}(y) \ \& \ Q(z, y, v) \ \& \ x = (v \text{ Gen } y) \text{ Imp } [\text{Sb}(v|z)] \}$

$x$  is a *formula* derived from the [axiom-schema III, 1](#) by substitution.

39.

$L_2\text{-Ax}(x) \{ \exists v, q, p \{ v, q, p \in x \ \& \ \text{Var}(v) \ \& \ \text{Form}(p) \ \& \ v \text{ Fr } p \ \& \ \text{Form}(q) \ \&$

$x = [v \text{ Gen } (p \text{ Dis } q)] \text{ Imp } [p \text{ Dis } (v \text{ Gen } q)] \}$

$x$  is a *formula* derived from the [axiom-schema III, 2](#) by substitution.

40.

$R\text{-Ax}(x) \{ \exists u, v, y, n \{ u, v, y, n \in x \ \& \ n \text{ Var } v \ \& \ (n+1) \text{ Var } u \ \& \ u \text{ Fr } y \ \& \ \text{Form}(y) \ \&$

$$x = u \text{ } \{v \text{ Gen } [[R(u)*E(R(v))] \text{ Aeq } y]]\}$$

$x$  is a *formula* derived from the [axiom-schema IV, 1](#) by substitution.

To the [axiom V, 1](#) there corresponds a determinate number  $z_4$  and we define:

41.

$$M-Ax(x) \text{ } \{ \{n\} [n \text{ } \& \text{ } x = n \text{ Th } z_4] \}$$

42.

$$Ax(x) \text{ } \{ Z-Ax(x) \text{ } \dot{\cup} \text{ } A-Ax(x) \text{ } \dot{\cup} \text{ } L_1-Ax(x) \text{ } \dot{\cup} \text{ } L_2-Ax(x) \text{ } \dot{\cup} \text{ } R-Ax(x) \text{ } \dot{\cup} \text{ } M-Ax(x) \}$$

$x$  is an *axiom*.

43.

$$F1(x \text{ } y \text{ } z) \text{ } \{ y = z \text{ Imp } x \text{ } \dot{\cup} \text{ } (\$v)[v \text{ } \& \text{ } \text{Var}(v) \text{ } \& \text{ } x = v \text{ Gen } y] \}$$

$x$  is an immediate consequence of  $y$  and  $z$ .

[186]

44.

$\mathbf{Bw(x) \ \forall n \{0 < n \leq l(x) \ \& \ \bigwedge Ax(n \ Gl \ x) \ \dot{\cup} \ (\exists p,q) [0 < p,q < n \ \& \ \bigwedge Fl(n \ Gl \ x, p \ Gl \ x, q \ Cl \ x)]\} \ \& \ l(x) > 0}$

$x$  is a *proof-schema* (a finite series of *formulae*, of which each is either an *axiom* or an *immediate consequence* of two previous ones).

45.

$\mathbf{x \ B \ y \ \mathbf{B}w(x) \ \& \ [l(x)] \ Gl \ x = y}$

$x$  is a *proof* of the *formulay*.

46.

$$\mathbf{Bew}(x) = (\mathbf{E}y)y \mathbf{B} x$$

$x$  is a *provable formula*. [ $\mathbf{Bew}(x)$  is the only one of the concepts 1-46 of which it cannot be asserted that it is recursive.]

The following proposition is an exact expression of a fact which can be vaguely formulated in this way: every recursive relation is definable in the system  $\mathbf{P}$  (interpreted as to content), regardless of what interpretation is given to the formulae of  $\mathbf{P}$ :

**Proposition V:** To every recursive relation  $\mathbf{R}(x_1 \dots x_n)$  there corresponds an  $n$ -place *relation-sign*  $\mathbf{r}$

(with the *free variables*<sup>38</sup>  $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n$ ) such that for every  $n$ -tuple of numbers  $(x_1 \dots x_n)$  the following

hold:

$$\mathbf{R}(x_1 \dots x_n) \text{ ® } \mathbf{Bew}\{\mathbf{Sb}[\mathbf{r}(u_1 \dots u_n)](\mathbf{Z}(x_1) \dots \mathbf{Z}(x_n))\} \text{ (3)}$$

$$\sim \mathbf{R}(x_1 \dots x_n) \text{ ® Bew}\{\text{Neg Sb}[r(u_1 \dots u_n)|(Z(x_1) \dots Z(x_n))]\} \text{ (4)}$$

We content ourselves here with indicating the proof of this proposition in outline, since it offers no difficulties of principle and is somewhat involved.<sup>39</sup> We prove the proposition for all relations  $\mathbf{R}(x_1 \dots x_n)$  of the form:  $x_1 = \mathbf{f}(x_2 \dots x_n)$ <sup>40</sup> (where  $\mathbf{f}$  is a recursive function) and apply mathematical induction on the degree of  $\mathbf{f}$ . For functions of the first degree (i.e. constants and the function  $x+1$ ) the proposition is trivial. Let  $\mathbf{f}$  then be of degree  $m$ . It derives from functions of lower degree  $\mathbf{f}_1 \dots \mathbf{f}_k$  by the operations of substitution or recursive definition. Since, by the inductive assumption, everything is already proved for  $\mathbf{f}_1 \dots \mathbf{f}_k$ , there exist corresponding *relation-signs*  $\mathbf{r}_1 \dots \mathbf{r}_k$  such that (3) and (4) hold. The processes of definition whereby  $\mathbf{f}$  is derived from  $\mathbf{f}_1 \dots \mathbf{f}_k$  (substitution and re-

[187]

cursive definition) can all be formally mapped in the system  $\mathbf{P}$ . If this is done, we obtain from  $\mathbf{r}_1 \dots \mathbf{r}_k$  a new *relation-sign*<sup>41</sup>, for which we can readily prove the validity of (3) and (4) by use of the inductive assumption. A *relation-sign*, assigned in this fashion to a recursive relation,<sup>42</sup> will be called recursive.

We now come to the object of our exercises:

Let  $\mathbf{c}$  be any class of *formulae*. We denote by  $\mathbf{Flg}(\mathbf{c})$  (set of consequences of  $\mathbf{c}$ ) the smallest set of *formulae*

which contains all the *formulae* of  $\mathbf{c}$  and all *axioms*, and which is closed with respect to the relation

"*immediate consequence of*".  $\mathbf{c}$  is termed  $\omega$ -consistent, if there is no *class-sign*  $\mathbf{a}$  such that:

$$(\mathbf{n})[\mathbf{Sb}(\mathbf{a} \ \mathbf{v} | \mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{n})) \hat{\mathbf{I}} \ \mathbf{Flg}(\mathbf{c})] \ \& \ [\mathbf{Neg}(\mathbf{v} \ \mathbf{Gen} \ \mathbf{a})] \hat{\mathbf{I}} \ \mathbf{Flg}(\mathbf{c})$$

where  $\mathbf{v}$  is the *free variable* of the *class-sign*  $\mathbf{a}$ .

Every  $\omega$ -consistent system is naturally also consistent. The converse, however, is not the case, as will be shown later.

The general result as to the existence of undecidable propositions reads:

**Proposition VI:** To every  $\omega$ -consistent recursive class  $\mathbf{c}$  of *formulae* there correspond recursive *class-signs*  $\mathbf{r}$ , such that neither  $\mathbf{v} \ \mathbf{Gen} \ \mathbf{r}$  nor  $\mathbf{Neg}(\mathbf{v} \ \mathbf{Gen} \ \mathbf{r})$  belongs to  $\mathbf{Flg}(\mathbf{c})$  (where  $\mathbf{v}$  is the *free variable* of  $\mathbf{r}$ ).

Proof: Let  $\mathbf{c}$  be any given recursive  $\omega$ -consistent class of *formulae*. We define:

$$\mathbf{B}w_c(\mathbf{x}) \text{ ?}(\mathbf{n})[\mathbf{n} \text{ } \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{x}) \text{ } \mathbb{R} \text{ } \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{n} \text{ } \mathbf{G}\mathbf{l} \text{ } \mathbf{x}) \text{ } \mathbb{U} \text{ } (\mathbf{n} \text{ } \mathbf{G}\mathbf{l} \text{ } \mathbf{x}) \text{ } \mathbb{I} \text{ } \mathbf{c} \text{ } \mathbb{U}]$$

$$(\mathbf{E}\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q})\{\mathbf{0} < \mathbf{p},\mathbf{q} < \mathbf{n} \text{ } \& \text{ } \mathbf{F}\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{n} \text{ } \mathbf{G}\mathbf{l} \text{ } \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p} \text{ } \mathbf{G}\mathbf{l} \text{ } \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{q} \text{ } \mathbf{G}\mathbf{l} \text{ } \mathbf{x})\} \text{ } \& \text{ } \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{x}) > \mathbf{0} \text{ } (5)$$

(cf. the analogous concept [44](#))

$$\mathbf{x} \text{ } \mathbf{B}_c \text{ } \mathbf{y} \text{ } \mathbf{B}w_c(\mathbf{x}) \text{ } \& \text{ } [\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{x})] \text{ } \mathbf{G}\mathbf{l} \text{ } \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} \text{ } (6)$$

$$\mathbf{B}ew_c(\mathbf{x}) \text{ } \text{?}(\mathbb{S}\mathbf{y})\mathbf{y} \text{ } \mathbf{B}_c \text{ } \mathbf{x} \text{ } (6.1)$$

(cf. the analogous concepts [45](#), [46](#))

The following clearly hold:

$$(\mathbf{x})[\mathbf{B}ew_c(\mathbf{x}) \text{ } \text{?} \text{ } \mathbb{I} \text{ } \mathbf{F}\mathbf{l}\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{c})] \text{ } (7)$$

$$(\mathbf{x})[\mathbf{B}ew(\mathbf{x}) \text{ } \mathbb{R} \text{ } \mathbf{B}ew_c(\mathbf{x})] \text{ } (8)$$

We now define the relation:

$$Q(x,y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x B_c [Sb(y 19|z(y))]\}. \quad (8.1)$$

Since  $x B_c y$  [according to (6), (5)] and  $Sb(y 19|Z(y))$  (according to definitions 17, 31) are recursive, so also is  $Q(x,y)$ . According to [Proposition V](#) and (8) there is therefore a *relation-sign*  $q$  (with the *free variables* 17, 19) such that

$$\sim\{x B_c [Sb(y 19|Z(y))]\} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Bew_c[Sb(q 17|Z(x) 19|Z(y))]. \quad (9)$$

$$x B_c [Sb(y 19|Z(y))] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Bew_c[Neg Sb(q 17|Z(x) 19|Z(y))]. \quad (10)$$

We put

$$p = 17 \text{ Gen } q \quad (11)$$

( $p$  is a *class-sign* with the *free variable* 19)

and

$$r = Sb(q 19|Z(p)) \quad (12)$$



(**r** is a recursive *class-sign* with the *free variable* 17).<sup>43</sup>

Then

$$\mathbf{Sb}(\mathbf{p} \mathbf{19}|\mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{p})) \text{ (13)}$$

$$= \mathbf{Sb}([\mathbf{17} \text{ Gen } \mathbf{q}] \mathbf{19}|\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}))$$

$$= \mathbf{17} \text{ Gen } \mathbf{Sb}(\mathbf{q} \mathbf{19}|\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{p}))$$

$$= \mathbf{17} \text{ Gen } \mathbf{r}^{44}$$

[because of (11) and (12)] and furthermore:

$$\mathbf{Sb}(\mathbf{q} \mathbf{17}|\mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{19}|\mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{p})) = \mathbf{Sb}(\mathbf{r} \mathbf{17}|\mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{x})) \text{ (14)}$$

[according to (12)]. If now in (9) and (10) we substitute **p** for **y**, we find, in virtue of (13) and (14):

$$\mathbf{x} \mathbf{B}_c(\mathbf{17} \text{ Gen } \mathbf{r}) \text{ ® } \mathbf{Bew}_c[\mathbf{Sb}(\mathbf{r} \mathbf{17}|\mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{x}))] \text{ (15)}$$

$$\mathbf{x} \mathbf{B}_c(\mathbf{17} \text{ Gen } \mathbf{r}) \text{ ® } \mathbf{Bew}_c[\mathbf{Neg} \mathbf{Sb}(\mathbf{r} \mathbf{17}|\mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{x}))] \text{ (16)}$$

Hence:

1. **17 Gen r** is not *c-provable*.<sup>45</sup> For if that were so, there would (according to [6.1](#)) be an **n** such that

**n B<sub>c</sub> (17 Gen r)**. By [\(16\)](#) it would therefore be the case that:

$$\mathbf{Bew}_c[\mathbf{Neg Sb}(r \mathbf{17|Z}(n))]$$

while—on the other hand—from the *c-provability* of **17 Gen r** there follows also that of **Sb(r 17|Z(n)). c**

would therefore be inconsistent (and, *a fortiori*,  $\omega$ -inconsistent).

2. **Neg(17 Gen r)** is not *c-provable*. Proof: As shown above, **17 Gen r** is not *c-provable*, i.e.

(according to [6.1](#)) the following holds: **(n) n B<sub>c</sub>(17 Gen r)**. Whence it follows, by [\(15\)](#), that

**(n) Bew<sub>c</sub>[Sb(r 17|Z(n))]**, which together with **Bew<sub>c</sub>[Neg(17 Gen r)]** would conflict with the  $\omega$ -consistency

of **c**.

**Neg(17 Gen r)** is therefore undecidable in **c**, so that [Proposition VI](#) is proved.

One can easily convince oneself that the above proof is constructive,<sup>45a</sup> i.e. that the following is demonstrated in an intuitionistically unobjectionable way: Given any recursively defined class  $\mathbf{c}$  of formulae: If then a formal decision (in  $\mathbf{c}$ ) be given for the (effectively demonstrable) *propositional formula*

**17 Gen r**, we can effectively state:

1. A *proof* for **Neg(17 Gen r)**.
2. For any given  $\mathbf{n}$ , a proof for **Sb(r 17|Z(n))**, i.e. a formal decision of **17 Gen r** would lead to the effective demonstrability of an  $\omega$ -inconsistency.

We shall call a relation (class) of natural numbers  $\mathbf{R}(x_1 \dots x_n)$  **calculable** [*entscheidungsdefinit*], if there is an  $n$ -place *relation-sign*  $\mathbf{r}$  such that (3) and (4) hold (cf. [Proposition V](#)). In particular, therefore, by Proposition V, every recursive relation is calculable. Similarly, a *relation-sign* will be called **calculable**, if it be assigned in this manner to a calculable relation. It is, then, sufficient for the existence of undecidable propositions, to assume of the class  $\mathbf{c}$  that it is  $\omega$ -consistent and calculable. For the property of being calculable carries over from  $\mathbf{c}$  to  $\mathbf{x B_c y}$  (cf. (5), (6))

[190]

and to  $Q(x,y)$  (cf. [8.1](#)), and only these are applied in the above proof. The undecidable proposition has in this case the form  $\forall \mathbf{r} \mathbf{Gen} \mathbf{r}$ , where  $\mathbf{r}$  is a calculable *class-sign* (it is in fact enough that  $\mathbf{c}$  should be calculable in the system extended by adding  $\mathbf{c}$ ).

If, instead of  $\omega$ -consistency, mere consistency as such is assumed for  $\mathbf{c}$ , then there follows, indeed, not the existence of an undecidable proposition, but rather the existence of a property ( $\mathbf{r}$ ) for which it is possible neither to provide a counter-example nor to prove that it holds for all numbers. For, in proving that  $\mathbf{17} \mathbf{Gen} \mathbf{r}$  is not *c-provable*, only the consistency of  $\mathbf{c}$  is employed (cf. [189]) and from  $\sim \mathbf{Bew}_{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{17} \mathbf{Gen} \mathbf{r})$  it follows, according to [\(15\)](#), that for every number  $\mathbf{x}$ ,  $\mathbf{Sb}(\mathbf{r} \mathbf{17} | \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{x}))$  is *c-provable*, and hence that  $\mathbf{Sb}(\mathbf{r} \mathbf{17} | \mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{x}))$  is not *c-provable* for any number.

By adding  $\mathbf{Neg}(\mathbf{17} \mathbf{Gen} \mathbf{r})$  to  $\mathbf{c}$ , we obtain a consistent but not  $\omega$ -consistent class of *formulae*  $\mathbf{c}'$ .  $\mathbf{c}'$  is consistent, since otherwise  $\mathbf{17} \mathbf{Gen} \mathbf{r}$  would be *c-provable*.  $\mathbf{c}'$  is not however  $\omega$ -consistent, since in virtue of  $\sim \mathbf{Bew}_{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{17} \mathbf{Gen} \mathbf{r})$  and [\(15\)](#) we have:  $(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{Bew}_{\mathbf{c}} \mathbf{Sb}(\mathbf{r} \mathbf{17} | \mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{x}))$ , and so *a fortiori*:  $(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{Bew}_{\mathbf{c}'} \mathbf{Sb}(\mathbf{r} \mathbf{17} | \mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{x}))$ , and

on the other hand, naturally:  $\text{Bew}_c[\text{Neg}(17 \text{ Gen } r)]$ .<sup>46</sup>

A special case of [Proposition VI](#) is that in which the class  $c$  consists of a finite number of *formulae* (with or without those derived therefrom by *type-lift*). Every finite class  $a$  is naturally recursive. Let  $a$  be the largest number contained in  $a$ . Then in this case the following holds for  $c$ :

$$x \hat{\in} c \iff (\exists m, n)[m \leq x \ \& \ n \in a \ \& \ n \hat{\in} a \ \& \ x = m \cdot \text{Th } n]$$

$c$  is therefore recursive. This allows one, for example, to conclude that even with the help of the axiom of choice (for all types), or the generalized continuum hypothesis, not all propositions are decidable, it being assumed that these hypotheses are  $\omega$ -consistent.

In the proof of [Proposition VI](#) the only properties of the system  $\mathbf{P}$  employed were the following:

1. The class of axioms and the rules of inference (i.e. the relation "immediate consequence of") are recursively definable (as soon as the basic signs are replaced in any fashion by natural numbers).
2. Every recursive relation is definable in the system  $\mathbf{P}$  (in the sense of [Proposition V](#)).

Hence in every formal system that satisfies assumptions 1 and 2 and is  $\omega$ -consistent, undecidable propositions exist of the form  $(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})$ , where  $\mathbf{F}$  is a recursively defined property of natural numbers, and so too in every extension of such

[191]

a system made by adding a recursively definable  $\omega$ -consistent class of axioms. As can be easily confirmed, the systems which satisfy assumptions 1 and 2 include the Zermelo-Fraenkel and the v. Neumann axiom systems of set theory,<sup>47</sup> and also the axiom system of number theory which consists of the Peano axioms, the operation of recursive definition [according to schema (2)] and the logical rules.<sup>48</sup> Assumption 1 is in general satisfied by every system whose rules of inference are the usual ones and whose axioms (like those of  $\mathbf{P}$ ) are derived by substitution from a finite number of schemata.<sup>48a</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> The addition of the Peano axioms, like all the other changes made in the system  $\mathbf{PM}$ , serves only to simplify the proof and can in principle be dispensed with.

<sup>17</sup> It is presupposed that for every variable type denumerably many signs are available.

<sup>18</sup> Unhomogeneous relations could also be defined in this manner, e.g. a relation between individuals and classes as a class of elements of the form:  $((x_2), ((x_1), x_2))$ . As a simple consideration shows, all the provable propositions about relations in **PM** are also provable in this fashion.

<sup>18a</sup> Thus  $x \text{ " } (a)$  is also a formula if  $x$  does not occur, or does not occur free, in  $a$ . In that case  $x \text{ " } (a)$  naturally means the same as  $a$ .

<sup>19</sup> With regard to this definition (and others like it occurring later), cf. J. Lukasiewicz and A. Tarski,

'Untersuchungen über den Aussagenkalkül', *Comptes Rendus des séances de la Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Varsovie* XXIII, 1930, Cl. 111.

<sup>20</sup> Where  $v$  does not occur in  $a$  as a free variable, we must put **Subst**  $a(v|b) = a$ . Note that "**Subst**" is a sign belonging to metamathematics.

<sup>21</sup> As in **PM I**, \*13,  $x_1 = y_1$  is to be thought of as defined by  $x_2 \text{ " } (x_2(x_1) \acute{E} x_2(y_1))$  (and similarly for higher types.)

<sup>22</sup> To obtain the axioms from the schemata presented (and in the cases of II, III and IV, after carrying

out the permitted substitutions), one must therefore still

1. eliminate the abbreviations

2. add the suppressqd brackets.

Note that the resultant expressions must be "formulae" in the above sense. (Cf. also the exact

definitions of the metamathematical concepts on [182]ff.)

<sup>23</sup>  $\mathbf{c}$  is therefore either a variable or 0 or a sign of the form  $\vdash \dots \vdash_{\mathbf{u}}$  where  $\mathbf{u}$  is either 0 or a variable of

type 1. With regard to the concept "free (bound) at a place in  $\mathbf{a}$ " cf. section I A5 of the work cited in

footnote 24.

<sup>24</sup> The rule of substitution becomes superfluous, since we have already dealt with all possible

substitutions in the axioms themselves (as is also done in J. v. Neumann, 'Zur Hilbertschen

Beweistheorie', *Math. Zeitschr.* 26, 1927).

<sup>25</sup> I.e. its field of definition is the class of non-negative whole numbers (or  $\mathbf{n}$ -tuples of such),

respectively, and its values are non-negative whole numbers.



<sup>26</sup> In what follows, small italic letters (with or without indices) are always variables for non-negative whole numbers (failing an express statement to the contrary). [Italics omitted.]

<sup>27</sup> More precisely, by substitution of certain of the foregoing functions in the empty places of the preceding, e.g.  $f_k(x_1, x_2) = f_p[f_q(x_1, x_1), f_r(x_2)]$  ( $p, q, r < k$ ). Not all the variables on the left-hand side must also occur on the right (and similarly in the recursion schema (2)).

<sup>28</sup> We include classes among relations (one-place relations). Recursive relations  $\mathbf{R}$  naturally have the property that for every specific  $\mathbf{n}$ -tuple of numbers it can be decided whether  $\mathbf{R}(x_1 \dots x_n)$  holds or not.

<sup>29</sup> For all considerations as to content (more especially also of a metamathematical kind) the Hilbertian symbolism is used, cf. Hilbert-Ackermann, *Grundzüge der theoretischen Logik*, Berlin 1928.

<sup>30</sup> We use [greek] letters  $\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{h}$ , as abbreviations for given  $\mathbf{n}$ -tuple sets of variables, e.g.  $x_1, x_2 \dots x_n$ .

<sup>31</sup> We take it to be recognized that the functions  $\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{y}$  (addition) and  $\mathbf{x}.\mathbf{y}$  (multiplication) are recursive.

<sup>32</sup> **a** cannot take values other than 0 and 1, as is evident from the definition of **a**.

<sup>33</sup> The sign  $\equiv$  is used to mean "equivalence by definition", and therefore does duty in definitions either for = or for  $\sim$  [not the negation symbol] (otherwise the symbolism is Hilbertian).

<sup>34</sup> Wherever in the following definitions one of the signs  $(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $(\mathbf{Sx})$ ,  $\mathbf{ex}$  occurs, it is followed by a limitation on the value of **x**. This limitation merely serves to ensure the recursive nature of the concept defined. (Cf. [Proposition IV](#).) On the other hand, the range of the defined concept would almost always remain unaffected by its omission.

<sup>34a</sup> For  $0 < \mathbf{n} \leq \mathbf{z}$ , where **z** is the number of distinct prime numbers dividing into **x**. Note that for

$$\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{z} + 1, \mathbf{n} \Pr \mathbf{x} = 0.$$

<sup>34b</sup>  $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \leq \mathbf{x}$  stands for:  $\mathbf{m} \leq \mathbf{x} \ \& \ \mathbf{n} \leq \mathbf{x}$  (and similarly for more than two variables).

<sup>35</sup> The limitation  $\mathbf{n} \leq (\Pr[\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{x})]^{2\mathbf{x} \cdot [\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{x})]^2})$  means roughly this: The length of the shortest series of formulae belonging to **x** can at most be equal to the number of constituent formulae of **x**. There are

however at most  $l(x)$  constituent formulae of length 1, at most  $l(x)-1$  of length 2, etc. and in all, therefore, at most  $1_{2}[l(x)\{l(x)+1\}] \leq [l(x)]^2$ . The prime numbers in  $n$  can therefore all be assumed smaller than  $\text{Pr}\{[l(x)]^2\}$ , their number  $\leq [l(x)]^2$  and their exponents (which are constituent formulae of  $x$ )  $\leq x$ .

<sup>36</sup> Where  $v$  is not a *variable* or  $x$  not a *formula*, then  $\text{Sb}(x \ v|y) = x$ .

<sup>37</sup> Instead of  $\text{Sb}[\text{Sb}[x \ v|y] \ z|y]$  we write:  $\text{Sb}(x \ v|y \ w|z)$  (and similarly for more than two *variables*).

<sup>38</sup> The variables  $u_1 \dots u_n$  could be arbitrarily allotted. There is always, e.g., an  $r$  with the free variables 17, 19, 23 ... etc., for which (3) and (4) hold.

<sup>39</sup> [Proposition V](#) naturally is based on the fact that for any recursive relation  $R$ , it is decidable, for every n-tuple of numbers, **from the axioms of the system P**, whether the relation  $R$  holds or not.

<sup>40</sup> From this there follows immediately its validity for every recursive relation, since any such relation is equivalent to  $\theta = f(x_1 \dots x_n)$ , where  $f$  is recursive.

<sup>41</sup> In the precise development of this proof, **r** is naturally defined, not by the roundabout route of indicating its content, but by its purely formal constitution.

<sup>42</sup> Which thus, as regards content, expresses the existence of this relation.

<sup>43</sup> **r** is derived in fact, from the recursive *relation-sign* **q** on replacement of a *variable* by a determinate number (**p**).

<sup>44</sup> The operations **Gen** and **Sb** are naturally always commutative, wherever they refer to different *variables*.

<sup>45</sup> "**x** is *c*-provable" signifies:  $\mathbf{x} \hat{\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{Flg}(\mathbf{c})$ , which, by (7), states the same as  $\mathbf{Bew}_c(\mathbf{x})$ .

<sup>45a</sup> Since all existential assertions occurring in the proof are based on [Proposition V](#), which, as can easily be seen, is intuitionistically unobjectionable.

<sup>46</sup> Thus the existence of consistent and not  $\omega$ -consistent **c**'s can naturally be proved only on the assumption that, in general, consistent **c**'s do exist (i.e. that **P** is consistent).

<sup>47</sup> The proof of assumption 1 is here even simpler than that for the system **P**, since there is only one kind of basic variable (or two for J. v. Neumann).

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Problem III in D. Hilbert's lecture: 'Probleme der Grundlegung der Mathematik', *Math. Ann.*

102.

<sup>48a</sup> The true source of the incompleteness attaching to all formal systems of mathematics, is to be found—as will be shown in Part II of this essay—in the fact that the formation of ever higher types can be continued into the transfinite (cf. D. Hilbert 'Über das Unendliche', *Math. Ann.* 95, p. 184), whereas in every formal system at most denumerably many types occur. It can be shown, that is, that the undecidable propositions here presented always become decidable by the adjunction of suitable higher types (e.g. of type  $\omega$  for the system **P**). A similar result also holds for the axiom system of set theory.

---

From [Proposition VI](#) we now obtain further consequences and for this purpose give the following

definition:

A relation (class) is called **arithmetical**, if it can be defined solely by means of the concepts +, ·

[addition and multiplication, applied to natural numbers]<sup>49</sup> and the logical constants  $\bar{\cup}$ ,  $\sim$ ,  $(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $=$ , where  $(\mathbf{x})$

and  $=$  are to relate only to natural numbers.<sup>50</sup> The concept of "arithmetical proposition" is defined in a

corresponding way. In particular the relations "greater [than]" and "congruent to a modulus" are

arithmetical, since

$$x > y \text{ } \bar{\cup} (\exists z)[y = x+z]$$

$$x @ y(\text{mod } n) \text{ } \bar{\cup} (\exists z)[x = y+z \cdot n \bar{\cup} y = x+z \cdot n]$$

We now have:

**Proposition VII:** Every recursive relation is arithmetical.

We prove this proposition in the form: Every relation of the form  $\mathbf{x}_0 = f(\mathbf{x}_1 \dots \mathbf{x}_n)$ , where  $f$  is

recursive, is arithmetical, and apply mathematical induction on the degree of  $f$ . Let  $f$  be of degree  $s$  ( $s > 1$ ).

Then either

[192]

$$1. f(x_1 \dots x_n) = r[c_1(x_1 \dots x_n), c_2(x_1 \dots x_n) \dots c_m(x_1 \dots x_n)]^{51}$$

(where  $p$  and all the  $x$ 's have degrees smaller than  $s$ ) or

$$2. f(0, x_2 \dots x_n) = y(x_2 \dots x_n)$$

$$f(k+1, x_2 \dots x_n) = m[k, f(k, x_2 \dots x_n), x_2 \dots x_n]$$

(where  $y, m$  are of lower degree than  $s$ ).

In the first case we have:

$$x_0 = f(x_1 \dots x_n) \text{ } \exists y_1 \dots y_m [R(x_0, y_1 \dots y_m) \ \& \ S_1(y_1, x_1 \dots x_n) \ \& \ \dots \ \& \ S_m(y_m, x_1 \dots x_n)],$$

where  $R$  and  $S_i$  are respectively the arithmetical relations which by the inductive assumption exist,

equivalent to  $x_0 = r(y_1 \dots y_m)$  and  $y = c_i(x_1 \dots x_n)$ . In this case, therefore,  $x_0 = f(x_1 \dots x_n)$  is arithmetical.

In the second case we apply the following procedure: The relation  $x_0 = f(x_1 \dots x_n)$  can be expressed

with the help of the concept "series of numbers" (f)<sup>52</sup> as follows:

$$x_0 = f(x_1 \dots x_n) \text{ } \text{\textcircled{S}} \{f_0 = y(x_2 \dots x_n) \ \& \ (k)[k < x_1 \text{ } \text{\textcircled{R}} \ f_{k+1} = m(k, f_k, x_2 \dots x_n)] \ \& \ x_0 = f_{x_1} \}$$

If  $S(y, x_2 \dots x_n)$  and  $T(z, x_1 \dots x_{n+1})$  are respectively the arithmetical relations—which by the inductive

assumption exist—equivalent to

$$y = y(x_2 \dots x_n) \ \text{and} \ z = m(x_1 \dots x_{n+1}),$$

the following then holds:

$$x_0 = f(x_1 \dots x_n) \text{ } \text{\textcircled{S}} \{S(f_0, x_2 \dots x_n) \ \& \ (k)[k < x_1 \text{ } \text{\textcircled{R}} \ T(f^{k+1}, k, f_k, x_2 \dots x_n)] \ \& \ x_0 = f_{x_1} \} \quad (17)$$

We now replace the concept "series of numbers" by "pair of numbers", by assigning to the number pair  $\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}$

the number series  $f^{(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d})}(f_k^{(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d})} = [\mathbf{n}]_{1+(k+1)\mathbf{d}})$ , where  $[\mathbf{n}]_{\mathbf{p}}$  denotes the smallest non-negative residue of  $\mathbf{n}$

modulo  $\mathbf{p}$ .



We then have the following:

Lemma 1: If  $\mathbf{f}$  is any series of natural numbers and  $\mathbf{k}$  any natural number, then there exists a pair of natural numbers  $\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}$ , such that  $\mathbf{f}^{(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d})}$  and  $\mathbf{f}$  agree in the first  $\mathbf{k}$  terms.

Proof: Let  $\mathbf{l}$  be the largest of the numbers  $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{f}_0, \mathbf{f}_1 \dots \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{k}-1}$ . Let  $\mathbf{n}$  be so determined that

$$\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{f}_i(\mathbf{mod}(1+(\mathbf{i}+1)\mathbf{l}!)) \text{ for } \mathbf{i} = 0, 1 \dots \mathbf{k}-1$$

[193]

which is possible, since every two of the numbers  $1+(\mathbf{i}+1)\mathbf{l}!$  ( $\mathbf{i} = 0, 1 \dots \mathbf{k}-1$ ) are relatively prime. For a prime number contained in two of these numbers would also be contained in the difference  $(\mathbf{i}_1 - \mathbf{i}_2)\mathbf{l}!$  and therefore, because  $|\mathbf{i}_1 - \mathbf{i}_2| < \mathbf{l}$ , in  $\mathbf{l}!$ , which is impossible. The number pair  $\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{l}!$  thus accomplishes what is required.

Since the relation  $\mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{n}]_{\mathbf{p}}$  is defined by  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{mod} \mathbf{p})$  &  $\mathbf{x} < \mathbf{p}$  and is therefore arithmetical, so also

is the relation  $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1 \dots \mathbf{x}_n)$  defined as follows:

$\mathbf{P}(x_0 \dots x_n) \text{ } \{ \mathbf{S}([n]_{d+1}, x_2 \dots x_n) \ \& \ (\mathbf{k}) [k < x_1 \text{ } \textcircled{\text{R}} \ \mathbf{T}([n]_{1+d(k+2)}, \mathbf{k}, [n]_{1+d(k+1)}, x_2 \dots x_n)] \ \& \}$

$$x_0 = [n]_{1+d(x_1+1)}$$

which, according to (17) and [Lemma 1](#), is equivalent to  $x_0 = f(x_1 \dots x_n)$  (we are concerned with the series  $f$  in (17) only in its course up to the  $x_1+1$ -th term). Thereby [Proposition VII](#) is proved.

According to [Proposition VII](#) there corresponds to every problem of the form  $(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})$  ( $\mathbf{F}$  recursive) an equivalent arithmetical problem, and since the whole proof of [Proposition VII](#) can be formalized (for every specific  $\mathbf{F}$ ) within the system  $\mathbf{P}$ , this equivalence is provable in  $\mathbf{P}$ . Hence:

**Proposition VIII:** In every one of the formal systems<sup>53</sup> referred to in [Proposition VI](#) there are undecidable arithmetical propositions.

The same holds (in virtue of the remarks at the end of Section 3) for the axiom system of set theory and its extensions by  $\omega$ -consistent recursive classes of axioms.

We shall finally demonstrate the following result also:

**Proposition IX:** In all the formal systems referred to in [Proposition VI<sup>53</sup>](#) there are undecidable problems of the restricted predicate calculus<sup>54</sup> (i.e. formulae of the restricted predicate calculus for which neither universal validity nor the existence of a counter-example is provable).<sup>55</sup>

[194]

This is based on

**Proposition X:** Every problem of the form  $(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})$  ( $\mathbf{F}$  recursive) can be reduced to the question of the satisfiability of a formula of the restricted predicate calculus (i.e. for every recursive  $\mathbf{F}$  one can give a formula of the restricted predicate calculus, the satisfiability of which is equivalent to the validity of  $(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})$ ).

We regard the restricted predicate calculus (r.p.c.) as consisting of those formulae which are constructed out of the basic signs:  $\sim, \mathbf{U}, (\mathbf{x}), =, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \dots$  (individual variables) and  $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z}) \dots$  (property and relation variables)<sup>56</sup> where  $(\mathbf{x})$  and  $=$  may relate only to individuals. To these signs we add yet a third kind of variables  $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z})$  etc. which represent object functions; i.e.  $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ , etc.

denote one-valued functions whose arguments and values are individuals.<sup>57</sup> A formula which, besides the first mentioned signs of the r.p.c., also contains variables of the third kind, will be called a formula in the wider sense (i.w.s.).<sup>58</sup> The concepts of "satisfiable" and "universally valid" transfer immediately to formulae i.w.s. and we have the proposition that for every formula i.w.s. **A** we can give an ordinary formula of the r.p.c. **B** such that the satisfiability of **A** is equivalent to that of **B**. We obtain **B** from **A**, by replacing the variables of the third kind **f(x)**, **y(x,y)** ... appearing in **A** by expressions of the form  $(\cdot z)F(z,x)$ ,  $(\cdot z)G(z,x)$ , ..., by eliminating the "descriptive" functions on the lines of **PM I** \*14, and by logically multiplying<sup>59</sup> the resultant formula by an expression, which states that all the **F**, **G** ... substituted for the **f**, **y** ... are strictly one-valued with respect to the first empty place.

We now show, that for every problem of the form  $(x) F(x)$  (**F** recursive) there is an equivalent concerning the satisfiability of a formula i.w.s., from which [Proposition X](#) follows in accordance with what has just been said.

Since **F** is recursive, there is a recursive function **F(x)** such that  $F(x) \neq 0$ , and for **F** there is a

series of functions  $F_1, F_2 \dots F_n$ , such that  $F_n = F$ ,  $F_1(x) = x+1$  and for every  $F_k (1 < k \leq n)$  either

$$1. (x_2 \dots x_m) [F_k(0, x_2 \dots x_m) = (F_p(x_2 \dots x_m))]$$

$$(x, x_2 \dots x_m) \{F_k[F_1(x), x_2 \dots x_m] = (F_q[x, F_k(x, x_2 \dots x_m), x_2 \dots x_m])\} \quad (18)$$

$$p, q < k$$

[195]

or

$$2. (x_1 \dots x_m) [F_k(x_1 \dots x_m) = F_r(F_{i_1}(c_1) \dots f_{i_s}(c_s))]^{60} \quad (19)$$

$$r < k, i_v < k \text{ (for } v = 1, 2 \dots s)$$

or

$$3. (\mathbf{x}_1 \dots \mathbf{x}_m) [F_k(\mathbf{x}_1 \dots \mathbf{x}_m) = F_1(F_1 \dots F_1(\mathbf{0}))] \quad (20)$$

In addition, we form the propositions:

$$(\mathbf{x}) \sim [F_1(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}] \ \& \ (\mathbf{x} \ \mathbf{y}) [F_1(\mathbf{x}) = F_1(\mathbf{y}) \ \& \ \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}] \quad (21)$$

$$(\mathbf{x}) [F_n(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}] \quad (22)$$

In all the formulae (18), (19), (20) (for  $\mathbf{k} = 2, 3, \dots, n$ ) and in (21), (22), we now replace the functions

$F_i$  by the function variable  $f_i$ , the number 0 by an otherwise absent individual variable  $\mathbf{x}_0$  and form the

conjunction  $\mathbf{C}$  of all the formulae so obtained.

The formula  $(\mathbf{x}_0)\mathbf{C}$  then has the required property, i.e

1. If  $(\mathbf{x}) [F(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}]$  is the case, then  $(\mathbf{x}_0)\mathbf{C}$  is satisfiable, since when the functions  $F_1, F_2 \dots F_n$  are

substituted for  $f_1, f_2 \dots f_n$  in  $(\mathbf{x}_0)\mathbf{C}$  they obviously yield a correct proposition.

2. If  $(\mathbf{x}_0)\mathbf{C}$  is satisfiable, then  $(\mathbf{x}) [F(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}]$  is the case.

Proof: Let  $Y_1, Y_2 \dots Y_n$  be the functions presumed to exist, which yield a correct proposition when substituted for  $f_1, f_2 \dots f_n$  in  $(Sx_0)C$ . Let its domain of individuals be  $I$ . In view of the correctness of  $(Sx_0)C$  for all functions  $Y_i$ , there is an individual  $a$  (in  $I$ ) such that all the formulae (18) to (22) transform into correct propositions (18') to (22') on replacement of the  $F_i$  by  $Y_i$  and of 0 by  $a$ . We now form the smallest sub-class of  $I$ , which contains  $a$  and is closed with respect to the operation  $Y_1(x)$ . This subclass ( $I'$ ) has the property that every one of the functions  $Y_i$ , when applied to elements of  $I'$ , again yields elements of  $I'$ . For this holds of  $Y_1$  in virtue of the definition of  $I'$ ; and by reason of (18'), (19'), (20') this property carries over from  $Y_i$  of lower index to those of higher. The functions derived from  $Y_i$  by restriction to the domain of individuals  $I'$ , we shall call  $Y_i'$ . For these functions also the formulae (18) to (22) all hold (on replacement of 0 by  $a$  and  $F_i$  by  $Y_i'$ ).

Owing to the correctness of (21) for  $Y_1'$  and  $a$ , we can map the individuals of  $I'$  in one-to-one correspondence on the natural numbers, and this in such a manner that  $a$  transforms into 0 and the function  $Y_1'$  into the successor function  $F_1$ . But, by this mapping, all the functions  $Y_i'$  transform into the functions

$F_i$ , and owing to the correct-

[196]

ness of (22) for  $Y_n$  and  $a$ , we get  $(x) [F_n(x) = 0]$  or  $(x) [F(x) = 0]$ , which was to be proved.<sup>61</sup>

Since the considerations leading to [Proposition X](#) (for every specific  $F$ ) can also be restated within the system  $P$ , the equivalence between a proposition of the form  $(x) F(x)$  ( $F$  recursive) and the satisfiability of the corresponding formula of the r.p.c. is therefore provable in  $P$ , and hence the undecidability of the one follows from that of the other, whereby [Proposition IX](#) is proved.<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Here, and in what follows, zero is always included among the natural numbers.

<sup>50</sup> The definiens of such a concept must therefore be constructed solely by means of the signs stated, variables for natural numbers  $x, y, \dots$  and the signs 0 and 1 (function and set variables must not occur). (Any other number-variable may naturally occur in to prefixes in place of  $x$ .)

<sup>51</sup> It is not of course necessary that all  $x_1 \dots x_n$  should actually occur in  $c_i$  [cf. the example in [footnote 27](#)].



<sup>52</sup>  $f$  signifies here a variable, whose domain of values consists of series of natural numbers.  $f_k$

denotes the  $k+1$ -th term of a series  $f$  ( $f_0$  being the first).

<sup>53</sup> These are the  $\omega$ -consistent systems derived from  $\mathbf{P}$  by addition of a recursively definable class of axioms.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Hilbert-Ackermann, *Grundzüge der theoretischen Logik*. In the system  $\mathbf{P}$ , formulae of the restricted predicate calculus are to be understood as those derived from the formulae of the restricted predicate calculus of  $\mathbf{PM}$  on replacement of relations by classes of higher type, as indicated on [176].

<sup>55</sup> In my article 'Die Vollständigkeit der Axiome des logischen Funktionenkalküls', *Monatsh. f.*

*Math. u. Phys.* XXXVII, 2, I have shown of every formula of the restricted predicate calculus that it

is either demonstrable as universally valid or else that a counter-example exists; but in virtue of

[Proposition IX](#) the existence of this counter-example is not always demonstrable (in the formal

systems in question).

<sup>56</sup> D. Hilbert and W. Ackermann, in the work already cited, do not include the sign = in the restricted predicate calculus. But for every formula in which the sign = occurs, there exists a formula without this sign, which is satisfiable simultaneously with the original one (cf. the article cited in [footnote 55](#)).

<sup>57</sup> And of course the domain of the definition must always be the **whole** domain of individuals.

<sup>58</sup> Variables of the third kind may therefore occur at all empty places instead of individual variables, e.g.  $y = f(x)$ ,  $F(x, f(y))$ ,  $G[y(x, f(y)), x]$  etc.

<sup>59</sup> I.e. forming the conjunction.

<sup>60</sup>  $c_i (i = 1 \dots s)$  represents any complex of the variables  $x_1, x_2 \dots x_m$ , e.g.  $x_1 x_3 x_2$ .

<sup>61</sup> From [Proposition X](#) it follows, for example, that the Fermat and Goldbach problems would be soluble, if one had solved the decision problem for the r.p.c.

<sup>62</sup> [Proposition IX](#) naturally holds also for the axiom system of set theory and its extensions by

recursively definable  $\omega$ -consistent classes of axioms, since in these systems also there certainly exist undecidable theorems of the form  $(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})$  ( $\mathbf{F}$  recursive).

---

#### 4

From the conclusions of Section 2 there follows a remarkable result with regard to a consistency proof of the system  $\mathbf{P}$  (and its extensions), which is expressed in the following proposition:

**Proposition XI:** If  $\mathbf{c}$  be a given recursive, consistent class<sup>63</sup> of *formulae*, then the *propositional formula* which states that  $\mathbf{c}$  is consistent is not *c-provable*; in particular, the consistency of  $\mathbf{P}$  is unprovable in  $\mathbf{P}$ ,<sup>64</sup> it being assumed that  $\mathbf{P}$  is consistent (if not, of course, every statement is provable).

The proof (sketched in outline) is as follows: Let  $\mathbf{c}$  be any given recursive class of formulae, selected once and for all for purposes of the following argument (in the simplest case it may be the null class). For proof of the fact that **17 Gen r** is not *c-provable*,<sup>65</sup> only the consistency of  $\mathbf{c}$  was made use of, as appears from 1, page 59; i.e.

$$\mathbf{Wid(c)} \text{ } \textcircled{R} \sim \mathbf{Bew_c(17 Gen r)} \text{ (23)}$$

i.e. by (6.1):

$$\mathbf{Wid(c)} \text{ } \textcircled{R} (x) \sim [x \mathbf{B_c (17 Gen r)}]$$

By (13),  $\mathbf{17 Gen r} = \mathbf{Sb(p 19|Z(p))}$  and hence:

$$\mathbf{Wid(c)} \text{ } \textcircled{R} (x) \sim [x \mathbf{B_c Sb(p 19|Z(p))}]$$

[197]

i.e. by (8.1):

$$\mathbf{Wid(c)} \text{ } \textcircled{R} (x) \mathbf{Q(x,p)} \text{ (24)}$$

We now establish the following: All the concepts defined (or assertions proved) in Sections 2<sup>66</sup> and 4 are also expressible (or provable) in  $\mathbf{P}$ . For we have employed throughout only the normal methods of definition and proof accepted in classical mathematics, as formalized in the system  $\mathbf{P}$ . In particular  $\mathbf{c}$  (like

any recursive class) is definable in  $\mathbf{P}$ . Let  $w$  be the propositional formula expressing  $\mathbf{Wid}(c)$  in  $\mathbf{P}$ . The relation  $\mathbf{Q}(x,y)$  is expressed, in accordance with (8.1), (9) and (10), by the *relation-sign*  $q$ , and  $\mathbf{Q}(x,p)$ , therefore, by  $r$  [since by (12)  $r = \mathbf{Sb}(q \ 19|Z(p))$ ] and the proposition  $(x) \mathbf{Q}(x,p)$  by **17 Gen r**.

In virtue of (24)  $w \mathbf{Imp} (\mathbf{17 Gen r})$  is therefore *provable* in  $\mathbf{P}^{67}$  (and *a fortiori c-provable*). Now if  $w$  were *c-provable*, **17 Gen r** would also be *c-provable* and hence it would follow, by (23), that  $c$  is not consistent.

It may be noted that this proof is also constructive, i.e. it permits, if a *proof* from  $c$  is produced for  $w$ , the effective derivation from  $c$  of a contradiction. The whole proof of [Proposition XI](#) can also be carried over word for word to the axiom-system of set theory  $\mathbf{M}$ , and to that of classical mathematics  $\mathbf{A}$ ,<sup>68</sup> and here too it yields the result that there is no consistency proof for  $\mathbf{M}$  or for  $\mathbf{A}$  which could be formalized in  $\mathbf{M}$  or  $\mathbf{A}$  respectively, it being assumed that  $\mathbf{M}$  and  $\mathbf{A}$  are consistent. It must be expressly noted that [Proposition XI](#) (and the corresponding results for  $\mathbf{M}$  and  $\mathbf{A}$ ) represent no contradiction of the formalistic standpoint of Hilbert. For this standpoint presupposes only the existence of a consistency proof effected by finite means,

and there might conceivably be finite proofs which **cannot** be stated in **P** (or in **M** or in **A**).

Since, for every consistent class **c**, **w** is not *c-provable*, there will always be propositions which are undecidable (from **c**), namely **w**, so long as **Neg(w)** is not *c-provable*; in

[198]

other words, one can replace the assumption of  $\omega$ -consistency in [Proposition VI](#) by the following: The statement "**c** is inconsistent" is not *c-provable*. (Note that there are consistent **c**'s for which this statement is *c-provable*.)

Throughout this work we have virtually confined ourselves to the system **P**, and have merely indicated the applications to other systems. The results will be stated and proved in fuller generality in a forthcoming sequel. There too, the mere outline proof we have given of [Proposition XI](#) will be presented in detail.

---

<sup>63</sup> **C** is consistent (abbreviated as **Wid(c)**) is defined as follows: **Wid(c)** =  $(\exists x) [\text{Form}(x) \ \& \ \sim \text{Bew}_c(x)]$ .

<sup>64</sup> This follows if **c** is replaced by the null class of *formulae*.

<sup>65</sup> **r** naturally depends on **c** (just as **p** does).

<sup>66</sup> From the definition of "recursive" on [179] up to the proof of [Proposition VI](#) inclusive.

<sup>67</sup> That the correctness of **w Imp (17 Gen r)** can be concluded from [\(23\)](#), is simply based on the fact

that—as was remarked at the outset—the undecidable proposition **17 Gen r** asserts its own

unprovability.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. J. v. Neumann, 'Zur Hilbertschen Beweistheorie', *Math. Zeitschr.* 26, 1927.

---

(Received: 17. xi. 1930.)

---

**BACK**



## INTRODUCTION

### [To Gödel's Theorem]

by

R. B. BRAITHWAITE

Every system of arithmetic contains arithmetical propositions, by which is meant propositions concerned solely with relations between whole numbers, which can neither be proved nor be disproved within the system. This epoch-making discovery by Kurt Gödel, a young Austrian mathematician, was announced by him to the Vienna Academy of Sciences in 1930 and was published, with a detailed proof, in a paper in the *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik* Volume 38 pp. 173-198 (Leipzig: 1931). This paper, entitled "Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme I" ("On formally undecidable propositions of *Principia Mathematica* and related systems I"), is translated in this book. Gödel intended to write a second part to the paper but this has never been published.

Gödel's Theorem, as a simple corollary of [Proposition VI](#) is frequently called, proves that there are arithmetical propositions which are undecidable (i.e. neither provable nor disprovable) within their arithmetical system, and the proof proceeds by actually specifying such a proposition, namely the proposition **g** expressed by the formula to which "**17 Gen r**" refers [188]. **g** is an arithmetical proposition; but the proposition that **g** is undecidable within the system is not an arithmetical proposition, since it is concerned with provability within an arithmetical system, and this is a metaarithmetical and not an arithmetical notion. Gödel's Theorem is thus a result which belongs not to mathematics but to metamathematics, the name given by Hilbert to the study of rigorous proof in mathematics and symbolic logic.

**METAMATHEMATICS.** Gödel's paper presupposes some knowledge of the state of metamathematics in 1930, which therefore I shall briefly explain. Following on the work of Frege and Peano, Whitehead and Russell's *Principia Mathematica* (1910-13) had exhibited the fundamental parts of mathematics, including arithmetic, as a *deductive system* starting from a limited number of axioms, in which each theorem is shown to



follow logically from the axioms and theorems which precede it according to a limited number of rules of inference. And other mathematicians had constructed other deductive systems which included arithmetic (see [note 3](#)). In order to show that in a deductive system every theorem follows from the axioms according to the rules of inference it is necessary to consider the *formulae* which are used to express the axioms and theorems of the system, and to represent the rules of inference by rules (Gödel calls them "mechanical" rules, [173]) according to which from one or more formulae another formula may be obtained by a manipulation of symbols. Such a representation of a deductive system will consist of a sequence of formulae (a *calculus*) in which the initial formulae express the axioms of the deductive system and each of the other formulae, which express the theorems, are obtained from the initial formulae by a chain of symbolic manipulations. The chain of symbolic manipulations in the calculus corresponds to and represents the chain of deductions in the deductive system.

But this correspondence between calculus and deductive system may be viewed in reverse, and by looking at it the other way round Hilbert originated metamathematics. Here a calculus is constructed, independently of any interpretation of it, as a sequence of formulae which starts with a few initial formulae and in which every other formula is obtained from preceding formulae by symbolic manipulations. The calculus can then be interpreted as representing a deductive system if the initial formulae can be interpreted as expressing the axioms of the system and if the rules of symbolic manipulation can be interpreted as representing the logical rules of inference of the system. If this can be done, a proof that a formula (other than one of the initial formulae) occurs in the sequence of formulae of the calculus yields a proof that the proposition which is the interpretation of this formula is a theorem of the deductive system, i.e. can be deduced from the axioms of the system by the system's rules of inference. Metamathematicians in the 1920's established many important results about deductive systems by converting proofs of what formulae can be obtained by symbolic manipulations within a calculus into proofs of what theorems can be proved within a deductive system which could be represented by the calculus. Frequently consideration of symbolic manipulations provided a "decision procedure" by which whole classes of theorems could actually be proved. Thus Presburger in 1930 published a decision procedure applicable to every proposition of a mutilated system of arithmetic which uses the operation of addition but not that of multiplication; he proved that every one of its propositions is decidable, i.e. either provable or disprovable, within this system.

Gödel's paper established the opposite of this for an arithmetical system which uses multiplication as well as addition—"the theory of ordinary whole numbers" [173]. And this is the piece of mathematics which is oldest in the history of civilization and which is of such practical importance that we make all our children learn a great deal of it at an early age. Gödel was the first to prove any unprovability theorem for arithmetic, and his way of proof was subtler and deeper than the metamathematical methods previously employed. Either of these facts would have ranked this paper high in the development of metamathematics. But it was the fact that it was a proposition of whole-number arithmetic which he showed to be undecidable that created such a scandal.

**GÖDEL's FORMAL SYSTEM P.** In order rigorously to prove the undecidability of

some arithmetical propositions it is necessary to be precise about the exact deductive system of arithmetic which is being considered. As is indicated in the title of his paper, Gödel takes for his arithmetical deductive system that part of the system of *Principia Mathematica* required to establish the theorems of whole-number arithmetic. Since his proof is metamathematical he is concerned with a calculus representing his arithmetical system: what he proves in [Proposition VI](#) is a result about the calculus and not about what the calculus represents, for what it directly establishes is that neither of two particular formulae—the first referred to by "**17 Gen r**", the second by "**Neg (17 Gen r)**" [189]—can be obtained from the initial formulae of the calculus by the rules of symbolic manipulation of the calculus. If the calculus is interpreted (as it can be interpreted) so that it represents the arithmetical part of the *Principia Mathematica* deductive system, with the second formula expressing the contradictory of the arithmetical proposition expressed by the first formula, then the theorem about the deductive system which corresponds to the calculus-theorem states that the proposition **g** to which "**17 Gen r**" refers is such that neither it nor its contradictory is provable within the system. Hence within the system **g** is neither provable nor disprovable. An unprovability theorem for the arithmetical deductive system which Gödel is considering is a simple corollary of [Proposition VI](#) about his calculus. Thus the paper is concerned with what formulae can (or, rather, cannot) be obtained within a particular calculus, although of course the calculus would have little general interest if it could not be interpreted as representing a deductive system of whole-number arithmetic.

Gödel's attention solely to his calculus will explain some features of his terminology which may puzzle philosophical logicians. He transfers many epithets which are applied more naturally to deductive systems than to calculi, using them to refer to features of his *formal system* (his term for what I have called his calculus). He employs *formula* in the way in which I have used it so that a formula is a "finite series of basic signs", but he goes on to say that "it is easy to state precisely just *which* series of basic signs are meaningful formulae and which are not" [174]. "Meaningful" is a misnomer, since it is the formal system that is being considered and not an interpretation of it. When he specifies on [177] precisely which series of basic signs are to be *well-formed formulae* (to use the modern term)—Gödel calls them formulae without a qualifying adjective—he makes no reference to meaning. A formula for him is a series of signs which either is an elementary formula (a concatenation of signs of specified sorts) or is built up out of elementary formulae together with some or all of three specified signs by the use, or repeated use, of three specified rules of construction. When Gödel speaks, in connexion with a formal system, of 'rules of inference', he is referring to the rules according to which one formula can be obtained from other formulae within the formal system. In his system he uses two 'rules of inference', which he specifies by giving one condition for a formula being an 'immediate consequence' of two formulae and one condition for its being an 'immediate consequence' of one formula [178]. A 'proof-schema', for him, is a series of formulae in which each formula (except the initial formulae, which he calls 'axioms') is an 'immediate consequence' of one or of two of the formulae preceding it in the series. A 'proof-schema' is a 'proof' of the last formula in it; and a formula is 'provable' if there is a 'proof' of it. Gödel gives his precise definition of the class of 'provable' formulae in language familiar to mathematicians as "the smallest class of formulae which contains the axioms and is closed with respect to the relation 'immediate consequence of'" [178], i.e. the smallest class which contains the axioms and which contains the 'immediate consequence' of every formula, and of every pair of

formulae, contained in the class. For the benefit of philosophical logicians I shall continue the practice followed in this paragraph of putting single quotation marks round terms which without quotation marks refer to features of deductive systems, when I am using them, in Gödel's manner, with reference to a formal system, i.e. to a calculus.

Gödel gives an "exact description" of his formal system **P** by specifying (1) its basic signs, (2) its formulae (i.e. its well-formed formulae), (3) its 'axioms' (initial formulae), (4) the relation of being an 'immediate consequence' of. He says that **P** is "essentially the system obtained by superimposing on the Peano axioms [for whole-number arithmetic] the logic of **PM** [*Principia Mathematica*]" [176]. Since the Peano axioms are 'provable' (and indeed 'proved') in the calculus of **PM**, Gödel's system **P** is virtually that part of the calculus of **PM** required to lead up to whole-number arithmetic: as Gödel says, "the addition of the Peano axioms, like all the other changes made in the system **PM**, serves only to simplify the proof and can in principle be dispensed with" ([note 16](#)). Gödel states his rules of symbolic construction and manipulation more precisely than do Whitehead and Russell. His only noteworthy divergence from them is that, instead of employing a limited number of 'axioms', he follows the example of von Neumann in using, besides three of [Peano's 'axioms'](#), eight '[axiom-schemata](#)' each covering an unlimited number of cases: by doing this he is able to manage with only two 'rules of inference' (see [note 24](#)). Gödel specifies the formal system **P** in the way he does in order to simplify his proof of the undecidability of some of the formulae of **P**. Since, as he explains, this undecidability is not due to "the special nature of the systems set up, but holds for a very extensive class of formal systems", the exact form he has chosen for **P** is of no intrinsic importance. What is essential is that **P** should be an appropriate subject for the exhibition of a method of metamathematical proof which Gödel invented, a method so powerful that it can establish an 'unprovability' result for every formal system capable of representing arithmetic.

**THE METHOD OF "ARITHMETIZATION"**. Gödel's novel metamathematical method is that of attaching numbers to the signs, to the series of signs (formulae) and to the series of series of signs ('proof-schemata') which occur in his formal system. Just as Descartes invented co-ordinate geometry by assigning number-pairs to the points of plane Euclidean geometry, so Gödel invented what might be called *co-ordinate metamathematics* by assigning numbers to the basic signs, series of basic signs, series of series of basic signs (all of which I shall for convenience lump together under the generic term *string*) which form an essential part of the subject-matter of metamathematics. Descartes proved geometrical theorems about points by proving algebraic theorems about numbers; Gödel established metamathematical results about the strings of his formal system by considering numbers co-ordinated with the strings. The difference between the co-ordinate systems of co-ordinate geometry and of co-ordinate metamathematics is that the former uses number-pairs for two-dimensional geometry, number-triads for three-dimensional geometry, and so on, and the numbers used are not confined to integers, whereas co-ordinate metamathematics is one-dimensional, using only single numbers, and these (in Gödel's paper) are restricted to being "natural numbers", i.e. 0, 1, 2, 3, etc.

Gödel explains what is now called his "arithmetization" method on [179]. What he does is to provide a co-ordinating rule according to which a different number (which I shall call a *Gödel number*) is assigned to each string in his formal system. The rule also works in reverse: of every number 0, 1, 2, 3, etc. the rule determines whether the number is the Gödel number of a basic sign, or of a series of basic signs, or of a series of series of basic signs, or is not a Gödel number at all (i.e. there is no string of which it is the Gödel number); and if the number is a Gödel number, the rule specifies uniquely which string it is of which it is the Gödel number. In his account Gödel speaks of his rule as establishing a "one-to-one correspondence". Not all numbers are Gödel numbers: the one-to-one correspondence established by the rule is between the members of a specific sub-class of the class of natural numbers, namely those which are Gödel numbers, and the members of the class of strings, which class is the union (logical sum) of three exclusive classes—the class of basic signs, the class of series of these signs, the class of series of series of these signs. The Gödel number of a series of series of signs is not explicitly mentioned in Gödel's account of his method of arithmetization, but he uses the notion in the definitions (from [22](#) onwards) which form an essential preliminary to the proof of his Theorem. This Gödel number is the number constructed out of the Gödel numbers of the elements of the series of series of signs in exactly the same way as the Gödel number of a series of signs is constructed out of the Gödel numbers of the signs which are the elements of this series of signs [179]. Thus the Gödel number of a series of  $k$  elements, whether these elements are signs or are series of signs, is constructed out of the elements' Gödel numbers  $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k$  as the number  $2^{n_1} 3^{n_2} \dots p_k^{n_k}$ , a product whose prime factors are the first  $k$  prime numbers (1 not being counted as a prime number) with the 1st, 2nd, ...  $k$ -th prime number occurring respectively  $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k$  times in the product. The one-to-one correspondence between Gödel numbers defined in this way and the strings of which they are Gödel numbers is a consequence of the "fundamental theorem of arithmetic", namely that every natural number greater than 1 which is not itself a prime has a unique resolution into prime factors.

Gödel's rule of arithmetization ensures that to every class of strings there corresponds a unique class of Gödel numbers, and vice versa. And that to any relation  $\mathbf{R}$  between strings there corresponds a unique relation  $\mathbf{R}'$  between Gödel numbers, and *vice versa*: i.e. the  $n$ -adic relation  $\mathbf{R}'$  holds between  $n$  Gödel numbers if and only if the  $n$ -adic relation  $\mathbf{R}$  holds between the  $n$  strings. For example, the metamathematical statement that the series  $\mathbf{s}$  of formulae is a 'proof' of the formula  $\mathbf{f}$  is true if and only if a certain arithmetical relation holds between the Gödel numbers of  $\mathbf{s}$  and of  $\mathbf{f}$  which corresponds to the relation: being a 'proof' of. Gödel uses the same language to refer to the arithmetical properties of, and relation between, Gödel numbers as he uses to refer to the corresponding properties of, and relations between, strings (see [note 9](#)), printing the terms in italics when they refer to arithmetical concepts applicable to Gödel numbers [179]. In a sequence of [definitions 6-46](#) he defines, step by step, a sequence of arithmetical concepts which correspond, according to his rule of arithmetization, to the metamathematical concepts expressed by the same words. [[Definitions 1-5](#) define the ancillary arithmetical concepts (being the  $n$ -th prime number, etc.) used in his method of arithmetization.] As examples, [definition 8](#) defines the arithmetical operation  $*$  upon two numbers  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  in such a way that the number  $\mathbf{x} * \mathbf{y}$  which is the result of performing this operation is the Gödel number of the string obtained by taking the string whose Gödel number is  $\mathbf{x}$  and placing the string whose Gödel number is  $\mathbf{y}$  immediately after it.



And [definition 45](#) defines the arithmetical relation **B** between **x** and **y** so that the proposition **x B y** is the same as the conjunction of the proposition that **x** is the Gödel number of a series of series of signs forming a 'proof-schema' with the proposition that the series of signs whose Gödel number is **y** is the last series of signs in this 'proof-schema', i.e. this 'proof-schema' is a 'proof' of the last formula in it. For the sake of clarity I shall not follow Gödel's abbreviating practice of using italicized words and phrases to refer to arithmetical concepts applicable to Gödel numbers, and shall use italics only in the ordinary way for emphasis. For example, while Gödel paraphrases the **x B y** of [definition 45](#) as: **x** is a *proof* of the *formula* **y**, I paraphrase it as: **x** is the Gödel number of a 'proof' of the formula whose Gödel number is **y**.

The interpreted symbolism used in these definitions, as in all Gödel's metamathematical statements (see [note 29](#)), is that of Hilbert and Ackermann's *Grundzüge der theoretischen Logik* (1928: English translation, 1950). The only deviations from the symbolism of *Principia Mathematica* are: "**~p**" to stand for **Not p**, "**p & q**" for **Both p and q**, "**p ® q**" for **Not both p and Not q** (the "**p É q**" of PM), "**p ~ q**" for either **both p and q** or **both Not p and Not q** (the "**p Q q**" of PM), and "**(Ex)**" as the existential quantifier in place of the "**(\$x)**" of PM. Gödel uses "**⊙**" as an abbreviation for "means the same as" in his definitions.

Except for these purely logical concepts, all the concepts involved in Gödel's [definitions 1-46](#), and also those in [\(5\)](#), [\(6\)](#), [\(6.1\)](#), [\(8.1\)](#), are arithmetical concepts (properties, relations, operations) which apply to natural numbers, i.e. the substitution values for the variables "**x**", "**y**", "**z**", "**n**", etc. occurring in the definitions are "0", "1", "2", ... And the logical concepts are restricted so that they apply to only a finite number of entities. Whenever a universal or existential quantifier occurs in any of the [definitions 1-45](#), a clause is inserted within the quantification which ensures that the quantification is only over a finite number of values. For example, the [first definition](#) defines "**x** is divisible by **y**" as There is a **z** *less than or equal to x* which is such that **x = y.z**, the phrase which I have italicized being inserted so as to restrict the quantification to numbers not greater than **x**. This makes the definiens equivalent to: **x = y.O** or **x = y.I** or ... or **x = y.x**, a truth-function of a finite number (**x+1**) of equalities. This restriction upon the quantifiers (except in [definition 46](#)) secures that all the arithmetical concepts employed (except **Bew**) are *recursive* in a sense of this word which Gödel defines and discusses in an excursus from his [main argument](#).

**RECURSIVENESS.** The notion of recursiveness has played a central part in metamathematics since Gödel's work on it, but little more will be said about it here than is necessary for an understanding of Gödel's proof of his Theorem.

The method of *recursive definition* is an extension of the method of definition by "mathematical induction" by which the natural numbers are, step by step, defined. Starting with

0, 1 is defined as the immediate successor of 0, 2 as the immediate successor of 1, and so on. A recursive definition (a "primitive recursive definition", as it is now called) is the specification of each number in a sequence of numbers by means of a specification of the first number and of a rule which specifies the  $(k+1)$ -th number in terms of the  $k$ -th number and of  $k$  itself. [This is a paraphrase of Gödel's definition of a *recursively defined* arithmetical function, where this function is of only one numerical variable: see eq. (2).] An arithmetical function is *recursive* if it is the last term in a finite sequence of functions in which each function is recursively defined by a rule involving two functions preceding it in the sequence (or is the successor function or a constant or obtained by substitution from a preceding function); and the recursiveness of other arithmetical concepts is defined by means of the notion of recursive function. The essential feature of a recursive concept—a dyadic relation  $\mathbf{R}$ , for example—is that whether or not  $\mathbf{R}$  holds between  $\mathbf{m}$  and  $\mathbf{n}$ , i.e. whether  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{m},\mathbf{n})$  is true or false, can be decided by a step-by-step procedure working upwards from  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0})$  with the use of a limited number of recursive definitions.

The importance of recursiveness for metamathematics in general lies in the fact that recursive definition enables every number in a recursively defined infinite sequence to be *constructed* according to a rule, so that a remark about the infinite sequence can be construed as a remark about the rule of construction and not as a remark about a given infinite totality. For this reason the use of only such mathematical concepts as are recursive is favoured by mathematical thinkers of both the finitist and intuitionist schools of metamathematics, and is accepted (although with extensions made by Gödel and others to the notion of recursiveness in this paper) by present-day constructivists who decline to talk about any mathematical entities that cannot be recursively constructed.

For the proof of Gödel's 'Unprovability' Theorem the importance of recursiveness lies in the fact ([Proposition V](#)) that every statement of a recursive relationship holding between given numbers  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots \mathbf{x}_n$  is expressible by a formula  $\mathbf{f}$  of the formal system  $\mathbf{P}$  which is 'provable' within  $\mathbf{P}$  if the statement is true and 'disprovable' within  $\mathbf{P}$  (i.e. the 'negation' of  $\mathbf{f}$ , written as  $\mathbf{Neg f}$ , is 'provable' within  $\mathbf{P}$ ) if the statement is false. Gödel only outlines a proof of this proposition, since it "offers no difficulties of principle and is somewhat involved" [186]; so I will expand what he says in his footnote ([note 39](#)). Since the relation  $\mathbf{R}$  in question is recursive, then if  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots \mathbf{x}_n)$  is true,  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots \mathbf{x}_n)$  can be proved in a *deductive system for arithmetic* by constructing a finite sequence of propositions starting with the axioms and ending with  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots \mathbf{x}_n)$ ; and if  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots \mathbf{x}_n)$  is false,  $\mathbf{Not R}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots \mathbf{x}_n)$  can similarly be proved. The *calculus* or formal system  $\mathbf{P}$  was designed by Gödel to represent this deductive system; so the finite sequence of propositions which constitutes a proof of  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots \mathbf{x}_n)$  or of  $\mathbf{Not R}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots \mathbf{x}_n)$  will be expressed in  $\mathbf{P}$  by a finite series of formulae ending in a formula  $\mathbf{f}$  in the one case and in the formula  $\mathbf{Neg f}$  in the other. To express in  $\mathbf{P}$  the step-by-step definitional procedure by which the truth or falsity of the recursive relationship is established is to construct either a 'proof' of  $\mathbf{f}$  or a 'proof' of  $\mathbf{Neg f}$ :  $\mathbf{f}$  or  $\mathbf{Neg f}$  will only appear in the formal system accompanied by a 'proof-

schema' of which it is the last formula. So if  $\mathbf{R}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  is true, there is a 'proof' of  $\mathbf{f}$ , and  $\mathbf{f}$  is a 'provable' formula ([definition 46](#)); and if  $\mathbf{R}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  is false,  $\mathbf{Neg f}$  is a 'provable' formula within the system  $\mathbf{P}$ .

Define a *class-sign* as a series of signs which is a formula and which contains exactly one free variable (which may occur at several places in the formula) [177]. [In Gödel's system  $\mathbf{P}$  there is no distinction between a class-sign and a property-sign, since ['axiom-schema' V](#) may be regarded as expressing the axioms that two properties (of the same type) which always go together are identical—"axioms of extensionality".] A class-sign is *recursive* if it can be interpreted as expressing a recursive arithmetical class, in which case the formula resulting from the substitution for its variable of a number-sign will be 'provable' or 'disprovable' according as the number represented by the number-sign in the interpretation of the system is or is not a member of this recursive class. A *recursive relation-sign* is defined similarly ([177]: see also [note 28](#)). Note that neither a class-sign nor a relation-sign is a basic sign, since the former contains one and the latter several free variables.

**THE UNPROVABILITY THEOREM FOR  $\mathbf{P}$ .** "We now come", as Gödel says, "to the object of our exercises"—the proof of the 'Unprovability' Theorem. To prove this he establishes [Proposition VI](#) which is more general than is necessary for proving that there are undecidable formulae in the formal system  $\mathbf{P}$ , since it is concerned not only with 'proofs' within  $\mathbf{P}$  but also with 'deductions' within  $\mathbf{P}$  from formulae not included among the 'axioms' of  $\mathbf{P}$ , i.e. with 'proofs' within a formal system  $\mathbf{P}'$  obtained from  $\mathbf{P}$  by adding these formulae as additional 'axioms'. Gödel requires this subtlety later on in his paper; but it complicates the proof of [Proposition VI](#), which I shall discuss in the simplified form in which the class  $\mathbf{c}$  of added formulae is the null class (i.e. no formulae are added to the axioms), so that a ' $\mathbf{c}$ -provable' formula within  $\mathbf{P}$  [189] is the same as a 'provable' formula within  $\mathbf{P}$ , and the argument is concerned solely with 'proofs' within  $\mathbf{P}$ . Gödel's  $\mathbf{B}_c$  is thus taken as equivalent to his relation  $\mathbf{B}$ , and  $\mathbf{Bew}_c$  as equivalent to his property  $\mathbf{Bew}$ .

[Proposition VI](#) simplified in this way may be stated as follows: *If the formal system  $\mathbf{P}$  satisfies a certain condition of 'consistency', then there is at least one recursive class-sign  $\mathbf{r}$  in  $\mathbf{P}$  such that neither  $\mathbf{v Gen r}$  nor  $\mathbf{Neg (v Gen r)}$  is 'provable' within  $\mathbf{P}$ , where  $\mathbf{v Gen r}$  is the generalization of  $\mathbf{r}$  with respect to its free variable  $\mathbf{v}$ .*

The undecidability of  $\mathbf{v Gen r}$  within  $\mathbf{P}$  depends upon  $\mathbf{P}$ 's satisfying a certain 'consistency' condition. Since this condition is only relevant to the last stage of the proof, and itself raises important questions, consideration of 'consistency' will be deferred until the main part of the proof has been discussed.

This main part is given from (8.1) to (16). Gödel states his argument in terms of Gödel numbers and of relations between Gödel numbers; and when the expressions *relation-sign*, *free variable*, *class-sign*, *provable* are used they are italicized to show that they refer to arithmetical concepts applicable to Gödel numbers. Because of the correspondence between these concepts as applied to Gödel numbers and metamathematical concepts as applied to the strings which have these Gödel numbers, Gödel's whole argument applies equally well if his symbols are interpreted as strings and the terms relation-sign, free variable, etc. are taken in their usual sense. Since Gödel's argument, though couched in terms of numbers, is a metamathematical argument, it may be convenient for philosophical logicians if I give it wholly in metamathematical terms. This will have the additional advantage that interpretations of the formulae can be inserted parenthetically at appropriate places, on the assumption that the calculus (Gödel's formal system **P**) is to be interpreted as representing a deductive system which includes propositional and first-order predicate logic—though, strictly speaking, any actual interpretation is irrelevant to the argument.

However, a recasting of Gödel's argument in metamathematical terms makes one unimportant modification necessary. For the part of his argument which establishes the 'unprovability' of **Neg** ( $\forall$  **Gen** **r**) requires at one point considering a statement about all numbers, whether or not they are Gödel numbers; and this statement cannot be construed without change as a statement about all strings, since a number which is not a Gödel number does not correspond to any string. But it is easy to close the gap in the recasting by considering the numbers which are Gödel numbers as arranged in a sequence of increasing magnitude, and then using, instead of a Gödel number itself, the number which gives the place of this Gödel number in the sequence. To be precise, if  $n$  is the  $(m+1)$ -th Gödel number in increasing order, call  $m$  the *G-number* of the string of which  $n$  is the Gödel number, and use the G-number  $m$  wherever Gödel in his argument uses the Gödel number  $n$ . Then every natural number 0, 1, 2, etc. will be the G-number of some string; and there will be a recursive one-to-one correspondence between natural numbers and strings. So arithmetical statements about all numbers can be construed as metamathematical statements about all strings. Of course Gödel's sequence of [definitions 6-46](#) defines arithmetical concepts which correspond to metamathematical concepts according to the Gödel-number method of arithmetization. But the purpose of his definitions is to establish that all the arithmetical concepts concerned (except **Bew**) are recursive and so are also all the corresponding metamathematical concepts. Consequently any proposition about them is expressible in **P** by a formula which is 'provable' or 'disprovable' according as the proposition is true or false. Having proved this (by [Proposition V](#)) Gödel makes no further use in his argument for the 'Unprovability' Theorem of his particular method of arithmetization. All that is necessary is that there should be a unique number assigned to every string. So no harm will result from continuing the argument using G-numbers instead of the corresponding Gödel numbers; and this use of G-numbers I shall call the "modified arithmetization".

To facilitate comparison with Gödel's text, I shall use Gödel's symbols, except that, as well as single small italic letters denoting numbers, I shall in future use the same letters in bold



type to stand for the strings of which these numbers are G-numbers. Thus  $x$  will be the string whose G-number is  $x$ . Gödel writes  $Z(x)$  for the Gödel number of the number-sign for the number  $x$  in his formal system  $P$  (see [definition 17](#)). This number-sign is "0" preceded by  $x$  "|" s; e.g. the number-sign for 3 is "|||0" (see [177]). I shall call these number-signs *numerals*; and shall write  $Gx$  (or, if  $x$  is a complex expression,  $G[x]$ ) for the numeral for the G-number of  $x$  and call  $Gx$  the *G-numeral* of  $x$ . Since every number is a G-number, every numeral is a G-numeral; and there is a recursive one-to-one correspondence between the members of the class of numerals "0", "|0", "||0", etc. and the members of the class of strings (which, of course, includes the class of numerals as a sub-class).

A class-sign will be written in the form  $a(v)$  and a dyadic relation-sign in the form  $b(v,w)$  with  $v$  or  $v, w$ , the free variables (of first type) concerned, mentioned explicitly. [But the G-numerals of  $a(v)$  and of  $b(v,w)$  will be abbreviated to  $Ga$  and to  $Gb$ .] Since we are concerned with the formal system  $P$  whose "individuals" are natural numbers [176] the substitution values for  $v$  and  $w$  will always be numerals, and thus always G-numerals. The result of substituting  $Gx$  for  $v$  and  $Gy$  for  $w$  in  $b(v,w)$  will be written as  $b(Gx,Gy)$ . [Gödel uses a typographically less convenient notation for substitution. In comparing my version with his text it should be remembered that 17 is the Gödel number of  $v$  and 19 that of  $w$ .]

The simplified [Proposition VI](#) may now be restated as: *If the formal system  $P$  satisfies a certain condition of 'consistency', then there is at least one recursive class-sign  $r(v)$  in  $P$  such that neither  $v \text{ Gen } r(v)$  nor  $Neg [v \text{ Gen } r(v)]$  is 'provable' within  $P$ .*

We can now follow the principal steps in the argument from [\(8.1\)](#) onwards.

Define  $Q'(x,y(u))$  as  $\text{Not } [x \text{ B } y(Gy)]$ , i.e.  $x$  is not a 'proof' of the formula obtained by substituting for the variable in the class-sign  $y(u)$  the G-numeral  $Gy$  for the class-sign itself.

Let  $Q(x,y)$  be the relationship between the G-numbers of  $x$  and of  $y$  which is equivalent to  $Q'(x, y(u))$  by the modified arithmetization.  $Q(x,y)$  is recursive; and so it follows from [Proposition V](#) that there is a recursive relation-sign  $q(v,w)$  which is such that

$Q(x,y) \rightarrow [q(Gx,Gy)]$  is 'provable';  
 $\text{Not } Q(x,y) \rightarrow [\text{Neg } q(Gx,Gy)]$  is 'provable'.

But  $Q'(x,y(u))$  is equivalent to  $Q(x,y)$ ; and thus

$Q'(x,y(u)) \rightarrow [q(Gx,Gy)]$  is 'provable';  
 $\text{Not } Q'(x,y(u)) \rightarrow [\text{Neg } q(Gx,Gy)]$  is 'provable'.

The relation-sign  $q(v,w)$  may therefore be regarded as a formula expressing the relation

which  $\mathbf{x}$  has to  $\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{u})$  when  $\mathbf{x}$  is not a 'proof' of  $\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{Gy})$ .

Consider the 'generalization' of the relation-sign  $\mathbf{q}(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w})$  with respect to the free variable  $\mathbf{v}$ , yielding the formula  $\mathbf{v Gen q}(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w})$ . This has one free variable, namely  $\mathbf{w}$ , and so is a class-sign. Call it  $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{w})$ . It may be regarded as denoting the class of which a class-sign  $\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{u})$  is a member if and only if everything is not a 'proof' of  $\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{Gy})$ , i.e. if and only if  $\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{Gy})$  is 'unprovable'.

Next consider the substitution in the same relation-sign  $\mathbf{q}(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w})$  of  $\mathbf{Gp}$  for the free variable  $\mathbf{w}$ , yielding the formula  $\mathbf{q}(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{Gp})$ . This also has one free variable,  $\mathbf{v}$ , and so is also a class-sign. Call it  $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v})$ . It may be regarded as denoting the class of strings which are not 'proofs' of  $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{Gp})$ . Since it may also be regarded, according to the modified arithmetization, as denoting the class of the G-numbers of these strings, which is a recursive arithmetical class,  $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v})$  is a recursive class-sign.

Now consider the 'generalization' of this class-sign  $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v})$  i.e. of  $\mathbf{q}(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{Gp})$ , with respect to its free variable  $\mathbf{v}$ , which yields the formula  $\mathbf{v Gen r}(\mathbf{v})$ . This has no free variable, and may be regarded as expressing the proposition that everything is not a 'proof' of  $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{Gp})$ , i.e. that  $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{Gp})$  is 'unprovable'.

But, and here is the crux of the argument,  $\mathbf{v Gen r}(\mathbf{v})$  is the same as  $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{Gp})$ . For we arrived at the former by first substituting  $\mathbf{Gp}$  for  $\mathbf{w}$  in  $\mathbf{q}(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w})$ , which yielded  $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v})$ , and then 'generalizing' with respect to  $\mathbf{v}$ , which yielded  $\mathbf{v Gen r}(\mathbf{v})$ . But, since the substitution and the 'generalization' had reference to different free variables, the two operations yield the same final result if performed in the reverse order, i.e. by first 'generalizing'  $\mathbf{q}(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w})$  with respect to  $\mathbf{v}$ , which yields  $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{w})$ , and then substituting  $\mathbf{Gp}$  for  $\mathbf{w}$  in  $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{w})$ , which yields  $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{Gp})$ . If either of the formulae  $\mathbf{v Gen r}(\mathbf{v})$  or  $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{Gp})$  be expanded to get rid of the abbreviations  $\mathbf{r}$  and  $\mathbf{p}$ , we get one and the same formula

$$\mathbf{v Gen q}(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{G}[\mathbf{v Gen q}(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w})]).$$

This formula, and of course each of the abbreviations of it, may be regarded as expressing the proposition that the formula itself is 'unprovable', i.e. the formula expresses its own 'unprovability'.

The formula of Gödel's which I have sometimes quoted, namely " $\mathbf{17 Gen r}$ ", is the modified arithmetization of my metamathematical " $\mathbf{v Gen r}(\mathbf{v})$ ", but with 17, the Godel number of my variable  $\mathbf{v}$ , used instead of the G-number of  $\mathbf{v}$ . Since it is immaterial in which way the metamathematical formula is written, I shall in the next few pages use the shortest form, namely  $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{Gp})$ .

Now for the last stages of the proof. We go back to  $\mathbf{Q}'(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{u}))$ , defined as

**Not [x B y(Gy)]**, i.e. as expressing the metamathematical proposition that **x** is not a 'proof' of **y(Gy)**. If we take the class-sign **y(u)** to be **p(u)**, which is the same as **p(w)**, since **u** and **w** are variables, we get for the consequences of the truth or falsity of **Q'(x, p(u))**, i.e. of the truth or falsity of **Not [x B p(Gp)]**:

**Not [x B p(Gp)]** → [**q(Gx, Gp)**] is 'provable';

**x B p(Gp)** → [**Neg q (Gx, Gp)**] is 'provable'.

**q(Gx, Gp)** is the same as **r(Gx)** (which corresponds to Gödel's expression in square brackets on the right-hand side of (15)).

Suppose now that **p(Gp)** were to be 'provable'. Then there would be a 'proof-schema' **n** such that **n B p(Gp)**, and hence such that **Neg q(Gn, Gp)** i.e. **Neg r(Gn)** would be 'provable'. But if **p(Gp)**, i.e. **v Gen r(v)**, were 'provable', so also would be **r(Gn)**. So from the supposition that **p(Gp)** is 'provable', there follows that both **r(Gn)** and **Neg r(Gn)** are 'provable'. Call a formal system (a calculus) '*consistent*' if it contains no pair of 'provable' formulae of the forms **f**, **Neg f**. Then, if **p(Gp)** is 'provable', the formal system **P** is 'inconsistent'; so, if **P** is 'consistent', **p(Gp)** is 'unprovable' within **P**.

Suppose that **P** is 'consistent' and that **Neg p(Gp)** were to be 'provable'. Since **p(Gp)** is 'unprovable', **Not [n B p(Gp)]** holds for every string **n**. Thus **q(Gn, Gp)**, i.e. **r(Gn)**, is 'provable' for every string **n**; and hence **r(m)** is 'provable' for every numeral **m**. But **Neg p(Gp)** is the same as **Neg [v Gen r(v)]**; and, if this were to be 'provable', the curious situation would arise of every substitution-instance **r(m)** of the class-sign **r(v)** being 'provable' while the 'generalization' of **r(v)** with respect to **v** was 'disprovable'. This situation is, however, compatible with the 'consistency' of **P**: in order to prohibit its occurrence a stronger form of consistency, called by Gödel '*w-consistency*', must be assumed to hold of **P**. [A formal system is '*w-consistent*' if it contains no class-sign **a(u)** which is such both that **a(m)** is 'provable' within the system for every numeral **m** and that **Neg [u Gen a(u)]** is 'provable' within the system [187].] Since the 'consistency' (sometimes called 'simple consistency') of **P** is a consequence of its '*ω-consistency*', the conjunction of '*ω-consistency*' with the 'provability' of **Neg p(Gp)** yields a contradiction; so, if the formal system **P** is '*ω-consistent*', **Neg p(Gp)** is 'unprovable' within **P**.

Combining these two results tells us that, if **P** is '*ω-consistent*', neither **p(Gp)** nor **Neg p(Gp)** is 'provable' within **P**, i.e. **p(Gp)** is undecidable within **P**.

In order to compare this with my simplified restatement of Gödel's [Proposition VI](#) we must remember that **p(Gp)** is the same as **v Gen r(v)**. **r(v)** is a recursive class-sign; so there is a recursive class-sign **r(v)** in **P** such that neither **v Gen r(v)** nor **Neg [v Gen r(v)]** is 'provable' within **P**, if **P** is '*ω-consistent*'.

'CONSISTENCY'. If a formal system (a calculus) is 'inconsistent', it will contain both a 'provable' formula  $f$  and a 'provable' formula  $\text{Neg } f$ . If its 'axioms' and 'rules of inference' are such that the 'inconsistent' calculus can be interpreted, with  $\text{Neg}$  interpreted as meaning Not and a 'provable' formula interpreted as standing for a provable proposition, so that the deductive system which it represents includes a deductive sub-system of propositional logic (as is the case with Gödel's calculus  $\mathbf{P}$ ), then this deductive system will have as theorems both a proposition  $p$  (namely, the proposition represented by  $f$ ) and its contradictory  $\text{Not } p$  (the proposition represented by  $\text{Neg } f$ ), and hence the conjunction  $p \ \& \ \text{Not } p$ —a self-contradiction. The deductive system will thus be inconsistent in the usual sense of the term, which, of course, is why Gödel uses the same word to apply to a calculus and I use the same word within single quotation marks.

Since  $p \ \dot{E} \ (p \ \dot{U} \ q)$ , which is equivalent to  $(p \ \& \ \text{Not } p) \ \dot{E} \ q$ , is either an axiom or a theorem in propositional logic (the formula representing it in Gödel's  $\mathbf{P}$  falls under '[axiom-schema II.2](#)'), and since *modus ponens* ( $q$  is an immediate consequence of  $p$  and  $p \ \dot{E} \ q$ ) is a rule of inference in propositional logic (Gödel's  $\mathbf{P}$  uses the corresponding 'rule': see [178]), every proposition is a consequence of a self-contradiction. An inconsistent deductive system which includes a sub-system of propositional logic will therefore contain every proposition whatever as a theorem of the system. So if a calculus can be interpreted as representing a deductive system with the very small number of features required for it to include propositional logic, and if the calculus is 'inconsistent', every (well-formed) formula in the calculus will be 'provable' within the calculus. Such a calculus will be of no interest, since there will be no division of its formulae into those which are 'provable' and those which are not. This is the principal reason why metamathematicians attach such importance to a calculus being 'consistent', altogether apart from whether or not the calculus is in fact interpreted to represent a deductive system.

If the calculus  $\mathbf{P}$  were 'inconsistent', all its formulae would be 'provable' and so the condition for ' $\omega$ -consistency' could not be satisfied. So if  $\mathbf{P}$  is ' $\omega$ -consistent', it is also 'consistent'. The notion of ' $\omega$ -consistency' is intimately connected with finitist methods of proof. It will not be further considered here, since it is not a necessary condition in an 'Unprovability' Theorem for Gödel's formal system  $\mathbf{P}$ . In 1936 Rosser, by an argument involving a recursive class-sign more complicated than Gödel's  $r(v)$ , established an 'Unprovability' Theorem for  $\mathbf{P}$  (and for systems of similar character) which required as a condition only that  $\mathbf{P}$  is 'consistent'.

A principal aim of Hilbert and his school had been to establish the 'consistency' of a calculus capable of being interpreted as expressing arithmetic, and thus to prove the consistency of a deductive system of arithmetic. To them the second great theorem contained in this paper was even more of a shock than the 'Unprovability' Theorem. For this second theorem proves the undecidability within  $\mathbf{P}$  of a formula expressing the 'consistency' of  $\mathbf{P}$ , thus showing that the 'consistency' of  $\mathbf{P}$ , if  $\mathbf{P}$  is 'consistent', cannot be established by a 'proof' within  $\mathbf{P}$ , i.e. a 'proof'

starting with only the 'axioms' of **P** and using only **P**'s 'rules of inference'. [If **P** is 'inconsistent', of course both **P**'s 'consistency' and **P**'s 'inconsistency' can be 'proved' within **P**.]

**THE 'UNPROVABILITY'-OF-'CONSISTENCY' THEOREM FOR P.** Gödel proves this theorem (his [Proposition XI](#)) in a general form, corresponding to that of his [Proposition VI](#), which is concerned with 'deductions' as well as 'proofs' within **P**. As with [Proposition VI](#) I shall discuss [Proposition XI](#) in a simplified form in which it is concerned solely with 'proofs' within **P**. The simplified form is obtained by taking the class **c** to be the null class, and consequently  $B_c$  and  $Bew_c$  as equivalent to **B** and to  $Bew$  respectively.

[Proposition XI](#) simplified in this way may be stated as follows: *If the formal system **P** is 'consistent', its 'consistency' is 'unprovable' within **P**.*

In order to prove this theorem Gödel uses the result established towards the end of the proof of his 'Unprovability' Theorem, namely that, if **P** is 'consistent', the formula  $p(Gp)$  is 'unprovable'. Since, as we have seen, this formula may be regarded as expressing its own 'unprovability', the metamathematical proposition

$P$  is 'consistent'  $\rightarrow p(Gp)$  is 'unprovable'

may be expressed within **P** by the formula, 'provable' within **P**,

$w \text{ Imp } p(Gp)$ ,

where **w** (this symbol no longer being used as a variable) is a recursive formula expressing in **P** the 'consistency' of **P**, and  $u \text{ Imp } v$  expresses in **P** the propositional schema Not a or b (see [definition 32](#)). Then it follows from the definition of 'immediate consequence' ([definition 43](#)) that, if **w** were to be 'provable',  $p(Gp)$  would also be 'provable'. But if **P** is 'consistent',  $p(Gp)$  is 'unprovable', and so also is **w**. Thus a formula **w** expressing the 'consistency' of **P** is 'unprovable' within **P**—on the assumption, of course, that **P** is 'consistent'.

In this paper Gödel only professed to "sketch in outline" the proof of his [Proposition XI](#), and the sequel in which he intended to present it "in detail" he never published. Indeed the part of the detailed proof which establishes that  $w \text{ Imp } p(Gp)$  is 'provable' within **P** requires exhibiting a 'proof' within **P** of  $w \text{ Imp } p(Gp)$ , and this is a lengthy and complicated business. However there is *prima facie* a gap in Gödel's "sketch" of the proof, namely how a recursive formula **w** which expresses the 'consistency' of **P** can be constructed in **P**; but this gap can easily be closed by an argument which I owe to Rosser. Let **t** be a particular formula which is 'provable' in **P**; e.g. one of the 'axioms' of **P**. If  $\text{Neg } t$  is also 'provable', **P** is 'inconsistent'. But, if

$\mathbf{P}$  is 'inconsistent', every (well-formed) formula is 'provable' in  $\mathbf{P}$ , and so  $\mathbf{Neg\ t}$  is 'provable'. Thus the 'inconsistency' of  $\mathbf{P}$  is logically equivalent to the 'provability' of  $\mathbf{Neg\ t}$ , and the 'consistency' of  $\mathbf{P}$  to the 'unprovability' of  $\mathbf{Neg\ t}$ . So all that is required is a recursive formula in  $\mathbf{P}$  expressing the 'unprovability' of  $\mathbf{Neg\ t}$ , which is easy to provide.  $\mathbf{x\ B\ y}$  ( $\mathbf{x}$  is a 'proof' of the formula  $\mathbf{y}$ ) is a recursive relation-sign ([definition 45](#)) with  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  as its free variables; hence  $\mathbf{Neg\ (x\ B\ Neg\ t)}$  is a recursive class-sign, with  $\mathbf{x}$  as its free variable, and  $\mathbf{x\ Gen\ [Neg\ (x\ B\ Neg\ t)]}$  is a recursive formula which expresses in  $\mathbf{P}$  the 'unprovability' of  $\mathbf{Neg\ t}$ , which is equivalent to the 'consistency' of  $\mathbf{P}$ . So the  $\mathbf{w}$  of the proof in the last paragraph may be taken to be  $\mathbf{x\ Gen\ [Neg\ (x\ B\ Neg\ t)]}$ , in which case the proof (when given in detail) will fully satisfy the requirements of finitists and constructivists.

Gödel says at the end of his paper that his 'Unprovability'-of-'Consistency' Theorem represents "no contradiction of the formalistic standpoint of Hilbert. For this standpoint presupposes only the existence of a consistency proof effected which *cannot* be stated in  $\mathbf{P}$ " (see [197]). This was a pious hope of Gödel's, made reasonable when he uttered it by the lack of precision in Hilbert's notion of a proof "effected by finite means". Clarification of this notion, to which this paper and later work of Gödel notably contributed, have explicated it in terms of the concept of recursiveness and of extensions of this concept; and it is now certain that, within any formal system using only such concepts and capable of expressing arithmetic, it is impossible to establish its own 'consistency' (if it is 'consistent'). In 1936 Gentzen was able to prove the 'consistency' of such a formal system, but only by using non-constructive methods of proof ("transfinite induction") which fall outside the constructive 'rules of inference' of the system. Gödel, in this paper which established his two great theorems by methods which are constructive in a precise sense, on the one hand showed the essential limitations imposed upon constructivist formal systems (which include all systems basing a calculus for arithmetic upon "mathematical induction"), and on the other hand displayed the power of constructivist methods for establishing metamathematical truths. To a philosophical logician it appears an even more remarkable feat to have been able to establish the internal undecidability of some arithmetical formulae than to provide (as Hilbert's school would have wished) a decision procedure for the whole of arithmetic.

**THE SYNTACTICAL CHARACTER OF GÖDEL'S THEOREMS.** In concluding this Introduction I wish to elaborate a point I have made several times in passing, namely that Gödel's two great theorems are metamathematical theorems about a calculus (his formal system  $\mathbf{P}$ ) and are not, in themselves, metamathematical theorems about a deductive system which is an interpretation of the calculus. However, theorems about deductive systems are immediate corollaries. The statement that there are arithmetical propositions which are neither provable nor disprovable within their arithmetical system (which at the beginning of this Introduction I called Gödel's Theorem *tout court*) is, for the deductive system for arithmetic represented by the calculus  $\mathbf{P}$ , a corollary of the 'Unprovability' Theorem for  $\mathbf{P}$ .



To appreciate this, consider the formula  $\forall \mathbf{G} \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v})$  whose undecidability (subject, of course, to  $\mathbf{P}$  being ' $\omega$ -consistent') was established by the proof of the 'Unprovability' Theorem. Interpret the class-sign  $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v})$  as denoting the class of G-numbers of the strings which are not 'proofs' of  $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{G}\mathbf{p})$ —the second interpretation of  $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v})$  mentioned. This class of numbers, specified thus metamathematically, may also be specified arithmetically by modifying the arithmetization of *series of formulae, formula, proof* provided by definitions 1-45. So if 'generalizing'  $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v})$  with respect to  $\mathbf{v}$  is interpreted as stating that the class of numbers denoted by  $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v})$  is the universal class, the formula  $\forall \mathbf{G} \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v})$  will be interpreted as expressing the proposition that every number is a member of a certain arithmetically specified class—a straight arithmetical proposition (call it  $\mathbf{g}$ ). If the calculus  $\mathbf{P}$  (assumed to be ' $\omega$ -consistent') is interpreted as representing a deductive system  $\mathbf{S}$  for arithmetic (and it was devised so that it could represent that part of the *Principia Mathematica* deductive system required for arithmetic), with the 'axioms' and 'rules of inference' of  $\mathbf{P}$  representing the axioms and rules of inference of  $\mathbf{S}$  (and such an interpretation permits the interpretation of  $\forall \mathbf{G} \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v})$  as expressing the arithmetical proposition  $\mathbf{g}$ ), then  $\mathbf{g}$  will be neither provable nor disprovable by the methods of proof available in  $\mathbf{S}$ , i.e. neither  $\mathbf{g}$  nor  $\mathbf{Not} \mathbf{g}$  will be a theorem of  $\mathbf{S}$ . [In Section 3 of this paper Gödel uses *arithmetical* in a more restricted sense than I have used it, and establishes that, even in this restricted sense, there will be arithmetical propositions undecidable in  $\mathbf{S}$ .] The undecidability (the 'unprovability' and 'undisprovability') of  $\forall \mathbf{G} \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v})$  within  $\mathbf{P}$  is transferred to the deductive system  $\mathbf{S}$  represented by  $\mathbf{P}$  to yield the undecidability (the unprovability and undisprovability) of  $\mathbf{g}$  within  $\mathbf{S}$ . Similarly the 'unprovability' within  $\mathbf{P}$  of the 'consistency' of  $\mathbf{P}$  (assumed to be 'consistent') transfers to  $\mathbf{S}$  to yield the unprovability within  $\mathbf{S}$  of the consistency of  $\mathbf{S}$ .

The undecidability of some arithmetical propositions within the deductive system  $\mathbf{S}$  may be classed among the syntactical metamathematical characteristics of the system  $\mathbf{S}$  (represented by the calculus  $\mathbf{P}$ ), for the reason that this undecidability derives from the undecidability of some formulae within the calculus  $\mathbf{P}$  which represents  $\mathbf{S}$ . Deductive systems, unlike calculi, have also *semantical* metamathematical characteristics; in particular their propositions have or lack the semantical property of *being true*—what Gödel in his introductory Section I calls being "correct as regards content" (*inhaltlich richtig*). Connecting the syntactical property of being provable with the semantical property of being true by taking every proposition provable within  $\mathbf{S}$  (i.e. every axiom and theorem of  $\mathbf{S}$ ) to be true (see [176]) gives an additional kick to the undecidability in  $\mathbf{S}$  of  $\mathbf{g}$ —by adding *that  $\mathbf{g}$  is true*. For the correlation of arithmetical and metamathematical propositions effected by the modified arithmetization ensures that  $\mathbf{g}$  will be true if and only if  $\forall \mathbf{G} \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{v})$  is 'unprovable' within  $\mathbf{P}$ , i.e. if and only if  $\mathbf{g}$  is unprovable within  $\mathbf{S}$ . Hence if  $\mathbf{g}$  were not true,  $\mathbf{g}$  would be provable within  $\mathbf{S}$  and so true—a contradiction. Consequently if the axioms and theorems of the deductive-system-for-arithmetic  $\mathbf{S}$  are true (and this implies the consistency of  $\mathbf{S}$ , for otherwise two propositions  $\mathbf{p}$  and  $\mathbf{Not} \mathbf{p}$ , which cannot both be true, would both be theorems of  $\mathbf{S}$ ), then there is an arithmetical proposition, namely  $\mathbf{g}$ , which is not provable within  $\mathbf{S}$  (a syntactical characteristic) but which nevertheless is true (a semantical characteristic). This metamathematical argument which, combines semantical with syntactical considerations, establishes the truth of an arithmetical proposition which cannot be proved

within **S**.

In his introductory Section 1 Gödel intermingles semantical with syntactical considerations in sketching a proof of the undecidability of **g** (which is the reason why I have seldom referred to this section in this Introduction). The distinction between what is syntactical and what semantical was not made explicitly until a year or two later (by Tarski, whose work included rigorously establishing unprovability theorems that were semantical); but it is implicit in Gödel's remark towards the end of Section I that "the exact statement of the proof [of the undecidability of **g**], which now follows, will have among others the task of substituting for the second of these assumptions [that every provable formula is also correct as regards content] a purely formal and much weaker one" [176]. Gödel's proof in Section 2 is a purely syntactical proof about a calculus (the formal system **P**) whose interpretation as a deductive system for arithmetic is, strictly speaking, irrelevant to his argument. It is true that Gödel explains arithmetization as a way of co-ordinating strings in his calculus with natural numbers, and he discusses recursive functions in terms of natural numbers (and I have followed him in speaking of numbers in both these contexts). But whenever he talks about numbers, and thus makes a remark which is *prima facie* about a deductive system rather than about a calculus, the remark is always a syntactical remark about the deductive system, and is therefore in essence a remark about the calculus which represents the system. For example, when Gödel says at the beginning of Section 2 that his formal system **P** has "numbers as individuals", and speaks of "variables of first type (for individuals, i.e. natural numbers including 0)" [176], all that is relevant to his argument is that *numerals* are the only substitution values (not containing variables) permitted for his variables of first type. This is shown most clearly when Gödel specifies the substitution operation in connexion with his 'axiom-schema' III.1, which requires the substitution for a variable of first type of a sign of first type, which he has previously explained as being "a combination of signs of the form: **a**, |**a**, ||**a**, |||**a**, etc., where **a** is either "0" [in which case the sign is a number-sign] or a variable of first type" ([176]; in Gödel's text 0 occurs instead of "0", but this would seem to be a misprint).

Gödel's 'arithmetization' of metamathematical concepts (as also my 'modified arithmetization') is in fact effected by correlating to each string **x** another string which is a numeral: there is no need to pass from a string **x** to this numeral by the indirect route of first moving to the Gödel number (or G-number) of **x** and then passing from this number to the numeral which expresses it in the calculus **P**. In the argument the equivalence, for example, between the metamathematical proposition about **P** stating that the string (the series of formulae) **n** is a 'proof' of the string (the formula) **y** and an arithmetical relationship between the G-numbers **n** and **y** of these strings may equally well be construed as an equivalence between the metamathematical proposition and the occurrence as a 'theorem' of **P** (i.e. as a 'provable' formula within **P**) of an appropriate 'recursive' 'arithmetical' formula **f** containing the strings (the numerals) **Gn** and **Gy**. [The requirement that **f** should be 'recursive' ensures that, if **f** is not a 'theorem' of **P**, **Neg f** is.] The peculiarity of the 'recursive' class-sign **r(v)** of the 'Unprovability' Theorem is that, if there were to be a string **n** which was a 'proof' of **v Gen r(v)**, the 'recursive'



'arithmetical' formula  $\text{Neg } r(\mathbf{Gn})$  would occur as a 'theorem' of  $\mathbf{P}$ , whereas  $r(\mathbf{Gn})$  would also appear as a 'theorem' of  $\mathbf{P}$  as an 'immediate consequence' of a formula falling under ['axiom-schema' III.I](#) and of  $\forall \mathbf{v} \text{ Gen } r(\mathbf{v})$ . In other words, if  $\forall \mathbf{v} \text{ Gen } r(\mathbf{v})$  were to be a 'theorem' (derived by a 'proof'  $\mathbf{n}$ ),  $r(\mathbf{Gn})$  would be a 'theorem' for a reason internal to the calculus, and  $\text{Neg } r(\mathbf{Gn})$  would be a 'theorem' for the reason that it was the 'recursive' formula whose occurrence as a 'theorem' was equivalent, according to the 'modified arithmetization', to  $\mathbf{n}$  being a 'proof' of  $\forall \mathbf{v} \text{ Gen } r(\mathbf{v})$ .

In the last paragraph, where part of the proof of Gödel's 'Unprovability' Theorem has been restated in terms which either are used within the calculus  $\mathbf{P}$  or are syntactical terms used to describe features of  $\mathbf{P}$ , I have put single quotation marks round 'recursive', 'arithmetical', 'arithmetization', 'modified arithmetization' to indicate that these words are being used (like 'theorem', 'proof', 'provable', etc.) as calculus terms and not as deductive-system terms. The whole of Gödel's formal argument in this paper is syntactical: that he arithmetizes metamathematics instead of only 'arithmetizing' it is purely a matter of expository convenience. For his arithmetization is in terms of recursive arithmetical concepts, and by his [Proposition V](#) the question as to whether or not a recursive arithmetical relationship holds between *numbers* is equivalent to the syntactical question as to which of two 'recursive' formulae containing *numerals*, of the forms  $\mathbf{f}$ ,  $\text{Neg } \mathbf{f}$  respectively, is a 'theorem' of the calculus  $\mathbf{P}$ . [In my sketch of Gödel's proof of the 'Unprovability' Theorem I have declined to follow him in using such terms as *formula*, *proof*, *class-sign* with an arithmetical interpretation; and I have, so far as was conveniently possible, employed G-numerals instead of G-numbers.]

Thus Gödel's two great theorems are theorems about his calculus  $\mathbf{P}$ : they assert the 'unprovability' within  $\mathbf{P}$  of certain well-formed formulae of  $\mathbf{P}$  (on the assumption that  $\mathbf{P}$  is ' $\omega$ -consistent' or 'consistent' respectively). Of course the interest to the learned world of the calculus  $\mathbf{P}$  is that it can be regarded as representing a deductive system for arithmetic in which, therefore, there are undecidable arithmetical propositions. Though Gödel's formal proofs apply only to  $\mathbf{P}$ , he indicates how similar proofs would apply to any calculus satisfying two very general conditions [190], conditions so general that any calculus capable of expressing arithmetic can hardly fail to satisfy them. So this paper of Gödel's proclaimed the thesis, which has been clarified and confirmed by the work of subsequent metamathematicians, that no calculus can be devised in such a way that every arithmetical proposition is represented in it by a formula which is either 'provable' or 'disprovable' within the calculus, and therefore that any deductive system whatever for arithmetic will have the general syntactical characteristic of *not* containing either a proof or a disproof of every arithmetical proposition.

This syntactical fact about arithmetic is sometimes described by saying that arithmetic, in its very nature, is incomplete. Gödel's discovery of this incompleteness, presented in this paper, is one of the greatest and most surprising of the intellectual achievements of this century.

[I am much indebted to Dr T. J. Smiley for criticizing most helpfully the penultimate draft of this Introduction.

R. B. B.]

---

[BACK](#)

Design © 1998 Siegfried. All rights reserved.



---

# **Fear and Trembling**

**by**

**Johannes DE SILENTIO, 1843**

**(alias Søren Kierkegaard)**

**tr. Walter Lowrie, 1941**

## **Table of Contents**

Was Tarquinius Superbus in seinem Garten mit den Mohnköpfen sprach, verstand der Sohn, aber nicht der Bote. (What Tarquinius Superbus spoke in his garden with the poppies was understood by his son, but not by the messenger.)<sup>1</sup> - Hamann.

Chapters [Preface](#) [Prelude](#) [A Panegyric upon Abraham](#) [Problemata: Problem I](#) [Problem II](#) [Problem III](#)  
[Epilogue](#)

**An HTML Presentation by Siegfried**

---

## **PREFACE<sup>2</sup>**

Not merely in the realm of commerce but in the world of ideas as well our

age is organizing a regular clearance sale. Everything is to be had at such a bargain that it is questionable whether in the end there is anybody who will want to bid. Every speculative price-fixer who conscientiously directs attention to the significant march of modern philosophy, every *Privatdocent*, tutor, and student, every crofter and cottar in philosophy, is not content with doubting everything but goes further. Perhaps it would be untimely and ill-timed to ask them where they are going, but surely it is courteous and unobtrusive to regard it as certain that they have doubted everything, since otherwise it would be a queer thing for them to be going further. This preliminary movement they have therefore all of them made, and presumably with such ease that they do not find it necessary to let drop a word about the how; for not even he who anxiously and with deep concern sought a little enlightenment was able to find any such thing, any guiding sign, any little dietetic prescription, as to how one was to comport oneself in supporting this prodigious task. "But Descartes<sup>3</sup> did it." Descartes, a venerable, humble and honest thinker, whose writings surely no one can read without the deepest emotion, did what he said and said what he did. Alas, alack, that is a great rarity in our times! Descartes, as he repeatedly affirmed, did not doubt in matters of faith. "*Memores tamen, ut jam dictum est, huic lumini naturali tamdiu tantum esse credendum, quamdiu nihil contrarium a Deo ipso revelatur. ... Praeter caetera autem, memoriae nostrae pro summa regula est infigendum, ea quae nobis a Deo revelata sunt, ut omnium certissima esse credenda; et quamvis forte lumen rationis, quam maxime clarum et evidens, aliud quid nobis suggerere videretur, sold tamen auctoritati divinae potius quam proprio nostro iudicio fidem esse adhibendam.*" <sup>4</sup> He did not cry, "Fire!" nor did he make it a duty for everyone to doubt; for Descartes was a quiet and solitary thinker, not a bellowing night-watchman; he modestly admitted that his method had importance for him alone and was justified in part by the bungled knowledge of his earlier years. "*Ne quis igitur putet me hic traditurum aliquam methodum quam unusquisque sequi debeat ad recte regendum rationem; illam enim tantum quam ipsemet secutus sum exponere decrevi. ... Sed simul ac illud studiorum curriculum absolvi (sc. juventutis), quo decurso mos est in eruditorum numerum cooptari, plane aliud coepi cogitare. Tot enim me dubiis totque erroribus implicatum esse animadverti, ut omnes discendi conatus nihil aliud mihi profuisse iudicarem, quam quod ignorantiam meam magis magisque detexissem.*" <sup>5</sup>

What those ancient Greeks (who also had some understanding of philosophy) regarded as a task for a whole lifetime, seeing that dexterity in doubting is not acquired in a few days or weeks, what the veteran combatant attained when he had preserved the equilibrium of doubt through all the pitfalls he encountered, who intrepidly denied the certainty of sense-perception and the certainty of the processes of thought, incorruptibly defied the apprehensions of self-love and the insinuations of sympathy—that is where everybody begins in our time.

In our time nobody is content to stop with faith but wants to go further. It would perhaps be rash to ask where these people are going, but

it is surely a sign of breeding and culture for me to assume that everybody has faith, for otherwise it would be queer for them to be ... going further. In those old days it was different, then faith was a task for a whole lifetime, because it was assumed that dexterity in faith is not acquired in a few days or weeks. When the tried oldster drew near to his last hour, having fought the good fight and kept the faith, his heart was still young enough not to have forgotten that fear and trembling which chastened the youth, which the man indeed held in check, but which no man quite outgrows ... except as he might succeed at the earliest opportunity in going further. Where these revered figures arrived, that is the point where everybody in our day begins to go further.

The present writer is nothing of a philosopher, he has not understood the System, does not know whether it actually exists, whether it is completed; already he has enough for his weak head in the thought of what a prodigious head everybody in our day must have, since everybody has such a prodigious thought. Even though one were capable of converting the whole content of faith into the form of a concept, it does not follow that one has adequately conceived faith and understands how one got into it, or how it got into one. The present writer is nothing of a philosopher; he is, *poetice et eleganter*, an amateur writer who neither writes the System nor *promises*<sup>6</sup> of the System, who neither subscribes to the System nor ascribes anything to it. He writes because for him it is a luxury which becomes the more agreeable and more evident, the fewer there are who buy and read what he writes. He can easily foresee his fate in an age when passion has been obliterated in favor of learning, in an age when an author who wants to have readers must take care to write in such a way that the book can easily be perused during the afternoon nap, and take care to fashion his outward deportment in likeness to the picture of that polite young gardener in the advertisement sheet,<sup>7</sup> who with hat in hand, and with a good certificate from the place where he last served, recommends himself to the esteemed public. He foresees his fate—that he will be entirely ignored. He has a presentiment of the dreadful event, that a jealous criticism will many a time let him feel the birch; he trembles at the still more dreadful thought that one or another enterprising scribe, a gulper of paragraphs, who to rescue learning is always willing to do with other peoples' writings what Trop<sup>8</sup> "to preserve good taste" magnanimously resolved to do with a book called *The Destruction of the Human Race*—that is, he will slice the author into paragraphs, and will do it with the same inflexibility as the man who in the interest of the science of punctuation divided his discourse by counting the words, so that there were fifty words for a period and thirty-five for a semicolon.

I prostrate myself with the profoundest deference before every systematic "bag-peerer" at the custom house, protesting, "This is not the System, it has nothing whatever to do with the System." I call down every blessing upon the System and upon the Danish shareholders in this omnibus<sup>9</sup>—for a tower it is hardly likely to become. I wish them all and sundry good luck and all prosperity.

*Respectfully,*  
Johannes DE SILENTIO

## **PRELUDE<sup>10</sup>**

Once upon a time there was a man who as a child had heard the beautiful story<sup>11</sup> about how God tempted Abraham, and how he endured temptation, kept the faith, and a second time received again a son contrary to expectation. When the child became older he read the same story with even greater admiration, for life had separated what was united in the pious simplicity of the child. The older he became, the more frequently his mind reverted to that story, his enthusiasm became greater and greater, and yet he was less and less able to understand the story. At last in his interest for that he forgot everything else; his soul had only one wish, to see Abraham, one longing, to have been witness to that event. His desire was not to behold the beautiful countries of the Orient, or the earthly glory of the Promised Land, or that godfearing couple whose old age God had blessed, or the venerable figure of the aged patriarch, or the vigorous young manhood of Isaac whom God had bestowed upon Abraham—he saw no reason why the same thing might not have taken place on a barren heath in Denmark. His yearning was to accompany them on the three days' journey when Abraham rode with sorrow before him and with Isaac by his side. His only wish was to be present at the time when Abraham lifted up his eyes and saw Mount Moriah afar off, at the time when he left the asses behind and went alone with Isaac up unto the mountain; for what his mind was intent upon was not the ingenious web of imagination but the shudder of thought.

That man was not a thinker, he felt no need of getting beyond faith; he deemed it the most glorious thing to be remembered as the father of it, an enviable lot to possess it, even though no one else were to know it.

That man was not a learned exegete, he didn't know Hebrew, if he had known Hebrew, he perhaps would easily have understood the story and Abraham.

### **I**

*"And God tempted Abraham and said unto him, Take Isaac, shine only son, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah, and offer him there for a burnt offering upon the mountain which I will show thee."*

It was early in the morning, Abraham arose betimes, he had the asses saddled, left his tent, and Isaac with him, but Sarah looked out of

the window after them until they had passed down the valley and she could see them no more.<sup>12</sup> They rode in silence for three days. On the morning of the fourth day Abraham said never a word, but he lifted up his eyes and saw Mount Moriah afar off. He left the young men behind and went on alone with Isaac beside him up to the mountain. But Abraham said to himself, "I will not conceal from Isaac whither this course leads him." He stood still, he laid his hand upon the head of Isaac in benediction, and Isaac bowed to receive the blessing. And Abraham's face was fatherliness, his look was mild, his speech encouraging. But Isaac was unable to understand him, his soul could not be exalted; he embraced Abraham's knees, he fell at his feet imploringly, he begged for his young life, for the fair hope of his future, he called to mind the joy in Abraham's house, he called to mind the sorrow and loneliness. Then Abraham lifted up the boy, he walked with him by his side, and his talk was full of comfort and exhortation. But Isaac could not understand him. He climbed Mount Moriah, but Isaac understood him not. Then for an instant he turned away from him, and when Isaac again saw Abraham's face it was changed, his glance was wild, his form was horror. He seized Isaac by the throat, threw him to the ground, and said, "Stupid boy, dost thou then suppose that I am thy father? I am an idolater. Dost thou suppose that this is God's bidding? No, it is my desire." Then Isaac trembled and cried out in his terror, "O God in heaven, have compassion upon me. God of Abraham, have compassion upon me. If I have no father upon earth, be Thou my father!" But Abraham in a low voice said to himself, "O Lord in heaven, I thank Thee. After all it is better for him to believe that I am a monster, rather than that he should lose faith in Thee."

When the child must be weaned, the mother blackens her breast, it would indeed be a shame that the breast should look delicious when the child must not have it. So the child believes that the breast has changed, but the mother is the same, her glance is as loving and tender as ever. Happy the person who had no need of more dreadful expedients for weaning the child!

## II

It was early in the morning, Abraham arose betimes, he embraced Sarah, the bride of his old age, and Sarah kissed Isaac, who had taken away her reproach, who was her pride, her hope for all time. So they rode on in silence along the way, and Abraham's glance was fixed upon the ground until the fourth day when he lifted up his eyes and saw afar off Mount Moriah, but his glance turned again to the ground. Silently he laid the wood in order, he bound Isaac, in silence he drew the knife—then he saw the ram which God had prepared. Then he offered that and returned home. ... From that time on Abraham became old, he could not forget that God had required this of him. Isaac thrived as before, but Abraham's eyes were darkened, and he knew joy no more.



When the child has grown big and must be weaned, the mother virginally hides her breast, so the child has no more a mother. Happy the child which did not in another way lose its mother.

### III

It was early in the morning, Abraham arose betimes, he kissed Sarah, the young mother, and Sarah kissed Isaac, her delight, her joy at all times. And Abraham rode pensively along the way, he thought of Hagar and of the son whom he drove out into the wilderness, he climbed Mount Moriah, he drew the knife.

It was a quiet evening when Abraham rode out alone, and he rode to Mount Moriah; he threw himself upon his face, he prayed God to forgive him his sin, that he had been willing to offer Isaac, that the father had forgotten his duty toward the son. Often he rode his lonely way, but he found no rest. He could not comprehend that it was a sin to be willing to offer to God the best thing he possessed, that for which he would many times have given his life; and if it was a sin, if he had not loved Isaac as he did, then he could not understand that it might be forgiven. For what sin could be more dreadful?

When the child must be weaned, the mother too is not without sorrow at the thought that she and the child are separated more and more, that the child which first lay under her heart and later reposed upon her breast will be so near to her no more. So they mourn together for the brief period of mourning. Happy the person who has kept the child as near and needed not to sorrow any more!

### IV

It was early in the morning, everything was prepared for the journey in Abraham's house. He bade Sarah farewell, and Eleazar, the faithful servant, followed him along the way, until he turned back. They rode together in harmony, Abraham and Isaac, until they came to Mount Moriah. But Abraham prepared everything for the sacrifice, calmly and quietly; but when he turned and drew the knife, Isaac saw that his left hand was clenched in despair, that a tremor passed through his body—but Abraham drew the knife.

Then they returned again home, and Sarah hastened to meet them, but Isaac had lost his faith. No word of this had ever been spoken in the world, and Isaac never talked to anyone about what he had seen, and Abraham did not suspect that anyone had seen it.

When the child must be weaned, the mother has stronger food in readiness, lest the child should perish. Happy the person who has stronger



food in readiness!

Thus and in many like ways that man of whom we are speaking thought concerning this event. Every time he returned home after wandering to Mount Moriah, he sank down with weariness, he folded his hands and said, "No one is so great as Abraham! Who is capable of understanding him?"

## **A PANEGRIC UPON ABRAHAM**

If there were no eternal consciousness in a man, if at the foundation of all there lay only a wildly seething power which writhing with obscure passions produced everything that is great and everything that is insignificant, if a bottomless void never satiated lay hidden beneath all—what then would life be but despair? If such were the case, if there were no sacred bond which united mankind, if one generation arose after another like the leafage in the forest, if the one generation replaced the other like the song of birds in the forest, if the human race passed through the world as the ship goes through the sea, like the wind through the desert, a thoughtless and fruitless activity, if an eternal oblivion were always lurking hungrily for its prey and there was no power strong enough to wrest it from its maw—how empty then and comfortless life would be! But therefore it is not thus, but as God created man and woman, so too He fashioned the hero and the poet or orator. The poet cannot do what that other does, he can only admire, love and rejoice in the hero. Yet he too is happy, and not less so, for the hero is as it were his better nature, with which he is in love, rejoicing in the fact that this after all is not himself, that his love can be admiration. He is the genius of recollection, can do nothing except call to mind what has been done, do nothing but admire what has been done; he contributes nothing of his own, but is jealous of the intrusted treasure. He follows the option of his heart, but when he has found what he sought, he wanders before every man's door with his song and with his oration, that all may admire the hero as he does, be proud of the hero as he is. This is his achievement, his humble work, this is his faithful service in the house of the hero. If he thus remains true to his love, he strives day and night against the cunning of oblivion which would trick him out of his hero, then he has completed his work, then he is gathered to the hero, who has loved him just as faithfully, for the poet is as it were the hero's better nature, powerless it may be as a memory is, but also transfigured as a memory is. Hence no one shall be forgotten who was great, and though time tarries long, though a cloud<sup>13</sup> of misunderstanding takes the hero away, his lover comes nevertheless, and the longer the time that has passed, the more faithfully will he cling to him.

No, not one shall be forgotten who was great in the world. But each was great in his own way, and each in proportion to the greatness of that

which he loved. For he who loved himself became great by himself, and he who loved other men became great by his selfless devotion, but he who loved God became greater than all. Everyone shall be remembered, but each became great in proportion to his expectation. One became great by expecting the possible, another by expecting the eternal, but he who expected the impossible became greater than all. Everyone shall be remembered, but each was great in proportion to the greatness of that with which he strove. For he who strove with the world became great by overcoming the world, and he who strove with himself became great by overcoming himself, but he who strove with God became greater than all. So there was strife in the world, man against man, one against a thousand, but he who strove with God was greater than all. So there was strife upon earth: there was one who overcame all by his power, and there was one who overcame God by his impotence. There was one who relied upon himself and gained all, there was one who secure in his strength sacrificed all, but he who believed God was greater than all. There was one who was great by reason of his power, and one who was great by reason of his wisdom, and one who was great by reason of his hope, and one who was great by reason of his love; but Abraham was greater than all, great by reason of his power whose strength is impotence, great by reason of his wisdom whose secret is foolishness, great by reason of his hope whose form is madness, great by reason of the love which is hatred of oneself.

By faith Abraham went out from the land of his fathers and became a sojourner in the land of promise. He left one thing behind, took one thing with him: he left his earthly understanding behind and took faith with him—otherwise he would not have wandered forth but would have thought this unreasonable. By faith he was a stranger in the land of promise, and there was nothing to recall what was dear to him, but by its novelty everything tempted his soul to melancholy yearning—and yet he was God's elect, in whom the Lord was well pleased! Yea, if he had been disowned, cast off from God's grace, he could have comprehended it better; but now it was like a mockery of him and of his faith. There was in the world one too who lived in banishment<sup>14</sup> from the fatherland he loved. He is not forgotten, nor his Lamentations when he sorrowfully sought and found what he had lost. There is no song of Lamentations by Abraham. It is human to lament, human to weep with them that weep, but it is greater to believe, more blessed to contemplate the believer.

By faith Abraham received the promise that in his seed all races of the world would be blessed. Time passed, the possibility was there, Abraham believed; time passed, it became unreasonable, Abraham believed. There was in the world one who had an expectation, time passed, the evening drew nigh, he was not paltry enough to have forgotten his expectation, therefore he too shall not be forgotten. Then he sorrowed, and sorrow did not deceive him as life had done, it did for him all it could, in the sweetness of sorrow he possessed his delusive expectation. It is human to sorrow, human to sorrow with them that sorrow, but it is greater to believe, more blessed to contemplate the believer. There is no song of

Lamentations by Abraham. He did not mournfully count the days while time passed, he did not look at Sarah with a suspicious glance, wondering whether she were growing old, he did not arrest the course of the sun, that Sarah might not grow old, and his expectation with her. He did not sing lullingly before Sarah his mournful lay. Abraham became old, Sarah became a laughingstock in the land, and yet he was God's elect and inheritor of the promise that in his seed all the races of the world would be blessed. So were it not better if he had not been God's elect? What is it to be God's elect? It is to be denied in youth the wishes of youth, so as with great pains to get them fulfilled in old age. But Abraham believed and held fast the expectation. If Abraham had wavered, he would have given it up. If he had said to God, "Then perhaps it is not after all Thy will that it should come to pass, so I will give up the wish. It was my only wish, it was my bliss. My soul is sincere, I hide no secret malice because Thou didst deny it to me"—he would not have been forgotten, he would have saved many by his example, yet he would not be the father of faith. For it is great to give up one's wish, but it is greater to hold it fast after having given it up, it is great to grasp the eternal, but it is greater to hold fast to the temporal after having given it up.<sup>15</sup>

Then came the fulness of time. If Abraham had not believed, Sarah surely would have been dead of sorrow, and Abraham, dulled by grief, would not have understood the fulfilment but would have smiled at it as at a dream of youth. But Abraham believed, therefore he was young; for he who always hopes for the best becomes old, and he who is always prepared for the worst grows old early, but he who believes preserves an eternal youth. Praise therefore to that story! For Sarah, though stricken in years, was young enough to desire the pleasure of motherhood, and Abraham, though gray-haired, was young enough to wish to be a father. In an outward respect the marvel consists in the fact that it came to pass according to their expectation, in a deeper sense the miracle of faith consists in the fact that Abraham and Sarah were young enough to wish, and that faith had preserved their wish and therewith their youth. He accepted the fulfilment of the promise, he accepted it by faith, and it came to pass according to the promise and according to his faith—for Moses smote the rock with his rod, but he did not believe.

Then there was joy in Abraham's house, when Sarah became a bride on the day of their golden wedding.

But it was not to remain thus. Still once more Abraham was to be tried. He had fought with that cunning power which invents everything, with that alert enemy which never slumbers, with that old man who outlives all things—he had fought with Time and preserved his faith. Now all the terror of the strife was concentrated in one instant. "And God tempted Abraham and said unto him, Take Isaac, thine only son, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah, and offer him there for a burnt offering upon the mountain which I will show thee."

So all was lost—more dreadfully than if it had never come to pass! So the Lord was only making sport of Abraham! He made miraculously the preposterous actual, and now in turn He would annihilate it. It was indeed foolishness, but Abraham did not laugh at it like Sarah when the promise was announced. All was lost! Seventy years of faithful expectation, the brief joy at the fulfilment of faith. Who then is he that plucks away the old man's staff, who is it that requires that he himself shall break it? Who is he that would make a man's gray hairs comfortless, who is it that requires that he himself shall do it? Is there no compassion for the venerable oldling, none for the innocent child? And yet Abraham was God's elect, and it was the Lord who imposed the trial. All would now be lost. The glorious memory to be preserved by the human race, the promise in Abraham's seed—this was only a whim, a fleeting thought which the Lord had had, which Abraham should now obliterate. That glorious treasure which was just as old as faith in Abraham's heart, many, many years older than Isaac, the fruit of Abraham's life, sanctified by prayers, matured in conflict—the blessing upon Abraham's lips, this fruit was now to be plucked prematurely and remain without significance. For what significance had it when Isaac was to be sacrificed? That sad and yet blissful hour when Abraham was to take leave of all that was dear to him, when yet once more he was to lift up his head, when his countenance would shine like that of the Lord, when he would concentrate his whole soul in a blessing which was potent to make Isaac blessed all his days—this time would not come! For he would indeed take leave of Isaac, but in such a way that he himself would remain behind; death would separate them, but in such a way that Isaac remained its prey. The old man would not be joyful in death as he laid his hands in blessing upon Isaac, but he would be weary of life as he laid violent hands upon Isaac. And it was God who tried him. Yea, woe, woe unto the messenger who had come before Abraham with such tidings! Who would have ventured to be the emissary of this sorrow? But it was God who tried Abraham.

Yet Abraham believed, and believed for this life. Yea, if his faith had been only for a future life, he surely would have cast everything away in order to hasten out of this world to which he did not belong. But Abraham's faith was not of this sort, if there be such a faith; for really this is not faith but the furthest possibility of faith which has a presentiment of its object at the extremest limit of the horizon, yet is separated from it by a yawning abyss within which despair carries on its game. But Abraham believed precisely for this life, that he was to grow old in the land, honored by the people, blessed in his generation, remembered forever in Isaac, his dearest thing in life, whom he embraced with a love for which it would be a poor expression to say that he loyally fulfilled the father's duty of loving the son, as indeed is evinced in the words of the summons, "the son whom thou lovest." Jacob had twelve sons, and one of them he loved; Abraham had only one, the son whom he loved.

Yet Abraham believed and did not doubt, he believed the preposterous. If Abraham had doubted—then he would have done

something else, something glorious; for how could Abraham do anything but what is great and glorious! He would have marched up to Mount Moriah, he would have cleft the fire-wood, lit the pyre, drawn the knife—he would have cried out to God, "Despise not this sacrifice, it is not the best thing I possess, that I know well, for what is an old man in comparison with the child of promise; but it is the best I am able to give Thee. Let Isaac never come to know this, that he may console himself with his youth." He would have plunged the knife into his own breast. He would have been admired in the world, and his name would not have been forgotten; but it is one thing to be admired, and another to be the guiding star which saves the anguished.

But Abraham believed. He did not pray for himself, with the hope of moving the Lord—it was only when the righteous punishment was decreed upon Sodom and Gomorrha that Abraham came forward with his prayers.

We read in those holy books: "And God tempted Abraham, and said unto him, Abraham, Abraham, where art thou? And he said, Here am I." Thou to whom my speech is addressed, was such the case with thee? When afar off thou didst see the heavy dispensation of providence approaching thee, didst thou not say to the mountains, Fall on me, and to the hills, Cover me? Or if thou wast stronger, did not thy foot move slowly along the way, longing as it were for the old path? When a call was issued to thee, didst thou answer, or didst thou not answer perhaps in a low voice, whisperingly? Not so Abraham: joyfully, buoyantly, confidently, with a loud voice, he answered, "Here am I." We read further: "And Abraham rose early in the morning"—as though it were to a festival, so he hastened, and early in the morning he had come to the place spoken of, to Mount Moriah. He said nothing to Sarah, nothing to Eleazar. Indeed who could understand him? Had not the temptation by its very nature exacted of him an oath of silence? He cleft the wood, he bound Isaac, he lit the pyre, he drew the knife. My hearer, there was many a father who believed that with his son he lost everything that was dearest to him in the world, that he was deprived of every hope for the future, but yet there was none that was the child of promise in the sense that Isaac was for Abraham. There was many a father who lost his child; but then it was God, it was the unalterable, the unsearchable will of the Almighty, it was His hand took the child. Not so with Abraham. For him was reserved a harder trial, and Isaac's fate was laid along with the knife in Abraham's hand. And there he stood, the old man, with his only hope! But he did not doubt, he did not look anxiously to the right or to the left, he did not challenge heaven with his prayers. He knew that it was God the Almighty who was trying him, he knew that it was the hardest sacrifice that could be required of him; but he knew also that no sacrifice was too hard when God required it—and he drew the knife.

Who gave strength to Abraham's arm? Who held his right hand up so that it did not fall limp at his side? He who gazes at this becomes paralyzed. Who gave strength to Abraham's soul, so that his eyes did not grow dim, so that he saw neither Isaac nor the ram? He who gazes at this

becomes blind.—And yet rare enough perhaps is the man who becomes paralyzed and blind, still more rare one who worthily recounts what happened. We all know it—it was only a trial.

If Abraham when he stood upon Mount Moriah had doubted, if he had gazed about him irresolutely, if before he drew the knife he had by chance discovered the ram, if God had permitted him to offer it instead of Isaac—then he would have betaken himself home, everything would have been the same, he has Sarah, he retained Isaac, and yet how changed! For his retreat would have been a flight, his salvation an accident, his reward dishonor, his future perhaps perdition. Then he would have borne witness neither to his faith nor to God's grace, but would have testified only how dreadful it is to march out to Mount Moriah. Then Abraham would not have been forgotten, nor would Mount Moriah, this mountain would then be mentioned, not like Ararat where the Ark landed, but would be spoken of as a consternation, because it was here that Abraham doubted.

Venerable Father Abraham! In marching home from Mount Moriah thou hadst no need of a panegyric which might console thee for thy loss; for thou didst gain all and didst retain Isaac. Was it not so? Never again did the Lord take him from thee, but thou didst sit at table joyfully with him in thy tent, as thou cost in the beyond to all eternity. Venerable Father Abraham! Thousands of years have run their course since those days, but thou hast need of no tardy lover to snatch the memorial of thee from the power of oblivion, for every language calls thee to remembrance—and yet thou cost reward thy lover more gloriously than does any other; hereafter thou cost make him blessed in thy bosom; here thou cost enthrall his eyes and his heart by the marvel of thy deed. Venerable Father Abraham! Second Father of the human race! Thou who first wast sensible of and didst first bear witness to that prodigious passion which disdains the dreadful conflict with the rage of the elements and with the powers of creation in order to strive with God; thou who first didst know that highest passion, the holy, pure and humble expression of the divine madness<sup>16</sup> which the pagans admired—forgive him who would speak in praise of thee, if he does not do it fittingly. He spoke humbly, as if it were the desire of his own heart, he spoke briefly, as it becomes him to do, but he will never forget that thou hadst need of a hundred years to obtain a son of old age against expectation, that thou didst have to draw the knife before retaining Isaac; he will never forget that in a hundred and thirty years thou didst not get further than to faith.

## **PROBLEMATA: PRELIMINARY EXPECTORATION**

An old proverb fetched from the outward and visible world says: "Only the man that works gets the bread." Strangely enough this proverb does not aptly apply in that world to which it expressly belongs. For the outward



world is subjected to the law of imperfection, and again and again the experience is repeated that he too who does not work gets the bread, and that he who sleeps gets it more abundantly than the man who works. In the outward world everything is made payable to the bearer, this world is in bondage to the law of indifference, and to him who has the ring, the spirit of the ring is obedient, whether he be Nouredin or Aladdin,<sup>17</sup> and he who has the world's treasure, has it, however he got it. It is different in the world of spirit. Here an eternal divine order prevails, here it does not rain both upon the just and upon the unjust, here the sun does not shine both upon the good and upon the evil, here it holds good that only he who works gets the bread, only he who was in anguish finds repose, only he who descends into the underworld rescues the beloved, only he who draws the knife gets Isaac. He who will not work does not get the bread but remains deluded, as the gods deluded Orpheus with an airy figure in place of the loved one, deluded him because he was effeminate, not courageous, because he was a cithara-player, not a man. Here it is of no use to have Abraham for one's father, nor to have seventeen ancestors—he who will not work must take note of what is written about the maidens of Israel,<sup>18</sup> for he gives birth to wind, but he who is willing to work gives birth to his own father.

There is a knowledge which would presumptuously introduce into the world of spirit the same law of indifference under which the external world sighs. It counts it enough to think the great—other work is not necessary. But therefore it doesn't get the bread, it perishes of hunger, while everything is transformed into gold. And what does it really know? There were many thousands of Greek contemporaries, and countless numbers in subsequent generations, who knew all the triumphs of Miltiades, but only one<sup>19</sup> was made sleepless by them. There were countless generations which knew by rote, word for word, the story of Abraham—how many were made sleepless by it?

Now the story of Abraham has the remarkable property that it is always glorious, however poorly one may understand it; yet here again the proverb applies, that all depends upon whether one is willing to labor and be heavy laden. But they will not labor, and yet they would understand the story. They exalt Abraham—but how? They express the whole thing in perfectly general terms: "The great thing was that he loved God so much that he was willing to sacrifice to Him the best." That is very true, but "the best" is an indefinite expression. In the course of thought, as the tongue wags on, Isaac and "the best" are confidently identified, and he who meditates can very well smoke his pipe during the meditation, and the auditor can very well stretch out his legs in comfort. In case that rich young man whom Christ encountered on the road had sold all his goods and given to the poor, we should extol him, as we do all that is great, though without labor we would not understand him—and yet he would not have become an Abraham, in spite of the fact that he offered his best. What they leave out of Abraham's history is dread;<sup>20</sup> for to money I have no ethical obligation, but to the son the father has the highest and most

sacred obligation. Dread, however, is a perilous thing for effeminate natures, hence they forget it, and in spite of that they want to talk about Abraham. So they talk—in the course of the oration they use indifferently the two terms, Isaac and "the best." All goes famously. However, if it chanced that among the auditors there was one who suffered from insomnia—then the most dreadful, the profoundest tragic and comic misunderstanding lies very close. He went home, he would do as Abraham did, for the son is indeed "the best."

If the orator got to know of it, he perhaps went to him, he summoned all his clerical dignity, he shouted, "O abominable man, offscouring of society, what devil possessed thee to want to murder thy son?" And the parson, who had not been conscious of warmth or perspiration in preaching about Abraham, is astonished at himself, at the earnest wrath which he thundered down upon that poor man. He was delighted with himself, for he had never spoken with such verve and unction. He said to himself and to his wife, "I am an orator. What I lacked was the occasion. When I talked about Abraham on Sunday I did not feel moved in the least." In case the same orator had a little superabundance of reason which might be lost, I think he would have lost it if the sinner were to say calmly and with dignity, "That in fact is what you yourself preached on Sunday." How could the parson be able to get into his head such a consequence? And yet it was so, and the mistake was merely that he didn't know what he was saying. Would there were a poet who might resolve to prefer such situations, rather than the stuff and nonsense with which comedies and novels are filled! The comic and the tragic here touch one another at the absolute point of infinity. The parson's speech was perhaps in itself ludicrous enough, but it became infinitely ludicrous by its effect, and yet this consequence was quite natural. Or if the sinner, without raising any objection, were to be converted by the parson's severe lecture, if the zealous clergyman were to go joyfully home, rejoicing in the consciousness that he not only was effective in the pulpit, but above all by his irresistible power as a pastor of souls, who on Sunday roused the congregation to enthusiasm, and on Monday like a cherub with a flaming sword placed himself before the man who by his action wanted to put to shame the old proverb, that "things don't go on in the world as the parson preaches."\*

---

\*In the old days they said, "What a pity things don't go on in the world as the parson preaches"—perhaps the time is coming, especially with the help of philosophy, when they will say, "Fortunately things don't go on as the parson preaches; for after all there is some sense in life, but none at all in his preaching."

---

If on the other hand the sinner was not convinced, his situation is pretty tragic. Presumably he would be executed or sent to the lunatic



asylum, in short, he would have become unhappy in relation to so-called reality—in another sense I can well think that Abraham made him happy, for he that labors does not perish.

How is one to explain the contradiction illustrated by that orator? Is it because Abraham had a prescriptive right to be a great man, so that what he did is great, and when another does the same it is sin, a heinous sin? In that case I do not wish to participate in such thoughtless eulogy. If faith does not make it a holy act to be willing to murder one's son, then let the same condemnation be pronounced upon Abraham as upon every other man. If a man perhaps lacks courage to carry his thought through, and to say that Abraham was a murderer, then it is surely better to acquire this courage, rather than waste time upon undeserved eulogies. The ethical expression for what Abraham did is, that he would murder Isaac; the religious expression is, that he would sacrifice Isaac; but precisely in this contradiction consists the dread which can well make a man sleepless, and yet Abraham is not what he is without this dread. Or perhaps he did not do at all what is related, but something altogether different, which is accounted for by the circumstances of his times—then let us forget him, for it is not worth while to remember that past which cannot become a present. Or had perhaps that orator forgotten something which corresponds to the ethical forgetfulness of the fact that Isaac was the son? For when faith is eliminated by becoming null or nothing, then there only remains the crude fact that Abraham wanted to murder Isaac—which is easy enough for anyone to imitate who has not faith, the faith, that is to say, which makes it hard for him.

For my part I do not lack the courage to think a thought whole. Hitherto there has been no thought I have been afraid of; if I should run across such a thought, I hope that I have at least the sincerity to say, "I am afraid of this thought, it stirs up something else in me, and therefore I will not think it. If in this I do wrong, the punishment will not fail to follow." If I had recognized that it was the verdict of truth that Abraham was a murderer, I do not know whether I would have been able to silence my pious veneration for him. However, if I had thought that, I presumably would have kept silent about it, for one should not initiate others into such thoughts. But Abraham is no dazzling illusion, he did not sleep into renown, it was not a whim of fate.

Can one then speak plainly about Abraham without incurring the danger that an individual might in bewilderment go ahead and do likewise? If I do not dare to speak freely, I will be completely silent about Abraham, above all I will not disparage him in such a way that precisely thereby he becomes a pitfall for the weak. For if one makes faith everything, that is, makes it what it is, then, according to my way of thinking, one may speak of it without danger in our age, which hardly extravagates in the matter of faith, and it is only by faith one attains likeness to Abraham, not by murder. If one makes love a transitory mood, a voluptuous emotion in a man, then one only lays pitfalls for the weak when one would talk about

the exploits of love. Transient emotions every man surely has, but if as a consequence of such emotions one would do the terrible thing which love has sanctified as an immortal exploit, then all is lost, including the exploit and the bewildered doer of it.

So one surely can talk about Abraham, for the great can never do harm when it is apprehended in its greatness; it is like a two-edged sword which slays and saves. If it should fall to my lot to talk on the subject, I would begin by showing what a pious and God-fearing man Abraham was, worthy to be called God's elect. Only upon such a man is imposed such a test. But where is there such a man? Next I would describe how Abraham loved Isaac. To this end I would pray all good spirits to come to my aid, that my speech might be as glowing as paternal love is. I hope that I should be able to describe it in such a way that there would not be many a father in the realms and territories of the King who would dare to affirm that he loved his son in such a way. But if he does not love like Abraham, then every thought of offering Isaac would be not a trial but a base temptation [*Anfechtung*]. On this theme one could talk for several Sundays, one need be in no haste. The consequence would be that, if one spoke rightly, some few of the fathers would not require to hear more, but for the time being they would be joyful if they really succeeded in loving their sons as Abraham loved. If there was one who, after having heard about the greatness, but also about the dreadfulness of Abraham's deed, ventured to go forth upon that road, I would saddle my horse and ride with him. At every stopping place till we came to Mount Moriah I would explain to him that he still could turn back, could repent the misunderstanding that he was called to be tried in such a conflict, that he could confess his lack of courage, so that God Himself must take Isaac, if He would have him. It is my conviction that such a man is not repudiated but may become blessed like all the others. But in time he does not become blessed. Would they not, even in the great ages of faith, have passed this judgment upon such a man? I knew a person who on one occasion could have saved my life if he<sup>21</sup> had been magnanimous. He said, "I see well enough what I could do, but I do not dare to. I am afraid that later I might lack strength and that I should regret it." He was not magnanimous, but who for this cause would not continue to love him?

Having spoken thus and moved the audience so that at least they had sensed the dialectical conflict of faith and its gigantic passion, I would not give rise to the error on the part of the audience that "he then has faith in such a high degree that it is enough for us to hold on to his skirts." For I would add, "I have no faith at all, I am by nature a shrewd pate, and every such person always has great difficulty in making the movements of faith—not that I attach, however, in and for itself, *any value to this difficulty which through the overcoming of it brought the clever head further than the point which the simplest and most ordinary man reaches more easily.*"

After all, in the poets love has its priests, and sometimes one hears a voice which knows how to defend it; but of faith one hears never a word.

Who speaks in honor of this passion? Philosophy goes further. Theology sits rouged at the window and courts its favor, offering to sell her charms to philosophy. It is supposed to be difficult to understand Hegel, but to understand Abraham is a trifle. To go beyond Hegel<sup>22</sup> is a miracle, but to get beyond Abraham is the easiest thing of all. I for my part have devoted a good deal of time to the understanding of the Hegelian philosophy, I believe also that I understand it tolerably well, but when in spite of the trouble I have taken there are certain passages I cannot understand, I am foolhardy enough to think that he himself has not been quite clear. All this I do easily and naturally, my head does not suffer from it. But on the other hand when I have to think of Abraham, I am as though annihilated. I catch sight every moment of that enormous paradox which is the substance of Abraham's life, every moment I am repelled, and my thought in spite of all its passion cannot get a hairs-breadth further. I strain every muscle to get a view of it—that very instant I am paralyzed.

I am not unacquainted with what has been admired as great and noble in the world, my soul feels affinity with it, being convinced in all humility that it was in my cause the hero contended, and the instant I contemplate his deed I cry out to myself, *jam tua res agitur*.<sup>23</sup> I think myself *into* the hero, but into Abraham I cannot think myself; when I reach the height I fall down, for what I encounter there is the paradox. I do not however mean in any sense to say that faith is something lowly, but on the contrary that it is the highest thing, and that it is dishonest of philosophy to give something else instead of it and to make light of faith. Philosophy cannot and should not give faith, but it should understand itself and know what it has to offer and take nothing away, and least of all should fool people out of something as if it were nothing. I am not unacquainted with the perplexities and dangers of life, I do not fear them, and I encounter them buoyantly. I am not unacquainted with the dreadful, my memory is a faithful wife, and my imagination is (as I myself am not) a diligent little maiden who all day sits quietly at her work, and in the evening knows how to chat to me about it so prettily that I must look at it, though not always, I must say, is it landscapes, or flowers, or pastoral idyls she paints. I have seen the dreadful before my own eyes, I do not flee from it timorously, but I know very well that, although I advance to meet it, my courage is not the courage of faith, nor anything comparable to it. I am unable to make the movements of faith, I cannot shut my eyes and plunge confidently into the absurd, for me that is an impossibility ... but I do not boast of it. I am convinced that God is love,<sup>24</sup> this thought has for me a primitive lyrical validity. When it is present to me, I am unspeakably blissful, when it is absent, I long for it more vehemently than does the lover for his object; but I do not believe, this courage I lack. For me the love of God is, both in a direct and in an inverse sense, incommensurable with the whole of reality. I am not cowardly enough to whimper and complain, but neither am I deceitful enough to deny that faith is something much higher. I can well endure living in my way, I am joyful and content, but my joy is not that of faith, and in comparison with that it is unhappy. I do not trouble God with my petty sorrows, the particular does not trouble me, I gaze only

at my love, and I keep its virginal flame pure and clear. Faith is convinced that God is concerned about the least things. I am content in this life with being married to the left hand, faith is humble enough to demand the right hand—for that this is humility I do not deny and shall never deny.

But really is everyone in my generation capable of making the movements of faith, I wonder? Unless I am very much mistaken, this generation is rather inclined to be proud of making what they do not even believe I am capable of making, viz. incomplete movements. It is repugnant to me to do as so often is done, namely, to speak inhumanly about a great deed, as though some thousands of years were an immense distance; I would rather speak humanly about it, as though it had occurred yesterday, letting only the greatness be the distance, which either exalts or condemns. So if (*in the quality of a tragic hero*, for I can get no higher) I had been summoned to undertake such a royal progress to Mount Moriah, I know well what I would have done. I would not have been cowardly enough to stay at home, neither would I have laid down or sauntered along the way, nor have forgotten the knife, so that there might be a little delay—I am pretty well convinced that I would have been there on the stroke of the clock and would have had everything in order, perhaps I would have arrived too early in order to get through with it sooner. But I also know what else I would have done. The very instant I mounted the horse I would have said to myself, "Now all is lost. God requires Isaac, I sacrifice him, and with him my joy—yet God is love and continues to be that for me; for in the temporal world God and I cannot talk together, we have no language in common." Perhaps one or another in our age will be foolish enough, or envious enough of the great, to want to make himself and me believe that if I really had done this, I would have done even a greater deed than Abraham; for my prodigious resignation was far more ideal and poetic than Abraham's narrow-mindedness. And yet this is the greatest falsehood, for my prodigious resignation was the surrogate for faith, nor could I do more than make the infinite movement, in order to find myself and again repose in myself. In that case I would not have loved Isaac as Abraham loved. That I was resolute in making the movement might prove my courage, humanly speaking; that I loved him with all my soul is the presumption apart from which the whole thing becomes a crime, but yet I did not love like Abraham, for in that case I would have held back even at the last minute, though not for this would I have arrived too late at Mount Moriah. Besides, by my behavior I would have spoiled the whole story; for if I had got Isaac back again, I would have been in embarrassment. What Abraham found easiest, I would have found hard, namely to be joyful again with Isaac; for he who with all the infinity of his soul, *propio motu et propriis auspiciis* [by his own power and on his own responsibility], has performed the infinite movement [of resignation] and cannot do more, only retains Isaac with pain.

But what did Abraham do? He arrived neither too soon nor too late. He mounted the ass, he rode slowly along the way. All that time he believed—he believed that God would not require Isaac of him, whereas he

was willing nevertheless to sacrifice him if it was required. He believed by virtue of the absurd; for there could be no question of human calculation, and it was indeed the absurd that God who required it of him should the next instant recall the requirement. He climbed the mountain, even at the instant when the knife glittered he believed ... that God would not require Isaac. He was indeed astonished at the outcome, but by a double-movement he had reached his first position, and therefore he received Isaac more gladly than the first time. Let us go further. We let Isaac be really sacrificed. Abraham believed. He did not believe that some day he would be blessed in the beyond, but that he would be happy here in the world. God could give him a new Isaac, could recall to life him who had been sacrificed. He believed by virtue of the absurd; for all human reckoning had long since ceased to function. That sorrow can derange a man's mind, that we see, and it is sad enough. That there is such a thing as strength of will which is able to haul up so exceedingly close to the wind that it saves a man's reason, even though he remains a little queer,<sup>25</sup> that too one sees. I have no intention of disparaging this; but to be able to lose one's reason, and therefore the whole of finiteness of which reason is the broker, and then by virtue of the absurd to gain precisely the same finiteness—that appalls my soul, but I do not for this cause say that it is something lowly, since on the contrary it is the only prodigy. Generally people are of the opinion that what faith produces is not a work of art, that it is coarse and common work, only for the more clumsy natures; but in fact this is far from the truth. The dialectic of faith is the finest and most remarkable of all; it possesses an elevation, of which indeed I can form a conception, but nothing more. I am able to make from the springboard the great leap whereby I pass into infinity, my back is like that of a tight-rope dancer, having been twisted in my childhood,<sup>26</sup> hence I find this easy; with a one-two-three! I can walk about existence on my head; but the next thing I cannot do, for I cannot perform the miraculous, but can only be astonished by it. Yes, if Abraham the instant he swung his leg over the ass's back had said to himself, "Now, since Isaac is lost, I might just as well sacrifice him here at home, rather than ride the long way to Moriah"—then I should have no need of Abraham, whereas now I bow seven times before his name and seventy times before his deed. For this indeed he did not do, as I can prove by the fact that he was glad at receiving Isaac, heartily glad, that he needed no preparation, no time to concentrate upon the finite and its joy. If this had not been the case with Abraham, then perhaps he might have loved God but not believed; for he who loves God without faith reflects upon himself, he who loves God believingly reflects upon God.

Upon this pinnacle stands Abraham. The last stage he loses sight of is the infinite resignation. He really goes further, and reaches faith; for all these caricatures of faith, the miserable lukewarm indolence which thinks, "There surely is no instant need, it is not worth while sorrowing before the time," the pitiful hope which says, "One cannot know what is going to happen ... it might possibly be after all"—these caricatures of faith are part and parcel of life's wretchedness, and the infinite resignation has already

consigned them to infinite contempt.

Abraham I cannot understand,<sup>27</sup> in a certain sense there is nothing I can learn from him but astonishment. If people fancy that by considering the outcome of this story they might let themselves be moved to believe, they deceive themselves and want to swindle God out of the first movement of faith, the infinite resignation. They would suck worldly wisdom out of the paradox. Perhaps one or another may succeed in that, for our age is not willing to stop with faith, with its miracle of turning water into wine, it goes further, it turns wine into water.

Would it not be better to stop with faith, and is it not revolting that everybody wants to go further? When in our age (as indeed is proclaimed in various ways) they will not stop with love, where then are they going? To earthy wisdom, to petty calculation, to paltriness and wretchedness, to everything which can make man's divine origin doubtful. Would it not be better that they should stand still at faith, and that he who stands should take heed lest he fall? For the movements of faith must constantly be made by virtue of the absurd, yet in such a way, be it observed, that one does not lose the finite but gains it every inch. For my part I can well describe the movements of faith, but I cannot make them. When one would learn to make the motions of swimming one can let oneself be hung by a swimming-belt from the ceiling and go through the motions (describe them, so to speak, as we speak of describing a circle), but one is not swimming. In that way I can describe the movements of faith, but when I am thrown into the water, I swim, it is true (for I don't belong to the beach-waders), but I make other movements, I make the movements of infinity, whereas faith does the opposite: after having made the movements of infinity, it makes those of finiteness. Hail to him who can make those movements, he performs the marvellous, and I shall never grow tired of admiring him, whether he be Abraham or a slave in Abraham's house; whether he be a professor of philosophy or a servant-girl, I look only at the movements. But at them I do look, and do not let myself be fooled, either by myself or by any other man. The knights of the infinite resignation are easily recognized: their gait is gliding and assured. Those on the other hand who carry the jewel of faith are likely to be delusive, because their outward appearance bears a striking resemblance to that which both the infinite resignation and faith profoundly despise ... to Philistinism.

I candidly admit that in my practice I have not found any reliable example of the knight of faith, though I would not therefore deny that every second man may be such an example. I have been trying, however, for several years to get on the track of this, and all in vain. People commonly travel around the world to see rivers and mountains, new stars, birds of rare plumage, queerly deformed fishes, ridiculous breeds of men—they abandon themselves to the bestial stupor which gapes at existence, and they think they have seen something. This does not interest me. But if I knew where there was such a knight of faith, I would make a pilgrimage to him on foot, for this prodigy interests me absolutely. I would



not let go of him for an instant, every moment I would watch to see how he managed to make the movements, I would regard myself as secured for life, and would divide my time between looking at him and practicing the exercises myself, and thus would spend all my time admiring him. As was said, I have not found any such person, but I can well think him. Here he is. Acquaintance made, I am introduced to him. The moment I set eyes on him I instantly push him from me, I myself leap backwards, I clasp my hands and say half aloud, "Good Lord, is this the man? Is it really he? Why, he looks like a tax-collector!" However, it is the man after all. I draw closer to him, watching his least movements to see whether there might not be visible a little heterogeneous fractional telegraphic message from the infinite, a glance, a look, a gesture, a note of sadness, a smile, which betrayed the infinite in its heterogeneity with the finite. No! I examine his figure from tip to toe to see if there might not be a cranny through which the infinite was peeping. No! He is solid through and through. His tread? It is vigorous, belonging entirely to finiteness; no smartly dressed townsman who walks out to Fresberg on a Sunday afternoon treads the ground more firmly, he belongs entirely to the world, no Philistine more so. One can discover nothing of that aloof and superior nature whereby one recognizes the knight of the infinite. He takes delight in everything, and whenever one sees him taking part in a particular pleasure, he does it with the persistence which is the mark of the earthly man whose soul is absorbed in such things. He tends to his work. So when one looks at him one might suppose that he was a clerk who had lost his soul in an intricate system of book-keeping, so precise is he. He takes a holiday on Sunday. He goes to church. No heavenly glance or any other token of the incommensurable betrays him; if one did not know him, it would be impossible to distinguish him from the rest of the congregation, for his healthy and vigorous hymn-singing proves at the most that he has a good chest. In the afternoon he walks to the forest. He takes delight in everything he sees, in the human swarm, in the new omnibuses,<sup>25</sup> in the water of the Sound; when one meets him on the Beach Road one might suppose he was a shopkeeper taking his fling, that's just the way he disports himself, for he is not a poet, and I have sought in vain to detect in him the poetic incommensurability. Toward evening he walks home, his gait is as indefatigable as that of the postman. On his way he reflects that his wife has surely a special little warm dish prepared for him, e.g. a calf's head roasted, garnished with vegetables. If he were to meet a man like-minded, he could continue as far as East Gate to discourse with him about that dish, with a passion befitting a hotel chef. As it happens, he hasn't four pence to his name, and yet he fully and firmly believes that his wife has that dainty dish for him. If she had it, it would then be an invidious sight for superior people and an inspiring one for the plain man, to see him eat; for his appetite is greater than Esau's. His wife hasn't it—strangely enough, it is quite the same to him. On the way he comes past a building site and runs across another man. They talk together for a moment. In the twinkling of an eye he erects a new building, he has at his disposition all the powers necessary for it. The stranger leaves him with the thought that he certainly was a capitalist, while my admired knight thinks, "Yes, if the money were needed, I dare say I could get it." He lounges at an open window and looks out on the

square on which he lives; he is interested in everything that goes on, in a rat which slips under the curb, in the children's play, and this with the nonchalance of a girl of sixteen. And yet he is no genius, for in vain I have sought in him the incommensurability of genius. In the evening he smokes his pipe; to look at him one would swear that it was the grocer over the way vegetating in the twilight. He lives as carefree as a ne'er-do-well, and yet he buys up the acceptable time at the dearest price, for he does not do the least thing except by virtue of the absurd. And yet, and yet—actually I could become furious over it, for envy if for no other reason—this man has made and every instant is making the movements of infinity. With infinite resignation he has drained the cup of life's profound sadness, he knows the bliss of the infinite, he senses the pain of renouncing everything, the dearest things he possesses in the world, and yet finiteness tastes to him just as good as to one who never knew anything higher, for his continuance in the finite did not bear a trace of the cowed and fearful spirit produced by the process of training; and yet he has this sense of security in enjoying it, as though the finite life were the surest thing of all. And yet, and yet the whole earthly form he exhibits is a new creation by virtue of the absurd. He resigned everything infinitely, and then he grasped everything again by virtue of the absurd. He constantly makes the movements of infinity, but he does this with such correctness and assurance that he constantly gets the finite out of it, and there is not a second when one has a notion of anything else. It is supposed to be the most difficult task for a dancer to leap into a definite posture in such a way that there is not a second when he is grasping after the posture, but by the leap itself he stands fixed in that posture. Perhaps no dancer can do it—that is what this knight does. Most people live dejectedly in worldly sorrow and joy; they are the ones who sit along the wall and do not join in the dance. The knights of infinity are dancers and possess elevation. They make the movements upward, and fall down again; and this too is no mean pastime, nor ungraceful to behold. But whenever they fall down they are not able at once to assume the posture, they vacillate an instant, and this vacillation shows that after all they are strangers in the world. This is more or less strikingly evident in proportion to the art they possess, but even the most artistic knights cannot altogether conceal this vacillation. One need not look at them when they are up in the air, but only the instant they touch or have touched the ground—then one recognizes them. But to be able to fall down in such a way that the same second it looks as if one were standing and walking, to transform the leap of life into a walk, absolutely to express the sublime in the pedestrian—that only the knight of faith can do—and this is the one and only prodigy.

But since the prodigy is so likely to be delusive, I will describe the movements in a definite instance which will serve to illustrate their relation to reality, for upon this everything turns. A young swain falls in love with a princess,<sup>29</sup> and the whole content of his life consists in this love, and yet the situation is such that it is impossible for it to be realized, impossible for it to be translated from ideality into reality.\*



---

\*Of course any other instance whatsoever in which the individual finds that for him the whole reality of actual existence is concentrated, may, when it is seen to be unrealizable, be an occasion for the movement of resignation. However, I have chosen a love experience to make the movement visible, because this interest is doubtless easier to understand, and so relieves me from the necessity of making preliminary observations which in a deeper sense could be of interest only to a few.

---

The slaves of paltriness, the frogs in life's swamp, will naturally cry out, "Such a love is foolishness. The rich brewer's widow is a match fully as good and respectable." Let them croak in the swamp undisturbed. It is not so with the knight of infinite resignation, he does not give up his love, not for all the glory of the world. He is no fool. First he makes sure that this really is the content of his life, and his soul is too healthy and too proud to squander the least thing upon an inebriation. He is not cowardly, he is not afraid of letting love creep into his most secret, his most hidden thoughts, to let it twine in innumerable coils about every ligament of his consciousness—if the love becomes an unhappy love, he will never be able to tear himself loose from it. He feels a blissful rapture in letting love tingle through every nerve, and yet his soul is as solemn as that of the man who has drained the poisoned goblet and feels how the juice permeates every drop of blood—for this instant is life and death.<sup>30</sup> So when he has thus sucked into himself the whole of love and absorbed himself in it, he does not lack courage to make trial of everything and to venture everything. He surveys the situation of his life, he convokes the swift thoughts, which like tame doves obey his every bidding, he waves his wand over them, and they dart off in all directions. But when they all return, all as messengers of sorrow, and declare to him that it is an impossibility, then he becomes quiet, he dismisses them, he remains alone, and then he performs the movements. If what I am saying is to have any significance, it is requisite that the movement come about normally.\*

---

*\*To this end passion is necessary. Every movement of infinity comes about by passion, and no reflection can bring a movement about. This is the continual leap in existence which explains the movement, whereas mediation is a chimera which according to Hegel is supposed to explain everything, and at the same time this is the only thing he has never tried to explain. Even to make the well-known Socratic distinction between what one understands and what one does not understand, passion is required, and of course even more to make the characteristic Socratic movement, the movement, namely, of ignorance. What our age lacks, however, is not reflection but passion. Hence in a sense our age is too tenacious of life to die, for dying is one of the most remarkable leaps, and a little verse of a poet has always attracted me much, because, after having expressed prettily and simply in five or six preceding lines his wish for good things in life, he concludes thus:<sup>31</sup>*  
*Ein seliger Sprung in die Ewigkeit.*

---

So for the first thing, the knight will have power to concentrate the whole content of life and the whole significance of reality in one single wish. If a man lacks this concentration, this intensity, if his soul from the beginning is dispersed in the multifarious, he never comes to the point of making the movement, he will deal shrewdly in life like the capitalists who invest their money in all sorts of securities, so as to gain on the one what they lose on the other—in short, he is not a knight. In the next place the knight will have the power to concentrate the whole result of the operations of thought in one act of consciousness. If he lacks this intensity, if his soul from the beginning is dispersed in the multifarious, he will never get time to make the movements, he will be constantly running errands in life, never enter into eternity, for even at the instant when he is closest to it he will suddenly discover that he has forgotten something for which he must go back. He will think that to enter eternity is possible the next instant, and that also is perfectly true, but by such considerations one never reaches the point of making the movements, but by their aid one sinks deeper and deeper into the mire.

So the knight makes the movement—but what movement? Will he forget the whole thing? (For in this too there is indeed a kind of concentration.) No! For the knight does not contradict himself, and it is a contradiction to forget the whole content of one's life and yet remain the same man. To become another man he feels no inclination, nor does he by any means regard this as greatness. Only the lower natures forget themselves and become something new. Thus the butterfly has entirely forgotten that it was a caterpillar, perhaps it may in turn so entirely forget it was a butterfly that it becomes a fish. The deeper natures never forget themselves and never become anything else than what they were. So the knight remembers everything, but precisely this remembrance is pain, and yet by the infinite resignation he is reconciled with existence. Love for that princess became for him the expression for an eternal love, assumed a religious character, was transfigured into a love for the Eternal Being, which did to be sure deny him the fulfilment of his love, yet reconciled him again by the eternal consciousness of its validity in the form of eternity, which no reality can take from him. Fools and young men prate about everything being possible for a man. That, however, is a great error. Spiritually speaking, everything is possible, but in the world of the finite there is much which is not possible. This impossible, however, the knight makes possible by expressing it spiritually, but he expresses it spiritually by waiving his claim to it. The wish which would carry him out into reality, but was wrecked upon the impossibility, is now bent inward, but it is not therefore lost, neither is it forgotten. At one moment it is the obscure emotion of the wish within him which awakens recollections, at another moment he awakens them himself; for he is too proud to be willing that what was the whole content of his life should be the thing of a fleeting moment. He keeps this love young, and along with him it increases in years

and in beauty. On the other hand, he has no need of the intervention of the finite for the further growth of his love. From the instant he made the movement the princess is lost to him. He has no need of those erotic tinglings in the nerves at the sight of the beloved etc., nor does he need to be constantly taking leave of her in a finite sense, because he recollects her in an eternal sense,<sup>32</sup> and he knows very well that the lovers who are so bent upon seeing "her" yet once again, to say farewell for the last time, are right in being bent upon it, are right in thinking that it is the last time, for they forget one another the soonest. He has comprehended the deep secret that also in loving another person one must be sufficient unto oneself. He no longer takes a finite interest in what the princess is doing, and precisely this is proof that he has made the movement infinitely. Here one may have an opportunity to see whether the movement on the part of a particular person is true or fictitious. There was one who also believed that he had made the movement; but lo, time passed, the princess did something else, she married<sup>33</sup>—a prince, let us say—then his soul lost the elasticity of resignation. Thereby he knew that he had not made the movement rightly; for he who has made the act of resignation infinitely is sufficient unto himself. The knight does not annul his resignation, he preserves his love just as young as it was in its first moment, he never lets it go from him, precisely because he makes the movements infinitely. What the princess does, cannot disturb him, it is only the lower natures which find in other people the law for their actions, which find the premises for their actions outside themselves. If on the other hand the princess is like-minded, the beautiful consequence will be apparent. She will introduce herself into that order of knighthood into which one is not received by balloting, but of which everyone is a member who has courage to introduce himself, that order of knighthood which proves its immortality by the fact that it makes no distinction between man and woman. The two will preserve their love young and sound, she also will have triumphed over her pains, even though she does not, as it is said in the ballad, "lie every night beside her lord." These two will to all eternity remain in agreement with one another, with a well-timed *harmonia praestabilita*,<sup>34</sup> so that if ever the moment were to come, the moment which does not, however, concern them finitely (for then they would be growing older), if ever the moment were to come which offered to give love its expression in time, then they will be capable of beginning precisely at the point where they would have begun if originally they had been united. He who understands this, be he man or woman, can never be deceived, for it is only the lower natures which imagine they were deceived. No girl who is not so proud really knows how to love; but if she is so proud, then the cunning and shrewdness of all the world cannot deceive her.

In the infinite resignation there is peace and rest; every man who wills it, who has not abased himself by scorning himself (which is still more dreadful than being proud), can train himself to make this movement which in its pain reconciles one with existence. Infinite resignation is that shirt we read about in the old fable.<sup>35</sup> The thread is spun under tears, the cloth bleached with tears, the shirt sewn with tears; but then too it is a better

protection than iron and steel. The imperfection in the fable is that a third party can manufacture this shirt. The secret in life is that everyone must sew it for himself, and the astonishing thing is that a man can sew it fully as well as a woman. In the infinite resignation there is peace and rest and comfort in sorrow—that is, if the movement is made normally. It would not be difficult for me, however, to write a whole book, were I to examine the various misunderstandings, the preposterous attitudes, the deceptive movements, which I have encountered in my brief practice. People believe very little in spirit, and yet making this movement depends upon spirit, it depends upon whether this is or is not a one-sided result of a *dura necessitas*, and if this is present, the more dubious it always is whether the movement is normal. If one means by this that the cold, unfruitful necessity must necessarily be present, one thereby affirms that no one can experience death before he actually dies, and that appears to me a crass materialism. However, in our time people concern themselves rather little about making pure movements. In case one who was about to learn to dance were to say, "For centuries now one generation after another has been learning positions, it is high time I drew some advantage out of this and began straightway with the French dances"—then people would laugh at him; but in the world of spirit they find this exceedingly plausible. What is education? I should suppose that education was the curriculum one had to run through in order to catch up with oneself, and he who will not pass through this curriculum is helped very little by the fact that he was born in the most enlightened age.

The infinite resignation is the last stage prior to faith, so that one who has not made this movement has not faith; for only in the infinite resignation do I become clear to myself with respect to my eternal validity, and only then can there be any question of grasping existence by virtue of faith.

Now we will let the knight of faith appear in the role just described. He makes exactly the same movements as the other knight, infinitely renounces claim to the love which is the content of his life, he is reconciled in pain; but then occurs the prodigy, he makes still another movement more wonderful than all, for he says, "I believe nevertheless that I shall get her, in virtue, that is, of the absurd, in virtue of the fact that with God all things are possible."<sup>36</sup> The absurd is not one of the factors which can be discriminated within the proper compass of the understanding: it is not identical with the improbable, the unexpected, the unforeseen. At the moment when the knight made the act of resignation<sup>37</sup> he was convinced, humanly speaking, of the impossibility. This was the result reached by the understanding, and he had sufficient energy to think it. On the other hand, in an infinite sense it was possible, namely, by renouncing it; but this sort of possessing is at the same time a relinquishing, and yet there is no absurdity in this for the understanding, for the understanding continued to be in the right in affirming that in the world of the finite where it holds sway this was and remained an impossibility. This is quite as clear to the knight of faith, so the only thing that can save him is the absurd, and this

he grasps by faith. So he recognizes the impossibility, and that very instant he believes the absurd; for, if without recognizing the impossibility with all the passion of his soul and with all his heart, he should wish to imagine that he has faith, he deceives himself, and his testimony has no bearing, since he has not even reached the infinite resignation.

Faith therefore is not an aesthetic emotion but something far higher, precisely because it has resignation as its presupposition; it is not an immediate instinct of the heart, but is the paradox of life and existence. So when in spite of all difficulties a young girl still remains convinced that her wish will surely be fulfilled, this conviction is not the assurance of faith, even if she was brought up by Christian parents, and for a whole year perhaps has been catechized by the parson. She is convinced in all her childish naïveté and innocence, this conviction also ennobles her nature and imparts to her a preternatural greatness, so that like a thaumaturge she is able to conjure the finite powers of existence and make the very stones weep, while on the other hand in her flurry she may just as well run to Herod as to Pilate and move the whole world by her tears. Her conviction is very lovable, and one can learn much from her, but one thing is not to be learned from her, one does not learn the movements, for her conviction does not dare in the pain of resignation to face the impossibility.

So I can perceive that it requires strength and energy and freedom of spirit to make the infinite movement of resignation, I can also perceive that it is feasible. But the next thing astonishes me, it makes my head swim, for after having made the movement of resignation, then by virtue of the absurd to get everything, to get the wish whole and uncurtailed—that is beyond human power, it is a prodigy. But this I can perceive, that the young girl's conviction is mere levity in comparison with the firmness faith displays notwithstanding it has perceived the impossibility. Whenever I essay to make this movement, I turn giddy, the very instant I am admiring it absolutely a prodigious dread grips my soul—for what is it to tempt God? And yet this movement is the movement of faith and remains such, even though philosophy, in order to confuse the concepts, would make us believe that it has faith, and even though theology would sell out faith at a bargain price.

For the act of resignation faith is not required, for what I gain by resignation is my eternal consciousness, and this is a purely philosophical movement which I dare say I am able to make if it is required, and which I can train myself to make, for whenever any finiteness would get the mastery over me, I starve myself until I can make the movement, for my eternal consciousness is my love to God, and for me this is higher than everything. For the act of resignation faith is not required, but it is needed when it is the case of acquiring the very least thing more than my eternal consciousness, for this is the paradoxical. The movements are frequently confounded, for it is said that one needs faith to renounce the claim to everything, yea, a stranger thing than this may be heard, when a man laments the loss of his faith, and when one looks at the scale to see where

he is, one sees, strangely enough, that he has only reached the point where he should make the infinite movement of resignation. In resignation I make renunciation of everything, this movement I make by myself, and if I do not make it, it is because I am cowardly and effeminate and without enthusiasm and do not feel the significance of the lofty dignity which is assigned to every man, that of being his own censor, which is a far prouder title than that of Censor General to the whole Roman Republic. This movement I make by myself, and what I gain is myself in my eternal consciousness, in blissful agreement with my love for the Eternal Being. By faith I make renunciation of nothing, on the contrary, by faith I acquire everything, precisely in the sense in which it is said that he who has faith like a grain of mustard can remove mountains. A purely human courage is required to renounce the whole of the temporal to gain the eternal; but this I gain, and to all eternity I cannot renounce it—that is a self-contradiction. But a paradoxical and humble courage is required to grasp the whole of the temporal by virtue of the absurd, and this is the courage of faith. By faith Abraham did not renounce his claim upon Isaac, but by faith he got Isaac. By virtue of resignation that rich young man should have given away everything, but then when he had done that, the knight of faith should have said to him, "By virtue of the absurd thou shalt get every penny back again. Canst thou believe that?" And this speech ought by no means to have been indifferent to the aforesaid rich young man, for in case he gave away his goods because he was tired of them, his resignation was not much to boast of.

It is about the temporal, the finite, everything turns in this case. I am able by my own strength to renounce everything, and then to find peace and repose in pain. I can stand everything—even though that horrible demon, more dreadful than death, the king of terrors, even though madness were to hold up before my eyes the motley of the fool, and I understood by its look that it was I who must put it on, I still am able to save my soul, if only it is more to me than my earthly happiness that my love to God should triumph in me. A man may still be able at the last instant to concentrate his whole soul in a single glance toward that heaven from which cometh every good gift, and his glance will be intelligible to himself and also to Him whom it seeks as a sign that he nevertheless remained true to his love. Then he will calmly put on the motley garb. He whose soul has not this romantic enthusiasm has sold his soul, whether he got a kingdom for it or a paltry piece of silver. But by my own strength I am not able to get the least of the things which belong to finiteness, for I am constantly using my strength to renounce everything. By my own strength I am able to give up the princess, and I shall not become a grumbler, but shall find joy and repose in my pain; but by my own strength I am not able to get her again, for I am employing all my strength to be resigned. But by faith, says that marvellous knight, by faith I shall get her in virtue of the absurd.

So this movement I am unable to make. As soon as I would begin to make it everything turns around dizzily, and I flee back to the pain of

resignation. I can swim in existence, but for this mystical soaring I am too heavy. To exist in such a way that my opposition to existence is expressed as the most beautiful and assured harmony with it, is something I cannot do. And yet it must be glorious to get the princess, that is what I say every instant, and the knight of resignation who does not say it is a deceiver, he has not had one only wish, and he has not kept the wish young by his pain. Perhaps there was one who thought it fitting enough that the wish was no longer vivid, that the barb of pain was dulled, but such a man is no knight. A free-born soul who caught himself entertaining such thoughts would despise himself and begin over again, above all he would not permit his soul to be deceived by itself. And yet it must be glorious to get the princess, and yet the knight of faith is the only happy one, the heir apparent to the finite, whereas the knight of resignation is a stranger and a foreigner. Thus to get the princess, to live with her joyfully and happily day in and day out (for it is also conceivable that the knight of resignation might get the princess, but that his soul had discerned the impossibility of their future happiness), thus to live joyfully and happily every instant by virtue of the absurd, every instant to see the sword hanging over the head of the beloved, and yet not to find repose in the pain of resignation, but joy by virtue of the absurd—this is marvellous. He who does it is great, the only great man. The thought of it stirs my soul, which never was niggardly in the admiration of greatness.

In case then everyone in my generation who will not stop at faith is really a man who has comprehended life's horror, who has understood what Daub<sup>38</sup> means when he says that a soldier who stands alone at his post with a loaded gun in a stormy night beside a powder-magazine ... will get strange thoughts into his head—in case then everyone who will not stop at faith is a man who had strength of soul to comprehend that the wish was an impossibility, and thereupon gave himself time to remain alone with this thought, in case everyone who will not stop at faith is a man who is reconciled in pain and is reconciled to pain, in case everyone who will not stop at faith is a man who in the next place (and if he has not done all the foregoing, there is no need of his troubling himself about faith)—in the next place did the marvellous thing, grasped the whole of existence by virtue of the absurd ... then what I write is the highest eulogy of my contemporaries by one of the lowliest among them, who was able only to make the movement of resignation. But why will they not stop at faith, why does one sometimes hear that people are ashamed to acknowledge that they have faith? This I cannot comprehend. If ever I contrive to be able to make this movement, I shall in the future ride in a coach and four.

If it is really true that all the Philistinism I behold in life (which I do not permit my word but my actions to condemn) is not what it seems to be—is it the miracle? That is conceivable, for the hero of faith had in fact a striking resemblance to it—for that hero of faith was not so much an ironist or a humorist, but something far higher. Much is said in our age about irony and humor, especially by people who have never been capable of engaging in the practice of these arts, but who nevertheless know how to



explain everything. I am not entirely unacquainted with these two passions,<sup>39</sup> I know a little more about them than what is to be found in German and German-Danish compendiums. I know therefore that these two passions are essentially different from the passion of faith. Irony and humor reflect also upon themselves, and therefore belong within the sphere of the infinite resignation, their elasticity is due to the fact that the individual is incommensurable with reality.

The last movement, the paradoxical movement of faith, I cannot make (be that a duty or whatever it may be), in spite of the fact that I would do it more than gladly. Whether a man has a right to make this affirmation, must be left to him, it is a question between him and the Eternal Being who is the object of faith whether in this respect he can hit upon an amicable compromise. What every man can do is to make the movement of infinite resignation, and I for my part would not hesitate to pronounce everyone cowardly who wishes to make himself believe he can not do it. With faith it is a different matter. But what every man has not a right to do, is to make others believe that faith is something lowly, or that it is an easy thing, whereas it is the greatest and the hardest.

People construe the story of Abraham in another way. They extol God's grace in bestowing Isaac upon him again—the whole thing was only a trial. A trial—that word may say much or little, and yet the whole thing is over as quickly as it is said. One mounts a winged horse, the same instant one is at Mount Moriah, the same instant one sees the ram; one forgets that Abraham rode only upon an ass, which walks slowly along the road, that he had a journey of three days, that he needed some time to cleave the wood, to bind Isaac, and to sharpen the knife.

And yet they extol Abraham. He who is to deliver the discourse can very well sleep till a quarter of an hour before he has to preach, the auditor can well take a nap during the discourse, for all goes smoothly, without the least trouble from any quarter. If there was a man present who suffered from insomnia, perhaps he then went home and sat in a corner and thought: "It's an affair of a moment, this whole thing; if only you wait a minute, you see the ram, and the trial is over." If the orator were to encounter him in this condition, he would, I think, confront him with all his dignity and say, "Wretched man, that thou couldst let thy soul sink into such foolishness! No miracle occurs. The whole of life is a trial." In proportion as the orator proceeds with his outpouring, he would get more and more excited, would become more and more delighted with himself, and whereas he had noticed no congestion of the blood while he talked about Abraham, he now felt how the vein swelled in his forehead. Perhaps he would have lost his breath as well as his tongue if the sinner had answered calmly and with dignity, "But it was about this you preached last Sunday."

Let us then either consign Abraham to oblivion, or let us learn to be



dismayed by the tremendous paradox which constitutes the significance of Abraham's life, that we may understand that our age, like every age, can be joyful if it has faith. In case Abraham is not a nullity, a phantom, a show one employs for a pastime, then the fault can never consist in the fact that the sinner wants to do likewise, but the point is to see how great a thing it was that Abraham did, in order that man may judge for himself whether he has the call and the courage to be subjected to such a test. The comic contradiction in the behavior of the orator is that he reduced Abraham to an insignificance, and yet would admonish the other to behave in the same way.

Should not one dare then to talk about Abraham? I think one should. If I were to talk about him, I would first depict the pain of his trial. To that end I would like a leech suck all the dread and distress and torture out of a father's sufferings, so that I might describe what Abraham suffered, whereas all the while he nevertheless believed. I would remind the audience that the journey lasted three days and a good part of the fourth, yea, that these three and a half days were infinitely longer than the few thousand years which separate me from Abraham. Then I would remind them that, in my opinion, every man dare still turn around ere he begins such an undertaking, and every instant he can repentantly turn back. If one does this, I fear no danger, nor am I afraid of awakening in people an inclination to be tried like Abraham. But if one would dispose of a cheap edition of Abraham, and yet admonish everyone to do likewise, then it is ludicrous.

It is now my intention to draw out from the story of Abraham the dialectical consequences inherent in it, expressing them in the form of *problemata*, in order to see what a tremendous paradox faith is, a paradox which is capable of transforming a murder into a holy act well-pleasing to God, a paradox which gives Isaac back to Abraham, which no thought can master, because faith begins precisely there where thinking leaves off.

## **PROBLEM I**

### **Is there such a thing as a teleological suspension of the ethical?**

The ethical as such is the universal, and as the universal it applies to everyone, which may be expressed from another point of view by saying that it applies every instant. It reposes immanently in itself, it has nothing without itself which is its *telos*,<sup>40</sup> but is itself *telos* for everything outside it, and when this has been incorporated by the ethical it can go no further. Conceived immediately as physical and psychical, the particular individual is the individual who has his *telos* in the universal, and his ethical task is to express himself constantly in it, to abolish his particularity in order to

become the universal. As soon as the individual would assert himself in his particularity over against the universal he sins, and only by recognizing this can he again reconcile himself with the universal. Whenever the individual after he has entered the universal feels an impulse to assert himself as the particular, he is in temptation (*Anfechtung*), and he can labor himself out of this only by penitently abandoning himself as the particular in the universal. If this be the highest thing that can be said of man and of his existence, then the ethical has the same character as man's eternal blessedness, which to all eternity and at every instant is his *telos*, since it would be a contradiction to say that this might be abandoned (i.e. teleologically suspended), inasmuch as this is no sooner suspended than it is forfeited, whereas in other cases what is suspended is not forfeited but is preserved precisely in that higher thing which is its *telos*.<sup>41</sup>

If such be the case, then Hegel is right when in his chapter on "The Good and the Conscience," <sup>42</sup> he characterizes man merely as the particular and regards this character as "a moral form of evil" which is to be annulled in the teleology of the moral, so that the individual who remains in this stage is either sinning or subjected to temptation (*Anfechtung*). On the other hand, Hegel is wrong in talking of faith, wrong in not protesting loudly and clearly against the fact that Abraham enjoys honor and glory as the father of faith, whereas he ought to be prosecuted and convicted of murder.

For faith is this paradox, that the particular is higher than the universal—yet in such a way, be it observed, that the movement repeats itself, and that consequently the individual, after having been in the universal, now as the particular isolates himself as higher than the universal. If this be not faith, then Abraham is lost, then faith has never existed in the world ... because it has always existed. For if the ethical (i.e. the moral) is the highest thing, and if nothing incommensurable remains in man in any other way but as the evil (i.e. the particular which has to be expressed in the universal), then one needs no other categories besides those which the Greeks possessed or which by consistent thinking can be derived from them. This fact Hegel ought not to have concealed, for after all he was acquainted with Greek thought.

One not infrequently hears it said by men who for lack of losing themselves in studies are absorbed in phrases that a light shines upon the Christian world whereas a darkness broods over paganism. This utterance has always seemed strange to me, inasmuch as every profound thinker and every serious artist is even in our day rejuvenated by the eternal youth of the Greek race. Such an utterance may be explained by the consideration that people do not know what they ought to say but only that they must say something. It is quite right for one to say that paganism did not possess faith, but if with this one is to have said something, one must be a little clearer about what one understands by faith, since otherwise one falls back into such phrases. To explain the whole of existence and faith along

with it, without having a conception of what faith is, is easy, and that man does not make the poorest calculation in life who reckons upon admiration when he possesses such an explanation; for, as Boileau says, "*un sot trouve toujours un plus sot qui l'admire.*"

Faith is precisely this paradox, that the individual as the particular is higher than the universal, is justified over against it, is not subordinate but superior—yet in such a way, be it observed, that it is the particular individual who, after he has been subordinated as the particular to the universal, now through the universal becomes the individual who as the particular is superior to the universal, for the fact that the individual as the particular stands in an absolute relation to the absolute. This position cannot be mediated, for all mediation comes about precisely by virtue of the universal; it is and remains to all eternity a paradox, inaccessible to thought. And yet faith is this paradox—or else (these are the logical deductions which I would beg the reader to have *in mente* at every point, though it would be too prolix for me to reiterate them on every occasion)—or else there never has been faith ... precisely because it always has been. In other words, Abraham is lost.

That for the particular individual this paradox may easily be mistaken for a temptation (*Anfechtung*) is indeed true, but one ought not for this reason to conceal it. That the whole constitution of many persons may be such that this paradox repels them is indeed true, but one ought not for this reason to make faith something different in order to be able to possess it, but ought rather to admit that one does not possess it, whereas those who possess faith should take care to set up certain criteria so that one might distinguish the paradox from a temptation (*Anfechtung*).

Now the story of Abraham contains such a teleological suspension of the ethical. There have not been lacking clever pates and profound investigators who have found analogies to it. Their wisdom is derived from the pretty proposition that at bottom everything is the same. If one will look a little more closely, I have not much doubt that in the whole world one will not find a single analogy (except a later instance which proves nothing), if it stands fast that Abraham is the representative of faith, and that faith is normally expressed in him whose life is not merely the most paradoxical that can be thought but so paradoxical that it cannot be thought at all. He acts by virtue of the absurd, for it is precisely absurd that he as the particular is higher than the universal. This paradox cannot be mediated; for as soon as he begins to do this he has to admit that he was in temptation (*Anfechtung*), and if such was the case, he never gets to the point of sacrificing Isaac, or, if he has sacrificed Isaac, he must turn back repentantly to the universal. By virtue of the absurd he gets Isaac again. Abraham is therefore at no instant a tragic hero but something quite different, either a murderer or a believer. The middle term which saves the tragic hero, Abraham has not. Hence it is that I can understand the tragic hero but cannot understand Abraham, though in a certain crazy sense I admire him more than all other men.

Abraham's relation to Isaac, ethically speaking, is quite simply expressed by saying that a father shall love his son more dearly than himself. Yet within its own compass the ethical has various gradations. Let us see whether in this story there is to be found any higher expression for the ethical such as would ethically explain his conduct, ethically justify him in suspending the ethical obligation toward his son, without in this search going beyond the teleology of the ethical.

When an undertaking in which a whole nation is concerned is hindered,<sup>43</sup> when such an enterprise is brought to a standstill by the disfavor of heaven, when the angry deity sends a calm which mocks all efforts, when the seer performs his heavy task and proclaims that the deity demands a young maiden as a sacrifice—then will the father heroically make the sacrifice. He will magnanimously conceal his pain, even though he might wish that he were "the lowly man who dares to weep,"<sup>44</sup> not the king who must act royally. And though solitary pain forces its way into his breast, he has only three confidants among the people, yet soon the whole nation will be cognizant of his pain, but also cognizant of his exploit, that for the welfare of the whole he was willing to sacrifice her, his daughter, the lovely young maiden. O charming bosom! O beautiful cheeks! O bright golden hair! (v. 687). And the daughter will affect him by her tears, and the father will turn his face away, but the hero will raise the knife.—When the report of this reaches the ancestral home, then will the beautiful maidens of Greece blush with enthusiasm, and if the daughter was betrothed, her true love will not be angry but be proud of sharing in the father's deed, because the maiden belonged to him more feelingly than to the father.

When the intrepid judge<sup>45</sup> who saved Israel in the hour of need in one breath binds himself and God by the same vow, then heroically the young maiden's jubilation, the beloved daughter's joy, he will turn to sorrow, and with her all Israel will lament her maiden youth; but every free-born man will understand, and every stout-hearted woman will admire Jephtha, and every maiden in Israel will wish to act as did his daughter. For what good would it do if Jephtha were victorious by reason of his vow if he did not keep it? Would not the victory again be taken from the nation?

When a son is forgetful of his duty,<sup>46</sup> when the state entrusts the father with the sword of justice, when the laws require punishment at the hand of the father, then will the father heroically forget that the guilty one is his son, he will magnanimously conceal his pain, but there will not be a single one among the people, not even the son, who will not admire the father, and whenever the law of Rome is interpreted, it will be remembered that many interpreted it more learnedly, but none so gloriously as Brutus.

If, on the other hand, while a favorable wind bore the fleet on with swelling sails to its goal, Agamemnon had sent that messenger who

fetches Iphigenia in order to be sacrificed; if Jephtha, without being bound by any vow which decided the fate of the nation, had said to his daughter, "Bewail now thy virginity for the space of two months, for I will sacrifice thee"; if Brutus had had a righteous son and yet would have ordered the lictors to execute him—who would have understood them? If these three men had replied to the query why they did it by saying, "It is a trial in which we are tested," would people have understood them better?

When Agamemnon, Jephtha, Brutus at the decisive moment heroically overcome their pain, have heroically lost the beloved and have merely to accomplish the outward sacrifice, then there never will be a noble soul in the world who will not shed tears of compassion for their pain and of admiration for their exploit. If, on the other hand, these three men at the decisive moment were to adjoin to their heroic conduct this little word, "But for all that it will not come to pass," who then would understand them? If as an explanation they added, "This we believe by virtue of the absurd," who would understand them better? For who would not easily understand that it was absurd, but who would understand that one could then believe it?

The difference between the tragic hero and Abraham is clearly evident. The tragic hero still remains within the ethical. He lets one expression of the ethical find its *telos* in a higher expression of the ethical; the ethical relation between father and son, or daughter and father, he reduces to a sentiment which has its dialectic in its relation to the idea of morality. Here there can be no question of a teleological suspension of the ethical itself.

With Abraham the situation was different. By his act he overstepped the ethical entirely and possessed a higher *telos* outside of it, in relation to which he suspended the former. For I should very much like to know how one would bring Abraham's act into relation with the universal, and whether it is possible to discover any connection whatever between what Abraham did and the universal ... except the fact that he transgressed it. It was not for the sake of saving a people, not to maintain the idea of the state, that Abraham did this, and not in order to reconcile angry deities. If there could be a question of the deity being angry, he was angry only with Abraham, and Abraham's whole action stands in no relation to the universal, is a purely private undertaking. Therefore, whereas the tragic hero is great by reason of his moral virtue, Abraham is great by reason of a purely personal virtue. In Abraham's life there is no higher expression for the ethical than this, that the father shall love his son. Of the ethical in the sense of morality there can be no question in this instance. In so far as the universal was present, it was indeed cryptically present in Isaac, hidden as it were in Isaac's loins, and must therefore cry out with Isaac's mouth, "Do it not! Thou art bringing everything to naught."

Why then did Abraham do it? For God's sake, and (in complete

identity with this) for his own sake. He did it for God's sake because God required this proof of his faith; for his own sake he did it in order that he might furnish the proof. The unity of these two points of view is perfectly expressed by the word which has always been used to characterize this situation: it is a trial, a temptation (*Fristelse*).<sup>47</sup> A temptation—but what does that mean? What ordinarily tempts a man is that which would keep him from doing his duty, but in this case the temptation is itself the ethical ... which would keep him from doing God's will. But what then is duty? Duty is precisely the expression for God's will.

Here is evident the necessity of a new category if one would understand Abraham. Such a relationship to the deity paganism did not know. The tragic hero does not enter into any private relationship with the deity, but for him the ethical is the divine, hence the paradox implied in his situation can be mediated in the universal.

Abraham cannot be mediated, and the same thing can be expressed also by saying that he cannot talk. So soon as I talk I express the universal, and if I do not do so, no one can understand me. Therefore if Abraham would express himself in terms of the universal, he must say that his situation is a temptation (*Anfechtung*), for he has no higher expression for that universal which stands above the universal which he transgresses.

Therefore, though Abraham arouses my admiration, he at the same time appalls me. He who denies himself and sacrifices himself for duty gives up the finite in order to grasp the infinite, and that man is secure enough. The tragic hero gives up the certain for the still more certain, and the eye of the beholder rests upon him confidently. But he who gives up the universal in order to grasp something still higher which is not the universal—what is he doing? Is it possible that this can be anything else but a temptation (*Anfechtung*)? And if it be possible ... but the individual was mistaken—what can save him? He suffers all the pain of the tragic hero, he brings to naught his joy in the world, he renounces everything ... and perhaps at the same instant debars himself from the sublime joy which to him was so precious that he would purchase it at any price. Him the beholder cannot understand nor let his eye rest confidently upon him. Perhaps it is not possible to do what the believer proposes, since it is indeed unthinkable. Or if it could be done, but if the individual had misunderstood the deity—what can save him? The tragic hero has need of tears and claims them, and where is the envious eye which would be so barren that it could not weep with Agamemnon; but where is the man with a soul so bewildered that he would have the presumption to weep for Abraham? The tragic hero accomplishes his act at a definite instant in time, but in the course of time he does something not less significant, he visits the man whose soul is beset with sorrow, whose breast for stifled sobs cannot draw breath, whose thoughts pregnant with tears weigh heavily upon him, to him he makes his appearance, dissolves the sorcery of sorrow, loosens his corslet, coaxes forth his tears by the fact that in his sufferings the sufferer forgets his own. One cannot weep over Abraham.



One approaches him with a *horror religiosus*, as Israel approached Mount Sinai.—If then the solitary man who ascends Mount Moriah, which with its peak rises heaven-high above the plain of Aulis, if he be not a somnambulist who walks securely above the abyss while he who is stationed at the foot of the mountain and is looking on trembles with fear and out of reverence and dread dare not even call to him—if this man is disordered in his mind, if he had made a mistake Thanks and thanks again to him who proffers to the man whom the sorrows of life have assaulted and left naked—proffers to him the fig-leaf of the word with which he can cover his wretchedness. Thanks be to thee, great Shakespeare, who art able to express everything, absolutely everything, precisely as it is—and yet why didst thou never pronounce this pang? Didst thou perhaps reserve it to thyself—like the loved one whose name one cannot endure that the world should mention? For the poet purchases the power of words, the power of uttering all the dread secrets of others, at the price of a little secret he is unable to utter ... and a poet is not an apostle, he casts out devils only by the power of the devil.

But now when the ethical is thus teleologically suspended, how does the individual exist in whom it is suspended? He exists as the particular in opposition to the universal. Does he then sin? For this is the form of sin, as seen in the idea. Just as the infant, though it does not sin, because it is not as such yet conscious of its existence, yet its existence is sin, as seen in the idea, and the ethical makes its demands upon it every instant. If one denies that this form can be repeated [in the adult] in such a way that it is not sin, then the sentence of condemnation is pronounced upon Abraham. How then did Abraham exist? He believed. This is the paradox which keeps him upon the sheer edge and which he cannot make clear to any other man, for the paradox is that he as the individual puts himself in an absolute relation to the absolute. Is he justified in doing this? His justification is once more the paradox; for if he is justified, it is not by virtue of anything universal, but by virtue of being the particular individual.

How then does the individual assure himself that he is justified? It is easy enough to level down the whole of existence to the idea of the state or the idea of society. If one does this, one can also mediate easily enough, for then one does not encounter at all the paradox that the individual as the individual is higher than the universal—which I can aptly express also by the thesis of Pythagoras, that the uneven numbers are more perfect than the even. If in our age one occasionally hears a rejoinder which is pertinent to the paradox, it is likely to be to the following effect: "It is to be judged by the result." A hero who has become a *skándalon*<sup>48</sup> to his contemporaries because they are conscious that he is a paradox who cannot make himself intelligible, will cry out defiantly to his generation, "The result will surely prove that I am justified." In our age we hear this cry rather seldom, for as our age, to its disadvantage, does not produce heroes, it has also the advantage of producing few caricatures. When in our age one hears this saying, "It is to be judged according to the result," a man is at once clear as to who it is he has the honor of talking with. Those who talk thus are a

numerous tribe, whom I will denominate by the common name of *Docents*.<sup>49</sup> In their thoughts they live secure in existence, they have a *solid* position and *sure* prospects in a well-ordered state, they have centuries and even millenniums between them and the concussions of existence, they do not fear that such things could recur—for what would the police say to that! and the newspapers! Their lifework is to judge the great, and to judge them according to the result. Such behavior toward the great betrays a strange mixture of arrogance and misery: of arrogance because they think they are called to be judges; of misery because they do not feel that their lives are even in the remotest degree akin to the great. Surely a man who possesses even a little *erectioris ingenii* [of the higher way of thinking] has not become entirely a cold and clammy mollusk, and when he approaches what is great it can never escape his mind that from the creation of the world it has been customary for the result to come last, and that, if one would truly learn anything from great actions, one must pay attention precisely to the beginning. In case he who should act were to judge himself according to the result, he would never get to the point of beginning. Even though the result may give joy to the whole world, it cannot help the hero, for he would get to know the result only when the whole thing was over, and it was not by this he became a hero, but he was such for the fact that he began.

Moreover, the result (inasmuch as it is the answer of finiteness to the infinite query) is in its dialectic entirely heterogeneous with the existence of the hero. Or is it possible to prove that Abraham was justified in assuming the position of the individual with relation to the universal ... for the fact that he got Isaac by *miracle*? If Abraham had actually sacrificed Isaac, would he then have been less justified?

But people are curious about the result, as they are about the result in a book—they want to know nothing about dread, distress, the paradox. They flirt aesthetically with the result, it comes just as unexpectedly but also just as easily as a prize in the lottery; and when they have heard the result they are edified. And yet no robber of temples condemned to hard labor behind iron bars, is so base a criminal as the man who pillages the holy, and even Judas who sold his Master for thirty pieces of silver is not more despicable than the man who sells greatness.

It is abhorrent to my soul to talk inhumanly about greatness, to let it loom darkly at a distance in an indefinite form, to make out that it is great without making the human character of it evident—wherewith it ceases to be great. For it is not what happens to me that makes me great, but it is what I do, and there is surely no one who thinks that a man became great because he won the great prize in the lottery. Even if a man were born in humble circumstances, I would require of him nevertheless that he should not be so inhuman toward himself as not to be able to think of the King's castle except at a remote distance, dreaming vaguely of its greatness and wanting at the same time to exalt it and also to abolish it by the fact that he exalted it meanly. I require of him that he should be man enough to



step forward confidently and worthily even in that place. He should not be unmanly enough to desire impudently to offend everybody by rushing straight from the street into the King's hall. By that he loses more than the King. On the contrary, he should find joy in observing every rule of propriety with a glad and confident enthusiasm which will make him frank and fearless. This is only a symbol, for the difference here remarked upon is only a very imperfect expression for spiritual distance. I require of every man that he should not think so inhumanly of himself as not to dare to enter those palaces where not merely the memory of the elect abides but where the elect themselves abide. He should not press forward impudently and impute to them kinship with himself; on the contrary, he should be blissful every time he bows before them, but he should be frank and confident and always be something more than a charwoman, for if he will not be more, he will never gain entrance. And what will help him is precisely the dread and distress by which the great are tried, for otherwise, if he has a bit of pith in him, they will merely arouse his justified envy. And what distance alone makes great, what people would make great by empty and hollow phrases, that they themselves reduce to naught.

Who was ever so great as that blessed woman, the Mother of God, the Virgin Mary? And yet how do we speak of her? We say that she was highly favored among women. And if it did not happen strangely that those who hear are able to think as inhumanly as those who talk, every young girl might well ask, "Why was not I too the highly favored?" And if I had nothing else to say, I would not dismiss such a question as stupid, for when it is a matter of favor, abstractly considered, everyone is equally entitled to it. What they leave out is the distress, the dread, the paradox. My thought is as pure as that of anyone, and the thought of the man who is able to think such things will surely become pure—and if this be not so, he may expect the dreadful; for he who once has evoked these images cannot be rid of them again, and if he sins against them, they avenge themselves with quiet wrath, more terrible than the vociferousness of ten ferocious reviewers. To be sure, Mary bore the child miraculously, but it came to pass with her after the manner of women, and that season is one of dread, distress and paradox. To be sure, the angel was a ministering spirit, but it was not a servile spirit which obliged her by saying to the other young maidens of Israel, "Despise not Mary. What befalls her is the extraordinary." But the Angel came only to Mary, and no one could understand her. After all, what woman was so mortified as Mary? And is it not true in this instance also that one whom God blesses He curses in the same breath? This is the spirit's interpretation of Mary, and she is not (as it shocks me to say, but shocks me still more to think that they have thoughtlessly and coquettishly interpreted her thus)—she is not a fine lady who sits in state and plays with an infant god. Nevertheless, when she says, "Behold the handmaid of the Lord"—then she is great, and I think it will not be found difficult to explain why she became the Mother of God. She has no need of worldly admiration, any more than Abraham has need of tears, for she was not a heroine, and he was not a hero, but both of them became greater than such, not at all because they were exempted

from distress and torment and paradox, but they became great through these.<sup>50</sup>

It is great when the poet, presenting his tragic hero before the admiration of men, dares to say, "Weep for him, for he deserves it." For it is great to deserve the tears of those who are worthy to shed tears. It is great that the poet dares to hold the crowd in check, dares to castigate men, requiring that every man examine himself whether he be worthy to weep for the hero. For the waste-water of blubberers is a degradation of the holy.—But greater than all this it is that the knight of faith dares to say even to the noble man who would weep for him, "Weep not for me, but weep for thyself."

One is deeply moved, one longs to be back in those beautiful times, a sweet yearning conducts one to the desired goal, to see Christ wandering in the promised land. One forgets the dread, the distress, the paradox. Was it so easy a matter not to be mistaken? Was it not dreadful that this man who walks among the others—was it not dreadful that He was God? Was it not dreadful to sit at table with Him? Was it so easy a matter to become an Apostle? But the result, eighteen hundred years—that is a help, it helps to the shabby deceit wherewith one deceives oneself and others. I do not feel the courage to wish to be contemporary with such events, but hence I do not judge severely those who were mistaken, nor think meanly of those who saw aright.

I return, however, to Abraham. Before the result, either Abraham was every minute a murderer, or we are confronted by a paradox which is higher than all mediation.

The story of Abraham contains therefore a teleological suspension of the ethical. As the individual he became higher than the universal. This is the paradox which does not permit of mediation. It is just as inexplicable how he got into it as it is inexplicable how he remained in it. If such is not the position of Abraham, then he is not even a tragic hero but a murderer. To want to continue to call him the father of faith, to talk of this to people who do not concern themselves with anything but words, is thoughtless. A man can become a tragic hero by his own powers—but not a knight of faith. When a man enters upon the way, in a certain sense the hard way of the tragic hero, many will be able to give him counsel; to him who follows the narrow way of faith no one can give counsel, him no one can understand. Faith is a miracle, and yet no man is excluded from it; for that in which all human life is unified is passion,\* and faith is a passion.

---

\*Lessing has somewhere given expression to a similar thought from a purely aesthetic point of view. What he would show expressly in this passage is that sorrow too can find a witty expression. To this end he quotes a rejoinder of the

unhappy English king, Edward II. In contrast to this he quotes from Diderot a story of a peasant woman and a rejoinder of hers. Then he continues: "That too was wit, and the wit of a peasant at that; but the situation made it inevitable. Consequently one must not seek to kind the excuse for the witty expressions of pain and of sorrow in the fact that the person who uttered them was a superior person, well educated, intelligent, and witty withal, *for the passions make all men again equal*—but the explanation is to be found in the fact that in all probability everyone would have said the same thing in the same situation. The thought of a peasant woman a queen could have had and must have had, just as what the king said in that instance a peasant too would have been able to say and doubtless would have said." Cf. Sämtliche Werke, XXX. p. 223.<sup>51</sup>

---

## **PROBLEM II**

### **Is there such a thing as an absolute duty toward God?**

The ethical is the universal, and as such it is again the divine. One has therefore a right to say that fundamentally every duty is a duty toward God; but if one cannot say more, then one affirms at the same time that properly I have no duty toward God. Duty becomes duty by being referred to God, but in duty itself I do not come into relation with God. Thus it is a duty to love one's neighbor, but in performing this duty I do not come into relation with God but with the neighbor whom I love. If I say then in this connection that it is my duty to love God, I am really uttering only a tautology, inasmuch as "God" is in this instance used in an entirely abstract sense as the divine, i.e. the universal, i.e. duty. So the whole existence of the human race is rounded off completely like a sphere, and the ethical is at once its limit and its content. God becomes an invisible vanishing point, a powerless thought, His power being only in the ethical which is the content of existence. If in any way it might occur to any man to want to love God in any other sense than that here indicated, he is romantic, he loves a phantom which, if it had merely the power of being able to speak, would say to him, "I do not require your love. Stay where you belong." If in any way it might occur to a man to want to love God otherwise, this love would be open to suspicion, like that of which Rousseau speaks, referring to people who love the Kaffirs instead of their neighbors.

So in case what has been expounded here is correct, in case there is no incommensurability in a human life, and what there is of the incommensurable is only such by an accident from which no consequences can be drawn, in so far as existence is regarded in terms of the idea, Hegel is right; but he is not right in talking about faith or in allowing Abraham to be regarded as the father of it; for by the latter he has pronounced judgment both upon Abraham and upon faith. In the Hegelian philosophy<sup>52</sup>

*das Äussere (die Entäusserung)* is higher than *das Innere*. This is frequently illustrated by an example. The child is *das Innere*, the man *das Äussere*. Hence it is that the child is defined by the outward, and conversely, the man, as *das Äussere*, is defined precisely by *das Innere*. Faith, on the contrary, is the paradox that inwardness is higher than outwardness—or, to recall an expression used above, the uneven number is higher than the even.

In the ethical way of regarding life it is therefore the task of the individual to divest himself of the inward determinants and express them in an outward way. Whenever he shrinks from this, whenever he is inclined to persist in or to slip back again into the inward determinants of feeling, mood, etc., he sins, he is in a temptation (*Anfechtung*). The paradox of faith is this, that there is an inwardness which is incommensurable for the outward, an inwardness, be it observed, which is not identical with the first but is a new inwardness. This must not be overlooked. Modern philosophy<sup>53</sup> has permitted itself without further ado to substitute in place of "faith" the immediate. When one does that it is ridiculous to deny that faith has existed in all ages. In that way faith comes into rather simple company along with feeling, mood, idiosyncrasy, vapors, etc. To this extent philosophy may be right in saying that one ought not to stop there. But there is nothing to justify philosophy in using this phrase with regard to faith. Before faith there goes a movement of infinity, and only then, *necopinare*,<sup>54</sup> by virtue of the absurd, faith enters upon the scene. This I can well understand without maintaining on that account that I have faith. If faith is nothing but what philosophy makes it out to be, then Socrates already went further, much further, whereas the contrary is true, that he never reached it. In an intellectual respect he made the movement of infinity. His ignorance is infinite resignation. This task in itself is a match for human powers, even though people in our time disdain it; but only after it is done, only when the individual has evacuated himself in the infinite, only then is the point attained where faith can break forth.

The paradox of faith is this, that the individual is higher than the universal, that the individual (to recall a dogmatic distinction now rather seldom heard) determines his relation to the universal by his relation to the absolute, not his relation to the absolute by his relation to the universal. The paradox can also be expressed by saying that there is an absolute duty toward God; for in this relationship of duty the individual as an individual stands related absolutely to the absolute. So when in this connection it is said that it is a duty to love God, something different is said from that in the foregoing; for if this duty is absolute, the ethical is reduced to a position of relativity. From this, however, it does not follow that the ethical is to be abolished, but it acquires an entirely different expression, the paradoxical expression—that, for example, love to God may cause the knight of faith to give his love to his neighbor the opposite expression to that which, ethically speaking, is required by duty.

If such is not the case, then faith has no proper place in existence,

then faith is a temptation (*Anfechtung*), and Abraham is lost, since he gave in to it.

This paradox does not permit of mediation, for it is founded precisely upon the fact that the individual is only the individual. As soon as this individual [who is aware of a direct command from God] wishes to express his absolute duty in [terms of] the universal [i.e. the ethical, and] is sure of his duty in that [i.e. the universal or ethical precept], he recognizes that he is in temptation [i.e. a trial of faith], and, if in fact he resists [the direct indication of God's will], he ends by not fulfilling the absolute duty so called [i.e. what here has been called the absolute duty]; and, if he doesn't do this, [i.e. doesn't put up a resistance to the direct intimation of God's will], he sins, even though *realiter* his deed were that which it was his absolute duty to do.\*

---

\*The translator has ventured to render this muddy sentence very liberally (though he has bracketed his explanatory additions), in order to bring out the meaning this sentence must have if it is to express the anguishing paradox of a "teleological suspension of the ethical." This is the meaning Niels Thulstrup gets out of it, and he tells me that this is the translation of Emanuel Hirsch. As S.K.'s sentence stands, without explanatory additions, it reminds me of a rigmarole I have often recited to the mystification of my hearers: "If a man were to signify, which he were not, if he had the power, which being denied him, he were to endeavor anyhow—merely because he don't, would you?" Much as I love Kierkegaard, I sometimes hate him for keeping me awake at night. Only between sleeping and waking am I able to unravel some of his most complicated sentences.

---

So what should Abraham do? If he would say to another person, "Isaac I love more dearly than everything in the world, and hence it is so hard for me to sacrifice him"; then surely the other would have shaken his head and said, "Why will you sacrifice him then?"—or if the other had been a sly fellow, he surely would have seen through Abraham and perceived that he was making a show of feelings which were in strident contradiction to his act.

In the story of Abraham we find such a paradox. His relation to Isaac, ethically expressed, is this, that the father should love the son. This ethical relation is reduced to a relative position in contrast with the absolute relation to God. To the question, "Why?" Abraham has no answer except that it is a trial, a temptation (*Fristelse*)—terms which, as was remarked above, express the unity of the two points of view: that it is for God's sake and for his own sake. In common usage these two ways of regarding the matter are mutually exclusive. Thus when we see a man do something which does not comport with the universal, we say that he scarcely can be doing it for God's sake, and by that we imply that he does

it for his own sake. The paradox of faith has lost the intermediate term, i.e. the universal. On the one side it has the expression for the extremest egoism (doing the dreadful thing it does for one's own sake); on the other side the expression for the most absolute self-sacrifice (doing it for God's sake). Faith itself cannot be mediated into the universal, for it would thereby be destroyed. Faith is this paradox, and the individual absolutely cannot make himself intelligible to anybody. People imagine maybe that the individual can make himself intelligible to another individual in the same case. Such a notion would be unthinkable if in our time people did not in so many ways seek to creep slyly into greatness. The one knight of faith can render no aid to the other. Either the individual becomes a knight of faith by assuming the burden of the paradox, or he never becomes one. In these regions partnership is unthinkable. Every more precise explication of what is to be understood by Isaac the individual can give only to himself. And even if one were able, generally speaking,<sup>55</sup> to define ever so precisely what should be intended by Isaac (which moreover would be the most ludicrous self-contradiction, i.e. that the particular individual who definitely stands outside the universal is subsumed under universal categories precisely when he has to act as the individual who stands outside the universal), the individual nevertheless will never be able to assure himself by the aid of others that this application is appropriate, but he can do so only by himself as the individual. Hence even if a man were cowardly and paltry enough to wish to become a knight of faith on the responsibility of an outsider, he will never become one; for only the individual becomes a knight of faith as the particular individual, and this is the greatness of this knighthood, as I can well understand without entering the order, since I lack courage; but this is also its terror, as I can comprehend even better.

In Luke 14:26, as everybody knows, there is a striking doctrine taught about the absolute duty toward God: "If any man cometh unto me and hateth not his own father and mother and wife and children and brethren and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." This is a hard saying, who can bear to hear it? For this reason it is heard very seldom. This silence, however, is only an evasion which is of no avail. Nevertheless, the student of theology learns to know that these words occur in the New Testament, and in one or another exegetical aid<sup>56</sup> he finds the explanation that *miseîn* in this passage and a few others is used in the sense of *meísein*, signifying *minus diligo, posthabeo, non colo, nihili facio*. However, the context in which these words occur does not seem to strengthen this tasteful explanation. In the verse immediately following there is a story about a man who desired to build a tower but first sat down to calculate whether he was capable of doing it, lest people might laugh at him afterwards. The close connection of this story with the verse here cited seems precisely to indicate that the words are to be taken in as terrible a sense as possible, to the end that everyone may examine himself as to whether he is able to erect the building.

In case this pious and kindly exegete, who by abating the price thought he could smuggle Christianity into the world, were fortunate

enough to convince a man that grammatically, linguistically and *kat' a'nalogían* [analogically] this was the meaning of that passage, it is to be hoped that the same moment he will be fortunate enough to convince the same man that Christianity is one of the most pitiable things in the world. For the doctrine which in one of its most lyrical outbursts, where the consciousness of its eternal validity swells in it most strongly, has nothing else to say but a noisy word which means nothing but only signifies that one is to be less kindly, less attentive, more indifferent; the doctrine which at the moment when it makes as if it would give utterance to the terrible ends by driveling instead of terrifying—that doctrine is not worth taking off my hat to.

The words are terrible, yet I fully believe that one can understand them without implying that he who understands them has courage to do them. One must at all events be honest enough to acknowledge what stands written and to admit that it is great, even though one has not the courage for it. He who behaves thus will not find himself excluded from having part in that beautiful story which follows, for after all it contains consolation of a sort for the man who had not courage to begin the tower. But we must be honest, and not interpret this lack of courage as humility, since it is really pride, whereas the courage of faith is the only humble courage.

One can easily perceive that if there is to be any sense in this passage, it must be understood literally. God it is who requires absolute love. But he who in demanding a person's love thinks that this love should be proved also by becoming lukewarm to everything which hitherto was dear—that man is not only an egoist but stupid as well, and he who would demand such love signs at the same moment his own death-warrant, supposing that his life was bound up with this coveted love. Thus a husband demands that his wife shall leave father and mother, but if he were to regard it as a proof of her extraordinary love for him that she for his sake became an indolent, lukewarm daughter etc., then he is the stupidest of the stupid. If he had any notion of what love is, he would wish to discover that as daughter and sister she was perfect in love, and would see therein the proof that she would love him more than anyone else in the realm. What therefore in the case of a man one would regard as a sign of egoism and stupidity, that one is to regard by the help of an exegete as a worthy conception of the Deity.

But how hate them? I will not recall here the human distinction between loving and hating—not because I have much to object to in it (for after all it is passionate), but because it is egoistic and is not in place here. However, if I regard the problem as a paradox, then I understand it, that is, I understand it in such a way as one can understand a paradox. The absolute duty may cause one to do what ethics would forbid, but by no means can it cause the knight of faith to cease to love. This is shown by Abraham. The instant he is ready to sacrifice Isaac the ethical expression for what he does is this: he hates Isaac. But if he really hates Isaac, he can



be sure that God does not require this, for Cain and Abraham are not identical. Isaac he must love with his whole soul; when God requires Isaac he must love him if possible even more dearly, and only on this condition can he *sacrifice* him; for in fact it is this love for Isaac which, by its paradoxical opposition to his love for God, makes his act a sacrifice. But the distress and dread in this paradox is that, humanly speaking, he is entirely unable to make himself intelligible. Only at the moment when his act is in absolute contradiction to his feeling is his act a sacrifice, but the reality of his act is the factor by which he belongs to the universal, and in that aspect he is and remains a murderer.

Moreover, the passage in Luke must be understood in such a way as to make it clearly evident that the knight of faith has no higher expression of the universal (i.e. the ethical) by which he can save himself. Thus, for example, if we suppose that the Church requires such a sacrifice of one of its members, we have in this case only a tragic hero. For the idea of the Church is not qualitatively different from that of the State, in so far as the individual comes into it by a simple mediation, and in so far as the individual comes into the paradox he does not reach the idea of the Church; he does not come out of the paradox, but in it he must find either his blessedness or his perdition. Such an ecclesiastical hero expresses in his act the universal, and there will be no one in the Church—not even his father and mother etc.—who fails to understand him. On the other hand, he is not a knight of faith, and he has also a different answer from that of Abraham: he does not say that it is a trial or a temptation in which he is tested.

People commonly refrain from quoting such a text as this in Luke. They are afraid of giving men a free rein, are afraid that the worst will happen as soon as the individual takes it into his head to comport himself as the individual. Moreover, they think that to exist as the individual is the easiest thing of all, and that therefore people have to be compelled to become the universal. I cannot share either this fear or this opinion, and both for the same reason. He who has learned that to exist as the individual is the most terrible thing of all will not be fearful of saying that it is great, but then too he will say this in such a way that his words will scarcely be a snare for the bewildered man, but rather will help him into the universal, even though his words do to some extent make room for the great. The man who does not dare to mention such texts will not dare to mention Abraham either, and his notion that it is easy enough to exist as the individual implies a very suspicious admission with regard to himself; for he who has a real respect for himself and concern for his soul is convinced that the man who lives under his own supervision, alone in the whole world, lives more strictly and more secluded than a maiden in her lady's bower. That there may be some who need compulsion, some who, if they were free-footed, would riot in selfish pleasures like unruly beasts, is doubtless true; but a man must prove precisely that he is not of this number by the fact that he knows how to speak with dread and trembling; and out of reverence for the great one is bound to speak, lest it be



forgotten for fear of the ill effect, which surely will fail to eventuate when a man talks in such a way that one knows it for the great, knows its terror—and apart from the terror one does not know the great at all.

Let us consider a little more closely the distress and dread in the paradox of faith. The tragic hero renounces himself in order to express the universal, the knight of faith renounces the universal in order to become the individual. As has been said, everything depends upon how one is placed. He who believes that it is easy enough to be the individual can always be sure that he is not a knight of faith, for vagabonds and roving geniuses are not men of faith. The knight of faith knows, on the other hand, that it is glorious to belong to the universal. He knows that it is beautiful and salutary to be the individual who translates himself into the universal, who edits as it were a pure and elegant edition of himself, as free from errors as possible and which everyone can read. He knows that it is refreshing to become intelligible to oneself in the universal so that he understands it and so that every individual who understands him understands through him in turn the universal, and both rejoice in the security of the universal. He knows that it is beautiful to be born as the individual who has the universal as his home, his friendly abiding-place, which at once welcomes him with open arms when he would tarry in it. But he knows also that higher than this there winds a solitary path, narrow and steep; he knows that it is terrible to be born outside the universal, to walk without meeting a single traveller. He knows very well where he is and how he is related to men. Humanly speaking, he is crazy and cannot make himself intelligible to anyone. And yet it is the mildest expression, to say that he is crazy. If he is not supposed to be that, then he is a hypocrite, and the higher he climbs on this path, the more dreadful a hypocrite he is.

The knight of faith knows that to give up oneself for the universal inspires enthusiasm, and that it requires courage, but he also knows that security is to be found in this, precisely because it is for the universal. He knows that it is glorious to be understood by every noble mind, so glorious that the beholder is ennobled by it, and he feels as if he were bound; he could wish it were this task that had been allotted to him. Thus Abraham could surely have wished now and then that the task were to love Isaac as becomes a father, in a way intelligible to all, memorable throughout all ages; he could wish that the task were to sacrifice Isaac for the universal, that he might incite the fathers to illustrious deeds—and he is almost terrified by the thought that for him such wishes are only temptations and must be dealt with as such, for he knows that it is a solitary path he treads and that he accomplishes nothing for the universal but only himself is tried and examined. Or what did Abraham accomplish for the universal? Let me speak humanly about it, quite humanly. He spent seventy years in getting a son of his old age. What other men get quickly enough and enjoy for a long time he spent seventy years in accomplishing. And why? Because he was tried and put to the test. Is not that crazy? But Abraham believed, and Sarah wavered and got him to take Hagar as a concubine—but therefore he also had to drive her away. He gets Isaac, then he has to be tried again.

He knew that it is glorious to express the universal, glorious to live with Isaac. But this is not the task. He knew that it is a kingly thing to sacrifice such a son for the universal, he himself would have found repose in that, and all would have reposed in the commendation of his deed, as a vowel reposes in its consonant,<sup>57</sup> but that is not the task—he is tried. That Roman general who is celebrated by his name of Cunctator<sup>58</sup> checked the foe by procrastination—but what a procrastinator Abraham is in comparison with him! ... yet he did not save the state. This is the content of one hundred and thirty years. Who can bear it? Would not his contemporary age, if we can speak of such a thing, have said of him, "Abraham is eternally procrastinating. Finally he gets a son. That took long enough. Now he wants to sacrifice him. So is he not mad? And if at least he could explain why he wants to do it—but he always says that it is a trial." Nor could Abraham explain more, for his life is like a book placed under a divine attachment and which never becomes *publici juris*.<sup>59</sup>

This is the terrible thing. He who does not see it can always be sure that he is no knight of faith, but he who sees it will not deny that even the most tried of tragic heroes walks with a dancing step compared with the knight of faith, who comes slowly creeping forward. And if he has perceived this and assured himself that he has not courage to understand it, he will at least have a presentiment of the marvellous glory this knight attains in the fact that he becomes God's intimate acquaintance, the Lord's friend, and (to speak quite humanly) that he says "Thou" to God in heaven, whereas even the tragic hero only addresses Him in the third person.

The tragic hero is soon ready and has soon finished the fight, he makes the infinite movement and then is secure in the universal. The knight of faith, on the other hand, is kept sleepless, for he is constantly tried, and every instant there is the possibility of being able to return repentantly to the universal, and this possibility can just as well be a temptation as the truth. He can derive evidence from no man which it is, for with that query he is outside the paradox.

So the knight of faith has first and foremost the requisite passion to concentrate upon a single factor the whole of the ethical which he transgresses, so that he can give himself the assurance that he really loves Isaac with his whole soul.\*

---

\*I would elucidate yet once more the difference between the collisions which are encountered by the tragic hero and by the knight of faith. The tragic hero assures himself that the ethical obligation [i.e., the lower ethical obligation, which he puts aside for the higher in the present case, accordingly, it is the obligation to spare his daughter's life] is totally present in him by the fact that he transforms it into a wish. Thus Agamemnon can say, "The proof that I do not offend against my parental duty is that my duty is my only wish." So here we have wish and duty face to face with one another. The fortunate chance in life is that the two

correspond, that my wish is my duty and vice versa, and the task of most men in life is precisely to remain within their duty and by their enthusiasm to transform it into their wish. The tragic hero gives up his wish in order to accomplish his duty. For the knight of faith wish and duty are also identical, but he is required to give up both. Therefore when he would resign himself to giving up his wish he does not find repose, for that is after all his duty. If he would remain within his duty and his wish he is not a knight of faith, for the absolute duty requires precisely that he should give them up. The tragic hero apprehended a higher expression of duty but not an absolute duty.

---

If he cannot do that, he is in temptation (*Anfechtung*). In the next place, he has enough passion to make this assurance available in the twinkling of an eye and in such a way that it is as completely valid as it was in the first instance. If he is unable to do this, he can never budge from the spot, for he constantly has to begin all over again. The tragic hero also concentrated in one factor the ethical which he teleologically surpassed, but in this respect he had support in the universal. The knight of faith has only himself alone, and this constitutes the dreadfulness of the situation. Most men live in such a way under an ethical obligation that they can let the sorrow be sufficient for the day, but they never reach this passionate concentration, this energetic consciousness. The universal may in a certain sense help the tragic hero to attain this, but the knight of faith is left all to himself. The hero does the deed and finds repose in the universal, the knight of faith is kept in constant tension. Agamemnon gives up Iphigenia and thereby has found repose in the universal, then he takes the step of sacrificing her. If Agamemnon does not make the infinite movement, if his soul at the decisive instant, instead of having passionate concentration, is absorbed by the common twaddle that he had several daughters and *vielleicht* [perhaps] the *Ausserordentliche* [extraordinary] might occur—then he is of course not a hero but a hospital-case. The hero's concentration Abraham also has, even though in his case it is far more difficult, since he has no support in the universal; but he makes one more movement by which he concentrates his soul upon the miracle. If Abraham did not do that, he is only an Agamemnon—if in any way it is possible to explain how he can be justified in sacrificing Isaac when thereby no profit accrues to the universal.

Whether the individual is in temptation (*Anfechtung*) or is a knight of faith only the individual can decide. Nevertheless it is possible to construct from the paradox several criteria which he too can understand who is not within the paradox. The true knight of faith is always absolute isolation, the false knight is sectarian. This sectarianism is an attempt to leap away from the narrow path of the paradox and become a tragic hero at a cheap price. The tragic hero expresses the universal and sacrifices himself for it. The sectarian punchinello, instead of that, has a private theatre, i.e. several good friends and comrades who represent the universal just about as well as the beadles in *The Golden Snuffbox*<sup>60</sup> represent justice. The knight of faith, on the contrary, is the paradox, is the individual, absolutely nothing but the individual, without connections or pretensions. This is the terrible

thing which the sectarian manikin cannot endure. For instead of learning from this terror that he is not capable of performing the great deed and then plainly admitting it (an act which I cannot but approve, because it is what I do) the manikin thinks that by uniting with several other manikins he will be able to do it. But that is quite out of the question. In the world of spirit no swindling is tolerated. A dozen sectaries join arms with one another, they know nothing whatever of the lonely temptations which await the knight of faith and which he dares not shun precisely because it would be still more dreadful if he were to press forward presumptuously. The sectaries deafen one another by their noise and racket, hold the dread off by their shrieks, and such a hallooing company of sportsmen think they are storming heaven and think they are on the same path as the knight of faith who in the solitude of the universe never hears any human voice but walks alone with his dreadful responsibility.

The knight of faith is obliged to rely upon himself alone, he feels the pain of not being able to make himself intelligible to others, but he feels no vain desire to guide others. The pain is his assurance that he is in the right way, this vain desire he does not know, he is too serious for that. The false knight of faith readily betrays himself by this proficiency in guiding which he has acquired in an instant. He does not comprehend what it is all about, that if another individual is to take the same path, he must become entirely in the same way the individual and have no need of any man's guidance, least of all the guidance of a man who would obtrude himself. At this point men leap aside, they cannot bear the martyrdom of being uncomprehended, and instead of this they choose conveniently enough the worldly admiration of their proficiency. The true knight of faith is a witness, never a teacher, and therein lies his deep humanity, which is worth a good deal more than this silly participation in others' weal and woe which is honored by the name of sympathy, whereas in fact it is nothing but vanity. He who would only be a witness thereby avows that no man, not even the lowliest, needs another man's sympathy or should be abased that another may be exalted. But since he did not win what he won at a cheap price, neither does he sell it out at a cheap price, he is not petty enough to take men's admiration and give them in return his silent contempt, he knows that what is truly great is equally accessible to all.

Either there is an absolute duty toward God, and if so it is the paradox here described, that the individual as the individual is higher than the universal and as the individual stands in an absolute relation to the absolute/or else faith never existed, because it has always existed, or, to put it differently, Abraham is lost, or one must explain the passage in the fourteenth chapter of Luke as did that tasteful exegete, and explain in the same way the corresponding passages and similar ones.<sup>61</sup>

### **PROBLEM III**

## **Was Abraham ethically defensible in keeping silent about his purpose before Sarah, before Eleazar, before Isaac?**

The ethical as such is the universal, again, as the universal it is the manifest, the revealed. The individual regarded as he is immediately, that is, as a physical and psychological being, is the hidden, the concealed. So his ethical task is to develop out of this concealment and to reveal himself in the universal. Hence whenever he wills to remain in concealment he sins and lies in temptation (*Anfechtung*), out of which he can come only by revealing himself.

With this we are back again at the same point. If there is not a concealment which has its ground in the fact that the individual as the individual is higher than the universal, then Abraham's conduct is indefensible, for he paid no heed to the intermediate ethical determinants. If on the other hand there is such a concealment, we are in the presence of the paradox which cannot be mediated inasmuch as it rests upon the consideration that the individual as the individual is higher than the universal, but it is the universal precisely which is mediation. The Hegelian philosophy holds that there is no justified concealment, no justified incommensurability. So it is self-consistent when it requires revelation, but it is not warranted in regarding Abraham as the father of faith and in talking about faith. For faith is not the first immediacy but a subsequent immediacy. The first immediacy is the aesthetical, and about this the Hegelian philosophy may be in the right. But faith is not the aesthetical—or else faith has never existed because it has always existed.

It will be best to regard the whole matter from a purely aesthetical point of view, and with that intent to embark upon an aesthetic deliberation, to which I beg the reader to abandon himself completely for the moment, while I, to contribute my share, will modify my presentation in conformity with the subject. The category I would consider a little more closely is *the interesting*, a category which especially in our age (precisely because our age lives *in discrimine rerum*) [at a turning point in history] has acquired great importance, for it is properly the category of the turning-point. Therefore we, after having loved this category *pro virili* [with all our power], should not scorn it as some do because we have outgrown it, but neither should we be too greedy to attain it, for certain it is that to be interesting or to have an interesting life is not a task for industrial art but a fateful privilege, which like every privilege in the world of spirit is bought only by deep pain. Thus, for example, Socrates was the most interesting man that ever lived, his life the most interesting that has been recorded, but this existence was allotted to him by the Deity, and in so far as he himself had to acquire it he was not unacquainted with trouble and pain. To take such a life in vain does not beseem a man who takes life seriously, and yet it is not rare to see in our age examples of such an endeavor.

Moreover the interesting is a border-category, a boundary between aesthetics and ethics. For this reason our deliberation must constantly glance over into the field of ethics, while in order to be able to acquire significance it must grasp the problem with aesthetic intensity and concupiscence. With such matters ethics seldom deals in our age. The reason is supposed to be that there is no appropriate place for it in the System. Then surely one might do it in a monograph, and moreover, if one would not do it prolixly, one might do it briefly and yet attain the same end—if, that is to say, a man has the predicate in his power, for one or two predicates can betray a whole world. Might there not be some place in the System for a little word like the predicate?

In his immortal *Poetics* (Chapter 11) Aristotle says,<sup>62</sup> *dúo mèn oûn toû múqou mérh perì taût' e'stí, peripéteia kai a'nagnw'risiv*. I am of course concerned here only with the second factor, a'nagnw'risiv, recognition. Where there can be question of a recognition there is implied *eo ipso* a previous concealment. So just as recognition is the relieving, the relaxing factor in the dramatic life, so is concealment the factor of tension. What Aristotle has to say in the same chapter about the merits of tragedy which are variously appraised in proportion as *peripéteia* and *a'nagnw'risiv* impinge<sup>63</sup> upon one another, and also what he says about the "individual" and the "double recognition," I cannot take into consideration here, although by its inwardness and quiet concentration what he says is peculiarly tempting to one who is weary of the superficial omniscience of encyclopedic scholars. A more general observation may be appropriate here. In Greek tragedy concealment (and consequently recognition) is an epic survival grounded upon a fate in which the dramatic action disappears from view and from which it derives its obscure and enigmatic origin. Hence it is that the effect produced by a Greek tragedy is like the impression of a marble statue which lacks the power of the eye. Greek tragedy is blind. Hence a certain abstraction is necessary in order to appreciate it properly. A son<sup>64</sup> murders his father, but only afterwards does he learn that it was his father. A sister<sup>65</sup> wants to sacrifice her brother, but at the decisive moment she learns who he is. This dramatic motive is not so apt to interest our *reflective* age. Modern drama has given up fate, has emancipated itself dramatically, sees with its eyes, scrutinizes itself, resolves fate in its dramatic consciousness. Concealment and revelation are in this case the hero's free act for which he is responsible.

Recognition and concealment are also present as an essential element in modern drama. To adduce examples of this would be too prolix. I am courteous enough to assume that everybody in our age, which is so aesthetically wanton, so potent and so enflamed that the act of conception comes as easy to it as to the partridge hen, which, according to Aristotle's affirmation,<sup>66</sup> needs only to hear the voice of the cock or the sound of its flight overhead—I assume that everyone, merely upon hearing the word "concealment" will be able to shake half a score of romances and comedies out of his sleeve. Wherefore I express myself briefly and so will throw out at once a general observation. In case one who plays hide and seek (and

thereby introduces into the play the dramatic ferment) hides something nonsensical, we get a comedy; if on the other hand he stands in relation to the idea, he may come near being a tragic hero. I give here merely an example of the comic. A man rouges his face and wears a periwig. The same man is eager to try his fortune with the fair sex, he is perfectly sure of conquering by the aid of the rouge and the periwig which make him absolutely irresistible. He captures a girl and is at the acme of happiness. Now comes the gist of the matter: if he is able to admit this embellishment, he does not lose all of his infatuating power; when he reveals himself as a plain ordinary man, and bald at that, he does not thereby lose the loved one.—Concealment is his free act, for which aesthetics also holds him responsible. This science is no friend of bald hypocrites, it abandons him to the mercy of laughter. This must suffice as a mere hint of what I mean—the comical cannot be a subject of interest for this investigation.

It is incumbent upon me to examine dialectically the part played by concealment in aesthetics and ethics, for the point is to show the absolute difference between the aesthetic concealment and the paradox.

A couple of examples. A girl is secretly in love with a man, although they have not definitely avowed their love to one another. Her parents compel her to marry another (there may be moreover a consideration of filial piety which determines her), she obeys her parents, she conceals her love, "so as not to make the other unhappy, and no one will ever know what she suffers."—A young man is able by a single word to get possession of the object of his longings and his restless dreams. This little word, however, will compromise, yea, perhaps (who knows?) bring to ruin a whole family, he resolves magnanimously to remain in his concealment, "the girl shall never get to know it, so that she may perhaps become happy by giving her hand to another." What a pity that these two persons, both of whom were concealed from their respective beloveds, were also concealed from one another, otherwise a remarkable higher unity might have been brought about.—Their concealment is a free act, for which they are responsible also to aesthetics. Aesthetics, however, is a courteous and sentimental science which knows of more expedients than a pawnbroker. So what does it do? It makes everything possible for the lovers. By the help of a chance the partners to the projected marriage get a hint of the magnanimous resolution of the other part, it comes to an explanation, they get one another and at the same time attain rank with real heroes. For in spite of the fact that they did not even get time to sleep over their resolution, aesthetics treats them nevertheless as if they had courageously fought for their resolution during many years. For aesthetics does not trouble itself greatly about time, whether in jest or seriousness time flies equally fast for it.

But ethics knows nothing about that chance or about that sentimentality, nor has it so speedy a concept of time. Thereby the matter receives a different aspect. It is no good arguing with ethics for it has pure categories. It does not appeal to experience, which of all ludicrous things is



the most ludicrous, and which so far from making a man wise rather makes him mad if he knows nothing higher than this. Ethics has in its possession no chance, and so matters do not come to an explanation, it does not jest with dignities, it lays a prodigious responsibility upon the shoulders of the puny hero, it denounces as presumption his wanting to play providence by his actions, but it also denounces him for wanting to do it by his suffering. It bids a man believe in reality and have courage to fight against all the afflictions of reality, and still more against the bloodless sufferings he has assumed on his own responsibility. It warns against believing the calculations of the understanding, which are more perfidious than the oracles of ancient times. It warns against every untimely magnanimity. Let reality decide—then is the time to show courage, but then ethics itself offers all possible assistance. If, however, there was something deeper which moved in these two, if there was seriousness to see the task, seriousness to commence it, then something will come of them; but ethics cannot help, it is offended, for they keep a secret from it, a secret they hold at their own peril.

So aesthetics required concealment and rewarded it, ethics required revelation and punished concealment.

At times, however, even aesthetics requires revelation. When the hero ensnared in the aesthetic illusion thinks by his silence to save another man, then it requires silence and rewards it. On the other hand, when the hero by his action intervenes disturbingly in another man's life, then it requires revelation. I am now on the subject of the tragic hero. I would consider for a moment Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis*. Agamemnon must sacrifice Iphigenia. Now aesthetics requires silence of Agamemnon inasmuch as it would be unworthy of the hero to seek comfort from any other man, and out of solicitude for the women too he ought to conceal this from them as long as possible. On the other hand, the hero, precisely in order to be a hero, must be tried by dreadful temptations which the tears of Clytemnestra and Iphigenia provide for him. What does aesthetics do? It has an expedient, it has in readiness an old servant who reveals everything to Clytemnestra. Then all is as it should be.

Ethics, however, has at hand no chance and no old servant. The aesthetical idea contradicts itself as soon as it must be carried out in reality. Hence ethics requires revelation. The tragic hero displays his ethical courage precisely by the fact that it is he who, without being ensnared in any aesthetic illusion, himself announces to Iphigenia her fate. If the tragic hero does this, then he is the beloved son of ethics in whom it is well pleased. If he keeps silent, it may be because he thinks thereby to make it easier for others, but it may also be because thereby he makes it easier for himself. However, he knows that he is not influenced by this latter motive. If he keeps silent, he assumes as the individual a serious responsibility inasmuch as he ignores an argument which may come from without. As a tragic hero he cannot do this, for ethics loves him precisely because he constantly expresses the universal. His heroic action demands courage, but



it belongs to this courage that he shall shun no argumentation. Now it is certain that tears are a dreadful *argumentum ad hominem*, and doubtless there are those who are moved by nothing yet are touched by tears. In the play Iphigenia had leave to weep, really she ought to have been allowed like Jephthah's daughter two months for weeping, not in solitude but at her father's feet, allowed to employ all her art "which is but tears," and to twine about his knees instead of presenting the olive branch of the suppliant.

Aesthetics required revelation but helped itself out by a chance; ethics required revelation and found in the tragic hero its satisfaction.

In spite of the severity with which ethics requires revelation, it cannot be denied that secrecy and silence really make a man great precisely because they are characteristics of inwardness. When Amor leaves Psyche he says to her, "Thou shalt give birth to a child which will be a divine infant if thou dost keep silence, but a human being if thou dost reveal the secret." The tragic hero who is the favorite of ethics is the purely human, and him I can understand, and all he does is in the light of the revealed. If I go further, then I stumble upon the paradox, either the divine or the demoniac, for silence is both. Silence is the snare of the demon, and the more one keeps silent, the more terrifying the demon becomes; but silence is also the mutual understanding between the Deity and the individual.

Before going on to the story of Abraham, however, I would call before the curtain several poetic personages. By the power of dialectic I keep them upon tiptoe, and by wielding over them the scourge of despair I shall surely keep them from standing still, in order that in their dread they may reveal one thing and another.\*

---

\*These movements and attitudes might well be a subject for further aesthetic treatment. However, I leave it undecided to what extent faith and the whole life of faith might be a fit subject for such treatment. Only, because it is always a joy to me to thank him to whom I am indebted, I would thank Lessing for some hints of a Christian drama which is found in his *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*.<sup>69</sup> He, however, fixed his glance upon the purely divine side of the Christian life (the consummated victory) and hence he had misgivings; perhaps he would have expressed a different judgment if he had paid more attention to the purely human side (*theologia viatorum*).<sup>70</sup> Doubtless what he says is very brief, in part evasive, but since I am always glad to have the company of Lessing, I seize it at once. Lessing was not merely one of the most comprehensive minds Germany has had, he not only was possessed of rare exactitude in his learning (for which reason one can securely rely upon him and upon his autopsy without fear of being duped by inaccurate quotations which can be traced nowhere, by half-understood phrases which are drawn from untrustworthy compendiums, or to be disoriented by a foolish trumpeting of novelties which the ancients have expounded far better) but he possessed at the same time an exceedingly uncommon gift of explaining what he himself had understood. There he stopped. In our age people go further and

explain more than they have understood.

---

In his *Poetics*<sup>67</sup> Aristotle relates a story of a political disturbance at Delphi which was provoked by a question of marriage. *The bridegroom, when the augurs*<sup>68</sup> *foretell to him that a misfortune would follow his marriage, suddenly changes his plan at the decisive moment when he comes to fetch the bride—he will not celebrate the wedding. I have no need of more.\**

---

\*According to Aristotle the historic catastrophe was as follows. To avenge themselves the family of the bride introduced a temple-vessel among his household goods, and he is sentenced as a temple-robber. This, however, is of no consequence, for the question is not whether the family is shrewd or stupid in taking revenge. The family has an ideal significance only in so far as it is drawn into the dialectic of the hero. Besides it is fateful enough that he, when he would shun danger by not marrying, plunges into it, and also that his life comes into contact with the divine in a double way: first by the saying of the augurs, and then by being condemned for sacrilege.

---

In Delphi this event hardly passed without tears; if a poet were to have adopted it as his theme, he might have dared to count very surely upon sympathy. Is it not dreadful that love, which in human life often enough was cast into exile, is now deprived of the support of heaven? Is not the old proverb that "marriages are made in heaven" here put to shame? Usually it is all the afflictions and difficulties of the finite which like evil spirits separate the lovers, but love has heaven on its side, and therefore this holy alliance overcomes all enemies. In this case it is heaven itself which separates what heaven itself has joined together. And who would have guessed such a thing? The young bride least of all. Only a moment before she was sitting in her chamber in all her beauty, and the lovely maidens had conscientiously adorned her so that they could justify before all the world what they had done, so that they not merely derived joy from it but envy, yea, joy for the fact that it was not possible for them to become more envious, because it was not possible for her to become more beautiful. She sat alone in her chamber and was transformed from beauty unto beauty, for every means was employed that feminine art was capable of to adorn worthily the worthy. But there still was lacking something which the young maidens had not dreamed of: a veil finer, lighter and yet more impenetrable than that in which the young maidens had enveloped her, a bridal dress which no young maiden knew of or could help her to obtain, yea, even the bride herself did not know how to obtain it. It was an invisible, a friendly power, taking pleasure in adorning a bride, which enveloped her in it without her knowledge; for she saw only how the bridegroom passed by and went up to the temple. She saw the door shut

behind him, and she became even more calm and blissful, for she only knew that he now belonged to her more than ever. The door of the temple opened, he stepped out, but maidenly she cast down her eyes and therefore did not see that his countenance was troubled, but he saw that heaven was jealous of the bride's loveliness and of his good fortune. The door of the temple opened, and the young maidens saw the bridegroom step out, but they did not see that his countenance was troubled, they were busy fetching the bride. Then forth she stepped in all her maidenly modesty and yet like a queen surrounded by her maids of honor, who bowed before her as the young maiden always bows before a bride. Thus she stood at the head of her lovely band and waited—it was only an instant, for the temple was near at hand—and the bridegroom came ... but he passed by her door.

But here I break off—I am not a poet, I go about things only dialectically. It must be remembered first of all that it is at the decisive instant the hero gets this elucidation, so he is pure and blameless, has not light-mindedly tied himself to the fiancée. In the next place, he has a divine utterance for him, or rather against him,<sup>71</sup> he is therefore not guided like those puny lovers by his own conceit. Moreover, it goes without saying that this utterance makes him just as unhappy as the bride, yea, a little more so, since he after all is the occasion of her unhappiness. It is true enough that the augurs only foretold a misfortune to *him*, but the question is whether this misfortune is not of such a sort that in injuring him it would also affect injuriously their conjugal happiness. What then is he to do? (1) Shall he preserve silence and celebrate the wedding?—with the thought that "perhaps the misfortune will not come at once, at any rate I have upheld love and have not feared to make myself unhappy. But keep silent I must, for otherwise even the short moment is wasted." This seems plausible, but it is not so by any means, for in doing this he has insulted the girl. He has in a way made the girl guilty by his silence, for in case she had known the truth she never would have consented to such a union. So in the hour of need he would not only have to bear the misfortune but also the responsibility for having kept silent and her justified indignation that he had kept silent. Or (2) shall he keep silent and give up celebrating the wedding? In this case he must embroil himself in a mystification by which he reduces himself to naught in relation to her. Aesthetics would perhaps approve of this. The catastrophe might then be fashioned like that of the real story, except that at the last instant an explanation would be forthcoming—however, that would be after it was all over, since aesthetically viewed it is a necessity to let him die ... unless this science should see its way to annul the fateful prophecy. Still, this behavior, magnanimous as it is, implies an offense against the girl and against the reality of her love. Or (3) shall he speak? One of course must not forget that our hero is a little too poetical for us to suppose that to sign away his love might not have for him a significance very different from the result of an unsuccessful business speculation. If he speaks, the whole thing becomes a story of unhappy love in the style of Axel and Valborg.\*

---

\*Moreover, from this point one might conduct the dialectical movements in another direction. Heaven foretells a misfortune consequent upon his marriage, so in fact he might give up the wedding but not for this reason give up the girl, rather live with her in a romantic union which for the lovers would be more than satisfactory. This implies, however, an offense against the girl because in his love for her he does not express the universal. However, this would be a theme both for a poet and for an ethicist who would defend marriage. On the whole, if poetry were to pay attention to the religious and to the inwardness of personalities, it would find themes of far greater importance than those with which it now busies itself. In poetry one hears again and again this story: a man is bound to a girl whom he once loved—or perhaps never sincerely loved, for now he has seen another girl who is the ideal. A man makes a mistake in life, it was in the right street but it was in the wrong house, for opposite, on the second floor, dwells the ideal—this people think a theme for poetry. A lover has made a mistake, he saw his fiancée by lamplight and thought she had dark hair, but, lo, on closer inspection she is blonde—but her sister, she is the ideal! This they think is a theme for poetry! My opinion is that every such man is a lout who may be intolerable enough in real life but ought instantly to be hissed off the stage when he would give himself airs in poetry. Only passion against passion provides a poetic collision, not the rumpus of these particulars within the same passion. If, for example, a girl in the Middle Ages, after having fallen in love, convinces herself that all earthly love is a sin and prefers a heavenly, here is a poetic collision, and the girl is poetic, for her life is in the idea.

---

This is a pair which heaven itself separates.<sup>72</sup> However, in the present case the separation is to be conceived somewhat differently since it results at the same time from the free act of the individuals. What is so very difficult in the dialectic of this case is that the misfortune is to fall only upon him. So the two lovers do not find like Axel and Valborg a common expression for their suffering, inasmuch as heaven levels its decree equally against Axel and Valborg because they are equally near of kin to one another. If this were the case here, a way out would be thinkable. For since heaven does not employ any visible power to separate them but leaves this to them, it is thinkable that they might resolve between them to defy heaven and its misfortune too.

Ethics, however, will require him to speak. His heroism then is essentially to be found in the fact that he gives up aesthetic magnanimity, which in this case, however, could not easily be thought to have any admixture of the vanity which consists in being hidden, for it must indeed be clear to him that he makes the girl unhappy. The reality of this heroism depends, however, upon the fact that he had had his opportunity [for a genuine love] and annulled it; for if such heroism could be acquired without this, we should have plenty of heroes in our age, in our age which has attained an unparalleled proficiency in forgery and does the highest things by leaping over the intermediate steps.

But then why this sketch, since I get no further after all than the

tragic hero? Well, because it is at least possible that it might throw light upon the paradox. Everything depends upon how this man stands related to the utterance of the augurs which is in one way or another decisive for his life. Is this utterance *publici juris*, or is it a *privatissimum*? The scene is laid in Greece, the utterance of the augur is intelligible to all. I do not mean merely that the ordinary man is able to understand its content lexically, but that the ordinary man can understand that an augur announces to the individual the decision of heaven. So the utterance of the augur is not intelligible only to the hero but to all, and no private relationship to the deity results from it. Do what he will, that which is foretold will come to pass, and neither by doing nor by leaving undone does he come into closer relationship with the deity, or become either the object of its grace or of its wrath. The result foretold is a thing which any ordinary man will be just as well able as the hero to understand, and there is no secret writing which is legible to the hero only. Inasmuch as he would speak, he can do so perfectly well, for he is able to make himself intelligible; inasmuch as he would keep silent, it is because by virtue of being the individual he would be higher than the universal, would delude himself with all sorts of fantastic notions about how she will soon forget the sorrow, etc. On the other hand, in case the will of heaven had not been announced to him by an augur, in case it had come to his knowledge in an entirely private way, in case it had put itself into an entirely private relationship with him, then we encounter the paradox (supposing there is such a thing—for my reflection takes the form of a dilemma), then he could not speak, however much he might wish to.<sup>73</sup> He did not then enjoy himself in the silence but suffered pain—but this precisely was to him the assurance that he was justified. So the reason for his silence is not that he as the individual would place himself in an absolute relation to the *universal*, but that he as the individual was placed in an absolute relation to the *absolute*. In this then he would also be able to find repose (as well as I am able to figure it to myself), whereas his magnanimous silence would constantly have been disquieted by the requirements of the ethical. It is very much to be desired that aesthetics would for once essay to begin at the point where for so many years it has ended, with the illusory magnanimity. Once it were to do this it would work directly in the interest of the religious, for religion is the only power which can deliver the aesthetical out of its conflict with the ethical. Queen Elizabeth<sup>74</sup> sacrificed to the State her love for Essex by signing his death-warrant. This was a heroic act, even if there was involved a little personal grievance for the fact that he had not sent her the ring. He had in fact sent it, as we know, but it was kept back by the malice of a lady of the court. Elizabeth received intelligence of this (so it is related, *ni fallor*), thereupon she sat for ten days with one finger in her mouth and bit it without saying a word, and thereupon she died. This would be a theme for a poet who knew how to wrench the mouth open—without this condition it is at the most serviceable to a conductor of the ballet, with whom in our time the poet too often confuses himself.

I will follow this with a sketch which involves the demoniacal. The legend of *Agnes and the Merman* will serve my purpose. The merman is a



seducer who shoots up from his hiding-place in the abyss, with wild lust grasps and breaks the innocent flower which stood in all its grace on the seashore and pensively inclined its head to listen to the howling of the ocean. This is what the poets hitherto have meant by it. Let us make an alteration. The merman was a seducer. He had called to Agnes, had by his smooth speech enticed from her the hidden sentiments, she has found in the merman what she sought, what she was gazing after down at the bottom of the sea. Agnes would like to follow him. The merman has lifted her up in his arms, Agnes twines about his neck, with her whole soul she trustingly abandons herself to the stronger one; he already stands upon the brink, he leans over the sea, about to plunge into it with his prey—then Agnes looks at him once more, not timidly, not doubtingly, not proud of her good fortune, not intoxicated by pleasure, but with absolute faith in him, with absolute humility, like the lowly flower she conceived herself to be; by this look she entrusts to him with absolute confidence her whole fate.<sup>75</sup> And, behold, the sea roars no more, its voice is mute, nature's passion which is the merman's strength leaves him in the lurch, a dead calm ensues—and still Agnes continues to look at him thus. Then the merman collapses, he is not able to resist the power of innocence, his native element is unfaithful to him, he cannot seduce Agnes. He leads her back again, he explains to her that he only wanted to show her how beautiful the sea is when it is calm, and Agnes believes him.—Then he turns back alone and the sea rages, but despair in the merman rages more wildly. He is able to seduce Agnes, he is able to seduce a hundred Agneses, he is able to infatuate every girl—but Agnes has conquered, and the merman has lost her. Only as a prey can she become his, he cannot belong faithfully to any girl, for in fact he is only a merman. Here I have taken the liberty of making a little alteration\* in the merman; substantially I have also altered Agnes a little, for in the legend Agnes is not entirely without fault—and generally speaking it is nonsense and coquetry and an insult to the feminine sex to imagine a case of seduction where the girl is not the least bit to blame.

---

\*One might also treat this legend in another way. The merman does not want to seduce Agnes, although previously he had seduced many. He is no longer a merman, or, if one so will, he is a miserable merman who already has long been sitting on the floor of the sea and sorrowing. However, he knows (as the legend in fact teaches),<sup>76</sup> that he can be delivered by the love of an innocent girl. But he has a bad conscience with respect to girls and does not dare to approach them. Then he sees Agnes. Already many a time when he was hidden in the reeds he had seen her walking on the shore.<sup>77</sup> Her beauty, her quiet occupation with herself, fixes his attention upon her; but only sadness prevails in his soul, no wild desire stirs in it. And so when the merman mingles his sighs with the sougning of the reeds she turns her ear thither, and then stands still and falls to dreaming, more charming than any woman and yet beautiful as a liberating angel which inspires the merman with confidence. The merman plucks up courage, he approaches Agnes, he wins her love, he hopes for his deliverance. But Agnes was no quiet maiden, she was fond of the roar of the sea, and the sad sighing beside the inland lake pleased her only because then she seethed more strongly within. She would be off and away, she would rush wildly out into the infinite with the

merman whom she loved—so she incites the merman. She disdained his humility, now pride awakens. And the sea roars and the waves foam and the merman embraces Agnes and plunges with her into the deep. Never had he been so wild, never so full of desire, for he had hoped by this girl to find deliverance. He soon became tired of Agnes, yet no one ever found her corpse, for she became a mermaid who tempted men by her songs.

---

In the legend Agnes is (to modernize my expression a little ) a woman who craves "the interesting," and every such woman can always be sure that there is a merman in the offing, for with half an eye mermen discover the like of that and steer for it like a shark after its prey. It is therefore very stupid to suppose (or is it a rumor which a merman has spread abroad?) that the so-called culture protects a girl against seduction. No, existence is more righteous and fair: there is only one protection, and that is innocence.

We will now bestow upon the merman a human consciousness and suppose that the fact of his being a merman indicates a human pre-existence in the consequences of which his life is entangled. There is nothing to prevent him from becoming a hero, for the step he now takes is one of reconciliation. He is saved by Agnes, the seducer is crushed, he has bowed to the power of innocence, he can never seduce again. But at the same instant two powers are striving for possession of him: repentance; and Agnes and repentance. If repentance alone takes possession of him, then he is hidden; if Agnes and repentance take possession of him, then he is revealed.

Now in case repentance grips the merman and he remains concealed, he has clearly made Agnes unhappy, for Agnes loved him in all her innocence, she believed that at the instant when even to her he seemed changed, however well he hid it, he was telling the truth in saying that he only wanted to show her the beautiful calmness of the sea. However, with respect to passion the merman himself becomes still more unhappy, for he loved Agnes with a multiplicity of passions and had besides a new guilt to bear. The demoniacal element in repentance will now explain to him that this is precisely his punishment [for the faults of his pre-existent state], and that the more it tortures him the better.

If he abandons himself to this demoniacal influence, he then perhaps makes still another attempt to save Agnes, in such a way as one can, in a certain sense, save a person by means of the evil. He knows that Agnes loves him. If he could wrest from Agnes this love, then in a way she is saved. But how? The merman has too much sense to depend upon the notion that an open-hearted confession would awaken her disgust. He will therefore try perhaps to incite in her all dark passions, will scorn her, mock her, hold up her love to ridicule, if possible he will stir up her pride. He will not spare himself any torment; for this is the profound contradiction in the

demoniacal, and in a certain sense there dwells infinitely more good in a demoniac than in a trivial person. The more selfish Agnes is, the easier the deceit will prove for him (for it is only very inexperienced people who suppose that it is easy to deceive innocence; existence is very profound, and it is in fact the easiest thing for the shrewd to fool the shrewd)—but all the more terrible will be the merman's sufferings. The more cunningly his deceit is planned, the less will Agnes bashfully hide from him her suffering; she will resort to every means, nor will they be without effect—not to shake his resolution, I mean, but to torture him.

So by help of the demoniacal the merman desires to be the individual who as the individual is higher than the universal. The demoniacal has the same characteristic as the divine inasmuch as the individual can enter into an absolute relation to it. This is the analogy, the counterpart, to that paradox of which we are talking. It has therefore a certain resemblance which may deceive one. Thus the merman has apparently the proof that his silence is justified for the fact that by it he suffers all his pain. However, there is no doubt that he can talk. He can thus become a tragic hero, to my mind a grandiose tragic hero, if he talks. Some, perhaps, will only understand wherein this is grandiose.\*

---

\*Aesthetics sometimes treats a similar subject with its customary coquetry. The merman is saved by Agnes, and the whole thing ends in a happy marriage. A happy marriage! That's easy enough. On the other hand, if ethics were to deliver the address at the wedding service, it would be quite another thing, I imagine. Aesthetics throws the cloak of love over the merman, and so everything is forgotten. It is also careless enough to suppose that at a wedding things go as they do at an auction where everything is sold in the state it is in when the hammer falls. All it cares for is that the lovers get one another, it doesn't trouble about the rest. If only it could see what happens afterwards—but for that it has no time, it is at once in full swing with the business of clapping together a new pair of lovers. Aesthetics is the most faithless of all sciences. Everyone who has deeply loved it becomes in a certain sense unhappy, but he who has never loved it is and remains a *pecus*.

---

He will then be able to wrest from his mind every self-deceit about his being able to make Agnes happy by his trick, he will have courage, humanly speaking, to crush Agnes. Here I would make in conclusion only one psychological observation. The more selfishly Agnes has been developed, the more dazzling will the self-deception be, indeed it is not inconceivable that in reality it might come to pass that a merman by his demoniac shrewdness has, humanly speaking, not only saved an Agnes but brought something extraordinary out of her; for a demon knows how to torture powers out of even the weakest person, and in his way he may have the best intentions toward a human being.



The merman stands at the dialectical turning-point. If he is delivered out of the demoniacal into repentance there are two paths open to him. He may hold back, remain in his concealment, but not rely upon his shrewdness. He does not come as the individual into an absolute relationship with the demoniacal but finds repose in the counter-paradox that the deity will save Agnes. (So it is the Middle Ages would perform the movement, for according to its conception the merman is absolutely dedicated to the cloister.) Or else he may be saved along with Agnes. Now this is not to be understood to mean that by the love of Agnes for him he might be saved from being henceforth a deceiver (this is the aesthetic way of performing a rescue, which always goes around the main point, which is the continuity of the merman's life); for so far as that goes he is already saved, he is saved inasmuch as he becomes revealed. Then he marries Agnes. But still he must have recourse to the paradox. For when the individual by his guilt has gone outside the universal he can return to it only by virtue of having come as the individual into an absolute relationship with the absolute. Here I will make an observation by which I say more than was said at any point in the foregoing discussion.\*

---

\*In the foregoing discussion I have intentionally refrained from any consideration of sin and its reality. The whole discussion points to Abraham, and him I can still approach by immediate categories—in so far, that is to say, as I am able to understand him. As soon as sin makes its appearance ethics comes to grief precisely upon repentance; for repentance is the highest ethical expression, but precisely as such it is the deepest ethical self-contradiction.

---

Sin is not the first immediacy, sin is a later immediacy. By sin the individual is already higher (in the direction of the demoniacal paradox) than the universal, because it is a contradiction on the part of the universal to impose itself upon a man who lacks the *conditio sine qua non*. If philosophy among other vagaries were also to have the notion that it could occur to a man to act in accordance with its teaching, one might make out of that a queer comedy. An ethics which disregards sin is a perfectly idle science; but if it asserts sin, it is *eo ipso* well beyond itself. Philosophy teaches that the immediate must be annulled (*aufgehoben*). That is true enough; but what is not true in this is that sin is as a matter of course the immediate, for that is no more true than that faith as a matter of course is the immediate.

As long as I move in these spheres everything goes smoothly, but what is said here does not by any means explain Abraham; for it was not by sin Abraham became the individual, on the contrary, he was a righteous man, he is God's elect. So the analogy to Abraham will not appear until after the individual has been brought to the point of being able to accomplish the universal, and then the paradox repeats itself.

The movements of the merman I can understand, whereas I cannot understand Abraham; for it is precisely through the paradox that the merman comes to the point of realizing the universal. For if he remains hidden and initiates himself into all the torments of repentance, then he becomes a demon and as such is brought to naught. If he remains concealed but does not think cunningly that being himself tormented in the bondage of repentance he could work Agnes loose, then he finds peace indeed but is lost for this world. If he becomes revealed and allows himself to be saved by Agnes, then he is the greatest man I can picture to myself; for it is only the aesthetic writer who thinks lightmindedly that he extols the power of love by letting the lost man be loved by an innocent girl and thereby saved, it is only the aesthetic writer who sees amiss and believes that the girl is the heroine, instead of the man being the hero. So the merman cannot belong to Agnes unless, after having made the infinite movement, the movement of repentance, he makes still one more movement by virtue of the absurd. By his own strength he can make the movement of repentance, but for that he uses up absolutely all his strength and hence he cannot by his own strength return and grasp reality. If a man has not enough passion to make either the one movement or the other, if he loiters through life, repenting a little, and thinks that the rest will take care of itself, he has once for all renounced the effort to live in the idea—and then he can very easily reach and help others to reach the highest attainments, i.e. delude himself and others with the notion that in the world of spirit everything goes as in a well-known game of cards where everything depends on haphazard. One can therefore divert oneself by reflecting how strange it is that precisely in our age when everyone is able to accomplish the highest things doubt about the immortality of the soul could be so widespread, for the man who has really made even so much as the movement of infinity is hardly a doubter. The conclusions of passion are the only reliable ones, that is, the only convincing conclusions. Fortunately existence is in this instance more kindly and more faithful than the wise maintain, for it excludes no man, not even the lowliest, it fools no one, for in the world of spirit only he is fooled who fools himself.

It is the opinion of all, and so far as I dare permit myself to pass judgment it is also my opinion, that it is not the highest thing to enter the monastery; but for all that it is by no means my opinion that in our age when nobody enters the monastery everybody is greater than the deep and earnest souls who found repose in a monastery. How many are there in our age who have passion enough to think this thought and then to judge themselves honestly? This mere thought of taking time upon one's conscience, of giving it time to explore with its sleepless vigilance every secret thought, with such effect that, if even, instant one does not make the movement by virtue of the highest and holiest there is in a man, one is able with dread and horror to discover\* and by dread itself, if in no other way, to lure forth the obscure *libido*<sup>78</sup> which is concealed after all in even, human life, whereas on the contrary, when one lives in society with others one so easily forgets, is let off so easily, is sustained in so many ways, gets

opportunity to start afresh—this mere thought, conceived with proper respect, I would suppose, must chasten many an individual in our age which imagines it has already reached the highest attainment.

---

\*People do not believe this in our serious age, and yet it is remarkable that even in paganism, more easy-going and less given to refection, the two outstanding representatives of the Greek *gnôqi sautón* [know thyself] as a conception of existence intimated each in his way that by delving deep into oneself one would first of all discover the disposition to evil. I surely do not need to say that I am thinking of Pythagoras and Socrates.

---

But about this people concern themselves very little in our age which has reached the highest attainment, whereas in truth no age has so fallen victim to the comic as this has, and it is incomprehensible that this age has not already by a *generatio acquivoca* [breeding without mating] given birth to its hero, the demon who would remorselessly produce the dreadful spectacle of making the whole age laugh and making it forget that it was laughing at itself. Or what is existence for but to be laughed at if men in their twenties have already attained the utmost? And for all that, what loftier emotion has the age found since men gave up entering the monastery? Is it not a pitiable prudence, shrewdness, faintheartedness, it has found, which sits in high places and cravenly makes men believe they have accomplished the greatest things and insidiously withholds them from attempting to do even the lesser things? The man who has performed the cloister-movement has only one movement more to make, that is, the movement of the absurd. How many in our age understand what the absurd is? How many of our contemporaries so live that they have renounced all or have gained all? How many are even so honest with themselves that they know what they can do and what they cannot? And is it not true that in so far as one finds such people one finds them rather among the less cultured and in part among women? The age in a kind of clairvoyance reveals its weak point, as a demoniac always reveals himself without understanding himself, for over and over again it is demanding the comic. If it really were this the age needed, the theater might perhaps need a new play in which it was made a subject of laughter that a person died of love—or would it not rather be salutary for this age if such a thing were to happen among us, if the age were to witness such an occurrence, in order that for once it might acquire courage to believe in the power of spirit, courage to stop quenching cravenly the better impulses in oneself and quenching enviously the better impulses in others ... by laughter? Does the age really need a ridiculous exhibition by a religious enthusiast in order to get something to laugh at, or does it not need rather that such an enthusiastic figure should remind it of that which has been forgotten?

If one would like to have a story written on a similar theme but more

touching for the fact that the passion of repentance was not awakened, one might use to this effect a tale which is narrated in the book of Tobit. The young Tobias wanted to marry Sarah the daughter of Raguel and Edna. But a sad fatality hung over this young girl. She had been given to seven husbands, all of whom had perished in the bride-chamber. With a view to my plan this feature is a blemish in the narrative, for almost irresistibly a comic effect is produced by the thought of seven fruitless attempts to get married notwithstanding she was very near to it—just as near as a student who seven times failed to get his diploma. In the book of Tobit the accent falls on a different spot, therefore the high figure is significant and in a certain sense is contributory to the tragic effect, for it enhances the courage of Tobias, which was the more notable because he was the only son of his parents (6: 14) and because the deterrent was so striking. So this feature must be left out. Sarah is a maiden who has never been in love, who treasures still a young maiden's bliss, her enormous first mortgage upon life, her *Vollmachtbrief zum Glücke*,<sup>79</sup> the privilege of loving a man with her whole heart. And yet she is the most unhappy maiden, for she knows that the evil demon who loves her will kill the bridegroom the night of the wedding. I have read of many a sorrow, but I doubt if there is anywhere to be found so deep a sorrow as that which we discover in the life of this girl. However, if the misfortune comes from without, there is some consolation to be found after all. Although existence did not bring one that which might have made one happy, there is still consolation in the thought that one would have been able to receive it. But the unfathomable sorrow which time can never divert, which time can never heal: To be aware that it was of no avail though existence were to do everything! A Greek writer conceals so infinitely much by his simple naïveté when he says: *pántov gàr ou'déis erota efugen h feúxetai, mécriv an kállon h kai o'fqalmoì bléposin* (cf. *Longi Pastoralia*).<sup>80</sup> There has been many a girl who became unhappy in love, but after all she became so, Sarah was so before she became so. It is hard not to find the man to whom one can surrender oneself devotedly, but it is *unspeakably* hard not to be able to surrender oneself. A young girl surrenders herself, and then they say, "Now she is no longer free"; but Sarah was never free, and yet she had never surrendered herself. It is hard if a girl surrendered herself and then was cheated,<sup>81</sup> but Sarah was cheated before she surrendered herself. What a world of sorrow is implied in what follows, when finally Tobias wishes to marry Sarah! What wedding ceremonies! What preparations! No maiden has ever been so cheated as Sarah, for she was cheated out of the most sacred thing of all, the absolute wealth which even the poorest girl possesses, cheated out of the secure, boundless, unrestrained, unbridled devotion of surrender—for first there had to be a fumigation by laying the heart of the fish and its liver upon glowing coals. And think of how the mother had to take leave of her daughter, who having herself been cheated out of all, in continuity with this must cheat the mother out of her most beautiful possession. Just read the narrative. "Edna prepared the chamber and brought Sarah thither and wept and received the tears of her daughter. And she said unto her, Be of good comfort, my child, the Lord of heaven and earth give thee joy for this thy sorrow! Be of good courage, my daughter." And then the moment of

the nuptials! Let one read it if one can for tears. "But after they were both shut in together Tobias rose up from the bed and said, Sister, arise, and let us pray that the Lord may have mercy upon us" (8:4).

In case a poet were to read this narrative, in case he were to make use of it, I wager a hundred to one that he would lay all the emphasis upon the young Tobias. His heroic courage in being willing to risk his life in such evident danger—which the narrative recalls once again, for the morning after the nuptials Raguel says to Edna, "Send one of the maidservants and let her see whether he be alive; but if not, that we may bury him and no man know of it" (8:12)—this heroic courage would be the poet's theme. I take the liberty of proposing another. Tobias acted bravely, stoutheartedly and chivalrously, but any man who has not the courage for this is a molly-coddle who does not know what love is, or what it is to be a man, or what is worth living for; he had not even comprehended the little mystery, that it is better to give than to receive, and has no inkling of the great one, that it is far more difficult to receive than to give—that is, if one has had courage to do without and in the hour of need did not become cowardly. No, it is Sarah that is the heroine. I desire to draw near to her as I never have drawn near to any girl or felt tempted in thought to draw near to any girl I have read about. For what love to God it requires to be willing to let oneself be healed when from the beginning one has been thus bungled without one's fault, from the beginning has been an abortive specimen of humanity!<sup>82</sup> What ethical maturity was required for assuming the responsibility of allowing the loved one to do such a daring deed! What humility before the face of another person! What faith in God to believe that the next instant she would not hate the husband to whom she owed everything!

Let Sarah be a man, and with that the demoniacal is close at hand. The proud and noble nature can endure everything, but one thing it cannot endure, it cannot endure pity. In that there is implied an indignity which can only be inflicted upon one by a higher power, for by oneself one can never become an object of pity. If a man has sinned, he can bear the punishment for it without despairing; but without blame to be singled out from his mother's womb as a sacrifice to pity, as a sweet-smelling savor in its nostrils, that he cannot put up with. Pity has a strange dialectic, at one moment it requires guilt, the next moment it will not have it, and so it is that to be predestinated to pity is more and more dreadful the more the individual's misfortune is in the direction of the spiritual. But Sarah had no blame attaching to her, she is cast forth as a prey to every suffering and in addition to this has to endure the torture of pity—for even I who admire her more than Tobias loved her, even I cannot mention her name without saying, "Poor girl." Put a man in Sarah's place, let him know that in case he were to love a girl a spirit of hell would come and murder his loved one—it might well be possible that he would choose the demoniacal part, that he would shut himself up within himself and say in the way a demoniacal nature talks in secret, "Many thanks, I am no friend of courteous and prolix phrases, I do not absolutely need the pleasure of love, I can become a Blue

Beard, finding my delight in seeing maidens perish during the night of their nuptials." Commonly one hears little about the demoniacal, notwithstanding that this field, particularly in our time, has a valid claim to be explored, and notwithstanding that the observer, in case he knows how to get a little in *rappor*t with the demon, can, at least occasionally, make use of almost every man for this purpose. As such an explorer Shakespeare is and constantly remains a hero. That horrible demon, the most demoniacal figure Shakespeare has depicted and depicted incomparably, the Duke of Gloucester (afterwards to become Richard III)—what made him a demon? Evidently the fact that he could not bear the pity he had been subjected to since childhood. His monologue in the first act of Richard III is worth more than all the moral systems which have no inkling of the terrors of existence or of the explanation of them.

I, that am rudely stamped, and want love's majesty  
To strut before a wanton ambling nymph;  
I, that am curtail'd of this fair proportion,  
Cheated of feature by dissembling nature,  
Deformed, unfinished, sent before my time  
Into this breathing world, scarce half made up,  
And that so lamely and unfashionable  
That dogs bark at me as I halt by them.

Such natures as that of Gloucester one cannot save by mediating them into an idea of society. Ethics in fact only makes game of them, just as it would be a mockery of Sarah if ethics were to say to her, "Why dost thou not express the universal and get married?" Essentially such natures are in the paradox and are no more imperfect than other men, but are either lost in the demoniacal paradox or saved in the divine. Now from time out of mind people have been pleased to think that witches, hobgoblins, gnomes etc. were deformed, and undeniably every man on seeing a deformed person has at once an inclination to associate this with the notion of moral depravity. What a monstrous injustice! For the situation must rather be inverted, in the sense that existence itself has corrupted them, in the same way that a stepmother makes the children wicked. The fact of being originally set outside of the universal, by nature or by a historical circumstance, is the beginning of the demoniacal, for which the individual himself however is not to blame. Thus Cumberland's Jew<sup>83</sup> is also a demon notwithstanding he does what is good. Thus too the demoniacal may express itself as contempt for men—a contempt, be it observed, which does not cause a man to behave contemptibly, since on the contrary he counts it his forte that he is better than all who condemn him.—In view of such cases the poets ought to lose no time in sounding the alarm. God knows what books are read now by the younger generation of verse makers! Their study likely consists in learning rhymes by rote. God knows what significance in existence these men have! At this moment I do not know what use they are except to furnish an edifying proof of the immortality of the soul, for the fact that one can say of them as Baggesen says<sup>84</sup> of the poet of our town, Kildevalle, "If he is immortal, then we all are."—What has



here been said about Sarah, almost as a sort of poetic production and therefore with a fantastic presupposition, acquires its full significance if one with psychological interest will delve deep into the meaning of the old saying: *Nullum unquam exstitit magnum ingenium sine aliqua dementia.*<sup>85</sup> For this dementia is the suffering allotted to genius in existence, it is the expression, if I may say so, of the divine jealousy, whereas the gift of genius is the expression of the divine favor. So from the start the genius is disoriented in relation to the universal and is brought into relation with the paradox—whether it be that in despair at his limitation (which in his eyes transforms his omnipotence into impotence) he seeks a demoniacal reassurance and therefore will not admit such limitation either before God or men, or whether he reassures himself religiously by love to the Deity. Here are implied psychological topics to which, it seems to me, one might gladly sacrifice a whole life—and yet one so seldom hears a word about them.<sup>86</sup> What relation has madness to genius? Can we construct the one out of the other? In what sense and how far is the genius master of his madness? For it goes without saying that to a certain degree he is master of it, since otherwise he would be actually a madman. For such observations, however, ingenuity in a high degree is requisite, and love; for to make observation upon a superior mind is very difficult. If with due attention to this difficulty one were to read through the works of particular authors most celebrated for their genius, it might in barely a single instance perhaps be possible, though with much pains, to discover a little.

I would consider still another case, that of an individual who by being hidden and by his silence would save the universal. To this end I make use of the legend of Faust.<sup>87</sup> Faust is a doubter,\* an apostate against the spirit, who takes the path of the flesh.

---

\*If one would prefer not to make use of a doubter, one might choose a similar figure, an ironist, for example, whose sharp sight has discovered fundamentally the ludicrousness of existence, who by a secret understanding with the forces of life ascertains what the patient wishes. He knows that he possesses the power of laughter if he would use it, he is sure of his victory, yea, also of his good fortune. He knows that an individual voice will be raised in resistance, but he knows that he is stronger, he knows that for an instant one still can cause men to seem serious, but he knows also that privately they long to laugh with him; he knows that for an instant one can still cause a woman to hold a fan before her eyes when he talks, but he knows that she is laughing behind the fan, that the fan is not absolutely impervious to vision, he knows that one can write on it an invisible inscription, he knows that when a woman strikes at him with her fan it is because she has understood him, he knows without the least danger of deception how laughter sneaks in, and how when once it has taken up its lodging it lies in ambush and waits. Let us imagine such an Aristophanes, such a Voltaire, a little altered, for he is at the same time a sympathetic nature, he loves existence, he loves men, and he knows that even though the reproof of laughter will perhaps educate a saved young race, yet in the contemporary generation a multitude of men will be ruined. So he keeps silent and as far as possible forgets how to laugh. But dare he keep silent? Perhaps there are sundry persons who do not in the least understand the difficulty I have in mind. They are likely of the opinion that it is an

admirable act of magnanimity to keep silent. That is not at all my opinion, for I think that every such character, if he has not had the magnanimity to keep silent, is a traitor against existence. So I require of him this magnanimity, but when he possesses it, dare he then keep silent? Ethics is a dangerous science and it might be possible that Aristophanes was determined by purely ethical considerations in resolving to reprove by laughter his misguided age. Aesthetical magnanimity does not help [to solve the question whether one ought to keep silent], for on the credit of that one does not take such a risk. If he is to keep silent, then into the paradox he must go.—I will suggest still another plan for a story. Suppose e.g. that a man possessed an explanation of a heroic life which explained it in a sorry way, and yet a whole generation reposes securely in an absolute belief in this hero, without suspecting anything of the sort.

---

This is what the poets mean by it, and whereas again and again it is repeated that every age has its Faust, yet one poet after another follows indefatigably the same beaten track. Let us make a little alteration. Faust is the doubter *par excellence*, but he is a sympathetic nature. Even in Goethe's interpretation of Faust I sense the lack of a deeper psychological insight into the secret conversations of doubt with itself. In our age, when indeed all have experienced doubt, no poet has yet made a step in this direction. So I think I might well offer them Royal Securities<sup>88</sup> to write on, so that they could write down all they have experienced in this respect—they would hardly write more than there is room for on the left hand margin.

Only when one thus deflects Faust back into himself, only then can doubt appear poetic, only then too does he himself discover in reality all its sufferings. He knows that it is spirit which sustains existence, but he knows then too that the security and joy in which men live is not founded upon the power of spirit but is easily explicable as an unreflected happiness. As a doubter, as the doubter, he is higher than all this, and if anyone would deceive him by making him believe that he has passed through a course of training in doubt, he readily sees through the deception; for the man who has made a movement in the world of spirit, hence an infinite movement, can at once hear through the spoken word whether it is a tried and experienced man who is speaking or a Münchhausen. What a Tamberlane is able to accomplish by means of his Huns, that Faust is able to accomplish by means of his doubt: to frighten men up in dismay, to cause existence to quake beneath their feet, to disperse men abroad, to cause the shriek of dread to be heard on all sides. And if he does it, he is nevertheless no Tamberlane, he is in a certain sense warranted and has the warranty of thought. But Faust is a sympathetic nature, he loves existence, his soul is acquainted with no envy, he perceives that he is unable to check the raging he is well able to arouse, he desires no Herostratic honor<sup>89</sup>—he keeps silent, he hides the doubt in his soul more carefully than the girl who hides under her heart the fruit of a sinful love, he endeavors as well as he can to walk in step with other men, but what goes on within him he consumes within himself, and thus he offers himself a sacrifice for the universal.



When an eccentric pate raises a whirlwind of doubt one may sometimes hear people say, "Would that he had kept silent." Faust realizes this idea. He who has a conception of what it means to live upon spirit knows also what the hunger of doubt is, and that the doubter hungers just as much for the daily bread of life as for the nutriment of the spirit. Although all the pain Faust suffers may be a fairly good argument that it was not pride possessed him, yet to test this further I will employ a little precautionary expedient which I invent with great ease. For as Gregory of Rimini was called *tortor infantium*<sup>90</sup> because he espoused the view of the damnation of infants, so I might be tempted to call myself *tortor heroum*; for I am very inventive when it is a question of putting heroes to the torture. Faust sees Marguerite—not after he had made the choice of pleasure, for my Faust does not choose pleasure—he sees Marguerite, not in the concave mirror of Mephistopheles but in all her lovable innocence, and as his soul has preserved love for mankind he can perfectly well fall in love with her. But he is a doubter, his doubt has annihilated reality for him; for so ideal is my Faust that he does not belong to these scientific doubters who doubt one hour every semester in the professorial chair, but at other times are able to do everything else, as indeed they do this, without the support of spirit or by virtue of spirit. He is a doubter, and the doubter hungers just as much for the daily bread of joy as for the food of the spirit. He remains, however, true to his resolution and keeps silent, and he talks to no man of his doubt, nor to Marguerite of his love.

It goes without saying that Faust is too ideal a figure to be content with the tattle that if he were to talk he would give occasion to an ordinary discussion and the whole thing would pass off without any consequences—or perhaps, and perhaps. ... (Here, as every poet will easily see, the comic is latent in the plan, threatening to bring Faust into an ironical relation to these fools of low comedy who in our age run after doubt, produce an external argument, e.g. a doctor's diploma, to prove that they really have doubted, or take their oath that they have doubted everything, or prove it by the fact that on a journey they met a doubter—these express-messengers and foot-racers in the world of spirit, who in the greatest haste get from one man a little hint of doubt, from another a little hint of faith, and then turn it to account as best they can, according as the congregation wants to have fine sand or coarse sand.)<sup>91</sup> Faust is too ideal a figure to go about in carpet-slippers. He who has not an infinite passion is not the ideal, and he who has an infinite passion has long ago saved his soul out of such nonsense. He keeps silent and sacrifices himself/or he talks with the consciousness that he will confound everything.

If he keeps silent, ethics condemns him, for it says, "Thou shalt acknowledge the universal, and it is precisely by speaking thou dost acknowledge it, and thou must not have compassion upon the universal." One ought not to forget this consideration when sometimes one judges a doubter severely for talking. I am not inclined to judge such conduct leniently, but in this case as everywhere all depends upon whether the

movements occur normally. If worse comes to worst, a doubter, even though by talking he were to bring down all possible misfortune upon the world, is much to be preferred to these miserable sweet-tooths who taste a little of everything, and who would heal doubt without being acquainted with it, and who are therefore usually the proximate cause of it when doubt breaks out wildly and with ungovernable rage.—If he speaks, then he confounds everything—for though this does not actually occur, he does not get to know it till afterwards, and the upshot cannot help a man either at the moment of action or with regard to his responsibility.

If he keeps silent on his own responsibility, he may indeed be acting magnanimously, but to his other pains he adds a little temptation (*Anfechtung*), for the universal will constantly torture him and say, "You ought to have talked. Where will you find the certainty that it was not after all a hidden pride which governed your resolution?"

If on the other hand the doubter is able to become the particular individual who as the individual stands in an absolute relation to the absolute, then he can get a warrant for his silence. In this case he must transform his doubt into guilt. In this case he is within the paradox, but in this case his doubt is cured, even though he may get another doubt.

Even the New Testament would approve of such a silence. There are even passages in the New Testament which commend irony—if only it is used to conceal something good. This movement, however, is as properly a movement of irony as is any other which has its ground in the fact that subjectivity is higher than reality. In our age people want to hear nothing about this, generally they want to know no more about irony than Hegel has said about it<sup>92</sup>—who strangely enough had not much understanding of it, and bore a grudge against it, which our age has good reason not to give up, for it had better beware of irony. In the Sermon on the Mount it is said, "When thou fastest, anoint thy head and wash thy face, that thou be not seen of men to fast." This passage bears witness directly to the truth that subjectivity is incommensurable with reality, yea, that it has leave to deceive. If only the people who in our age go gadding about with vague talk about the congregational idea<sup>93</sup> were to read the New Testament, they would perhaps get other ideas into their heads.

But now as for Abraham—how did he act? For I have not forgotten, and the reader will perhaps be kind enough to remember, that it was with the aim of reaching this point I entered into the whole foregoing discussion—not as though Abraham would thereby become more intelligible, but in order that the unintelligibility might become more desultory.<sup>94</sup> For, as I have said, Abraham I cannot understand, I can only admire him. It was also observed that the stages I have described do none of them contain an analogy to Abraham. The examples were simply educed in order that while they were shown in their own proper sphere they might at the moment of variation [from Abraham's case] indicate as it were the

boundary of the unknown land. If there might be any analogy, this must be found in the paradox of sin, but this again lies in another sphere and cannot explain Abraham and is itself far easier to explain than Abraham.

So then, Abraham did not speak, he did not speak to Sarah, nor to Eleazar, nor to Isaac, he passed over three ethical authorities; for the ethical had for Abraham no higher expression than the family life.

Aesthetics permitted, yea, required of the individual silence, when he knew that by keeping silent he could save another. This is already sufficient proof that Abraham does not lie within the circumference of aesthetics. His silence has by no means the intention of saving Isaac, and in general his whole task of sacrificing Isaac for his own sake and for God's sake is an offense to aesthetics, for aesthetics can well understand that I sacrifice myself, but not that I sacrifice another for my own sake. The aesthetic hero was silent. Ethics condemned him, however, because he was silent by virtue of his accidental particularity. His human foreknowledge was what determined him to keep silent. This ethics cannot forgive, every such human knowledge is only an illusion, ethics requires an infinite movement, it requires revelation. So the aesthetic hero can speak but will not.

The genuine tragic hero sacrifices himself and all that is his for the universal, his deed and every emotion with him belong to the universal, he is revealed, and in this self-revelation he is the beloved son of ethics. This does not fit the case of Abraham: he does nothing for the universal, and he is concealed.

Now we reach the paradox. Either the individual as the individual is able to stand in an absolute relation to the absolute (and then the ethical is not the highest)/or Abraham is lost—he is neither a tragic hero, nor an aesthetic hero.

Here again it may seem as if the paradox were the easiest and most convenient thing of all. However, I must repeat that he who counts himself convinced of this is not a knight of faith, for distress and anguish are the only legitimations that can be thought of, and they cannot be thought in general terms, for with that the paradox is annulled.

Abraham keeps silent—but he *cannot* speak. Therein lies the distress and anguish. For if I when I speak am unable to make myself intelligible, then I am not speaking—even though I were to talk uninterruptedly day and night. Such is the case with Abraham. He is able to utter everything, but one thing he cannot say, i.e. say it in such a way that another understands it, and so he is not speaking. The relief of speech is that it translates me into the universal. Now Abraham is able to say the most beautiful things any language can express about how he loves Isaac. But it is not this he has at heart to say, it is the profounder thought that he would sacrifice him because it is a trial. This latter thought no one can understand, and hence

everyone can only misunderstand the former. This distress the tragic hero does not know. He has first of all the comfort that every counter-argument has received due consideration, that he has been able to give to Clytemnestra, to Iphigenia, to Achilles, to the chorus, to every living being, to every voice from the heart of humanity, to every cunning, every alarming, every accusing, every compassionate thought, opportunity to stand up against him. He can be sure that everything that can be said against him has been said, unsparingly, mercilessly—and to strive against the whole world is a comfort, to strive with oneself is dreadful. He has no reason to fear that he has overlooked anything, so that afterwards he must cry out as did King Edward the Fourth at the news of the death of Clarence: [95](#)

Who su'd to me for him? who, in my wrath,  
Kneel'd at my feet and bade me be advised?  
Who spoke of brotherhood? who spoke of love?

The tragic hero does not know the terrible responsibility of solitude. In the next place he has the comfort that he can weep and lament with Clytemnestra and Iphigenia—and tears and cries are assuaging, but unutterable sighs are torture. Agamemnon can quickly collect his soul into the certainty that he will act, and then he still has time to comfort and exhort. This Abraham is unable to do. When his heart is moved, when his words would contain a blessed comfort for the whole world, he does not dare to offer comfort, for would not Sarah, would not Eleazar, would not Isaac say, "Why wilt thou do it? Thou canst refrain?" And if in his distress he would give vent to his feelings and would embrace all his dear ones before taking the final step, this might perhaps bring about the dreadful consequence that Sarah, that Eleazar, that Isaac would be offended in him and would believe he was a hypocrite. He is unable to speak, he speaks no human language. Though he himself understood all the tongues of the world, though his loved ones also understood them, he nevertheless cannot speak—he speaks a divine language ... he "speaks with tongues."

This distress I can well understand, I can admire Abraham, I am not afraid that anyone might be tempted by this narrative light-heartedly to want to be the individual, but I admit also that I have not the courage for it, and that I renounce gladly any prospect of getting further—if only it were possible that in any way, however late, I might get so far. Every instant Abraham is able to break off, he can repent the whole thing as a temptation (*Anfechtung*), then he can speak, then all could understand him—but then he is no longer Abraham.

Abraham cannot speak, for he cannot utter the word which explains all (that is, not so that it is intelligible), he cannot say that it is a test, and a test of such a sort, be it noted, that the ethical is the temptation (*Versuchung*). He who is so situated is an emigrant from the sphere of the universal. But the next word he is still less able to utter. For, as was

sufficiently set forth earlier, Abraham makes two movements: he makes the infinite movement of resignation and gives up Isaac (this no one can understand because it is a private venture); but in the next place, he makes the movement of faith every instant. This is his comfort, for he says: "But yet this will not come to pass, or, if it does come to pass, then the Lord will give me a new Isaac, by virtue viz. of the absurd." The tragic hero does at last get to the end of the story. Iphigenia bows to her father's resolution, she herself makes the infinite movement of resignation, and now they are on good terms with one another. She can understand Agamemnon because his undertaking expresses the universal. If on the other hand Agamemnon were to say to her, "In spite of the fact that the deity demands thee as a sacrifice, it might yet be possible that he did not demand it—by virtue viz. of the absurd," he would that very instant become unintelligible to Iphigenia. If he could say this by virtue of human calculation, Iphigenia would surely understand him, but from that it would follow that Agamemnon had not made the infinite movement of resignation, and so he is not a hero, and so the utterance of the seer is a sea-captain's tale and the whole occurrence a vaudeville.

Abraham did not speak. Only one word of his has been preserved, the only reply to Isaac, which also is sufficient proof that he had not spoken previously. Isaac asks Abraham where the lamb is for the burnt offering. "And Abraham said, God will provide Himself the lamb for the burnt offering, my son."

This last word of Abraham I shall consider a little more closely. If there were not this word, the whole event would have lacked something; if it were to another effect, everything perhaps would be resolved into confusion.

I have often reflected upon the question whether a tragic hero, be the culmination of his tragedy a suffering or an action, ought to have a last rejoicer. In my opinion it depends upon the life-sphere to which he belongs, whether his life has intellectual significance, whether his suffering or his action stands in relation to spirit.

It goes without saying that the tragic hero, like every other man who is not deprived of the power of speech, can at the instant of his culmination utter a few words, perhaps a few appropriate words, but the question is whether it is appropriate for him to utter them. If the significance of his life consists in an outward act, then he has nothing to say, since all he says is essentially chatter whereby he only weakens the impression he makes, whereas the ceremonial of tragedy requires that he perform his task in silence, whether this consists in action or in suffering. Not to go too far afield, I will take an example which lies nearest to our discussion. If Agamemnon himself and not Calchas had had to draw the knife against Iphigenia, then he would have only demeaned himself by wanting at the last moment to say a few words, for the significance of his act was

notorious, the juridical procedure of piety, of compassion, of emotion, of tears was completed, and moreover his life had no relation to spirit, he was not a teacher or a witness to the spirit. On the other hand, if the significance of a hero's life is in the direction of spirit, then the lack of a rejoinder would weaken the impression he makes. What he has to say is not a few appropriate words, a little piece of declamation, but the significance of his rejoinder is that in the decisive moment he carries himself through. Such an intellectual tragic hero ought to have what in other circumstances is too often striven for in ludicrous ways, he ought to have and he ought to keep the last word. One requires of him the same exalted bearing which is seemly in every tragic hero, but in addition to this there is required of him one word. So when such an intellectual tragic hero has his culmination in suffering (in death), then by his last word he becomes immortal before he dies, whereas the ordinary tragic hero on the other hand does not become immortal till after his death.

One may take Socrates as an example. He was an intellectual tragic hero. His death sentence was announced to him. That instant he dies—for one who does not understand that the whole power of the spirit is required for dying, and that the hero always dies before he dies, that man will not get so very far with his conception of life. So as a hero it is required of Socrates that he repose tranquilly in himself, but as an intellectual tragic hero it is required of him that he at the last moment have spiritual strength sufficient to carry himself through. So he cannot like the ordinary tragic hero concentrate upon keeping himself face to face with death, but he must make this movement so quickly that at the same instant he is consciously well over and beyond this strife and asserts himself. If Socrates had been silent in the crisis of death, he would have weakened the effect of his life and aroused the suspicion that in him the elasticity of irony was not an elemental power but a game, the flexibility of which he had to employ at the decisive moment to sustain him emotionally.\*

---

\*Opinions may be divided as to which rejoinder of Socrates is to be regarded as the decisive one, inasmuch as Socrates has been in so many ways volatilized by Plato. I propose the following. The sentence of death is announced to him, the same instant he dies, the same instant he overcomes death and carries himself through in the famous reply which expresses surprise that he had been condemned by a majority of three votes.<sup>96</sup> With no vague and idle talk in the marketplace, with no foolish remark of an idiot, could he have jested more ironically than with the sentence which condemned him to death.

---

What is briefly suggested here has to be sure no application to Abraham in case one might think it possible to find out by analogy an appropriate word for Abraham to end with, but it does apply to this extent, that one thereby perceives how necessary it is that Abraham at the last

moment must carry himself through, must not silently draw the knife, but must have a word to say, since as the father of faith he has absolute significance in a spiritual sense. As to what he must say, I can form no conception beforehand; after he has said it I can maybe understand it, maybe in a certain sense can understand Abraham in what he says, though without getting any closer to him than I have been in the foregoing discussion. In case no last rejoinder of Socrates had existed, I should have been able to think myself into him and formulate such a word; if I were unable to do it, a poet could, but no poet can catch up with Abraham.

Before I go on to consider Abraham's last word more closely I would call attention to the difficulty Abraham had in saying anything at all. The distress and anguish in the paradox consisted (as was set forth above) in silence—Abraham cannot speak.\*

---

\*If there can be any question of an analogy, the circumstance of the death of Pythagoras furnishes it, for the silence which he had always maintained he had to carry through in his last moment, and therefore [being compelled to speak] he *said*, "It is better to be put to death than to speak" (cf. Diogenes Laertius, viii. 39).

---

So in view of this fact it is a contradiction to require him to speak, unless one would have him out of the paradox again, in such a sense that at the last moment he suspends it, whereby he ceases to be Abraham and annuls all that went before. So then if Abraham at the last moment were to say to Isaac, "To thee it applies," this would only have been a weakness. For if he could speak at all, he ought to have spoken long before, and the weakness in this case would consist in the fact that he did not possess the maturity of spirit and the concentration to think in advance the whole pain but had thrust something away from him, so that the actual pain contained a plus over and above the thought pain. Moreover, by such a speech he would fall out of the role of the paradox, and if he really wanted to speak to Isaac, he must transform his situation into a temptation (*Anfechtung*), for otherwise he could say nothing, and if he were to do that, then he is not even so much as a tragic hero.

However, a last word of Abraham has been preserved, and in so far as I can understand the paradox I can also apprehend the total presence of Abraham in this word. First and foremost, he does not say anything, and it is in this form he says what he has to say. His reply to Isaac has the form of irony, for it always is irony when I say something and do not say anything. Isaac interrogates Abraham on the supposition that Abraham knows. So then if Abraham were to have replied, "I know nothing," he would have uttered an untruth. He cannot say anything, for what he knows



he cannot say. So he replies, "God will provide Himself the lamb for the burnt offering, my son." Here the double movement in Abraham's soul is evident, as it was described in the foregoing discussion. If Abraham had merely renounced his claim to Isaac and had done no more, he would in this last word be saying an untruth, for he knows that God demands Isaac as a sacrifice, and he knows that he himself at that instant precisely is ready to sacrifice him. We see then that after making this movement he made every instant the next movement, the movement of faith by virtue of the absurd. Because of this he utters no falsehood, for in virtue of the absurd it is of course possible that God could do something entirely different. Hence he is speaking no untruth, but neither is he saying anything, for he speaks a foreign language. This becomes still more evident when we consider that it was Abraham himself who must perform the sacrifice of Isaac. Had the task been a different one, had the Lord commanded Abraham to bring Isaac out to Mount Moriah and then would Himself have Isaac struck by lightning and in this way receive him as a sacrifice, then, taking his words in a plain sense, Abraham might have been right in speaking enigmatically as he did, for he could not himself know what would occur. But in the way the task was prescribed to Abraham he himself had to act, and at the decisive moment he must know what he himself would do, he must know that Isaac will be sacrificed. In case he did not know this definitely, then he has not made the infinite movement of resignation, then, though his word is not indeed an untruth, he is very far from being Abraham, he has less significance than the tragic hero, yea, he is an irresolute man who is unable to resolve either on one thing or another, and for this reason will always be uttering riddles. But such a hesitator is a sheer parody of a knight of faith.

Here again it appears that one may have an understanding of Abraham, but can understand him only in the same way as one understands the paradox. For my part I can in a way understand Abraham, but at the same time I apprehend that I have not the courage to speak, and still less to act as he did—but by this I do not by any means intend to say that what he did was insignificant, for on the contrary it is the one only marvel.

And what did the contemporary age think of the tragic hero? They thought that he was great, and they admired him. And that honorable assembly of nobles, the jury which every generation impanels to pass judgment upon the foregoing generation, passed the same judgment upon him. But as for Abraham there was no one who could understand him. And yet think what he attained! He remained true to his love. But he who loves God has no need of tears, no need of admiration, in his love he forgets his suffering, yea, so completely has he forgotten it that afterwards there would not even be the least inkling of his pain if God Himself did not recall it, for God sees in secret and knows the distress and counts the tears and forgets nothing.

So either there is a paradox, that the individual as the individual



stands in an absolute relation to the absolute/or Abraham is lost.

## EPILOGUE

One time in Holland when the market was rather dull for spices the merchants had several cargoes dumped into the sea to peg up prices. This was a pardonable, perhaps a necessary device for deluding people. Is it something like that we need now in the world of spirit? Are we so thoroughly convinced that we have attained the highest point that there is nothing left for us but to make ourselves believe piously that we have not got so far—just for the sake of having something left to occupy our time? Is it such a self-deception the present generation has need of, does it need to be trained to virtuosity in self-deception, or is it not rather sufficiently perfected already in the art of deceiving itself? Or rather is not the thing most needed an honest seriousness which dauntlessly and incorruptibly points to the tasks, an honest seriousness which lovingly watches over the tasks, which does not frighten men into being over hasty in getting the highest tasks accomplished, but keeps the tasks young and beautiful and charming to look upon and yet difficult withal and appealing to noble minds. For the enthusiasm of noble natures is aroused only by difficulties. Whatever the one generation may learn from the other, that which is genuinely human no generation learns from the foregoing. In this respect every generation begins primitively, has no different task from that of every previous generation, nor does it get further, except in so far as the preceding generation shirked its task and deluded itself. This authentically human factor is passion, in which also the one generation perfectly understands the other and understands itself. Thus no generation has learned from another to love, no generation begins at any other point than at the beginning, no generation has a shorter task assigned to it than had the preceding generation, and if here one is not willing like the previous generations to stop with love but would go further, this is but idle and foolish talk.

But the highest passion in a man is faith, and here no generation begins at any other point than did the preceding generation, every generation begins all over again, the subsequent generation gets no further than the foregoing—in so far as this remained faithful to its task and did not leave it in the lurch. That this should be wearisome is of course something the generation cannot say, for the generation has in fact the task to perform and has nothing to do with the consideration that the foregoing generation had the same task—unless the particular generation or the particular individuals within it were presumptuous enough to assume the place which belongs by right only to the Spirit which governs the world and has patience enough not to grow weary. If the generation begins that sort of thing, it is upside down, and what wonder then that the whole of existence seems to it upside down, for there surely is no one who has

found the world so upside down as did the tailor in the fairy tale<sup>97</sup> who went up in his lifetime to heaven and from that standpoint contemplated the world. If the generation would only concern itself about its task, which is the highest thing it can do, it cannot grow weary, for the task is always sufficient for a human life. When the children on a holiday have already got through playing all their games before the clock strikes twelve and say impatiently, "Is there nobody can think of a new game?" does this prove that these children are more developed and more advanced than the children of the same generation or of a previous one who could stretch out the familiar games, to last the whole day long? Or does it not prove rather that these children lack what I would call the lovable seriousness which belongs essentially to play?

Faith is the highest passion in a man. There are perhaps many in every generation who do not even reach it, but no one gets further. Whether there be many in our age who do not discover it, I will not decide, I dare only appeal to myself as a witness who makes no secret that the prospects for him are not the best, without for all that wanting to delude himself and to betray the great thing which is faith by reducing it to an insignificance, to an ailment of childhood which one must wish to get over as soon as possible. But for the man also who does not so much as reach faith life has tasks enough, and if one loves them sincerely, life will by no means be wasted, even though it never is comparable to the life of those who sensed and grasped the highest. But he who reached faith (it makes no difference whether he be a man of distinguished talents or a simple man) does not remain standing at faith, yea, he would be offended if anyone were to say this of him, just as the lover would be indignant if one said that he remained standing at love, for he would reply, "I do not remain standing by any means, my whole life is in this." Nevertheless he does not get further, does not reach anything different, for if he discovers this, he has a different explanation for it.

"One must go further, one must go further." This impulse to go further is an ancient thing in the world. Heraclitus the obscure, who deposited his thoughts in his writings and his writings in the Temple of Diana (for his thoughts had been his armor during his life, and therefore he hung them up in the temple of the goddess),<sup>98</sup> Heraclitus the obscure said, "One cannot pass twice through the same stream." [Plato's *Cratylus*, §402.] Heraclitus the obscure had a disciple who did not stop with that, he went further and added, "One cannot do it even once." [Cf. Tennemann, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, I, p. 220.] Poor Heraclitus, to have such a disciple! By this amendment the thesis of Heraclitus was so improved that it became an Eleatic thesis which denies movement, and yet that disciple desired only to be a disciple of Heraclitus ... and to go further—not back to the position Heraclitus had abandoned.

---

## Translator's Notes

(I am indebted to most of these notes to the editors of the Danish edition of S.K.'s Complete Works.)

<sup>1</sup> The story of Tarquin's son at Gabii is told in the [Translator's] Introduction[: ]

[...the motto on the back of the title page, which he got from Hamann, recalls the well-known story of old Rome, which relates that when the son of Tarquinius Superbus had craftily gained the confidence of the people of Gabii he secretly sent a messenger to his father in Rome, asking what he should do next. The father, not willing to trust the messenger, took him into the field where as he walked he struck off with his cane the heads of the tallest poppies. The son understood that he was to bring about the death of the most eminent men in the city and proceeded to do so.]

<sup>2</sup> The Preface is aimed especially at Martensen's review of J.L. Heiberg's "Introductory Lectures to Speculative Logic," *Danske Maanedskrift*, No. 16 for 1836, pp. 515ff.

<sup>3</sup> Descartes is mentioned here because Martensen made appeal to him in the article mentioned in the preceding note.

<sup>4</sup> Remembering, however, as I have already said, that the natural light is to be trusted only in so far as nothing to the contrary is revealed by God Himself. ... Moreover, it must be fixed in one's memory as the highest rule, that what has been revealed to us by God is to be believed as the most certain of all things; and even though the light of reason should seem most clearly to suggest something else, we must nevertheless give credence to the divine authority only, rather than our own judgment. (*Principia philosophiae, pars prima* 28 and 76.)

<sup>5</sup> Let no one think that I am here to propound a method which everyone ought to follow in order to govern his reason aright; for I have merely the intention of expounding the method I myself have followed. ... But no sooner had I finished the course of study at the conclusion of which one is ordinarily adopted into the ranks of the learned, than I began to think of something very different from that. For I became aware that I was involved in so many doubts, so many errors, that all efforts to learn were, as I saw it, of no other help to me than I might more and more discover my ignorance (*Dissertatio de methodo*, pp. 2 and 3)

<sup>6</sup> Martensen gave such "promises" in the article referred to in notes 2 and 3.

<sup>7</sup> S.K.'s contemptuous way of referring to the *Berlingske Tidende*, a newspaper owned and edited by his *bête noire*, the wholesale merchant Nathanson. This advertisement attracted particular attention because the enterprising young gardener accompanied it with a sketch of himself in the ingratiating attitude here described.

<sup>8</sup> In J.L. Heiberg's *The Reviewer and the Beast*, Trop tears his own tragedy, *The Destruction of the Human Race*, into two equal pieces, remarking, "Since it doesn't cost more to preserve good taste, why shouldn't we do it?"

<sup>9</sup> Only three years before this the first omnibus was seen in Copenhagen.

<sup>10</sup> One might blamelessly be in doubt how to translate this title (as the four translators into German, French and English have been) had not S.K. himself indicated (IV B 81) that he here uses the word *Stemming* in the sense of *proimion*, the Greek word which gives us proem. I have preferred to use the word prelude because it will be more commonly understood. Cf. IV A 93.

<sup>11</sup> Genesis, Chapter 22.

<sup>12</sup> Judith 10: 11. S.K. quotes this passage in the *Postscript*. Cf. III A 197.

<sup>13</sup> Alluding to various passages in Homer (e.g. *Illiad* III 381) where a divinity saves a hero by enveloping him in a cloud and carrying him away. We discover additional pathos in the picture of the "lover" when we remember that at the end of *The Point of View* (pp. 62f. and 100ff.) S.K. looks for the coming of his poet, his lover.

<sup>14</sup> It is evident from the sequel that Jeremiah is meant.

<sup>15</sup> Here we have a glimpse of "repetition."

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Plato's *Phaedrus*, 22 and 37.

<sup>17</sup> In Oelenschläger's play *Alladin* the hero is contrasted with Nouredin the representative of darkness.

<sup>18</sup> Isaiah 26: 18.

<sup>19</sup> Themistocles, as related in Plutarch's *Themistocles*, 3, 3.

<sup>20</sup> Eleven months later (with only one pseudonymous work intervening) S.K. published *The Concept of Dread [=Anxiety]*, and this remained one his most distinctive categories. Although all have agreed to use the word "dread," no one can think it adequate as a translation of *Angst*. For though it denotes the presentiment of evil it does not sufficiently emphasize the anguish of the experience.

<sup>21</sup> The connection requires a masculine pronoun, but Regina is meant, and she must have known it, for such were her words when she refused to give Kierkegaard back his freedom.

<sup>22</sup> As Professor Martensen had claimed to do (*Danske Maanedskrift*, No. 16 referred to in note 2 above. Cf. I A 328, p. 130). But Sibbern too claimed for Heiberg that he "goes beyond Hegel" (the same review, No. 10, year 1838, p. 292).

<sup>23</sup> Quoted from Horace's *Letters*, I, 18, 84: "It's your affair when the neighbor's house is afire."

<sup>24</sup> The reader may need to be apprised that Johannes *de silentio* is in that religious stage which by Johannes Climacus in the *Postscript* is called "religiousness A," the basis of all religiousness, but therefore not the distinctively Christian position, which here is called "religiousness B," or the paradoxical religiousness which is characterized by faith in the strictest sense.

<sup>25</sup> This is decidedly autobiographical.

<sup>26</sup> S.K. attributed his spinal curvature to a fall from a tree when he was a child.

<sup>27</sup> The reader who has not heard or has not heeded S.K.'s warning not to attribute to him personally a single word the pseudonyms say may need here to be reminded that it is not S.K. who reiterates so insistently that he cannot understand Abraham. It is Johannes *de silentio* who says this, and the purpose of it is to emphasize the fact that the paradoxical religiousness (religiousness B) is and remains a paradox to everyone who stands on a lower plane, even to one who has got so high as to be able to make the movement of infinite resignation, so long as his religion is in the sphere of immanence.

<sup>28</sup> Introduced about 1840 in Copenhagen.

<sup>29</sup> The "princess" is of course the most obvious analogue to Regina, and one which she could not fail to discover; but every other reader may need the hint that in this whole paragraph S.K. describes his own act of resignation.

<sup>30</sup> At the time of his engagement S.K. registered the observation that certain insects die the instant they fertilize their mate, and he repeated this in the sixth Diapsalm of *Either/Or*.

<sup>31</sup> "A blissful leap into eternity."

<sup>32</sup> Cf. what is said in *Repetition* about the young man who "recollects" his love as soon as he is engaged. It is quoted in my *Kierkegaard*, p. 212.

<sup>33</sup> It seems clear enough that this passage was written after S.K. learned of Regina's engagement, and the tone of it suggests that he had had time to repent of the very different language he used when he rewrote *Repetition*. It is therefore an additional argument for the view that this book was written later than the other.

<sup>34</sup> "The pre-established harmony" was a fundamental concept of Leibnitz's philosophy.

<sup>35</sup> See *Magyarische Sagen* by Johan Graf Mailáth (Stuttgart u. Tübingen 1838), Vol. II, p. 18 Cf. *Journal* II A 449.

<sup>36</sup> An entry in the *Journal* (IV A 107) dated May 17 [1843], at the time, that is, when he was composing these two works in Berlin, S.K. says: "If I had had faith, I would have remained with Regina." He was then only a knight of infinite resignation, but he was in the way of becoming a knight of faith.

<sup>37</sup> It would have been well had I remarked earlier that the Danish words *resignere* and *Resignation* have a more active sense than we attach to the word "resignation," that they imply an act rather than a passive endurance of a situation, and therefore could be translated by "renounce," "renunciation"—yet it would not do to dub our knight the knight of renunciation.

<sup>38</sup> See Rosenkranz, *Erinnerungen an Karl Daub* (Berlin 1837), p. 2. Cf. *Journal* IV A 92.

<sup>39</sup> S.K. liked to be called "Master of Irony" in view of the big book on *The Concept of Irony* by which he won his degree of Master of Arts.

<sup>40</sup> A Greek word meaning end or goal—which S.K. writes with Greek letters but I transliterate because it is of such common occurrence, and also because it is in the way of becoming an English word.

<sup>41</sup> This is the conception of the ethical which is stressed in the Second Part of *Either/Or*. Perhaps Schrempf is right in affirming that what caused S.K. unnecessary agony was his acceptance of the Hegelian notion of the relation between the universal and the particular.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. *Philosophie des Rechts*, 2nd ed. (1840) §§129-141 and Table of Contents p. xix.

<sup>43</sup> The Trojan war. When the Greek fleet was unable to set sail from Aulis because of an adverse wind the seer Calchas announced that King Agamemnon had offended Artemis and that the goddess demanded his daughter Iphigenia as a sacrifice of expiation.

<sup>44</sup> See Euripides, *Iphigenia in Aulis*, v. 448 in Wilster's translation. Agamemnon says, "How lucky to be born in lowly station where one may be allowed to weep." The confidants mentioned below are Menelaus, Calchas and Ulysses. Cf. v. 107.

<sup>45</sup> Jephtha. Judges 11:30-40.

<sup>46</sup> The sons of Brutus, while their father was Consul, took part in a conspiracy to restore the king Rome has expelled, and Brutus ordered them put to death.

<sup>47</sup> This is temptation in the sense we ordinarily attach to the word. For temptation in a higher sense (*Anfaegtelse*) I have in the translation of other books used the phrase "trial of temptation." Professor Swenson, in an important passage of the *Postscript*, preferred to use the German word *Anfechtung*. In this work I have use "temptation" and added the German word in parentheses. The distinction between the two sorts of temptation is plainly indicated by S.K. in this paragraph.

<sup>48</sup> This is the Scriptural word which we translate by "offense" or "stumbling block." Only Mr. Dru has preferred to use the identical word "scandal."

<sup>49</sup> *Docents* and *Privatdocents* (both of them German titles for

subordinate teachers in the universities) were very frequently the objects of S.K.'s satire. He spoke more frequently about "the professor" after Martensen had attained that title.

<sup>50</sup> It would be interesting and edifying to make an anthology of the passages in which S.K. speaks of the Blessed Virgin; for surely no Protestant was ever so much engrossed in this theme, and perhaps no Catholic has appreciated more profoundly this unique position of Mary.

<sup>51</sup> In *Auszüge aus den Literatur-Briefen*, 81st letter, in Maltzahn's ed. Vol. vi, pp. 205ff.

<sup>52</sup> E.g. Hegel's *Logik*, ii, Book 2, Sect 3, Cap. C (*Werke* IV, pp. 177ff.; *Encyclopedie* I §140 (*Werke* VI, pp. 275ff.)).

<sup>53</sup> It appears from the *Journal* (I A 273) that S.K. had in mind Schleiermacher's "Theology of Feeling," and also (with not so obvious a justification) the dogmatists of the Hegelian school. The Danish editors refer to Marheineke, *Dogmatik*, 2nd ed. §§70, 71, 86.

<sup>54</sup> Unexpected.

<sup>55</sup> In this particular instance S.K. could define precisely what he understood by Isaac, that is, Regina; and the formlessness of this sentence was intentional—it is a smokescreen.

<sup>56</sup> The Danish editors refer to Bretschneider's Lexicon; but no language lacks "exegetical aids" which serve the purpose of emasculating the New Testament. In this instance the absolute word "hate" is weakened successively by each term used to define it: "feel dislike," "love less," "put in a subordinate place," "show no reverence," "regard as naught."

<sup>57</sup> The Hebrew consonants *yodh* and *vav* originally indicated vowel sounds, and when the vowel sounds came to be written below the consonants these letters became superfluous in this respect and were said to repose (*hvile*) in the vowel. So S.K. understood the situation in his *Journal* II A 406, but here he has inverted it.

<sup>58</sup> Fabius Maximus who in 217 B.C. conducted the war against Hannibal and received the appellation of Cunctator for his successful strategy of delay or procrastination.

<sup>59</sup> Public property.



<sup>60</sup> A play by Olussen, which in Act ii, Scene 10 and elsewhere speaks of "two witnesses" but not of beadles (*Stokemændene*) i.e. four men appointed to attend legal proceedings as witnesses.

<sup>61</sup> The corresponding passages are Deut. 16:6f. and 33:9; Matt. 10:37, 19:29. In the manuscript 1 Cor. 7:11 is spoken of as a "similar" passage, but not with good reason.

<sup>62</sup> Two parts of the myth, viz. change and recognition, have to do with this.

<sup>63</sup> The word is literally "carron." The Danish editors explain that it means here to coincide at the same instant. Thus Oedipus by "recognizing" who he is brings about a "change" in his fortune.

<sup>64</sup> Oedipus in Sophocles' tragedy of that name.

<sup>65</sup> Iphigenia in Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*.

<sup>66</sup> In his *Natural History*, V, 4, 7. Cf. *Journal* IV A 36.

<sup>67</sup> Book viii (5), Cap. 3, 3.

<sup>68</sup> Title of a Roman priesthood, which S.K. (I know not for what reason) applies here to the Greek soothsayers.

<sup>69</sup> Vol. I, §§1 and 2–p. 10 in Maltzahn's ed.

<sup>70</sup> Theology of pilgrims—contrasted with *theologia beatorum*, and ancient division no longer in vogue.

<sup>71</sup> It is remembered that S.K. believed his marriage was prohibited by a "divine veto." Hence the prospective bridegroom of Delphi presents the closest analogy to his situation. In fact, the *Journal* shows that every line of conduct contemplated in this passage was seriously considered by S.K.—even the possibility of a "romantic union" without marriage. But it was the second line of conduct he chose.

<sup>72</sup> Axel and Valborg are the pair of unhappy lovers most celebrated in Danish literature. Because of their close consanguinity the Church forbade their marriage.

<sup>73</sup> This in fact was S.K.'s position.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. Lessing, *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, Vol. I, art. 22 (in Maltzahn's ed VII, p. 96).

<sup>75</sup> Nowhere, not even in the *Journal*, has S.K. so perfectly described the modest confidence with which Regina committed herself to him.

<sup>76</sup> It is found in the fairy tale of "Beauty and the Beast" (Molbeck, No. 7), but not in the legend of "Agnes and the Merman."

<sup>77</sup> Cf. the *Stages*, pp. 193ff.

<sup>78</sup> S.K. uses here the word "emotion," but it is clear that he has in mind what a modern psychology has called *libido*.

<sup>79</sup> Letter of credit on happiness. See Schiller's "Resignation," 3rd strophe (*Gedichte, 2te Periode*).

<sup>80</sup> For no one has ever escaped from love or ever will so long as there be beauty and eyes to see with. Longus, *Daphnis and Chloë*. Introduction, §4. Cf. *Journal* IV A 30.

<sup>81</sup> Unfortunately the Danish word *bedrage* means to defraud as well as deceive. I seek to straddle both meanings (imperfectly) by using the word "cheat."

<sup>82</sup> So it was S.K. was accustomed to think of himself. How ingenious of him to make this story fit his case by the device of "supposing" Sarah was a man!

<sup>83</sup> *The Jew*, a play by Cumberland which was many times presented at the Royal Theater in Copenhagen between 1795 and 1834 and was published in a Danish translation in 1796. Scheva the Jew everyone regarded as a miser and a userer, but in secret he did great works of beneficence.

<sup>84</sup> In *Kierkegaarden in Sobradise* (Danske Værker, I, p. 282).

<sup>85</sup> There never was great genius without some madness. As quoted by Seneca (*de tranquillitate animi*, 17, 10) from Aristotle the phrase is: *sine mixtura dementiae*. S.K. quoted it in his *Journal* (IV A 148) at a time when he was anxiously inquiring whether his own state of mind might not be close to madness.

<sup>86</sup> If before the beginning of this century S.K. had been widely

known in Europe, we would trace to him rather than to Dostoevski or any other the modern preoccupation with such topics.

<sup>87</sup> It is to be remembered that in his university days S.K. was absorbingly interested in the legends of Faust, Don Juan, and Ahsverus (the Wandering Jew), which he took to be typical of doubt, sensuality and despair. The following footnote deals with other themes which interested him at the same time. He wrote a big book (his dissertation for the master's degree) on *The Concept of Irony*, and he made preparation for a work on satire.

<sup>88</sup> In one financial crisis S.K.'s father increased his fortune by investing in bonds issued by the Crown (i.e. on the credit of the absolute sovereign), and in a later crisis S.K. lost much of his by investing in the same security.

<sup>89</sup> The honor of destroying. Herostratus, to make his name immortal, burnt the temple of Artemis at Ephesus in the year 356 B.C.

<sup>90</sup> Executioner of infants. This name was given this Augustinian monk (who was Professor in the University of Paris and died in 1358) because he maintained the view that unbaptized infants went to hell—instead of the limbo to which the common Catholic view consigned them. *Tortor heroum* means torturer (executioner) of heroes.

<sup>91</sup> Holberg's *Erasmus Montanus*, Act I, Scene 3: Peter Deacon says (about bargaining for the price of a grave), "I can say to a peasant, 'Will you have fine sand or simple earth?'"

<sup>92</sup> *Werke* (2nd ed.), VIII, pp. 195ff; X, 1, pp. 84ff.; XIV, pp. 53ff.; XVI, pp. 486ff.

<sup>93</sup> Adherents of Grundtvig who advocated his doctrine of the Church.

<sup>94</sup> This is S.K.'s word, and here it means, leaping from one point to another so as to illuminate the subject from all sides, or in order that the intelligibility might be broken down into its several parts.

<sup>95</sup> Shakespeare's *King Richard III*, Act II, Scene 1.

<sup>96</sup> Plato's *Apology*, Cap. 25. The best texts now read "thirty votes," but in the older editions "three" was commonly read.

<sup>97</sup> "The Tailor in Heaven," one of Grimm's *Fairy Tales*. But according to Grimm the tailor was really dead (2nd German ed., I, p. 177).

<sup>98</sup> Cf. the *Journal*, IV A 58.

---



BACK

Version 1.0. – August 1999.

Design and editing © 1999 Siegfried. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.

## An Ode to Joy

An HTML Presentation by Siegfried

*Friedrich von Schiller (1759-1805)*



Joy, thou beauteous godly lightning,  
Daughter of [Elysium](#),  
Fire drunken we are ent'ring  
Heavenly, thy holy home!  
Thy enchantments bind together,  
What did custom's sword divide,  
Beggars are a prince's brother,  
Where thy gentle wings abide.

Be embrac'd, ye millions yonder!  
Take this kiss throughout the world!  
Brothers--o'er the stars unfurl'd  
Must reside a loving father.

Who the noble prize achieveth,  
Good friend of a friend to be;  
Who a lovely wife attaineth,  
Join us in his jubilee!

Yes--he too who but one being  
On this earth can call his own!  
He who ne'er was able, weeping  
Stealeth from this league alone!

He who in the great ring dwelleth,  
Homage pays to sympathy!  
To the stars above leads she,  
Where on high the Unknown reigneth.

Joy is drunk by every being  
From kind nature's flowing breasts,  
Every evil, every good thing  
For her rosy footprint quests.  
Gave she us both wines and kisses,  
In the face of death, a friend,  
To the worm were given blisses  
And the [Cherubs](#) God attend.

Fall before him, all ye millions?  
Know'st thou the Creator, world?  
Seek above the stars unfurl'd,  
Yonder dwells He in the heavens.

Joy commands the hardy mainspring  
Of the universe [eterne](#).  
Joy, oh joy the wheel is driving  
Which the worlds' great clock doth turn.  
Flowers from the buds she coaxes,  
Suns from out the [hyaline](#),  
Spheres she rotates through expanses,  
Which the seer can't divine.

As the suns are flying, happy  
Through the heaven's glorious plane,  
Travel, brothers, down your lane,  
Joyful as in hero's vict'ry.

From the truth's own fiery mirror  
On the searcher doth she smile.  
Up the steep incline of honor  
Guideth she the suff'rer's mile.  
High upon faith's sunlit mountains  
One can see her banner flies,  
Through the breach of open'd coffins  
She in angel's choir doth rise.

Suffer on courageous millions!  
Suffer for a better world!  
O'er the tent of stars unfurl'd  
God rewards you from the heavens.

Gods can never be requited,  
Beauteous 'tis, their like to be.  
Grief and want shall be reported,  
So to cheer with gaiety.  
Hate and vengeance be forgotten,  
Pardon'd be our mortal foe  
Not a teardrop shall him dampen,  
No repentance bring him low.

Let our book of debts be cancell'd!  
Reconcile the total world!  
Brothers--o'er the stars unfurl'd  
God doth judge, as we have settl'd.

Joy doth bubble from this [rummer](#),  
From the golden blood of grape  
Cannibals imbibe good temper,  
Weak of heart their courage take-  
Brothers, fly up from thy places,  
When the brimming cup doth pass,  
Let the foam shoot up in spaces:  
To the goodly Soul this glass!

Whom the crown of stars doth honor,  
Whom the hymns of [Seraphs](#) bless,  
To the goodly Soul this glass  
O'er the tent of stars up yonder!

Courage firm in grievous trial,  
Help, where innocence doth scream,  
Oaths which sworn to are eternal,  
Truth to friend and foe the same,  
Manly pride 'fore kingly power-  
Brothers, cost it life and blood,-  
Honor to whom merits honor,  
Ruin to the lying brood!

Closer draw the holy circle,  
Swear it by this golden wine,  
Faithful to the vow divine,  
Swear it by the Judge celestial!

Rescue from the tyrant's [fetters](#),  
Mercy to the villain e'en,  
Hope within the dying hours,  
Pardon at the guillotine!  
E'en the dead shall live in heaven!  
Brothers, drink and all agree,  
Every sin shall be forgiven,  
Hell forever cease to be.

A serene departing hour!  
Pleasant sleep beneath the [pall](#)!  
Brothers--gentle words for all  
Doth the Judge of mortals utter!

*Alvin T. P. P. P.*

---

### Definitions

Cherubs

*n. pl.* Second-order angels; defenders of the faith.

Elysium

*n.* Final resting place; condition of true happiness.

eterne

*adj.* Eternal or everlasting.

fetters

*n. pl.* Shackles, chains, or restraints.

hyaline

*n.* Something transparent or translucent; ether.

pall

*n.* A cloak or cover.

rummer

*n.* A drinking glass.

Seraphs

*n. pl.* First-order angels with 3 pairs of wings.

---

BACK



Design © 1998 Siegfried. All rights reserved. Distribute texts freely.

---

WILHELM TELL

A Drama by Friedrich Von Schiller

New Year's Gift for 1805.

Translated by William F. Wertz, Jr.

---

DRAMATIS PERSONAE:

HERMANN GESSLER, Imperial Governor in Schwyz and Uri

WERNER, BARON VON ATTINGHAUSEN, Standard-bearer

ULRICH VON RUDENZ, his nephew From Uri

WALTER FURST

WILHELM TELL

ROSSELMANN, the priest

PETERMANN, the sacristan

KUONI, the herdsman

WERNI, the hunter

RUODI, the fisherman

From Unterwalden:

ARNOLD VOM MELCHTAL

KONRAD BAUMGARTEN

MEIER VON SARNEN

STRUTH VON WINKELRIED

KLAUS VON DER FLUE

BURKHARDT AM BUHEL

ARNOLD VON SEWA

PFEIFER VON LUZERN

KUNZ VON GERSAU

JENNI, fisher boy

SEPPI, herdsman boy

GERTRUD, Stauffacher's wife

HEDWIG, Tell's wife, Furst's daughter

BERTA VON BRUNECK, a rich heiress

Countrymen from Schwyz:

WERNER STAUFFACHER

KONRAD HUNN

ITEL REDING

HANS AUF DER MAUER

JORG IM HOFE

ULRICH DER SCHMIED

JOST VON WEILER

Peasant women:

ARMGARD

MECHTHILD

ELSBETH

HILDEGARD

---

Wilhelm Tell, Schiller's last and greatest republican drama, was written at the end of his life, from 1803-4, when Schiller was at the peak of his artistic genius. The play was first performed in Weimar on March 17, 1804, and first put in print in October of that year, by Cotta at Tubingen. It was dedicated, as the title indicates, as a New Year's Gift to the World.

---

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACT I. - ACT II. - ACT III. - ACT IV. - ACT V.

---

ACT I. CONTENTS:

\* SCENE I.

High rocky shore of the Vierwaldstattersee, opposite Schwyz.

\* SCENE II. At Steinen in Schwyz.

A linden tree in front of STAUFFACHER's house on the country road, near the bridge. WERNER STAUFFACHER, PFEIFER VAN LUCERNE enter in conversation.

\* SCENE III. Public place near Altorf.

On an eminence in the hinterground one sees a fortress being constructed, which is already so far advanced, that the form of the whole is evident. The back side is finished, the front is being built even now, the scaffolding is still standing, on which the workmen are climbing up and down, upon the highest part of the roof hangs the slater. -- Everything is in motion and work. TASKMASTER. MASTER- STONEMASON. JOURNEYMEN and

Laborers.

\* SCENE IV.

Walter Furst's house. WALTER FURST and ARNOLD VON MELCHTAL enter simultaneously from different sides.

---

ACT I

---

\* SCENE I.

High rocky shore of the Vierwaldstattersee, opposite Schwyz.

The lake makes a cove in the land, a hut is not far from the shore, fisherboy conveys himself in a boat. Across the lake one sees the green meadows, villages and farms lie in the bright sunshine. To the left of the spectator the peaks of the Haken show themselves, surrounded by clouds; to the right in the distant hinterground one sees the ice-covered mountains. Even before the curtain rises, one hears the cowherd's dance and the harmonious chime of the cattle bells, which continues for some time even during the opening scene.

---

FISHERBOY (sings in the boat):

(Melody of the cowherd's dance.)

The lake it doth smile, to hathing it calleth,  
The boy asleep on the verdant shore falleth,  
There hears he a ringing,  
Like flute-tones so nice,  
Like voices of angels  
In Paradise.  
And as he awakens in happiness blest  
There waters are washing him round the breast,  
And it calls from the bottom:  
Th'art mine, laddy dear!  
Entice I the sleeper,  
I pull him in here.

HERDSMAN (upon the mountain):

(Variation of the cowherd's dance.)

Ye pastures farewell!  
Ye meadows aglowing!  
The herdsman is going,  
The summer is hence.  
We go to the mount, return we'll be making,  
When the cuckoo calls, when the songs are awaking,  
When with flowers the earth itself new doth array,  
When the fountains flow in the loveliest May.  
Ye pastures farewell,  
Ye meadows aglowing!  
The herdsman is going,  
The summer is hence.

ALPINE HUNTER (appears opposite upon the top of the rock):

(Second Variation.)

The heights are athund'ring, now trembles the bridge,  
Nor feareth the archer on dizzying ridge,  
He strideth undaunted  
O'er ice-covered fields,  
No spring there is flaunted,  
No shoot there green yields;  
And under the footsteps a mist-covered sea,  
No longer the cities of man doth he see,  
Through the rift of clouds only  
He glimpses the world,  
Deep under the water  
Green fields are unfurl'd.

(The landscape is altered, one hears a muffled crack from the mountains, shadows of clouds move across the region. RUODI the fisherman comes out of the hut WERNI the hunter climbs from the rocks. KUONI the herdsman comes, with the milkpail on his shoulder. SEPPI his handyman, follows him.)

RUODI: Be speedy, Jenni. Haul the boat ashore.  
The grizzled Vale-Lord comes, dull roars the glacier,  
The Mythenstein is drawing on his cap,  
And from the weather cleft a cold wind blows,  
The storm, I think, will be here, ere we know't.

KUONI: Rain's coming, Ferryman. My sheep are eating  
The grass with greed, and Watcher paws the earth.

WERNI: The fish are springing, and the waterfowl  
Dives down below. A storm is now approaching.

KUONI (to his boy):  
Look, Seppi, that the cattle have not strayed.

SEPPI: I recognize brown Liesel by her bell.

KUONI: So we are missing none, she goes the farthest.

RUODI: A pretty peal of bells there, Master Herdsman.

WERNI: And handsome cows -- They're yours, compatriot?

KUONI: I'm not so rich -- they are my gracious Lord's,  
Of Attinghausen's, and to me entrusted.

RUODI: How fair the band appears on that cow's neck.

KUONI: That knows she too, that she doth lead the herd,  
And took I it from her, she'd cease to feed.

RUODI: That makes no sense! A cow devoid of reason --

WERNI: That's easy said. The beast hath reason too,  
That's known to us, we men who hunt the Chamois,  
Who shrewdly post, when they to pasture go,  
A sentinel, who pricks his ears and warns  
With piercing whistle, when the hunter nears.

RUODI (to the herdsman): You drive them home?

KUONI: The Alp is grazed quite bare.

WERNI: Safe journey home, my friend!

KUONI: That wish I you,  
Not all your trips are ended in return.

ROUDI: There comes a man who rushes with great haste.

WERNI: I know him, it is Baumgart of Alzellen.

(KONRAD BAUMGARTEN rushing in breathless.)

BAUMGARTEN: May God be willing, Ferryman, your boat!

RUODI: Now, now, what is the hurry?

BAUMGARTEN: Cast off now!  
You must save me from death! Set me across!

KUONI: Compatriot, what's wrong?

WERNI: Who follows you?

BAUMGARTEN (to the fisherman):  
Haste, haste, e'en now they're close upon my heels!  
The Gov'rnor's troopers are in hot pursuit,  
I am a man of death, if I am seized.

RUODI: Why are the troopers in pursuit of you?

BAUMGARTEN: First rescue me, and then I'll talk to you.

WERNI: You are defiled with blood, what hath occurred?

BAUMGARTEN: The Emperor's cast'llan, who at Rossberg sat --

KUONI: The Wolfenschiesen? He's pursuing you?  
He'll harm no man again, I've vet him dead.

ALL (fall back):

May God forgive you! What is it you've done?

BAUMGARTEN: What any free man in my place had done!  
I've exercised my household right against  
Him who'd defile mine honor and my

KUONI: The Castilian hath your honor then impaired?

BAUMGARTEN: That he did not his evil lust fulfill,  
Hast God and my good axe alone prevented.

WERNI: You've split his head in two then with your axe?

KUONI: O, let us hear, you've time enough, before  
He hath the boat unfastened from the shore.

BAUMGARTEN: I had been felling timber in the woods,  
When ran my wife toward me in mortal fear.  
The Cast'llan quartered in my house, he had  
Commanded her, to get a bath prepared.  
And when he had indecencies of her

Demanded, she escaped, to search for me.  
Then ran I brisk thereto, just as I was,  
And with the axe I've blessed his bath for him.

WERNI: You've acted well, no man can blame you for it.

KUONI: The maniac! Now hath he his reward!  
'Twas long deserved from Unterwalden's people.

BAUMGARTEN: The deed was noised about, I am pursued --  
And while we're speaking -- God -- the time is flying --

(It begins to thunder.)

KUONI: Quick, Ferryman convey this man across.

RUODI: It can't be done. A violent storm is now  
Approaching. You must wait.

BAUMGARTEN: Oh, Holy God!  
I can not wait. The least delay is death --

KUONI (to the fisherman):  
Set out with God, one must assist his neighbor,  
The like can happen to each one of us.

(Roaring and thundering.)

RUODI: The Fohn is loose, see how the waters rise,  
I can not steer against the storm and waves.

BAUMGARTEN (embraces his knees):  
So must I fall into the tyrants hands,

WERNI: His life's at stake, have mercy Ferryman.

KUONI: He is a father, and hath wife and children!

(Repeated peals of thunder.)

RUODI: So what? I have a life as well to lose,  
Have wife and child at home, like he -- Look how  
It surges, how it heaves and whirlpools draw,  
And all the water rouses from the depths.  
-- I would be glad to save this worthy man,  
Yet it's impossible, you see yourself.

BAUMGARTEN (still on his knees):  
So must I fall into the tyrant's hands,  
The shore of rescue now so near to sight!  
-- Lies yonder! I can reach it with mine eyes,  
My voice's sound can make its way across,  
Here is the boat, that would convey me thence,  
And must I lie here, helpless, and forlorn!

KUONI: Look, who is now come here!

WERNI: Tis Tell from Burglen.

(TELL with crossbow.)

TELL: Who is the man, who here implores for help?

KUONI: It's an Alzeller man, he hath his honor  
Defended, and the Wolfenschiessen slain,  
The Cast'llan of the King, who sat at Rossberg --  
The Governor's troopers are upon his heels,  
He begs the boatman carry him across,  
But he's afraid o'th' storm and will not go.

RUODI: Now here is Tell, he steers the rudder too  
He'll be my witness, should the trip be dared.

TELL: If need be, Ferryman, all may be ventured.

(Violent peals of thunder, the lake surges up.)

RUODI: Am I to plunge into the jaws of hell?  
That none would do, who did possess his senses.

TELL: The valiant man thinks of himself the last,  
Put trust in God and rescue the distressed.

RUODI: Secure in port tis easy to advise,  
Here is the boat and there the lake! Attempt it!

TELL: The lake can pity, but the Governor will not,  
Attempt it, Boatman!

HERDSMAN AND HUNTER: Save him! Save him! Save him!

RUODI: And 'twere my brother and my very child,  
It can not be, 'tis Simon-Juda day,  
Here raves the lake and wants to have its victim.

TELL: With idle talk will nothing here be done,  
The hour insists, the man must now be helped.  
Speak, Boatman, wilt thou take him?

RUODI: No, not I!

TELL: I' th' name of God then! Give the boat to me,  
I will attempt it, with my feeble strength.

KUONI: Ha, valiant Tell!

WERNI: That is the hunter's way!

BAUMGARTEN: You are my savior and mine angel, Tell!

TELL: I'll save you from the pow'r o' th Governor  
From per'l of storm another must give aid.  
Yet better is't, you fall into God's hands,  
Than into men's! (to the herdsman) Compatriot, console  
My wife, if something human falls to me,  
I've done, but what I could not leave undone.

(He springs into the boat.)

KUONI (to fisherman):  
You are a master of the helm. What Tell  
Hath dared to do, that could not you have ventured?

RUODI: Far better men do not take Tell's example,  
There are not two, like he is, in the mountains.



WERNI (hath climbed upon the rock):  
He pushes off. God help thee, valiant swimmer!  
See, how the bark is reeling on the waves!

KUONI (on the bank):  
The surge is passing thence -- I see't no more.  
Yet wait, here it appears again! Robustly  
The valiant man is working through the breakers.

SEPPI: The Governor's troopers come now at full gallop.

KUONI: God knows, they are! And that was help in need.

(A troupe of Landenberg troopers.)

FIRST TROOPER: Give up the murderer, you have concealed.

SECOND: This way he came, in vain you're hiding him.

KUONI AND RUODI: Whom mean you, trooper?

FIRST TROOPER (discovers the boat):  
Ha, what see I! Devil!

WERNI (above):  
Is't he in yonder boat, you seek? -- Ride on!  
If you lay quickly to, you'll haul him in.

SECOND: Accurs'd! He hath escaped.

FIRST (to herdsman and fisherman): You've helped him to escape,  
You'll pay us for it -- Fall upon their herds!  
Tear down the cottage, burn and strike it down!

(Rush off.)

SEPPI (Rushes after them.):  
O my poor lambs!

KUONI (follows): O woe is me! My herds!

WERNI: O these berserkers!

RUODI (Wrings his hands.): Righteousness of Heaven,  
When will the savior come into this land?

(Follows them.)

---

\* SCENE II. At Steinen in Schwyz.

A linden tree in front of STAUFFACHER's house on the country road, near  
the bridge. WERNER STAUFFACHER, PFEIFER VAN LUCERNE enter in conversation.

---

PFEIFER: Yes, yes, Lord as I told you.  
Swear not to Austria, if you can help it.  
Hold firmly to the Empire as before,  
God shield you in your ancient freedom!

(Presses his hand cordially and wants to go.)

STAUFFACHER: Yet stay, until my wife returns are  
My guest in Schwas, I in Lucerne am yours.

PFEIFER: Much thanks! I must reach Jersey yet today.  
-- What difficulties you may have to suffer  
From arrogance and greed of governors,  
Bear it with patience! It can alter, quickly,  
Another Emperor can gain the throne.  
Are you once Austria's, you're hers forever.

(He exits.)

(STAUFFACHER sits down sorrowfully upon a bench under the linden tree.  
Thus is he found by GERTRUDE, his wife, who places herself along side  
him and observes him for a long time silently.)

GERTRUD: So grave, my friend? No longer do I know thee.  
For many days in silence I observe,  
How gloomy spirits furrow in thy brow.  
Upon thine heart a silent grief is weighing,  
Confide in me, I am thy faithful wife,  
And I demand my half of all thy sorrow.

(STAUFFACHER extends his hand to her and is silent.)

What can oppress thine heart, tell it to me.  
Thine industry is blest, thy fortunes bloom,  
Full are the barns, and now the herd of oxen,  
The breed of horses sleek and fully fed  
Is safely from the mountain brought back home  
To winter in their comfortable stalls.  
-- Here stands thy house, rich, like a nobleman's,  
From beauteous timber is it newly built  
And fit together with the standard gauge,  
From many windows shines it pleasant, bright,  
With colored coats of arms is it adorned,  
And proverbs sage, the which the wanderer  
Delaying reads and at their meaning wonders.

STAUFFACHER: The house stands well constructed and well joined,  
But ah -- the ground, on which we built it, rocks.

GERTRUD: My Werner, tell me, what thou mean'st by that?

STAUFFACHER: Of late I sat as now beneath this linden,  
With joy reflecting on what's fairly done,  
When came from Kussnacht, from his citadel,  
The Gov'nor riding with his mercenaries.  
Before this house he halted in surprise,  
Though I rose quickly, and submissively,  
As is becoming, I approached the Lord,  
Who represents the Emperor's judicial  
Power i'th' land. To whom belongs this house?  
He asked maliciously, for well he knew't.  
But thinking quickly thus I answered him:  
This house, Lord Gov'nor, is my Lord's the Emp'ror's  
And yours and mine in fief -- then he replies:

"I'm regent in the land i'th' Emp'ror's stead  
And will not, that the farmer's house be built  
With his own hand, and he thus freely live,

As if he were the master in the land.  
I shall make bold, to hinder you in this."

This saying rode he thence defiantly.  
But I remained behind with doleful soul,  
Considering the evil man's remarks.

GERTRUD: My dearest Lord and husband! Wouldst thou take  
An honest word of counsel from thy wife?  
I boast to be the noble Iberg's daughter,  
A much-experienced man. We sisters sat,  
There spinning wool, throughout the lengthy nights,  
When round our father leaders of the people  
Convened themselves, and there the parchments read  
Of ancient emp'rors, and the country's weal  
Considered in judicious conversation.  
Heedful I heard there many prudent words,  
What intellectuals think, what good men wish,  
And silently I've kept them in my heart.  
So listen to me then and heed my speech,  
For what thee pressed, behold, I long have known.  
-- The Governor resents thee, would thee harm,  
Because thou art an hindrance to him, that  
The men of Schwyz will not subject themselves  
To th' upstart prince's house, but true and firm  
Adhere unto the realm, just as their worthy  
Forefathers have resolved and have performed. --  
Is't not so, Werner? Tell me, if I lie!

STAUFFACHER: So is it, that is Gessler's grudge against me.

GERTRUD: He envies thee, since thou dost dwell in bliss,  
A free man on thine own inheritance,  
-- For he hath none. From Emperor and realm  
Thou hold'st this house in fief, thou may'st it show,  
So well as any prince displays his land,  
For over thee thou recognize no lord  
Except the highest in all Christendom --  
He merely is his house's younger son,  
Naught calls he his except his knightly cloak,  
He therefore sees each honest man's good fortune  
With squinting eyes of poisonous disfavor,  
Thee hath he long ago destruction sworn --  
As yet thou art uninjured -- Wilt thou wait,  
Until he wreaks his evil will on thee?  
The smart man thinks ahead.

STAUFFACHER: What's to be done!

GERTRUD (steps nearer):  
So hear what I advise! Thou know'st, how here  
In Schwyz all honest men do now complain  
About this Gov'rnor's greed and tyranny.  
So have no doubt, that they there yonder too  
In Unterwalden and in Uri land  
Are weary of oppression and the yoke --  
For just as Gessler here, there yonder o'er  
The lake the Landenberger is as brazen --  
There comes no fishing boat across to us,  
Which doth not tell of some new mischief and  
Beginning-violence from the governors.

Therefore it would be wise, if some of you,  
Of sound intent, did quietly confer,  
How we might free ourselves of this oppression,  
So know I well, that God would not desert you  
And would be gracious to a righteous cause --  
Dost thou not have a friend in Uri, speak,  
To whom thou may'st thine heart sincerely open?

STAUFFACHER: I know of many men of courage there  
And men of high repute and eminence,  
Who are my trusted friends and confidants.

(He stands up.)

Wife, what a storm of dangerous ideas  
Awak'st thou in my quiet breast! My innermost  
Thou bring'st from me into the light of day,  
And what I secretly forbade myself  
To think, thou boldly speak'st with easy tongue.  
-- Hast thou considered well, what thou advisest?  
The savage discord and the clang of arms  
Thou callest forth into this peaceful vale --  
Dared we, a feeble folk of herdsmen, go  
To battle with the master of the world?  
'Tis only for some pretext, that they wait,  
In order to unleash on this poor land  
Their savage hordes of military might,  
Therein to govern with the victor's rights  
And 'neath the show of righteous punishment  
To extirpate our ancient freedom's charter.

GERTRUD: You too are men, know how to wield your axe,  
And God gives help unto courageous men!

STAUFFACHER: Oh wife! A fearful raging scourge is war,  
It strikes at once the shepherd and his herd.

GERTRUD: One must endure, whatever heaven sends,  
Inequity endures no noble heart.

STAUFFACHER: This house delights thee, that we newly built.  
But war, the monster, burns it to the ground.

GERTRUD: Thought I my heart to temp'ral goods enslaved,  
I'd throw the torch with mine own hand thereto.

STAUFFACHER: Thou dost believe in human kind! But war  
Spares not the tender infant in its cradle.

GERTRUD: The innocent in heaven have a friend!  
-- Look forward, Werner, not behind thee now!

STAUFFACHER: We men can perish bravely sword in hand,  
And yet what destiny will fall to you?

GERTRUD: The final choice is left e'en to the weakest,  
A spring from yonder bridge doth make me free.

STAUFFACHER (falls into her arms):  
Who presses such a heart unto his bosom,  
He joyfully can fight for hearth and home,  
And fears he not the hosts of any king --

To Uri shall I post without delay,  
There lives a friend of mine, Lord Walter Furst,  
Who thinks the same as I about these times.  
There too I find the noble Banneret  
Of Attinghaus -- although of lofty stock  
He loves the people, honors ancient customs.  
With both of these I shall confer, how one  
May bravely fight against the country's foes --  
Farewell -- and while I am away, bear thou  
With prudent sense the regiment o' th' house --  
To th' pilgrim, wand'ring to the House of God,  
To th' pious monk, collecting for his cloister,  
Give richly and dispatch him well cared for.  
Stauffacher's house is not concealed. It stands  
Out by the public way, a welcome roof  
For all the wanderers, who take this road.

(While they exit toward the hinterground, WILHELM TELL enters  
downstage with BAUMGARTEN.)

TELL (to BAUMGARTEN):  
Now you will have no further need of me,  
Go into yonder house, wherein resides  
Stauffacher, who's a father to th' oppressed.  
-- Yet see, there's he himself -- Come, follow me!

(Walks toward him, the scene changes.)

---

\* SCENE III. Public place near Altorf.

On an eminence in the hinterground one sees a fortress being constructed,  
which is already so far advanced, that the form of the whole is evident.  
The back side is finished, the front is being built even now, the  
scaffolding is still standing, on which the workmen are climbing up and  
down, upon the highest part of the roof hangs the slater. -- Everything is  
in motion and work.

TASKMASTER. MASTER- STONEMASON. JOURNEYMEN and Laborers.

---

TASKMASTER (with stick, drives the workers):  
Not long be idle, brisk! The building stones  
This way, the lime, the mortar bring up here!  
If the Lord Governor comes, that he may see  
The work's advanced -- It saunters just like snails.

(To two laborers, who bear loads)

Call that a load? At once go double it!  
O how these laggards shirk their very duty!

FIRST JOURNEYMAN: Yet it is hard, that we should bear the stones  
To build a keep and dungeon for ourselves!

TASKMASTER: What's that you murmur?  
That's a wretched people,  
To naught adroit except to milk their cows,  
And saunter idly all around the mountains.

OLD MAN (takes a rest): I can no more.

TASKMASTER (shakes him): Get up, old man, to work!

FIRST JOURNEYMAN: Have you no viscera at all, that you  
Would drive the aged man to hard forced labor,  
Who scarce can haul himself?

MASTER STONEMASON AND JOURNEYMEN:  
It cries to heaven!

TASKMASTER: Look to yourselves, I do, what is my office.

SECOND JOURNEYMAN: Taskmaster, how's the fortress to be named,  
That we build here?

TASKMASTER: Keep Uri it is called,  
For underneath this yoke you will be bowed.

JOURNEYMEN: Keep Uri!

TASKMASTER: Well, what's there to laugh about?

SECOND JOURNEYMAN: With this small hut you want to humble Uri?

FIRST JOURNEYMAN: Let's see, how many of such molehills one  
Must place upon another, ere a mountain  
Is made therefrom, that's like the least in Uri!

(Taskmaster goes toward the hinterground.)

MASTER STONEMASON: I cast the hammer in the deepest lake,  
That served in building this accursed structure!

(TELL and STAUFFACHER enter.)

STAUFFACHER: O had I never lived, to look at this!

TELL: Here 'tis not good to be. Let us proceed.

STAUFFACHER: Am I in Uri, in the land of freedom?

MASTER STONEMASON: O Lord, if you at first had seen the cellars  
Beneath the towers! Yes, who lives in there,  
Will never hear the rooster crow again!

STAUFFACHER: O God!

STONEMASON: Behold these flanks, these buttresses,  
They stand, as built for all eternity!

TELL: Whatever hands have built, hands can destroy.

(Pointing, toward the mountains.)

That house of freedom God hath built for us.

(One hears a drum, people enter, who carry a hat upon a pole, a crier  
follows them, women and children press tumultuously thereafter.)

FIRST JOURNEYMAN: What means the drum?  
Give your attention!

MASTER STONEMASON: Why A carnival parade and why the hat?

CRIER: I' th' Emperor's name! Hear ye!

JOURNEYMEN: Be quiet! Hear ye!

CRIER: You see this hat before you, men of Uri!  
It will be placed upon a lofty column,  
I' th' midst of Altorf, in the highest place,  
And this is both the Governor's will and purpose:  
The hat should have like honor as himself,  
One should show reverence for him with bent knee  
And with uncovered head -- Thus will the King  
Distinguish who are the obedient.  
His limb and goods are forfeit to the King,  
Whoe'er distains to follow this command.

(The people burst out loudly laughing, the drums are beat, they pass on.)

FIRST JOURNEYMAN: What new outrageous thing the Governor  
Hath now devised! We must revere a hat!  
Say! Hath one ever heard of such a thing?

MASTER STONEMASON: We are to bend our knees before a hat!  
He plays his game with earnest worthy people?

FIRST JOURNEYMAN: If it were but the imperial crown! So is't  
The hat of Austria; I saw it hang  
Above the throne, where one assigns the fiefs!

MASTER STONEMASON: The hat of Austria! Pay heed, it is  
A trick, to sell us out to Austria!

JOURNEYMEN: No worthy man will yield to this disgrace.

MASTER STONEMASON: Come, let us reach agreement with the others.

(They go to the rear.)

TELL (to STAUFFACHER):  
You know now what occurs. Fare well, Lord Werner!

STAUFFACHER: Where will you go?  
O haste not so from hence.

TELL: My home's without its father. Fare ye well.

STAUFFACHER: My heart is now so full, to speak with you.

TELL: The heavy heart doth not grow light through words.

STAUFFACHER: However words could lead us unto deeds.

TELL: The only deed is now be still and patient.

STAUFFACHER: Should one endure, what's unendurable?

TELL: 'Tis hasty rulers, who but briefly rule.  
-- When out of its abyss the Fohn arises,  
One puts the fires out, the ships make haste  
To seek the harbor, and the mighty spirit  
Walks harmless, without trace, across the earth.  
Let every one live quietly at home,  
The peaceful man is gladly granted peace.

STAUFFACHER: You think?

TELL: The snake bites not if unprovoked.  
They'll finally grow weary of themselves,  
If they see that the provinces stay calm.

STAUFFACHER: We could do much, if we but stood together.

TELL: In shipwreck one more eas'ly helps himself.

STAUFFACHER: So coldly do you quit the common cause?

TELL: A man counts safely only on himself.

STAUFFACHER: In unity the weak are mighty too.

TELL: The strong man is most mighty when alone.

STAUFFACHER: So can the fatherland not count on you,  
When desperately it acts in self-defense?

TELL (gives him his hand): Tell fetches a lost sheep from the abyss,  
And would he then be one to quit his friends?  
Whate'er you do, excuse me from your counsel,  
I can't consider or select for long.  
If you have need of me for certain deeds,  
Then call on Tell, I shall not fail to act.

(Depart to different sides. A sudden riot ensues around the  
scaffolding.)

MASTER STONEMASON (runs in):  
What is't?

FIRST JOURNEYMAN (comes forward, shouting):  
The slater is now fallen from the roof.

(BERTA with retinue.)

BERTA (rushes in): Hath he been shattered? Run now, save him, help --  
If help is possible, save him, here is gold --

(Throws her jewelry among the people.)

MASTER STONEMASON: Hence with your gold -- You think all can be bought  
With gold, when you have torn the father from  
The children and the husband from his wife,  
And have brought misery upon the world,  
You think to make amends with gold -- Be gone!  
We were a happy people, ere you came,  
With you hath desperation entered in.

BERTA (to the TASKMASTER, who returns):  
Is he alive? (TASKMASTER gives a sign to the contrary.)  
O ill-begotten castle, built  
With curses, curses shall inhabit thee! (Exit.)

---

\* SCENE IV.

Walter Furst's house.



WALTER FURST and ARNOLD VON MELCHTAL enter simultaneously from different sides.

---

MELCHTAL: Lord Walter Furst --

WALTER FURST: If we should be surprised!  
Stay, where you are. We are beset by spies.

MELCHTAL: You bring me naught from  
Unterwalden? Naught  
From my dear father? I can bear't no longer,  
To lie here idly like a prisoner.  
What have I done then that's so criminal,  
That I should hide just like a murderer?  
O' th' brazen rascal, who would drive away  
From me the oxen, my most excellent team,  
Before mine eyes on orders from the Governor,  
I have but with my staff the finger broken.

WALTER FURST:  
You are too rash. The rascal was the Gov'rnor's,  
He was dispatched by your superiors,  
You had received a penalty, you should,  
As harsh it was, have paid it silently.

MELCHTAL: Should I have countenanced the flippant talk  
Of one so unashamed: "If peasants want  
Their bread, then, let them pull the plow themselves!"  
It cut me to the soul, to see the knave  
Unyoke the oxen, beauteous creatures, from the plow,  
They bellowed low, as though they had the sense  
Of some abuse, and struck out with their horns,  
Here I was overwhelmed by righteous anger,  
And of myself not lord, I struck the mess'nger.

WALTER FURST: O scarcely do we master our own hearts,  
How should the hasty youth restrain himself!

MELCHTAL: I pity but the father -- He demands  
So much attention, and his son's away.  
The gov'nor's hateful to him, since he e'er  
Hath striven honestly for right and freedom.  
So therefore they will harry the old man,  
And there is none, who shields him from affront.  
-- Come what may come with me, I must go over.

WALTER FURST: Just wait and patiently compose yourself,  
Until reports come to us from yon forest.  
-- I hear a knocking, go -- Perhaps a message  
From th' Gov'nor -- Go in there You are not safe  
In Uri 'fore the Landenberger's arm,  
Since tyrants give a hand to one another.

MELCHTAL: They're teaching us, what we should do.

WALTER FURST: Now go!  
I'll call you back, when it is safe out here.

(MELCHTAL goes therein.)

The wretched man, I may not now confess  
To him, what evil I suspect -- Who knocks?  
So oft the door doth creak, I fear disaster.  
Mistrust and treason lurk in every corner,  
Into the house's inmost rooms the bearers  
Of power penetrate, soon we shall need,  
To place a lock and key upon our doors.

(He opens and steps back astounded, as WERNER STAUFFACHER enters.)

What see I? You, Lord Werner! Now, by God!  
A worthy, cherished guest -- No better man  
Hath ever walked across this threshold yet.  
You're highly welcome underneath my roof!  
What brings you here? What seek you here in Uri?

STAUFFACHER (extending him his hand):  
The olden times and olden Switzerland.

WALTER FURST: You bring them with you -- Look, how I rejoice,  
My heart grows warm upon the sight of you,  
-- Sit down, Lord Werner -- How did you depart  
From Lady Gertrud, your most pleasant wife,  
Sagacious Iberg's highly prudent daughter?  
By all the wand'ers from the German lands,  
Who cross the Meinrad's Cell to Italy,  
Your hospitality is praised -- But say,  
Have you just come direct from Fluelen hence,  
And did you look in any other place,  
Before you placed your foot upon this threshold?

STAUFFACHER (sits down): Yes, an astonishing new work I've seen  
In preparation, with which I'm not pleased.

WALTER FURST: O friend, you have it then with but one glance!

STAUFFACHER: A thing like that hath never been in Uri --  
In human mem'ry was no prison here,  
Nor dwelling fortified except the grave.

WALTER FURST: A grave of freedom is't. You name its name.

STAUFFACHER: Lord Walter Furst, I won't hold back with you,  
No idle curiosity conducts  
Me here, I'm pressed by heavy cares -- Oppression  
I've left at home, oppression find I here.  
For 'tis insufferable, what we endure,  
And there's no end in sight to this distress.  
Free hath the Schweizer been from ancient times,  
We are accustomed, to be treated well,  
The like of this was in the land ne'er known,  
So long a herdsman drove upon these mountains.

WALTER FURST: Yes, tis unparalleled, how they are acting!  
Even our noble Lord of Attinghausen,  
Who hath the ancient times still seen himself,  
Believes, it is no longer to be borne.

STAUFFACHER: Below yon forest goes it poorly too,  
And bloody is the penance -- Wolfenschiessen,  
The Emp'ror's Governor, who dwelt at Rossberg,

He had a longing for forbidden fruit,  
Baumgarten's wife, that keeps house in Alzellen,  
He wished to misuse her to bold excess,  
And with his axe the man hath struck him dead.

WALTER FURST: O righteous are the judgments of the Lord!  
-- Baumgarten, do you say? A modest man.  
He's rescued surely and is well concealed?

STAUFFACHER: Your son-in-law took him across the lake,  
I keep him hidden at my house in Steinen --  
-- Yet more atrocious things hath this same man  
Conveyed to me, of what's been done in Sarnen.  
The heart of every honest man must bleed.

WALTER FURST (attentively): Say on, what is't?

STAUFFACHER: In Melchtal, then, where one  
Goes into Kerns, there lives an upright man,  
They call him Heinrich von der Halden, and  
His voice is of some weight in the Assembly.

WALTER FURST: Who knows him not! What is't with him?  
Proceed!

STAUFFACHER: The Landenberger penalized his son  
For some small misdeed, ordered his best pair  
Of oxen, be unharnessed from the plow,  
The boy then struck the knave and took to flight.

WALTER FURST (in highest excitement):  
And yet the father -- say, how's it with him?

STAUFFACHER: The Landenberger had the father summoned.  
He should produce his son upon the spot,  
And as the old man swore with truthfulness,  
That he knew nothing of the fugitive,  
The Gov'rnor ordered torturers to come --

WALTER FURST (Springs up and wants to lead him to the other side.):  
O hush, no more!

STAUFFACHER (with climbing sound):  
"E'en hath the son escaped me,  
Yet have I thee!" -- Has him thrown to the ground,  
The pointed steel has plunged into his eyes --

WALTER FURST: Merciful Heaven!

MELCHTAL (rushes out): In his eyes, you say?

STAUFFACHER (astonished, to WALTER FURST):  
Who is the youth?

MELCHTAL (grasps him with convulsive vehemence):  
Into his eyes? Speak on!

WALTER FURST: O the lamentable old man!

STAUFFACHER: Who is't?

(As WALTER FURST gives him a sign.)

This is the son? All righteous God!

MELCHTAL: And I  
Had to be hence! -- Into both of his eyes?

WALTER FURST: Restrain yourself, endure it like a man!

MELCHTAL: Because of my offense, of my misdeed!  
-- He's blind then! Really blind and fully blinded?

STAUFFACHER: I say't. The fountain of his sight's run out,  
The sunlight he will ne'er behold again.

WALTER FURST: O spare his anguish!

MELCHTAL: Never! Never more!

(He presses his hand upon his eyes and is silent a few moments, then he turns from the one to the other and speaks with a gentle voice, choked by tears.)

O, what a noble gift of heaven is  
The light o' th' eye -- For every being lives  
From light, and each and every happy creature --  
The plants themselves turn joyously toward light.  
And he must sit there, feeling, in the night,  
In constant darkness -- he's refreshed no more  
By meadows of warm green, the flower's glaze,  
The reddish glaciers he can see no more --  
To die is naught -- to live and not to see,  
That's misery -- Why do you look at me  
So grievously? I have two lively eyes,  
And can give neither to my blinded father,  
Nor any shimmer from the sea of light,  
That splendid, dazzling, breaks upon mine eyes.

STAUFFACHER: Alas, I must enlarge your sorrow further,  
Instead of healing it -- He wants still more!  
The Governor hath stolen all from him,  
Naught hath he left to him except his staff,  
To wander bare and blind from door to door.

MELCHTAL: Naught but his staff to th' sightless aged man!  
Everything robbed, and e'en the light o' th' sun,  
The common good o' th' poorest wretch --  
Now speak To me no more of staying or of hiding!  
What kind of wretched coward have I been,  
That of mine own security I thought,  
And not of thine -- thy precious head left as  
Security within the tyrant's hands!  
Faint-hearted caution, travel hence --  
On naught But bloody retribution shall I think --  
I will go over there -- No one shall stop me --  
And from the Governor claim my father's eyes --  
I'll find him even in the midst of all  
His mounted men -- Life is but naught to me,  
If I can only quench this feverish,  
Enormous pain in his life's blood!

(He wants to leave.)

WALTER FURST: Remain!

What could you do to him?

He sits in Sarnen Upon his lofty lordly keep and scoffs  
At unavailing wrath in his safe fortress.

MELCHTAL: And lived he yonder in the icy palace  
Of Schreckhorn or much higher, where the Jungfrau  
Sits veiled eternally -- I still would make  
MY way to him, with only twenty youths,  
Disposed like I, then I would break his fortress.  
And if none follows me, and if you all  
So frightened for your huts and for your herds,  
Bow down before the tyrant's yoke -- I'll call  
The herdsmen all together in the mountains,  
There underneath the open roof of heaven,  
Where still the mind is fresh and heart is sound  
Relate the story of this monstrous horror.

STAUFFACHER (to WALTER FURST):

It hath now reached its height -- Are we to wait,  
Until the last extreme --

MELCHTAL: What last extreme

Is to be feared yet, if the star o' th' eye  
Is safe no longer in its cavity? --  
Are we defenseless? Wherefore did we learn  
To bend the bow and swing the heavy weight  
Of battle axes? Every creature hath  
Been granted a defense in its despair,  
Th' exhausted stag will take a stand and show  
His dreaded antlers to the pack of hounds,  
The chamois drags the hunter in th' abyss --  
The ox itself, the gentle fellow lodger  
Of man, who bends th' enormous power of  
His neck with patience underneath the yoke,  
Springs up, provoked, whets his gigantic horns  
And slings his enemy up to the clouds.

WALTER FURST: If the three cantons thought as we three men,  
So then might we perhaps accomplish something.

STAUFFACHER: If Uri calls, if Unterwalden helps,  
The Schweizer will revere the ancient bond.

MELCHTAL: In Unterwalden I have many friends,  
And each would risk his life and limb with joy,  
If he hath back up from the others and  
A shield -- O pious fathers of this land!  
I'm standing here now but a youth between you,  
The much experienced -- my voice must be  
Discreetly silent in the land's Assembly.  
Because I'm young and know not much of life,  
Do not disdain my counsel and my speech,  
Not lustful youthful blood impels me, but  
The painful violence o' th' greatest woe,  
Which e'en the stone o' th' rock must move to pity.  
You both are fathers, heads of both your houses,  
And you desire to have a virtuous son,  
Who will revere your head's most sacred locks,  
And piously protect your eyesight's star.  
O since you both have suffered nothing yet

In limb and property, your eyes still move  
Themselves alert and bright within their spheres,  
So therefore be not distant to our need.  
The tyrant's sword hangs over you as well,  
You've turned away the land of Austria,  
MY father's crime was nothing more than that,  
You share an equal guilt and condemnation.

STAUFFACHER (to WALTER FURST): Do you decide,  
I am prepared to follow.

WALTER FURST: We wish to hear, what do the noble lords  
Of Sillinen, and Attinghaus advise --  
Their names, I think, will win us over friends.

MELCHTAL: Where's there a name within the forest mountains  
That's worthier than yours or that of yours?  
The people do believe i' th' genuine worth  
Of names like these, their ring is good i' th' country.  
Rich was your heritage in father's virtue  
And richly you've enlarged on it --  
What need of noblemen?  
Let's finish it alone.  
Were we indeed alone i' th' land! I think,  
We'd know already how to shield ourselves.

STAUFFACHER: The noble's plight is not the same as ours,  
The stream, which rages in the lower grounds,  
Til now hath not yet reached unto the heights --  
But they will not refuse us their support  
When they once see the country up in arms.

WALTER FURST: Were there 'tween us and Austria an umpire,  
So then would justice and the law decide  
But he who doth oppress us, is our Emp'ror  
And highest judge -- so therefore  
God must help us Through our own arm --  
Now you seek out the men  
Of Schwyz, and I'll win over friends in Uri.  
But whom are we to send to Unterwalden --

MELCHTAL: Send me o'er there --  
Whom should it more concern --

WALTER FURST: I won't allow it, you're my guest,  
I have To guarantee your safety!

MELCHTAL: Let me go!  
I know the byways and the rocky paths,  
Friends too I find enough, who'll hide me from  
The enemy and gladly give me shelter.

STAUFFACHER: Let him with God go over there.  
O'er there There are no traitors -- so detested is  
This tyranny, that it can find no tool.  
Below the forest too should the Alzellen  
Recruit confederates and rouse the land.

MELCHTAL: How shall we safely then communicate,  
That we deceive suspicions of the tyrants?

STAUFFACHER: We could perhaps arrange to meet at Treib Or Brunnen,

Where the merchant vessels land.

WALTER FURST: So openly we may not go to work.  
Hear my idea. To th' left o' th' lake, on th' way  
To Brunnen, opposite the Mythenstein,  
A meadow lies concealed within the woods,  
It's called the Rutli by the shepherd folk,  
Because the timber there was all uprooted.  
That's where our canton's boundary and yours

(to MELCHTAL)

Adjoin each other, and a little trip

(to STAUFFACHER)

In your light boat bears you across from Schwyz.

Upon deserted paths can we go thence  
At night and quietly deliberate.  
Let each bring there with him ten trusted men,  
Who are at one with us within their hearts,  
So then may we discuss the common cause  
In common and with God resolve afresh.

STAUFFACHER: So be't.  
Now give your staunch right hand to me,  
And give me yours as well and thus, as we  
Three men have now, among ourselves, entwined  
Our hands, in honesty, without deception,  
So too shall we three cantons stand together  
In defense and in offense, death and life.

WALTER FURST AND MELCHTAL: In death and life!

(They hold their hands clasped together for a few moments longer and  
are silent.)

MELCHTAL: O blinded, aged father!  
Thou can'st no longer see the day of freedom,  
But thou shalt hear it -- When from Alp to Alp  
The fiery signals rise aloft in flame,  
The sturdy castles of the tyrants fall,  
Unto thy cottage shall the Schweizer travel,  
To carry to thine ear the joyous news,  
And in thy night shall it be day to thee.

(They part from one another.)

---

ACT II. CONTENTS:

\* SCENE I.

Manor of the BARON VON ATTINGHAUSEN. A Gothic hall adorned with escutcheons and helmets. The BARON, an old man of eighty-five years, of tall and noble stature, on a staff, on which there is a chamois horn, and clothed in a pelisse. KUONI and another six farm hands stand around him with rakes and scythes. -- ULRICH VON RUDENZ enters in knight's apparel.

\* SCENE II. A meadow surrounded by high rocks and woods.

Upon the rocks are tracks, with rails, also ladders, by which one later sees the countrymen descend. In the hinterground the lake shows itself, above which at first a lunar rainbow is to be seen. The prospect is closed by high mountains, behind which still higher glaciers tower. It is completely night upon the stage, only the lake and the white glacier shine in the moonlight. MELCHTAL, BAUMGARTEN, WINKELRIED, MEIER VON SARNEN, BURKHARDT AM BUHEL, ARNOLD VON SEWA, KLAUS VON DER FLUE and yet four other countrymen, all armed.

---

ACT II

---

\* SCENE I.

Manor of the BARON VON ATTINGHAUSEN. A Gothic hall adorned with escutcheons and helmets. The BARON, an old man of eighty-five years, of tall and noble stature, on a staff, on which there is a chamois horn, and clothed in a pelisse. KUONI and another six farm hands stand around him with rakes and scythes. -- ULRICH VON RUDENZ enters in knight's apparel.

---

RUDENZ: Here am I, Uncle -- Now what is your will?

ATTINGHAUSEN: Permit, that I by ancient fam'ly custom  
First share the morning drink with these my workmen.

(He drinks from a beaker, which then is passed around.)

In former times I was with them in field and forest  
Directing all their work with mine own eye,  
Just as my banner led them into battle,  
Now I can not be more than but the steward,  
And if the genial sun come not to me,  
I can no longer seek it on the mountains.  
And so in closer still and closer circles,  
I move on slowly to the closest and  
The last, where every life comes to a stop  
I'm but my shadow, soon I'm but my name.

KUONI (to RUDENZ with the beaker):  
I bring it to you, squire.

(Here RUDENZ hesitates, to take the beaker.)

Drink up! It is  
From out one beaker and from out one heart.

ATTINGHAUSEN: Go, children, and when closing time is come,  
Then we shall talk about the country's business.

(Farm hands exit.)

(ATTINGHAUSEN and RUDENZ.)

ATTINGHAUSEN: I see that you are girded and prepared.  
Thou wilt to Altorf and the master's castle?

RUDENZ: Yes, Uncle, and I may not tarry longer --



ATTINGHAUSEN: (sits down): Art thou so hurried?  
How? Are th' hours of  
Thy youth so meanly measured, that thou must  
Be sparing of them to thine aged uncle?

RUDENZ: I see, that you are not in need of me,  
I am now but a stranger in this house.

ATTINGHAUSEN: (Hath scrutinized him with his eyes for some time.):  
Yes sadly art thou. Sadly hath this home  
To thee become so strange! -- Oh, Uly! Uly!  
No longer know I thee. In silks thou struttest,  
The peacock feather thou displayest proudly,  
And fling'st the purple mantle round thy shoulders,  
Thou look'st with scorn upon the countryman,  
And art ashamed of his familiar greeting.

RUDENZ: The honor, which is due him, give I gladly,  
The rights, that he usurps, I must deny him.

ATTINGHAUSEN: Th' entire land lies neath the heavy wrath O' th' King --  
And every man of honor's heart  
Is deeply troubled by the tyrant's force,  
Which we must suffer -- Thee alone moves not  
The universal pain -- One sees thee stand  
Apostate from thine own upon the side  
O' th' country's enemies, defying our.  
Distress to follow after easy joys,  
And court for princely favor, all the while  
Thy fatherland bleeds from the heavy scourge.

RUDENZ: The land is sore oppressed --  
Wherefore, mine uncle?  
Who is't, who plunged it into this distress?  
It would cost but a single easy word,  
To instantly be free of this oppression,  
And win a favorable Emperor.  
Woe unto those, who seal the people's eyes,  
That they resist what truly is the best.  
For their own selfish gain they would prevent  
The cantons taking oath to Austria,  
As every country all around hath done.  
It suits them well, to take their seats upon  
The master's bench with noblemen -- they wish  
The Emperor lord, to have no lord at all.

ATTINGHAUSEN: Must I hear that and from thy very mouth!

RUDENZ: 'Twas you who summoned me, now let me finish. --  
What person is it, Uncle, you yourself Play here?  
Have you no higher pride than to  
Be canton magistrate or standard bearer  
And govern here alongside of these herdsman?  
How? Is it not a far more glorious choice,  
To pay one's homage to our royal lord,  
Attach oneself unto his splendid camp,  
Than yours to be the peer of one's own servants,  
And share the judgment seat with countrymen?

ATTINGHAUSEN: Ah, Uly! Uly! I discern them now,

The voices of seduction!  
They have seized Thine open ear,  
they've filled thine heart with poison.

RUDENZ: Yes, I conceal it not -- deep in my soul  
I'm pained by scorn of strangers, who call us  
The peasant noblemen -- Nor can I bear't,  
Whilst all the noble youth from everywhere  
Are reaping honor under Hapsburg's banner,  
To sit here idly on my heritage,  
And see the springtime of my life depart  
In ordinary daily labor -- Elsewhere  
Great deeds are happening, a world of fame  
Is brilliantly astir beyond these mountains --  
My helm and shield are rusting in the hall,  
The martial trumpeting of valiant tones,  
The herald's call, which summons to the tourney,  
It doth not penetrate into these valleys,  
Naught but the cowherd dance and cattle bells  
Do I hear here in one unchanging peal.

ATTINGHAUSEN: Deluded man, seduced by idle glow!  
Despise thy land of birth! Thou art ashamed  
Of ancient pious customs of thy fathers!  
With burning tears thou wilt some day be sick  
With longing for your own paternal mountains,  
And for that melody i' th' cowherd's dance,  
Which now in proud disgust thou dost disdain,  
With painful longing will it capture thee,  
When it awakes thee in the foreign land.  
Oh, mighty is the urge o' th' fatherland!  
The false and alien world is not for thee,  
There in the haughty Emperor's court thou wilt  
Remain forever strange with thy true heart!  
The world, it doth require other virtues,  
Than those thou hast acquired in these valleys.  
-- Go hither then, dispose of thy free soul,  
Take land in fief, become a prince's servant,  
There thou canst be lord of thyself and prince  
Of thine own heritage and thy free soil.  
Ah, Uly! Uly! Stay among thine own!  
Go not to Altorf -- O, do not forsake,  
The sacred cause of thine own fatherland! --  
I am the last one of my line.  
My name will end with me.  
There hang my helm and shield,  
These will they bury with me in the grave.  
And must I think with my last dying breath,  
That thou but wait'st the closing of mine eyes,  
To take thyself 'fore this new feudal court,  
And all my noble goods, which freely  
I received from God, receive from Austria!

RUDENZ: It is in vain that we resist the King,  
The world belongs to him, wish we alone  
To stiffen selfishly and to withdraw,  
To interrupt the chain of territories,  
Which he hath mightily drawn up around us?  
His are the markets, and the courts, his are  
The merchant roads, and e'en the horse of burden,

That passes on the Gotthard, pays him toll.  
By his dominions, as within a net,  
Are we enmeshed and circled round about. --  
And will the Empire fend for us? Can it  
Defend itself 'gainst Austria's growing power?  
Helps God us not, no Emperor can help us.  
What good can be assigned the Emperor's word,  
When they to meet both war and money needs,  
May pawn the cities, which have fled beneath  
The eagle's shield, and sell them to the Empire?  
-- No, Uncle! 'Tis a blessing and wise caution,  
In grievous times like these of party strife,  
To join oneself unto some mighty chief.  
The Emperor's crown proceeds from line to line,  
It hath no memory for faithful service,  
To serve hereditary masters well,  
Means strewing seeds i'th' future.

ATTINGHAUSEN: Thou art so wise?  
Wilt see more clearly, than thy noble father,  
Who battled for the precious gem of freedom  
With property and blood and hero's strength? --  
Sail down unto Lucerne, inquire there,  
How Austria's rule doth weigh upon the land!  
Soon they will come up here to count our sheep  
And cows, to measure off our Alpine lands,  
To ban the fowl and large game animals  
In our free forest lands, to set up tolls  
At all our bridges, and at all our gates,  
Out of our poverty to pay for lands  
They purchase, with our blood to fund their wars --  
-- No, if we have to risk our blood thereon,  
So be't for us -- we purchase liberty  
More cheaply than enslavement!

RUDENZ: What can we,  
A shepherd folk, i' th' face of Albrecht's armies!

ATTINGHAUSEN: O learn to know this shepherd  
people, boy! I know them, I have led them into battle,  
I have observed them fighting at Favenz.  
Let them come here, to force a yoke on us,  
That we are resolute, we shall not bear!  
-- O learn to feel, the stock from which thou art!  
Cast not away the genuine pearl of thine  
Own worth for idle show and hollow pomp --  
To be known as the head of a free people,  
That but from love devotes itself to thee,  
That's loyal to thee both in strife and death --  
That be thy pride, of this nobility  
Make boast -- the native bonds knit firmly to  
The fatherland, to th' cherished, join thyself,  
Hold fast to it with thine entire heart.  
Here are the sturdy roots of all thy strength,  
There in the alien world thou stand'st alone,  
A slender weed, that every storm may snap.  
O come, thou hast not seen us for some time,  
Try it with us for but one day -- today  
Go not to Altorf -- Hear'st thou? Not today,  
But this one day bestow thee on thine own!

(He takes his hand.)

RUDENZ: I gave my word -- Let go of me -- I'm bound.

ATTINGHAUSEN (Lets go of his hand, with earnestness.):  
Th'art bound -- O yes indeed, unhappy one!  
Thou art, though not by word and oath,  
'Tis through the ropes of love that thou art bound!

(Rudenz turns away.)

-- Conceal it, as thou wilt. It is the lady,  
Berta von Bruneck, who draws thee unto  
The castle, fetters thee to th' Emperor's service.  
The knightly lady thou hast hopes to win  
By thy defection from thy land -- Be not deceived!  
They show the bride to thee but as a lure,  
Yet she's not granted to thine innocence.

RUDENZ: Enough have I now heard. Fare well to you.

(He exits.)

ATTINGHAUSEN: Deluded youth, stay here! -- He's gone away!  
I can not hold him back, not rescue him --  
So hath the Wolfenschiessen turned away  
From his own country -- so will others follow,  
The alien magic tears the youth away,  
By force aspiring far beyond our mountains. --  
O ill-begotten hour, when what is strange  
Came here into these tranquil blessed valleys,  
To ruin the pious innocence of custom! --  
The new is pressing on with might, the old,  
The worthy is now leaving, other times are coming,  
A different-thinking generation lives!  
What do I here?  
All those are buried now,  
With whom I shared my work and passed my life.  
Beneath the earth my time already lies;  
He's blest, who with the new no longer needs to live!

(Exit.)

---

\* SCENE II. A meadow surrounded by high rocks and woods.

Upon the rocks are tracks, with rails, also ladders, by which one later  
sees the countrymen descend. In the hinterground the lake shows itself,  
above which at first a lunar rainbow is to be seen. The prospect is closed  
by high mountains, behind which still higher glaciers tower. It is  
completely night upon the stage, only the lake and the white glacier shine  
in the moonlight. MELCHTAL, BAUMGARTEN, WINKELRIED, MEIER VON SARNEN,  
BURKHARDT AM BUHEL, ARNOLD VON SEWA, KLAUS VON DER FLUE and yet four other  
countrymen, all armed.

---

MELCHTAL (still backstage):  
The mountain pass is op'ning, follow me,  
I know the rock and little cross thereon,

We're at our goal, here is the Rutli.

(Enter with storm-lanterns.)

WINKELRIED: Hark!

SEWA: Deserted.

MEIER: There's no countryman here yet.  
We are the first to come, we Unterwaldners.

MELCHTAL: How far is't in the night?

BAUMGARTEN: The fire watch  
In Selisberg hath only just called two.

(One hears ringing in the distance.)

MEIER: Hush! Hark!

AM BUHEL: The matin bell i' th' forest chapel  
Rings clearly over here from Schwyzerland.

VON DER FLUE: The air is pure and bears the sound so far.

MELCHTAL: Go some of you and light some fire wood,  
That it burn brightly, when the men arrive.

(Two countrymen exit.)

SEWA: It is a beauteous lunar night. The lake  
Lies calmly here just like a level mirror.

AM BUHEL: They have an easy voyage.

WINKELRIED (points toward the lake): Ha, behold!  
Look yonder! See you naught?

MEIER: What then? -- Yes, truly!  
A rainbow in the middle of the night!

MELCHTAL: It is the light o' th' moon, that causes it.

VON DER FLUE: That is a passing strange and wondrous sign!  
There live full many, who've not seen the like.

SEWA: 'Tis doubled, see, a paler one's above.

BAUMGARTEN: A boat is passing underneath it now.

MELCHTAL: That's Stauffacher who crosses in his boat,  
The worthy man would not delay for long.

(Goes with BAUMGARTEN toward the shore.)

MEIER: It is the Uri, who delay the longest.

AM BUHEL: They have to detour widely through the mountains,  
So that they may deceive the Governor's spies.

(In the meantime the two countrymen have set a fire in the middle of  
the place.)

MELCHTAL (on the shore):

Who is it? Give the word!

STAUFFACHER (from below): Friends of the land.

(All go to the rear, toward those arriving. Out of the boat climbs STAUFFACHER, ITEL REDING, HANS AUF DER MAUER, JORG IM HOFE, KONRAD HUNN, ULRICH DER SCHMIED, JOST VON WEILER and yet three other countrymen, likewise armed.)

ALL (shout): Be welcome!

(Whilst the rest linger in the rear, MELCHTAL comes forward with STAUFFACHER.)

MELCHTAL: O Lord Stauffacher! I've him  
Beheld, who never could see me again!  
I've placed my hands upon his very eyes,  
I've drawn the burning feeling of revenge  
From the extinguished sunlight of his glance.

STAUFFACHER: Speak not of vengeance. We desire to meet  
The threatened evil, not avenge the past.  
-- Now say, what you in Unterwalden have  
Achieved and 'listed for the common cause,  
How think the countrymen, how you yourself  
Have managed to escape the snares of treason.

MELCHTAL: Through the Surenen's fearsome mountain range,  
Upon the widespread empty fields of ice,  
Where but the croaking lammergeyer caws,  
I reached the Alpine meadow, where the herdsmen  
From Uri and from Engelberg extend  
Their greetings and in common tend their flocks,  
My thirst relieving with the glacier's milk,  
Which in the Runsen foams and gushes down.  
I stayed in isolated Alpine huts,  
Both mine own host and guest, until I came  
Unto the homes of social living men.  
-- Already through these valleys word rang out  
Of new atrocities, which had occurred,  
And pious awe I found for my misfortune  
'Fore every gate, where wandering I knocked.  
Indignant did I find these upright souls  
About the violence of the new regime,  
For as their Alpine meadows ceaselessly  
Give nourishment to the same plants, their springs  
Flow uniformly, even clouds and winds  
Pursue unchangeably the self-same course,  
So hath the ancient customs here from grandsire  
To grandson persevered just as before,  
Nor do they bear audacious innovation  
I' th' old accustomed even way of life.  
-- Their hardened hands to me they did extend,  
From the walls they lifted down their rusty swords,  
And from their eyes there flashed a joyous feeling  
Of courage, as I spake the names to them,  
Which to the mountain countryman are holy,  
Your name and that of Walter Furst -- What you  
Would deem is right, they swore an oath to do,  
They swore to follow you e'en unto death.  
-- So sped I safely 'neath the holy shield

Of hospitality from farm to farm --  
And as I came into my native vale,  
Where widely scattered round my cousins dwell --  
As I beheld my father, robbed and blind,  
On stranger's straw, sustained by charity  
Of tender-hearted people --

STAUFFACHER: Lord in Heaven!

MELCHTAL: Then wept I not! No -- not in helpless tears  
Did I pour out the force of my hot grief,  
Deep in my bosom like a precious treasure  
I locked it up and thought of action only.  
I crept through every winding of the mountain,  
No vale was so concealed, I spied it out,  
Unto the glacier's ice-attired foot  
Expected I and found inhabited huts,  
And everywhere, my footsteps carried me,  
Found I the self-same hate of tyranny  
For even at this final boundary  
Of living nature, where the rigid earth  
No longer gives, the governor's greed doth rob --  
The very hearts of all those honest people  
Aroused I with the goading of my words,  
And all of them are ours with heart and mouth.

STAUFFACHER: Great things have you achieved in little time.

MELCHTAL: I did still more. Tis those two fortresses  
Rossberg and Sarnen, the countryman doth fear  
For from behind their walls of stone the foe  
Defends himself with ease and harms the land.  
With mine own eyes I wished to study it,  
I went to Sarnen and beheld the castle.

STAUFFACHER: You risked yourself e'en in the tiger's den?

MELCHTAL: I was disguised there in a pilgrim's dress  
I saw the Governor feasting at the table --  
Now judge, if I can master mine own heart  
I saw the enemy and slew him not.

STAUFFACHER: Forsooth, good fortune smiled upon your boldness.

(In the meantime the other countrymen are come forward and are  
approaching both of them.)

Yet tell me right away, who are the friends  
And upright men, who followed after you?  
Make me acquainted with them, that we may  
Draw near in trust and open up our hearts.

MEIER: Who knows not you, my Lord, in these three lands?  
My name is Meier von Sarnen, this one here  
Is Struth von Winkelried, my sister's son.

STAUFFACHER: You do not name me any unknown names.  
A Winkelried it was, who slew the dragon  
I' th' swamp at Weiler and his life relinquished  
In this affray.

WINKELRIED: That was my sire, Lord Werner.

MELCHTAL (points to two countrymen):  
These dwell behind the woods, are cloister monks  
From Engelberg -- You will not look upon  
Them with disdain, because they're serfs, and sit  
Not free like we upon our heritage--  
They love the land, are else of good repute.

STAUFFACHER (to both of them):  
Give me your hand. He's fortunate, whose body  
Is duty-bound to no one on this earth,  
But honesty doth thrive in every class.

KONRAD HUNN: This is Lord Reding, our old Magistrate.

MEIER: I know him well. He is my adversary,  
Who o'er a piece of land disputes with me.  
-- Lord Reding, we are enemies at court,  
Here we are one.

(Shakes his hand.)

STAUFFACHER: Now that is bravely spoken.

WINKELRIED: You hear? They're coming. Hear the horn of Uri!

(To the right and left one sees armed men climb down from the rocks  
with storm lanterns.)

AUF DER MAUER: Look! Is that not God's pious servant there,  
The worthy pastor climbing down? Nor shuns  
He toils o' th' way and terrors of the night,  
A faithful shepherd caring for his people.

BAUMGARTEN: The Sacrist trails him and Lord Walter Furst,  
But Tell I do not see among the number.

(WALTER FURST, ROSSELMANN the pastor, PETERMANN the Sacristan, KUONI  
the shepherd, WERNI the hunter, RUODI the fisherman and yet five other  
countrymen, all together, thirty-three in number, step forward and  
take their places around the fire.)

WALTER FURST: So must we now upon our native soil  
And our paternal lands in secrecy  
Creep forth to meet, like murderers must do,  
And by the night, which lends its sable cloak  
But to the crime and to conspiracies  
That shun the sunlight, we must seize upon  
Our goodly right, the which is pure and clear,  
Just as the splendid open womb of day.

MELCHTAL: Leave it at that. What darksome night hath spun,  
Is free and joyous in the light o' th' sun.

ROSSELMANN: Confederates, hear what God bids my heart!  
We're meeting here in place of an Assembly  
And can be deemed to represent the people,  
So let us meet by ancient usages  
O' th' land, as we were wont in tranquil times,  
Whatever is unlawful in this meeting,  
Be pardoned by the need o' th' time. Yet God  
Is everywhere, where justice is dispensed,



And underneath his Heaven do we stand.

STAUFFACHER: Tis well, let's meet in line with ancient custom,  
Though it is night, so shines our justice forth.

MELCHTAL: Though not in number full, the heart is here  
Of all the people, here the best attend.

KONRAD HUNN: Are not the ancient books as well at hand,  
Yet they are written down within our hearts.

ROSSELMANN: Now then, so let the ring be formed at once.  
Set up the swords of power in the ground.

AUF DER MAUER: Now let the Magistrate assume his place,  
And let his bailiffs stand at either side!

SACRISTAN: There are three peoples here, to which belongs  
The right, to give a head to the Assembly?

MEIER: Sehwyz may contest with Uri for this honor  
We Unterwaldners freely stand aside.

MELCHTAL: We stand aside, we are the suppliants,  
Who ask assistance from their mighty friends.

STAUFFACHER: Let Uri then assume the sword, its flag  
Takes precedence upon our march to Rome.

WALTER FURST: The honor of the sword should fall to Schwyz,  
For we all pride ourselves upon its stock.

ROSSELMANN: Let me resolve this noble competition,  
Schwyz leads in council, Uri in the field.

WALTER FURST (hands STAUFFACHER the swords):  
So take!

STAUFFACHER: Not I, to th' eldest be the honor.

IM HOFE: Ulrich der Schmied is most advanced in years.

AUF DER MAUER: The man is brave, but not of free estate,  
No bondman can become a judge in Schwyz.

STAUFFACHER: Is not Lord Reding here, the Magistrate?  
Why should we seek for one yet worthier?

WALTER FURST: Let him be Magistrate and chief o' th' day!  
Who doth agree thereto, lift up his hand.

(All lift up their right hand.)

REDING (steps into the middle):  
I can not place my hand upon the books,  
So swear I by th' eternal stars above,  
That I will never deviate from justice.

(The two swords are placed upright before him, the ring is formed  
around him, SCHWYZ holds the center, URI places itself to the right,  
and UNTERWALDEN to the left. He stands leaning on his battle sword.)

What is it, that hath brought together here

Three mountain people at this ghostly hour  
Upon the barren shoreline of this lake?  
What should the content be of this new league,  
Which we here found beneath the heaven's stars?

STAUFFACHER (steps into the ring):  
No new alliance do we found, it is  
An old alliance from our fathers' time,  
That we renew! Know well, confederates!  
Though lake, though mountain range may us divide,  
And every people govern for itself,  
So are we yet of but one stock and blood,  
And but one homeland is't, from which we come.

WINKELRIED: So is it true, as it is said in song,  
That we've come from afar into this land?  
O, tell us now, whatever's known to you,  
That this new league be strengthened by the old.

STAUFFACHER: Hear, what the aged herdsmen do relate.  
-- There was a mighty people, in the land  
Back to the north, that suffer'd from harsh famine.  
In this distress th' Assembly did resolve,  
That every tenth man as the lot might fall  
Should leave his fatherland -- that did occur!  
And forth, lamenting, men and women went,  
A giant army, toward the midday sun,  
With sword in hand they struck through German lands,  
Unto the highlands of these mountain forests.  
And never did the host become fatigued,  
Until they came upon the savage vale,  
Where now the Muotta runs between the meads --  
No trace of human beings was here seen,  
But one lone shelter stood upon the shore,  
Here sat a man and waited for the ferry --  
Yet violently the lake did rage and was  
Not passable; so they beheld the land  
More closely and perceived the beauteous wealth  
Of timber and discovered goodly springs  
And thought, they were in their dear fatherland --  
Then they at once determined to remain,  
Erected there the ancient town of Schwyz,  
And many bitter days they had, to clear  
The forest with its widely spreading roots --  
Then later, as the soil no more sufficed  
The people's number, they proceeded hither  
To the black mountain, yes to Weissland hence,  
Where, hidden by eternal walls of ice  
Another people speak another tongue.  
The village Stanz they built beside the Kernwald,  
The village Altorf by the valley of the Reuss --  
Yet stayed they ever mindful of their source,  
From all the foreign races, that since then  
Have settled in the middle of their land,  
The men of Schwyz each other recognize,  
There is the heart, the blood by which they're known.

(Extends his hand to the right and left.)

AUF DER MAUER: Yes, we are of one heart and of one blood!

ALL (extending their hands): We are one people and will act as one.

STAUFFACHER: The other people bear a foreign yoke,  
They have submitted to the conqueror.  
Even within our country's bounds there live  
Some settlers, who are bound by foreign duties,  
And pass their servitude on to their children.  
Yet we, the genuine race of ancient Schwyz,  
We have forever kept our liberty.  
Never to princes have we bowed the knee,  
Freely we chose the Emperor's protection.

ROSSELMANN: We freely chose the Empire's shield and refuge,  
So doth it read in Emp'ror Friedrich's charter.

STAUFFACHER: For masterless is also not the freest.  
There has to be a chief, a highest judge,  
Where one may turn for justice in disputes.  
Hence for the ground, which they have salvaged from  
The ancient wilderness, our fathers granted  
The honor to the Emperor, who's called  
The Lord of German and Italian soil,  
And like the other freemen of his realm  
Pledged him the noble service of their arms,  
For this alone is every freeman's duty,  
To shield the Empire, which gives him protection.

MELCHTAL: What is beyond that, hath the mark of serfdom.

STAUFFACHER: Whene'er the call to arms went forth they follow'd  
The Empire's banner and they fought its battles.  
To Italy they marched with arms in hand,  
To place the Roman crown upon his head.  
At home they ruled themselves most cheerfully  
By ancient usages and their own law  
Blood sentences alone were th' Emp'ror's right.  
And thereto was assigned a noble count,  
Who had his domicile not in the land  
When blood guilt came to pass, they summon'd him,  
And 'neath the open heavens, plain and clear,  
Spake he the law and with no fear of men.  
Where are the traces here, that we are slaves?  
Is there one, who knows otherwise, speak out!

IM HOFE: NO, everything stands thus, just as you state  
We've never tolerated despotism.

STAUFFACHER: E'en to th' Emperor we refused obedience,  
When he once bent the law to favor parsons.  
For as the clerics from the Abbey of  
Einsiedeln laid a claim upon the Alp  
Which we have grazed on since our fathers' time,  
The Abbot yielded up an ancient charter,  
Which granted him the unowned wilderness --  
For our existence there had been concealed --  
And then we spake: "The charter is a fraud.  
No Emperor can bestow, that which is ours.  
And does the Realm deny our rights, we can  
Amidst our mountains do without the Realm."  
-- In such a way our fathers spake! Should we  
Endure the infamy of this new yoke,

And suffer from the foreign vassal, what  
No Emp'ror in his might would do to us? --  
This soil we have created for ourselves  
By labor of our hands, the ancient wood,  
Which else was but the savage home of bears,  
We've changed into a domicile for men,  
The brood of dragons have we extirpated,  
Which poison-swollen climbed out of the swamps,  
The misty cover have we torn away,  
Which always grey hung o'er this wilderness,  
The solid rocks blown up, o'er the abyss  
The wanderer conducted on safe paths,  
By the possession of a thousand years  
The soil is ours -- and now the foreign vassal  
Should dare to come and forge his chains on us,  
And bring disgrace upon our very soil?  
Is there no help against such great distress?

(A great motion among the countrymen.)

No, there's a limit to the tyrant's power,  
When the oppressed can find no justice, when  
The burden grows unbearable-- he reaches  
With hopeful courage up unto the heavens  
And seizes hither his eternal rights,  
Which hang above, inalienable  
And indestructible as stars themselves --  
The primal state of nature reappears,  
Where man stands opposite his fellow man --  
As last resort, when not another means  
Is of avail, the sword is given him --  
The highest of all goods we may defend  
From violence. -- Thus stand we 'fore our country,  
Thus stand we 'fore our wives, and 'fore our children!

ALL (striking their swords):  
Thus stand we 'fore our wives and 'fore our children!

ROSSELMANN (steps into the ring):  
Before you seize the swords, bethink it well.  
You could resolve it calmly with the Emperor.  
It costs you but a word and those same tyrants,  
Who now oppress you harshly, flatter you.  
-- Accept, what often hath been offered you,  
Renounce the Empire, yield to Austria's power --

AUF DER MAUER:  
What says the priest? We swear to Austria!

AM BUHEL:  
Hark not to him!

WINKELRIED: It is a traitor's counsel,  
A foe o' th' country!

REDING: Calm, confederates!

SEWA: We swear to Austria, after such disgrace!

VON DER FLUE: We let ourselves be cowed by force to do,  
What we refused to kindness!

MEIER: Then were  
We slaves and would deserve to be the same!

AUF DER MAUER:  
Let him be stripped of all a Schweizer's rights  
Whoever speaks of giving up to Austria!  
Magistrate, I insist thereon, this be  
The first law of the land, that we here give.

MELCHTAL: So be't. Who speaks of giving up to Austria,  
Shall be an outlaw and all honor lack,  
No countryman receive him at his hearth.

ALL (raise their right hands):  
We're all agreed, that this be law!

REDING (after a pause): It is't.

ROSSELMANN: Now be you free, you are so through the law,  
Never shall Austria extort by force,  
What it could not obtain by friendly suit --

JOST VON WEILER: To the agenda, now.

REDING: Confederates!  
Have all the gentle means as well been tried?  
Perhaps the King is not aware, it is  
Not by his will at all, that we must suffer.  
This final means we should as well attempt,  
First bring our grievances before his ear,  
Before we seize the sword. For force is still  
Atrocious, even in a righteous cause,  
God only helps, when men no longer help.

STAUFFACHER (to KONRAD HUNN):  
Now is't for you, to give report. Speak forth.

KONRAD HUNN: I was at Rheinfeld at the Emperor's palace,  
To plead against the Governor's harsh oppression,  
To claim the charter of our ancient freedom,  
Which each new King hath formerly confirmed.  
I found the envoys there of many cities,  
From Swabia and from the path o' th' Rhine,  
Who each and all received their documents,  
And joyously returned unto their lands.  
Your envoy, I was shown to councillors,  
And they sent me away with empty comfort:  
"The Emperor at present had no time,  
He would attend to us some other time."  
-- And as I tearfully passed through the halls  
Of the King's castle, I beheld Duke Hansen  
Stand weeping in a window bay, 'round him  
The noble Lords of Wart and Tegerfeld.  
They called to me and stated: "Help your selves,  
And do not wait for justice from the King.  
Did he not rob his very brother's child,  
And keep from him his just inheritance?  
The Duke implored him for his mother's land,  
He had now fully come of age, it were  
Now time, for him to rule both land and people.

How did he answer him? The Emperor placed  
A wreath on him: that be the jewel of youth."

AUF DER MAUER: You have now heard it.  
Do not wait for right And justice from the Emperor!  
Help your selves.

REDING: Naught else is left to us. Now give advice,  
How we shall guide it to a happy end.

WALTER FURST: (steps into the ring):  
We want to drive away the hated force,  
The ancient rights, as we inherit them  
From our own fathers, we want to preserve  
Not unrestrain'd to reach for what is new.  
The Emperor retain, what is the Emperor's  
Who hath a master, serve him dutifully.

MEIER: I hold my land in fief from Austria.

WALTER FURST: Continue then, to give its due to Austria.

JOST VON WEILER: The Lords of Rappersweil receive my tax.

WALTER FURST: Continue then, to pay your rent and tax.

ROSSELMANN: To Zurich's noble Lady am I sworn.

WALTER FURST: Give to the cloister, that which is the cloister's.

STAUFFACHER: I hold no fief except those of the Empire.

WALTER FURST: What needs be, that be done, but not beyond.  
The gov'rnors with their vassals would we drive  
Away and all their fortress castles raze,  
Yet, if it might be, bloodlessly. Thus let  
The Emperor see, that only under force  
We've shed the pious duties of respect.  
And sees he us remain within our bounds,  
Perhaps he'll statesmanlike o'ercome his wrath,  
For a just fear is wakened by a people,  
That moderates itself with sword in hand.

REDING: Yet let us hear! How can it be achieved?  
The enemy hath weapons in his hands,  
And verily he will not yield in peace.

STAUFFACHER: He will, when he beholds us under arms,  
We shall surprise him, ere he is prepared.

MEIER: 'Tis quickly said, but difficult to do.  
Two fortress castles tower in the land,  
Which shield the enemy and would be fearsome,  
If e'er the King should fall upon our land.  
Rossberg and Sarnen must be overcome,  
Before a sword is raised in these three lands.

STAUFFACHER: Delay so long, so will the foe be warned.  
There are too many, who now share the secret.

MEIER: There are no traitors in the forest states.

ROSSELMANN: Zeal also, though 'tis good, can still betray.

WALTER FURST: Delay it longer, so the keep in Altorf  
Is finished, and the Governor secured.

MEIER: You think but of yourselves.

SACRISTAN: And you're unjust.

MEIER (jumping up): Unjust! That Uri dares to say to us!

REDING: Upon your oath, be calm!

MEIER: Indeed, if Schwyz  
Be leagued with Uri, then must we be silent.

REDING: I must point out to you before th' Assembly,  
That you disturb the peace with vehement mind!  
Stand we not all of us for the same cause?

WINKELRIED: If we delay until it's Feast o' th' Lord,  
Then custom brings with it, that all the serfs  
Bring presents to the castle for the Governor,  
And thus ten men or twelve are able to  
Assemble unobserved inside the palace,  
Who secretly bear sharpened blades with them,  
Which one can swiftly mount upon a staff,  
For none can come with weapons in the castle.  
Close by i' th' woods the larger number waits,  
And if the others have successfully  
Secured the gate, so will a horn be blown,  
And those will burst forth from their ambush place,  
Thus is the castle ours with little work.

MELCHTAL: The Rossberg I will undertake to scale,  
A wench i' th' castle is disposed to me,  
And I'll delude her easily, to pass  
A ladder to me for a nightly visit,  
Am I once up, my friends will follow me.

REDING: Are all agreed, that it shall be postponed?

(The majority raise their hands.)

STAUFFACHER (counts the votes): It is a twenty to twelve majority!

WALTER FURST: If on a certain day the castles fall,  
So from one mountain to another we  
Shall give the sign with smoke, th' militia will  
Be summoned, quickly, in each capital,  
Then when the governors see our armed resolve,  
Believe me, they will soon give up the fight  
And willingly accept a peaceful escort,  
To flee beyond the borders of our land.

STAUFFACHER: From Gessler only fear I fierce resistance,  
Surrounded by his cavalry he's dreadful,  
Not without blood quits he the field, yes though  
Repelled he still is dreadful to the land,  
Hard is't and almost dangerous to spare him.

BAUMGARTEN: Where it is dang'rous to the neck, place me.  
To Tell I owe the saving of my life.

With pleasure I shall stake it for the land,  
My honor I've secured, my heart contented.

REDING: Time brings advice. Await it patiently.  
One must as well entrust some things to th' moment.  
-- Yet see, while we still meet here in the night,  
Upon the highest mount the morn already  
Displays her glowing beacon -- Come, let's part,  
Before the light of day surprises us.

WALTER FURST: Fear not, the night yields slowly from the valleys.

(All have involuntarily removed their hats and contemplate the sunrise  
with silent concentration.)

ROSSELMANN: Upon this light, that gives us greeting first  
Of all the people, who far under us  
With heavy breathing dwell in smoke-filled cities,  
Now let us take the oath of this new league.

-- We will become a single land of brothers,  
Nor shall we part in danger and distress.

(All repeat the words with three fingers raised.)

-- We will be free, just as our fathers were,  
And sooner die, than live in slavery.

(As above.)

-- We will rely upon the highest God  
And we shall never fear the might of men.

(As above. The countrymen embrace one another.)

STAUFFACHER: Now each one go in silence on his way  
Unto his friendships and community,  
Who's herdsman, winter up his herd in peace  
And quietly 'list friends into the league, --  
What still must be endured until that time,  
Endure it! Let the tyrant's reckoning  
Increase, until one day the universal  
And th' individual debt at once are paid.  
Let every one restrain his righteous rage,  
And save his vengeance only for the whole,  
For he despoils the universal good,  
Who only helps himself in his own cause.

(Whilst they exit in greatest calm to three different sides, the  
orchestra breaks in with a magnificent flourish, the empty stage  
remains open for a time and displays the spectacle of the rising sun  
over the ice-capped mountains.)

---

ACT III. CONTENTS:

\* SCENE I. Court before TELL's house.

He is busy with the carpenter's axe, HEDWIG with some domestic work. WALTER  
and WILHELM play at the rear with a small crossbow.

\* SCENE II.



An enclosed wild region of the forest, waterfalls plunge in spray from the rocks. BERTA in hunting dress. Directly thereafter RUDENZ.

\* SCENE III.

Meadow near Altorf. In the foreground trees, to the rear the hat upon a pole. The prospect is bound by the Bannberg, over which a snowcovered mountain towers. FRIESSHART and LEUTHOLD keep watch.

---

ACT III

---

\* SCENE I. Court before TELL's house.

He is busy with the carpenter's axe, HEDWIG with some domestic work. WALTER and WILHELM play at the rear with a small crossbow.

---

WALTER (sings): With the shaft, the crossbow,  
Over mounts and streams  
Doth the archer follow  
Soon as morning beams.  
As in realms of breezes  
Kites soar regally,  
Over mounts and gorges  
Rules the archer free.  
He commands the yonder,  
That his shaft achieves,  
That is his own plunder,  
What there creeps and flees.

(Comes springing.)

My string is snapped in two.  
Please mend it, Father.

TELL: I not. A genuine archer helps himself.

(Boys move away.)

HEDWIG: The boys commence betimes to shoot the bow.

TELL: Tis only early practice, makes a master.

HEDWIG: Ah would to God, they never learnt!

TELL: They should learn everything.  
Whoever wants  
To pass through life alert, must be prepared  
For defense and for offense.

HEDWIG: Ah, he'll find  
No peace at home.

TELL: I can not either, Mother,  
I was not formed by nature for a herdsman,  
Restless I must pursue a fleeting goal,  
And only then do I enjoy my life,

If every day I seize anew some quarry.

HEDWIG: And think'st thou not about the fear o' th' housewife,  
Who in the time, while thee awaiting, grieves,  
For I am overwhelmed with dread, at what  
The servants tell about your daring trips.  
With each farewell my heart begins to quake,  
That thou wilt never more return to me.  
I see thee on the savage icy mountain,  
Astray, from one cliff to the other make  
A leap that's false, and see, how leaping back  
The chamois drags thee with him in th' abyss,  
How avalanches bury thee alive,  
How underneath thy foot the treach'rous snow  
Gives way and then thou sinkest down, into  
A living tomb, within the gruesome vault --  
Ah, in a hundred alternating forms  
Doth death pursue the daring Alpine hunter,  
That is an ill-begotten way of life,  
That leads with breakneck speed to the abyss!

TELL: Who freshly looks around with healthy senses,  
Who trusts in God and his own agile strength,  
Will easily escape each need and danger,  
The mountain frights not him, who's born thereon.

(He hath finished his work, lays his tools aside.)

And now, methinks, the door will hold for years.  
The axe at home doth save the carpenter.

(Takes his hat.)

HEDWIG: Where art thou bound?

TELL: To Altorf, to thy father.

HEDWIG: Hast thou naught dangerous in mind? Confess.

TELL: What mak'st thou think so, wife?

HEDWIG: There is some plot Against the gov'nors  
-- On the Rutli they Conferred,  
I know, and thou art in the league.

TELL: I was not there with them -- however I  
Will not foresake my country, when it calls.

HEDWIG: They'll put thee in a place, where there is danger,  
The heaviest will be thy share, as always.

TELL: Each man is taxed according to his means.

HEDWIG: The Unterwaldner hast thou brought across  
The lake i' th' storm -- It was a miracle,  
That you escaped -- Didst thou think then at all  
Of child and wife?

TELL: Dear wife, I thought of you  
Therefore I saved the father for his children.

HEDWIG: To sail upon that raging lake!

That is Not putting trust in God!  
That's tempting God.

TELL: Who ponders far too much, will little do.

HEDWIG: Yes, thou art good and helpful, servest all  
And when thou com'st in need, no one helps thee.

TELL: Forbid it God, that ever I need help.

(He takes the crossbow and arrows.)

HEDWIG: What wilt thou with the crossbow? Leave it here.

TELL: I lack my arm, when I'm without my weapon.

(The boys come back.)

WALTER: Father, where art thou bound?

TELL: To Altorf, boy  
To Grand-dad -- Wilt thou come?

WALTER: Yes sure I will.

HEDWIG: The Gov'rnor is now there. Stay out of Altorf.

TELL: He leaves, today.

HEDWIG: Then let him first be gone  
Remind him not of thee, thou know'st, he hates us.

TELL: His ill-will shall not greatly injure me  
I do what's right and shrink before no foe.

HEDWIG: 'Tis those who do what's right, he hates the most.

TELL: Because he cannot come at them -- The knight  
Will probably leave me in peace, methinks.

HEDWIG: So, know'st thou that?

TELL: It was not long ago,  
That I went hunting through the wild ravines  
Of Schachental on a deserted trail,  
And there I did proceed alone upon  
A rocky trail, where 'twas no room to yield,  
For over me the wall of rock hung sheer,  
And under thundered frightfully the Schachen,

(The boys press toward him to the right and left and look at him with  
anxious curiosity.)

Then came the Governor in my direction,  
He was alone with me, I too alone,  
Just man to man, and next to us the chasm.  
And when the gentleman caught sight of me  
And knew 'twas me, whom he not long before  
Had punished harshly for some minor cause,  
And saw me with my stately arms in hand  
Come striding hitherward, then turned he pale,  
His knees began to fail, I saw it coming,  
That he would sink against the wall of rock. --

Then feeling sorry for him, I advanced  
Respectfully and said: 'Tis I, Lord Governor.  
But he could not bring forth a sound  
Out of his mouth -- He beckoned silently  
To me with but his hand, to go my way,  
Then went I forth and sent his train to him.

HEDWIG: He hath before thee trembled -- Woe to thee!  
That thou hast seen him weak, he'll ne'er forgive.

TELL: Thus shun I him, and he'll not seek for me.

HEDWIG: Just stay away today. Go hunting rather.

TELL: What mean'st thou?

HEDWIG: I'm uneasy. Stay away.

TELL: How can'st thou worry so without a reason?

HEDWIG: Because there is no reason -- Tell, stay here.

TELL: I gave my promise, my dear wife, to come.

HEDWIG: Must thou, then go -- But leave the boy with me!

WALTER: No, Mother dear. I m going with my father.

HEDWIG: Walty, dost thou intend to leave thy mother?

WALTER: I'll bring thee something pretty back from Grand-dad.

(Leaves with his father.)

WILHELM: Mother, I'll stay with thee!

HEDWIG (embraces him): Oh yes, thou art  
Mine own dear child, th'art left alone to me.

(She goes to the courtyard gate and follows the departing ones with  
her eyes for some time.)

---

\* SCENE II.

An enclosed wild region of the forest, waterfalls plunge in spray from the  
rocks. BERTA in hunting dress. Directly thereafter RUDENZ.

---

BERTA: He follows me. At last I can explain.

RUDENZ (enters rashly): My lady, now at last alone I find you,  
Abysses close us in on every side,  
I fear no witness in this wilderness  
I throw this lengthy silence from my heart --

BERTA: You're sure, the huntsmen do not follow us?

RUDENZ: The huntsmen are out there --  
'Tis now or never!  
I have to seize upon this precious moment --  
I have to see my destiny decided,

And should it sever me from you forever.  
-- O, do not arm your gracious glances with  
This dark severity -- For who am I,  
That I would raise this daring wish to you?  
Fame hath not named me yet, nor may I take  
My place along the side of all those knights,  
Who woo you with their glory and their glitter.  
Naught have I but my faithful loving heart --

BERTA (solemnly and sternly):  
How can you talk of love and faithfulness  
Who is not faithful to his nearest duties?

(RUDENZ steps back.)

The slave of Austria, who sells himself  
To th' stranger, to th' oppressor of his people?

RUDENZ: From you, my lady, hear I this reproach?  
Whom seek I then, but you upon that side?

BERTA: You think to find me then upon the side  
Of traitors? Rather would I give my hand  
To Gessler himself, to th' oppressor, than  
To th' nature-forgetting son of Schweiz,  
Who can transform himself into his tool!

RUDENZ: O God, what must I hear?

BERTA: And how? What can  
Lie nearer to a good man than his own?  
Can any noble heart have fairer duties,  
Than to defend those who are innocent,  
And to protect the rights of the oppressed? --  
My very soul bleeds for your countrymen,  
I suffer with them, for I have to love them,  
Who are so modest and yet full of strength,  
They draw all of my heart unto them hence,  
Each day I learn to honor them the more. --  
But you, whom nature and your knightly duty  
Have given them as natural protector,  
And who desert them, faithlessly go over  
To th' foe, and place his countrymen in chains,  
You are the one, who hurts and injures me,  
I must constrain my heart, that I not hate you.

RUDENZ: Do I not want the best then for my people?  
Not peace for them beneath the mighty scepter  
Of Austria --

BERTA: You want to give them bondage!  
You want to banish freedom from the last  
Castle, that still remains to her on earth,  
The people understand their fortune better,  
Vain show will not seduce their certain feelings,  
They have now cast the net about your head --

RUDENZ: Berta! You hate me, you have scorn for me!

BERTA: Did I, 'twere better for me-- But to see  
Him who's despised and is contemptible,  
Whom one would rather love --

RUDENZ: O Berta! Berta!  
You show to me the highest heav'nly bliss,  
And hurl me down at one and the same moment.

BERTA: No, no, the noble is not all suppressed  
Within you! It but slumbers, I'll awake it,  
You must use violence against yourself,  
To deaden your hereditary virtue,  
Yet well for you, 'tis mightier than you,  
Despite yourself you are both good and noble!

RUDENZ: You trust in me! O Berta, with your love  
I can become and be all things!

BERTA: Then be,  
That for which glorious nature fashioned you!  
Fulfill the place, where she hath stationed you,  
Stand by your people and your native land,  
And battle for your holy right.

RUDENZ: Woe's me!  
How can I hope to win you, to possess you,  
If I resist the power of the Emperor?  
And is it not your kinsmen's mighty will,  
That like a tyrant dictates to your hand.

BERTA: All my estates lie in the forest cantons,  
And is the Schweizer free, so am I too.

RUDENZ: Berta! O what a view you ope to me!

BERTA: Hope not, to win my hand through Austria's favor,  
They stretch their hand out for my heritage,  
Which they would add to their great heritage.  
This self-same greed for land, which would devour  
Your liberty, endangers mine as well! --  
O friend, I'm destined to be sacrificed,  
Perhaps to be rewarded to some minion --  
Yonder where falsehood and intrigue reside,  
They'll drag me hence to the Imperial court,  
'Tis there my hated chains of wedlock wait,  
And love alone -- your love can rescue me!

RUDENZ: You could resolve yourself, to living here,  
In mine own fatherland to be mine own?  
O Berta, all my yearning in the distance,  
What was it, but a striving after you?  
I sought you only on the path of fame,  
And all my greed for honor was my love.  
Could you enclose yourself with me in this  
Still valley and renounce all earthly show --  
O then I've found the goal of all my striving,  
Then may the stream of the ferocious world  
Strike on the certain shore of this great mountain --  
I have no further fugitive desires  
To cast forth yonder in life's distances --  
Then may these rocky heights around us here  
Spread an impenetrable solid wall,  
And this sequestered blessed vale alone  
Be open to the heavens and be lit!

BERTA: Now art thou fully, as my prescient heart  
Hath dreamt thee, my belief hath not deceived me!

RUDENZ: Be gone, thou vain illusion, that deludes me!  
I should find happiness in mine own home.  
Here where the boy grew up so merrily,  
Where traces of a thousand joys surround me,  
Where every spring and tree hath life for me,  
In mine own fatherland thou wilt be mine!  
Ah, I have always loved it well! I feel,  
Without it I lacked every earthy joy.

BERTA: Where were the blessed island to be found,  
If it's not here in th' land of innocence?  
Here, where the old fidelity's at home,  
Where falsehood hath not found a way in yet,  
No envy clouds the fountain of our bliss,  
And ever bright the hours escape from us. --  
There see I thee in genuine manly worth,  
The foremost of the free and of thy peers,  
Revered with homage that is pure and free,  
Great as a king would act within his realm.

RUDENZ: There see I thee, the crown of womanhood,  
In charming womanly activity,  
Erect the heaven for me in my house  
And, as the springtime scatters forth its flowers  
Adorn my path of life with beauteous grace  
And all around bring life and happiness!

BERTA: See, my dear friend, the reason why I grieved,  
As I saw thee this highest bliss of life  
Destroy thyself -- Woe's me! What were my fate,  
If I were forced to follow the proud knight,  
The land's oppressor to his gloomy castle! --  
There is no castle here. No walls divide  
Me from a people, whom I can make happy!

RUDENZ: Yet how to save myself -- how 'scape the snare,  
That I have placed around my head in folly?

BERTA: Tear it apart with manly resolution!  
Whate'er therefrom occurs -- Stand by thy people,  
It is thy place by birth.

(Hunting horns in the distance.)

The hunting party Comes nearer --  
Go, we must now part -- Fight for  
The fatherland, thou fightest for thy love!  
It is one foe, before whom we all quake,  
And 'tis one freedom that shall free us all!

(Exeunt.)

---

\* SCENE III.

Meadow near Altorf. In the foreground trees, to the rear the hat upon a pole. The prospect is bound by the Bannberg, over which a snowcovered

mountain towers. FRIESSHART and LEUTHOLD keep watch.

---

FRIESSHART: We keep our watch in vain. There's no one who  
Will pass this way and render his obeisance to  
The hat. Yet here it was just like a fair,  
Now is th' entire meadow as deserted,  
E'er since the bugbear hung upon the pole.

LEUTHOLD: But common rabble show themselves and swing  
Their scruffy caps at us in peevishness.  
The decent people, all would rather make  
The lengthy detour. half way round the town,  
Before they bent their backs before the hat.

FRIESSHART: They have to pass across this place, when they  
Come from the town hall at the midday hour.  
Then was I sure, to make a goodly catch,  
For no one thought thereon, to greet the hat.  
Then it is seen by Rosselmann, the priest --  
Came just then from an invalid -- and set  
Forth with the Rev'rend, right there 'fore the pole --  
The Sacrist had to tinkle with the bell,  
Then all fell on their knees, myself with them,  
And greeted thus the monstrance, not the hat. --

LEUTHOLD: Harken, companion, I begin to think,  
We stand here in the pillory 'fore this hat,  
'Tis after all an insult for a trooper,  
To stand on guard before an empty hat --  
And every honest fellow must despise us. --  
Obeisance to perform unto a hat,  
This is in confidence! A foolish order!

FRIESSHART: Why not unto an empty, hollow hat?  
Bow'st thou indeed 'fore many hollow skulls.

(HILDEGARD, MECHTHILD and ELSBETH enter with children and place  
themselves around the pole.)

LEUTHOLD: And thou art also such an eager knave,  
And gladly brak'st misfortune to brave people.  
Let anyone that wants, pass by the hat,  
I'll close mine eyes and look not over there.

MECHTHILD: There hangs the Governor --  
Have respect, you rogues.

ELSBETH: Would t' God, he went, and left his hat to us,  
The country would not be the worse therefor!

FRIESSHART (chases them away):  
Would you leave here? Accursed women folk!  
Who asks for you? Dispatch your husbands here  
If they've the courage, to defy the order.

(Wives go.)

(Tell enters with his crossbow, leading his boy by the hand. They pass  
by the hat to the front of the stage, without taking notice thereof.)



WALTER (points toward the Bannberg):  
Father, is't true, that on the mountain there  
The trees will bleed, if anyone should strike  
Upon them with his axe?

TELL: Who says that, boy?

WALTER: The master herdsman says --  
The trees have been  
Bewitched, he says, and he who injures them,  
Will have his hand grow up from out the grave.

TELL: The trees have been bewitched, that is the truth.  
-- See'st thou the glaciers there, those icy horns,  
Which high up in the heavens disappear?

WALTER: Those are the glaciers, which at night so thunder,  
And send the avalanches down on us.

TELL: So is't, and long ago had avalanches  
Submerged the town of Altorf underneath  
Their weight, had not the forest over there  
Stood up against it as a kind of bulwark.

WALTER (after some reflection):  
Are there some countries,  
Father, with no mountains?

TELL: If one descends down under from our heights,  
And always deeper climbs, along the streams,  
Arrives one in a giant, level land,  
Where forest waters no more roaring foam,  
The rivers run in leisure and in peace,  
There sees one freely all of heaven's spaces,  
The grain grows there in lengthy, beauteous pastures,  
And like a garden is the land to see.

WALTER: Oh, father, why then do we not descend  
Below with speed into this beauteous land,  
Instead of worrying and toiling here?

TELL: The land is fair and goodly as the Heaven,  
Yet those who till it, they do not enjoy -  
The blessings, which they plant.

WALTER: Live they not free  
As thou upon their own inheritance?

TELL: The field belongs to th' Bishop and the King.

WALTER: So may they yet hunt freely in the woods?

TELL: To th' master doth belong the game and fowl.

WALTER: They may indeed fish freely in the streams?

TELL: The stream, the sea, the salt belong to th' King.

WALTER: Who is the King then, whom they all do fear?

TELL: He is the one, who fosters and protects them.

WALTER: They can't courageously defend themselves?

TELL: The neighbor there may not his neighbor trust.

WALTER: Father, for me 'tis cramp'd in that wide land,  
I'd rather live here 'neath the avalanches.

TELL: 'Tis better, child, to have these glacier peaks  
Behind one's back, than evil-minded men.

(They want to pass by.)

WALTER: Oh, Father, see the hat there on the pole.

TELL: What is this hat to us? Come, let us go.

(Whilst he wants to leave, Friesshart steps toward him with pike held  
out.)

FRIESSHART: - I' th' name o' th' Emperor!  
Halt there and stand!

TELL (seizes the pike): What would ye?  
Wherefore do ye hold me up?

FRIESSHART: You've broke the mandate, you must follow us.

LEUTHOLD: You have not shown obeisance to the hat.

TELL: Friend, let me go.

FRIESSHART: Away, away to prison!

WALTER: My father into prison! Help! Oh help!

(Calling into the stage.)

This way, you men, you goodly people, help,  
By force, by force, they take him prisoner.

(ROSSELMANN the priest and PETERMANN the sacristan come hither, with  
three other men.)

SACRISTAN: What gives?

ROSSELMANN: Why layst thou hand upon this man?

FRIESSHART: He is a foe o' th' Emperor, a traitor!

TELL (seizes him violently): A traitor, I!

ROSSELMANN: Thou errest, friend, that's Tell,  
A man of honor and good citizen.

WALTER (catches sight of Walter Furst and hastens to him):  
Grandfather, help, violence is done to father.

FRIESSHART: To prison, away!

WALTER FURST (rushing hither): I offer surety, halt!  
-- For God's sake, Tell, what is occurring here?

(MELCHTAL and STAUFFACHER come.)

FRIESSHART: The Governor's sovereign authority

He hath contemned, and will not recognize.

STAUFFACHER: That had been done by Tell?

MELCHTAL: Thou liest, rogue!

LEUTHOLD: He hath not shown obeisance to the hat.

WALTER FURST: And therefore he should go to prison?  
Friend, Accept my surety and let him free.

FRIESSHART: Stand surety for thyself and thine own life!  
We're doing, what we have to -- Hence with him!

MELCHTAL (to the country people):  
No, that is flagrant violence! Shall we endure,  
That one remove him, brashly, 'fore our eyes?

SACRISTAN: We are the stronger.  
Friends, allow it not,  
We have one back against the other here!

FRIESSHART: Who disobeys the order of the Governor?

THREE MORE COUNTRYMEN (rushing hither):  
We'll help. What's happ'ning?  
Strike them to the ground.

(HILDEGARD, MECHTHILD and ELSBETH return.)

TELL: I help myself indeed. Go, goodly people,  
Think you, if I had wanted to use strength,  
That I would be afraid before their pikes?

MELCHTAL (to FRIESSHART): Try, if you dare, to take him from our midst

WALTER FURST AND STAUFFACHER: Be calm! Be peaceful!

FRIESSHART (shouts): Riot and rebellion!

(One hears hunting horns.)

WIVES: Here comes the Governor!

FRIESSHART (raises his voice): Mutiny! Rebellion!

STAUFFACHER: Shout, 'til thou burstest, knave!

ROSSELMANN and MELCHTAL: Wilt thou be silent?

FRIESSHART (calls still louder):  
Come help, come help the servants of the law.

WALTER FURST: The Governor's here! Woe's us, what will occur!

(GESSLER on horseback, the falcon on his fist, RUDOLF DER HARRAS,  
BERTA and RUDENZ, a large retinue of armed servants, who form a circle  
of pikes around the entire stage.)

RUDOLF DER HARRAS: Room for the Governor!

GESSLER: Drive them from another!  
Why gather people here?  
Who calls for help?

(General silence.)

Who was't? I want to know it. (To FRIESSHART)  
Thou step forth!  
Who art thou and why holdest thou this man?

(He gives the falcon to a servant.)

FRIESSHART: Severest Lord,  
I am thy man in arms  
And duly-appointed watchman of the hat.  
This man I seized while in the very act,  
As he refused obeisance to the hat.  
I wanted to arrest him, as thou bad'st,  
And forcibly the people want to free him.

GESSLER (after a pause):  
Despisest thou so much thine Emperor, Tell,  
And me, who have here acted in his stead,  
That thou denyest the honor to the hat,  
Which I've hung up to test obedience?  
Thine evil aims thou hast betrayed to me.

TELL: Excuse me, gracious Lord!  
From thoughtlessness,  
Not from contempt of you is it occurred,  
Were I discreet, then would I not be Tell,  
I beg for mercy, it shan't occur again.

GESSLER (after some silence):  
Thou art a master of the crossbow, Tell,  
One says, thou'd take it up with any archer?

WALTER TELL: That must be true, my Lord -- my father shot  
An apple from a tree at a hundred strides.

GESSLER: Is that thy boy there, Tell?

TELL: Yes, gracious Lord.

GESSLER: Hast thou yet other children?

TELL: Two boys, Lord.

GESSLER: And which one is't, whom thou dost love the most?

TELL: Lord, both alike are children dear to me.

GESSLER: Now, Tell! since at a hundred strides thou hitt'st  
An apple from a tree,  
So thou wilt have To prove thine art to me --  
Now take the crossbow --  
Thou hast it there at hand -- and make thee ready,  
To shoot an apple from the young boy's head --  
Yet I would counsel, aim it well, that thou  
The apple hitt'st with the initial shot,  
For miss't thou it, so is thine own head lost.

(All give signs of terror.)

TELL: Lord -- what monstrosity do you demand  
Of me -- I'm from the head of mine own child --

-- No, no, my gracious Lord, that have you not  
In mind -- Forbid it merciful God -- that you  
Could not in earnest from a father ask!

GESSLER: Now thou shalt shoot the apple from the head  
O' th' stripling -- I desire and will it.

TELL: Should aim my crossbow at the darling head  
Of mine own child -- I'd rather perish first!

GESSLER: Thou shootest or thou die'st with thine own boy.

TELL: I should become the murd'rer of my child!  
Lord, you do not have children -- you know not,  
What is bestirr'd within a father's heart.

GESSLER: Oh, Tell, thou art now suddenly discreet!  
They said to me, that thou wouldst be a dreamer,  
And wander'st from the ways of other men.  
Thou lov'st unusual things -- thus have I now  
Picked out a special daring task for thee.  
An other would consider well --  
Thou shut'st thine eyes and seizest on it heartily.

BERTA: O do not jest, my Lord! with these poor people!  
You see them standing pale and trembling here --  
They're little used to humor from your mouth.

GESSLER: Who tells you, that I jest?

(Reaches toward a branch of the tree, which hangs down over him.)

Here is the apple. Make room for him --  
And let him take his distance,  
As custom is -- I give him eighty strides --  
Not fewer, and not more -- It was his boast,  
That at a hundred he could hit his man --  
Now, archer, hit, and do not miss the mark!

RUDOLF DER HARRAS: God, this grows earnest --  
Fall, boy, on your knees,  
It counts, and beg the Governor for thy life.

WALTER FURST (aside to MELCHTAL, who scarcely controls his impatience):  
Constrain yourself, I beg of you, keep calm.

BERTA (to the GOVERNOR): Let this suffice, my Lord!  
It is inhuman,  
To play thus with a father's anxious fears.  
If this poor man as well hath forfeited  
Both life and limb through his slight guilt, by God!  
He had already suffered tenfold death.  
Release him now uninjured to his hut,  
He hath now come to know you, and this hour  
He and his children's children will remember.

GESSLER: Open a lane there -- Quickly  
Why waitest thou? Thy life is forfeit, thee  
I can destroy, And see, I mercifully place thy fate  
Upon the art of thine own practiced hand.  
He can't complain about the harsh decree,  
Whom one makes master of his destiny.

Thou boastest of thy certain eye. Well then!  
'Tis time then, Archer, to display thine art,  
The aim is worthy and the prize is great!  
To hit the black within the target, that  
Can others do as well, to me he's master,  
Who's certain of his art at any time,  
Whose heart doth not disturb his hand nor eye.

WALTER FURST (throws himself down before him):  
Lord Governor, we recognize your highness,  
Yet now let mercy pass for justice, take  
The half of my possessions, take them all,  
But from this ghastly deed release a father!

WALTER TELL: Grandfather, do not kneel fore the false man!  
I Say, where I am to stand, I'm not afraid,  
My father hits the bird in midst of flight,  
He will not miss the heart of his own child.

STAUFFACHER: Lord Governor, doth his innocence not move you?

ROSSELMANN: Remember, that there is a God in Heaven,  
To whom you must account for all your deeds.

GESSLER (points to the boy):  
Bind him to yonder linden tree!

WALTER TELL: Bind me! No, I will not be bound.  
I will keep still,  
Just like a lamb, nor will I even breathe.  
But if you bind me, no, then I can not,  
Then I shall surely rage against my bonds.

RUDOLF DER HARRAS: Just let your eyes at least be covered, boy.

WALTER TELL: And why the eyes? Do you think,  
I'm afraid O' th' shaft from father's hand?  
I will await It firmly, nor so much as bat an eyelash.  
-- Quick, father, show them, that thou art an archer,  
He doubts thou art, he thinks to ruin us --  
To spite the ruthless tyrant, shoot and hit.

(He goes to the linden, the apple is placed on his head.)

MELCHTAL (to the country people): What?  
Shall this outrage be performed  
before Our very eyes?  
Whereunto have we sworn?

STAUFFACHER: It is in vain.  
We have no weapons here,  
You see the wood of lances that surrounds us.

MELCHTAL: O would that we had acted with quick deeds,  
God pardon those, who counseled to delay!

GESSLER (to Tell): To work!  
One carries weapons not in vain.  
'Tis dangerous, to bear a murder weapon,  
And on the archer may the shaft rebound.  
This haughty right, the peasant doth assume,  
Offends the highest master of the land.

Let none be armed, except he who commands.  
It pleases you, to bear the shaft and bow,  
Well, then will I give you the mark thereto.

TELL (bends the crossbow and inserts the shaft):  
Open the lane! Make room!

STAUFFACHER: What, Tell? You mean to --  
By no means -- You tremble,  
Your hand is shaking, and your knees give way --

TELL (lets the crossbow sink): It swims before mine eyes!

WIVES: Oh God in Heaven!

TELL (to the GOVERNOR): Excuse me from this shot.  
Here is my heart!

(He tears open his breast.)

Call forth your mounted men and strike me down.

GESSLER: I do not want thy life, I want the shot.  
-- Thou canst do all things,  
Tell, at naught despair'st thou,  
The rudder thou directest as the bow,  
No storm frights thee, when there is need of rescue  
Now, savior, help thy self -- thou savest all!

(TELL stands in fearful battle, with his hands moving convulsively and his rolling eyes directed now at the GOVERNOR, now at the heaven. -- Suddenly he reaches into his quiver, takes out a second arrow and sticks it in his collar. The GOVERNOR observes all of these motions.)

WALTER TELL (beneath the linden):  
Father, take shot, I'm not afraid.

TELL: I must!

(He gathers himself together and takes aim.)

RUDENZ (who the entire time stood in the most violent excitement and restrained himself with force, steps forward):  
Lord Governor, further you will not proceed  
You will not -- It was surely but a test --  
The end you have achieved -- But too far driven  
Severity will miss its own wise end,  
And much too tightly stretched the bow will split.

GESSLER: Be silent, till you're called on.

RUDENZ: I will speak  
I may, the King's esteem is holy to me,  
But such a rule as this must hatred earn.  
That's not the purpose of the King -- I may  
Maintain -- Such cruelty my people don't  
Deserve, thereto are you not authorized.

GESSLER: Ha, you are growing bold!

RUDENZ: I have been silent  
At every grievous action, which I saw,  
My seeing eyes have I kept tightly closed,

My overswelling and indignant heart  
Have I pressed downwards deep within my bosom.  
Yet to be silent further were now treason  
Unto my fatherland and to the Emperor.

BERTA (throws herself between him and the GOVERNOR):  
O God, you rouse this maniac still more.

RUDENZ: My people I abandoned, I renounced  
The kindred of my blood, I broke all bonds  
Of nature, to attach myself to you --  
The best for all I hoped thus to promote,  
When strengthened I the power of the Emperor --  
The blind hath fallen from mine eyes --  
With dread I see myself led up to the abyss --  
My independent judgment you've misled,  
My honest heart seduced -- With best intent,  
I had well-nigh achieved my people's ruin.

GESSLER: Audacious man, this language to thy Lord?

RUDENZ: The Emperor is my Lord, not you --  
I'm free as you are born and I compare myself  
With you in every virtue of a knight.  
And stood you not here in the Emperor's name,  
Which I esteem, e'en where it is disgraced,  
My glove I would throw down 'fore you, you should  
Give answer to me after knightly custom. --  
Yes, beckon to your mounted men -- I'm not  
Defenseless here, as they (pointing to the people)  
I have a sword, And who comes near to me

STAUFFACHER (calls): The apple's fallen!

(Whilst everyone turned himself toward this side and BERTA threw herself between RUDENZ and the GOVERNOR, TELL hath discharged his arrow.)

ROSSELMANN: The boy's alive!

MANY VOICES: The apple hath been struck!

(WALTER FURST reels and threatens to sink, BERTA holds him.)

GESSLER (astonished): He hath then shot the arrow?  
How? the madman!

BERTA: The boy's alive! come to yourself, good father!

WALTER TELL (comes running with the apple):  
Father, here is the apple Knew I well,  
That thou would'st never injure thine own boy.

(TELL stood with body bent forward, as though he wanted to follow the arrow -- the crossbow drops from his hand -- as he sees the boy come, he hastens to meet him with open arms and lifts him with intense ardor to his heart, in this position he collapses exhausted. All stand moved.)

BERTA: O gracious Heaven!

WALTER FURST (to father and son):



Children! my dear children!

STAUFFACHER: Oh God be praised!!

LEUTHOLD: That was a shot! Thereof  
Will they still speak unto the end of time.

RUDOLF DER HARRAS: They will relate the tale o' th' archer Tell,  
So long the mountains stand upon their ground.

(Hands the GOVERNOR the apple.)

GESSLER: By God, the apple's shot right through the middle!  
It was a master shot, I have to praise him.

ROSSELMANN: The shot was good, yet woe to him, who him  
Thereto hath driven, that he tempted God.

STAUFFACHER: Come to yourself, Tell, rise, you've like a man  
Redeemed yourself, and can go freely home.

ROSSELMANN: Come, come and bring the son unto his mother.

(They want to lead him away.)

GESSLER: Tell, listen!

TELL (comes back): What command you, Lord?

GESSLER: Thou stuck'st  
A second arrow on thyself -- Yes, yes,  
I saw it well -- What meantest thou therewith?

TELL (embarrassed):  
Lord, that is but a custom with all archers.

GESSLER: No, Tell, I will not let that answer pass,  
There must have been some other purpose to it.  
Say to me truthfully and gladly, Tell,  
Whate'er it be, thy life I promise thee.  
Whe'reto the second shaft?

TELL: Well then, O Lord,  
Since you have promised to ensure my life,  
So will I thoroughly report the truth.

(He pulls the shaft from his collar and looks at the GOVERNOR with a  
frighful glance.)

This second arrow I had shot through -- you,  
If with the first I'd struck my darling child,  
And you -- in truth! I would not then have missed.

GESSLER: Well, Tell! I've promised to ensure thy life,  
I gave my knightly word, that I will keep --  
But since I have perceived thine evil mind,  
I'll have thee taken and put under guard,  
Where neither moon nor sun will shine on thee,  
Thereby I shall be safer 'fore thine arrows.  
Arrest him, servants! Bind him up!

(TELL is bound.)

STAUFFACHER: What, Lord?  
How could you treat a man in such a way,  
In whom God's hand is visibly proclaimed?

GESSLER: Now let us see, if it will save him twice.  
-- Bring him unto my ship, I'll follow straight Away,  
I'll pilot him myself to Kussnacht.

ROSSELMANN: You will imprison him outside the land?

COUNTRY PEOPLE: That you may not, that may the Emperor not,  
That violates the charters of our freedom!

GESSLER: Where are they?  
Hath the Emperor confirmed them?  
He hath them not as yet confirmed -- This favor  
Must needs be earned first through obedience.  
You are all rebels 'gainst the Emperor's court  
And foster here audacious mutiny.  
I know you all -- I see completely through you --  
Him I am now removing from your midst,  
Yet all of you are sharers in his guilt.  
Who's smart, learn to be silent and obey.

(He departs, BERTA, RUDENZ, HARRAS and servants follow, FRIESSHART and  
LEUTHOLD remain behind.)

WALTER FURST (in violent pain):  
It is foreby, he hath resolved, to bring  
Destruction on myself with all my house!

STAUFFACHER (to TELL): O why had you to rouse the tyrant's rage!

TELL: Restrain himself, who felt my pangs of pain!

STAUFFACHER: Now everything, oh everything is lost!  
With you are we all fettered and enchained!

COUNTRY PEOPLE (ring around TELL):  
With you our final comfort goes away!

LEUTHOLD (approaches): Tell, I have pity -- yet  
I must obey.

TELL: Farewell!

WALTER TELL (clinging to him with intense pain):  
O Father! Father! Dearest Father!

TELL (lifts his arms toward the heaven):  
Up yonder is thy father! Call on him!

STAUFFACHER: Tell, shall I say naught of you to your wife?

TELL (lifts the boy with ardor to his breast):  
The boy's uninjured, God will give me help.

(Tears himself away quickly and follows the armed servants.)

---

ACT IV. CONTENTS:

\* SCENE I.

The eastern shore of the Vierwaldstattensee. The unusually shaped rugged rocks in the West close the prospect. The lake is agitated, violently roaring and raging, between which lightning and peals of thunder. KUNZ VON GERSAU. Fisherman and Fisherboy.

\* SCENE II.

The noble court at Attinghausen. The BARON, in an armchair, dying. WALTER FURST, STAUFFACHER, MELCHTAL and BAUMGARTEN busy around him. WALTER TELL kneeling before the dying man.

\* SCENE III.

The hollow lane near Kussnacht. One climbs hereunder from behind between rocks, and the travellers are seen already on the high ground, before they appear upon the stage. Rocks surround the entire stage, on one of the foremost there is a projection overgrown with bushes.

---

ACT II

---

\* SCENE I.

The eastern shore of the Vierwaldstattensee. The unusually shaped rugged rocks in the West close the prospect. The lake is agitated, violently roaring and raging, between which lightning and peals of thunder. KUNZ VON GERSAU. Fisherman and Fisherboy.

---

KUNZ: I saw it with mine eyes, you can believe me,  
It all hath happened, as I said to you.

FISHERMAN: Tell led away a prisoner to Kussnacht,  
The best man in the land, the bravest arm,  
If it should once be meant for liberty.

KUNZ: The Gov'rnor bears him up the lake himself,  
They were just now about to board the ship,  
When I set off from Fluelen, yet the storm,  
That even now is on its way, and which  
Compelled me also, suddenly to land here,  
May very well have hindered their departure.

FISHERMAN: Tell now in fetters, in the Gov'rnor's power!  
O surely, he'll entomb him deep enough,  
That he'll not see the light of day again!  
For he must fear the righteous vengeance of  
The free man, whom he's grievously provoked!

KUNZ: The Magistrate as well, the noble Lord  
Of Attinghaus, 'tis said, lies near to death.

FISHERMAN: So breaks the final anchor of our hope!  
He was the only one, who still might raise  
His voice in favor of the people's rights!

KUNZ: The storm is growing worse. So fare ye well,

I'll take some quarters in the town, for none  
Will give more thought today to a departure.

(Exits.)

FISHERMAN: Tell taken prisoner and the Baron dead!  
Lift up thy brazen forehead, tyranny,  
Cast all your shame away, the mouth of truth  
Is dumb, the seeing eye is blinded now,  
The arm, that should have saved us, is in fetters!

BOY: It's hailing hard, come in the cottage,  
Father, It is not good, to house here in the open.

FISHERMAN: Rage on, ye winds, descend in flames, ye Lightning,  
Ye clouds burst open, pour hereunder, streams  
O' th' heav'n and drown the land! Annihilate  
The unborn generations in their seed!  
Ye-savage elements become our lord,  
Ye bears come back, ye ancient wolves return  
To this great wilderness, the land is yours,  
Who wants to live here without liberty!

BOY: Hark, how the chasm roars, the whirlpool howls,  
So hath it never raged within this gorge!

FISHERMAN: To take aim at the head of his own child,  
Such had before been ordered of no father!  
And should not nature in ferocious wrath  
Rise in revolt -- O I'd not be surprised,  
If th' rocks were now to bow into the lake,  
If yonder jagged peaks, yon tow'rs of ice,  
Which since creation's day have never thawed,  
Were now to melt down from their lofty summits,  
If th' mountains break, if ancient crevices  
Collapse, that then a second flood would come  
To swallow up all dwellings of the living!

(One hears ringing.)

BOY: Hark ye, they're ringing on the mountain yonder,  
They've surely seen a vessel in distress,  
And toll the bell, that we be called to prayer.

(Climbs upon a high ground.)

FISHERMAN: Woe to the vessel, that now underway,  
Within this dreadful cradle is now rocked!  
Here is the rudder useless and the helmsman,  
The storm is master, wind and waves play ball  
With human beings -- There is near and far  
No haven, which accords him friendly shelter!  
Sheer and ascending jaggedly the rocks  
Stare inhospitably across at him,  
And show him but their stony jagged breast.

BOY: (points left): Father, a ship, it comes from Fluelen hence.

FISHERMAN: God help the wretched people!  
If the storm is once entangled in this waterway,  
Then it will rage with th' anguish of a beast,  
That strikes against the cage's iron bars,

Howling it seeks to find a door in vain,  
For it is on all sides confined by rocks,  
Which high as Heaven wall the narrow pass.

(He climbs upon the high ground.)

BOY: It is the master's ship from Uri, Father,  
I know't by its red roof and by its flag.

FISHERMAN: Judgments of God!  
Yes, he it is himself,  
The Gov'rnor, who here sails --  
There ships he hence,  
And carries in the ship his own offense!  
Swift hath the arm of the avenger found him,  
Now over him he knows the stronger Lord,  
These waves will not pay heed unto his voice,  
These rocky cliffs will not bow down their heads  
Before his hat -- My boy, now do not pray,  
Do not attempt to stay the Judge's arm!

BOY: I pray not for the Governor -- I pray  
For Tell, who is upon the ship with him.

FISHERMAN: O mindlessness o' th' sightless elements!  
Must thou, to catch a single guilty man,  
Destroy the ship together with the helmsman!

BOY: Look, look, they were already safely by  
The Buggisgrat, but now the force o' th' storm,  
Which is rebounding from the Teafelmunster,  
Hurls them back unto the great Axenberg. --  
I see them no more.

FISHERMAN: There is the Hakmesser,  
Where many ship already hath been broken.  
If they don't steer thereover prudently,  
So will the ship be shattered on the rocks,  
Which sink precipitously in the depths.  
-- They have a helmsman who is very good  
On board, if one could save them, it were Tell,  
Yet they have fettered both his arms and hands.

(WILHELM TELL with his crossbow. He comes with rapid strides, glances  
around in amazement and displays the most violent movement. When he is  
in the middle of the stage, he throws himself down, his hands to the  
earth and then stretching out to the heaven.)

BOY (notices him): Look, Father, who's the man, who's kneeling there?

FISHERMAN: He clutches at the earth with both his hands,  
And doth appear to be beside himself.

BOY (comes forward): What see I Father!  
Father, come and see!

FISHERMAN (approaches): Who is it? -- God in Heaven!  
What! Is't Tell?  
How come you hither? Speak!

BOY: But were you not  
In yonder ship imprisoned and bound up?

FISHERMAN: Were they not taking you away to Kussnacht?

TELL (stands up): I am set free.

FISHERMAN AND BOY: Set free! O miracle of God!

BOY: Whence come you here?

TELL: From yonder vessel.

FISHERMAN: What?

BOY (simultaneously):  
Where is the Gov'rnor?

TELL: Drifting on the waves.

FISHERMAN: Is't possible? But you?  
How are you here?  
How 'scaped you from your bonds and from the storm?

TELL: By God's most gracious providence -- Attend!

FISHERMAN AND BOY:  
O speak on, speak on!

TELL: Do you know, what's come  
To pass in Altorf?

FISHERMAN: I know all, speak on!

TELL: Of how the Gov'rnor had me seized and bound,  
And would convey me to his fort in Kussnacht.

FISHERMAN: And that with you at Fluelen he embarked!  
All this we know, say, how have you escaped?

TELL: I lay there in the ship, fast bound with cords,  
Defenseless, an abandoned man -- nor hope I,  
To see again the joyful light o' th' sun,  
The lovely countenance of wife and children,  
And cheerlessly I look i' th' waste of water --

FISHERMAN: O wretched man!

TELL: So then we disembark,  
The Governor, Rudolf der Harras and the servants.  
And yet my quiver and my crossbow lay  
Upon the bow beside the pilot's rudder.  
And just as we now come around the bend  
Near little Axen, God ordained it so,  
That such an awful murd'rous thunderstorm  
Burst forth abruptly from the Gotthard gorges,  
That every rower's heart within him sank  
And all thought it their wretched fate to drown.  
Then heard I, how one of his servants turned  
To th' Governor and spake these words to him:  
You see your need and that of ours, my Lord,  
And that we all are near the edge of death --  
And yet the helmsmen know not what to do  
Because of their great fear and are not well  
Apprised o' th' course to take -- But now here's Tell,

A robust man and knows to steer a ship,  
What, if we were to use him in our need?  
Then spake the Governor to me: Tell, if  
Thou dar'st, to help us to escape this storm,  
So I've a mind to free thee from thy bonds.  
But I then spake: Yes, Lord, with help of God  
I'll venture it, and help us to escape.  
So from my bonds I was released and stood  
Up at the helm and steered uprightly forth.  
Yet glance I sideways, where my weapons lay,  
And on the shore I sharply look to see,  
Where there might be a chance for my escape.  
And when I did perceive a shelf of rocks,  
That sprang forth flattened out into the lake

FISHERMAN: I know't, 'tis at the foot of the great Axen,  
Yet I can't deem it possible - it rises  
So steep -- to reach it springing from a boat --

TELL: I bade the men, to put forth handily,  
Until we came before the rocky ledge,  
There, cried I, shall the worst be overcome --  
And as we briskly rowing soon arrived,  
I pray that God be merciful, and force,  
With all my body's power pressed together,  
The vessel's bow hence to the rocky wall --  
Now quickly snatching up mine arms,  
I swing Myself upon the ledge by leaping high,  
And with a forceful footkick to my rear,  
I send the little craft i' th' gorge of water --  
There let it, as God wills, drift on the waves!  
So am I here, delivered from the might  
O' th' storm and from the might far worse of man.

FISHERMAN: Tell, Tell, the Lord hath wrought a miracle  
Through you, I scarce can trust it to my senses --  
But say on! Whence intend you now to go,  
For there's no safety for you, in so far  
The Gov'rnor hath escaped this storm alive.

TELL: I hear him say, as I lay bound in chains  
Upon the ship, he fain would land at Brunnen,  
And crossing Schwyz bring me unto his castle.

FISHERMAN: Will he then make his way thence over land?

TELL: He plans to.

FISHERMAN: O so hide yourself without  
Delay, not twice God helps you from his hands.

TELL: Name me the nearest way to Arth and Kussnacht.

FISHERMAN: The open highway leads by way of Steinen,  
But yet a shorter way and more concealed  
My boy can take you on by way of Lowerz.

TELL (gives him his hand):  
May God reward your kindness.  
Fare ye well.

(Goes and comes back again.)

-- Have you not also sworn an oath at Rutli?  
Methinks, I heard your name --

FISHERMAN: Yes, I was there,  
And I have sworn the oath unto the League.

TELL: So speed to Burglen, do me this one favor,  
My wife despairs of me, report to her,  
That I've escaped and am now well concealed.

FISHERMAN: Yet whither shall I tell her, that you've fled?

TELL: You'll find my father-in-law there by her side  
And others, who have sworn the oath in Rutli --  
They should be resolute and of good courage,  
For Tell is free and master of his arm,  
And soon shall they hear further news from me.

FISHERMAN: What have you now in mind?  
Reveal it freely.

TELL: Is it once done, 'twill also be discussed.

(Exits.)

FISHERMAN: Show him the way, Jenni --  
God be with him!  
He leads to th' goal, whate'er he's undertaken.

(Exits.)

---

\* SCENE II.

The noble court at Attinghausen. The BARON, in an armchair, dying. WALTER FURST, STAUFFACHER, MELCHTAL and BAUMGARTEN busy around him. WALTER TELL kneeling before the dying man.

---

WALTER FURST: It is foreby with him, he's over there.

STAUFFACHER: He lies not as one dead --  
Behold, the feather  
Doth move upon his lips! His sleep is now  
At rest, and peacefully his features smile.

(BAUMGARTEN goes to the door and speaks with someone.)

WALTER FURST (to BAUMGARTEN):  
Who is't?

BAUMGARTEN (comes back):  
It's Lady Hedwig, your own daughter,  
She'd like to speak with you, would see the boy.

(WALTER TELL stands up.)

WALTER FURST: Can I console her now?  
Am I consoled Myself?  
Is every pain heaped on my head?



HEDWIG (pushing her way in):  
Where is my child? Let me, I must see him --

STAUFFACHER: Be calm, bethink, you're in the house of death --

HEDWIG (falls upon her boy):  
My Walty! O he is alive.

WALTER TELL (clings to her): Poor Mother!

HEDWIG: Can it be truly so?  
Art thou unharmed?

(Examines him with anxious care)

Is't possible? Could he take aim at thee?  
How could he? O he hath no heart -- He could  
Dispatch the arrow at his very child!

WALTER FURST: He did with dread, with pain dismembered soul,  
Compelled he did it, since it meant his life.

HEDWIG: O if he had a father's heart, before  
He'd done it, he'd have died a thousand times!

STAUFFACHER:  
You should give praise to God's kind dispensation,  
Which guided it so well --

HEDWIG: Can I forget,  
What could have been the issue God in Heaven!  
And live I eighty years -- I'll see the boy  
Forever bound, his father aim at him  
And ever flies the shaft into my heart.

MELCHTAL: If you knew, how the Gov'rnor taunted him!

HEDWIG: O brutal heart of men!  
If once their pride  
Hath been abused, then they heed nothing more,  
In the blind frenzy of the game he'll stake  
The child's existence and the mother's heart!

BAUMGARTEN: Is then your husband's lot not hard enough,  
That you insult him more with harsh rebuke?  
Have you no feelings for his sufferings?

HEDWIG (turns around toward him and looks upon him with a large view):  
Hast thou tears only for thy friend's distress? --  
Where were you, when they put that excellent man  
In shackles? Where was your assistance then?  
You just looked on, you let the horrible occur,  
You bore it patiently, that they led off  
Your friend from out your midst --  
Hath Tell e'er acted In such a way to you?  
Did he stand there Lamenting,  
When the Gov'rnor's troopers were  
Pursuing thee, or when the raging lake  
Roared out before thee? Not with idle tears  
Bemoaned he thee, he sprang into the vessel, wife  
And child forgot he and delivered thee --

WALTER FURST: What could we dare to do to rescue him,  
Since we were few in number and unarmed!

HEDWIG (throws herself upon his breast):  
O Father! And as well hast thou lost him!  
The country, we have all of us lost him!  
He misses all of us, ah! we miss him!  
God save his very soul before despair.  
To him down in the solitary dungeon  
Doth come no friendly comfort -- Fell he ill!  
Ah, in the prison's dank obscurity  
He must fall ill --  
Just as the Alpine rose  
Turns pale and withers in the swampy air,  
So there's no life for him but in the light  
O' th' sun, and in the balsam stream of air.  
Imprisoned! He! His very breath is freedom,  
He can not live in the rank breath o' th' grave.

STAUFFACHER: Becalm yourself.  
For we all want to act,  
To open up his prison doors.

HEDWIG: What can you do without him? -- Just so long  
As Tell was free, yes, then there was still hope,  
Then innocence could always find a friend,  
Then did the persecuted have a helper,  
Tell rescued all of you -- But all of you  
Together could not free him from his chains!

(The BARON awakes.)

BAUMGARTEN: He's stirring, still!

ATTINGHAUSEN (sitting up): Where is he?

STAUFFACHER: Who?

ATTINGHAUSEN: I need him,  
In my last moment he abandons me!

STAUFFACHER: He means the squire --  
Have they sent after him?

WALTER FURST: They have sent after him --  
Be comforted!  
For he hath found his heart, he's one of ours.

ATTINGHAUSEN: Hath he then spoken for his fatherland?

STAUFFACHER: With hero's daring.

ATTINGHAUSEN: Wherefore comes he not,  
That he may now receive my final blessing?  
I feel, that soon my life will swiftly end.

STAUFFACHER: Not so, my noble Lord!  
For this short sleep  
Hath quickened you, and now your look is bright.

ATTINGHAUSEN: The pain is life and even it hath left me,

My suffering is, just like my hope, at end.

(He notices the boy.)

Who is the boy?

WALTER FURST: Give him your blessing, Lord!  
He is my grandson and is fatherless.

(HEDWIG sinks down with the boy before the dying man.)

ATTINGHAUSEN: And fatherless  
I leave you all, yes all Behind --  
And woe is me, that my last sight  
Hath seen the ruin of the fatherland!  
Must I attain the utmost height of life,  
To perish utterly with all my hopes!

STAUFFACHER (to WALTER FURST):  
Shall he depart amid this dark affliction?  
Shall we not brighten up his final hours  
With beauteous beams of hope? -- O noble Baron!  
Raise up your spirit! We are not entirely  
Abandoned, are not lost beyond all rescue.

ATTINGHAUSEN: Who is to save you?

WALTER FURST: We ourselves. Now hear!  
The Cantons three have to each other pledged  
Their solemn word, to drive away the tyrants.  
The League has now been formed, a holy oath  
Binds us together. Action will be taken,  
Before the year begins anew its cycle,  
Your ashes shall repose in a free land.

ATTINGHAUSEN: O say to me!  
The League has now been formed?

MELCHTAL: On the same day the Forest  
Cantons will Rise up all three of one accord.  
All is prepared, and to this hour the secret is  
Well kept, though many hundreds share in it.  
The ground is hollow underneath the tyrants,  
The days of their continued rule are numbered,  
And soon no trace of them will e'er be found.

ATTINGHAUSEN: But what of all the fortresses i th' land?

MELCHTAL: On the same day they all shall fall to us.

ATTINGHAUSEN: And are the nobles party to this League?

STAUFFACHER: We hope for their assistance, when it counts,  
But now the peasant on his own hath sworn.

ATTINGHAUSEN (raises himself up slowly, with great astonishment):  
And hath the peasant ventured such a deed,  
With his own means, with no help from the nobles,  
Hath he relied so much on his own strength --  
Yes, then there is no further need of ours,  
We can descend in comfort to our graves,  
For after us -- the majesty of man

Will live and be maintained by others' strengths.

(He lays his hand upon the head of the child, who lies before him on his knee.)

Upon this head, whereon the apple lay,  
Your new and better freedom shall grow green,  
The old is falling down, the times are changing,  
And from the ruins blossoms forth new life.

STAUFFACHER (to WALTER FURST): See, what a splendor pours forth round his eye!  
That is not the extinction of mere nature,  
That is the beam of renovated life.

ATTINGHAUSEN: The noble climbs down from his ancient castle  
And swears his civic oath unto the cities,  
In Uchtland, and in Thurgau it's begun,  
The noble Bern lifts up her ruling head,  
And Freiburg is a stronghold of the free,  
The busy Zurich arms its guilds to form  
A host prepared for war -- it breaks the might  
Of kings against her everlasting walls --

(He speaks the following in the tone of a seer -- his speech rises to inspiration.)

The princes see I and the noble lords  
Equipped in suits of armor coming forth,  
To war upon a harmless folk of herdsmen.  
'Twill be a fight unto the death, and glorious  
Will many pass become by bloody decision.  
The peasant hurls himself with naked breast,  
A willing sacrifice, i' th' troop of lances,  
He breaks them, and the blood o' th' noble falls,  
And freedom lifts its winning banner high.

(Grasping WALTER FURST's and STAUFFACHER's hands.)

Therefore hold fast together -- fast and always --  
No place of freedom be strange to another --  
Set watches high upon your mountain tops,  
That League with League can quickly be assembled --  
Be one-- be one-- be one--

(He falls back on the cushion -- his hands now soulless still hold the others clasped. FURST and STAUFFACHER regard him for some time still in silence, then they step away, each one given over to his own grief. Meanwhile the servants have quickly forced themselves in, they approach with signs of a more silent or more agitated grief, some kneel down by him and shed tears on his hand, during this silent scene the castle bell tolls.)

(RUDENZ to former.)

RUDENZ (entering hastily): Lives he?  
O tell me, can he hear me still?

WALTER FURST (points hence with averted face):  
You are our feudal lord and our protector,  
And now this castle hath another name.

RUDENZ (beholds the corpse and stands seized by intense pain):  
O gracious God! -- Comes my remorse too late?  
Could he not live a few more pulses longer,  
That he might see my altered heart?  
Oh, I have held his faithful voice in scorn,  
While he still wandered in the light -- He is  
Now gone, is gone eternally and leaves  
Me with this heavy unpaid debt! -- O speak!  
Did he depart this life displeased with me?

STAUFFACHER: He heard while he was dying, what you've done,  
And blessed the courage, with which you have spoken!

RUDENZ (kneels down before the dead man):  
Yes, sacred vestige of a precious man!  
Thou soulless body! Here I pledge to thee  
Upon thy hand of death now cold --  
I have forever broken all my foreign bonds,  
I am restored once more unto my people,  
I am a Schweizer and I wish to be --  
With my entire soul --

(Standing up.)

Mourn for our friend,  
The father of us all, yet don't despair!  
'Tis not his lands alone that fall to me,  
His heart -- his spirit hath devolved on me,  
And my fresh youth shall execute for you,  
Whate'er his great old age still owed to you. --  
O venerable father, give your hand to me!  
And give me yours as well! Melchtal, you too!  
Bethink you not! O do not turn away!  
Receive my promise and my solemn oath.

WALTER FURST: Give him your hand.  
For his repentent heart Deserves our trust.

MELCHTAL: You've held the countryman in disregard.  
Now speak, what is one to expect from you?

RUDENZ: O think not of the errors of my youth!

STAUFFACHER (to MELCHTAL): Be one!  
That was our father's final word,  
Be mindful now thereof!

MELCHTAL: Here is my hand!  
The farmer's handshake, noble Lord, is also  
A good man's word!  
What is the knight without us?  
And our estate is older far than yours.

RUDENZ: I honor it, and with my sword shall guard it.

MELCHTAL: The arm, Lord Baron, which subjects the hard  
Earth to itself and fructifies her womb,  
Can just as well protect the breast of man.

RUDENZ: You shall defend my breast, and I will yours,  
So are we each one through the other strong. --  
Yet whereto talk we, while our fatherland

Is still a prey of foreign tyranny?  
If first the soil is swept clean of the foe,  
Then we'll no doubt be reconciled in peace.

(After that, he pauses for a moment.)

You're silent? Have you naught to tell me? How?  
So must I force myself against your will  
Into the secret bus'ness of your League. --  
You have convened -- you've sworn an oath at Rutli --  
I know -- know all, that you transacted there,  
And what was not confided me by you,  
I've kept as if it were a sacred pledge.  
I never was my country's foe, trust me,  
And never had I acted there against you. --  
Yet wrongly did you act, to put it off,  
The hour is pressing, and swift action's needed --  
Tell was the sacrifice of your delay --

STAUFFACHER: We swore an oath to wait 'til Christmas Day.

RUDENZ: I was not there, I have not sworn thereto.  
Wait if you will, I'm acting.

MELCHTAL: What? You would --

RUDENZ: I count me now among the country's fathers,  
And it is my first duty, to protect you.

WALTER FURST: To give this precious dust unto the earth,  
Is now your nearest duty and most sacred.

RUDENZ: When we have freed the land, then we can lay  
The fresh-cut wreath of victory on his bier. --  
O friends! I do not have your cause alone,  
I also have mine own which I must fight  
Out with these tyrants -- Hear and know!  
My Berta hath disappeared, abducted secretly,  
With brazen crime from out our very midst!

STAUFFACHER: And hath the tyrant dared commit an act  
So violent 'gainst a free and noble woman?

RUDENZ: Alas my friends! I promised help to you,  
And now must I implore it first from you.  
My loved one's stolen, torn away from me,  
Who knows, where the berserker's hidden her,  
What violence they may make bold to use,  
To force her heart into the hated bond!  
Forsake me not, O help me to her rescue --  
She loves you, she deserves it of the land,  
That all should take up arms in her behalf --

WALTER FURST : What would you do?

RUDENZ: How can I know? Alas!  
In this dark night, which veils her destiny,  
In monstrous dread of this uncertainty,  
Where I know nothing firm to seize upon,  
There's only this that's clear within my soul:  
Beneath the ruins of the tyrant's might  
Alone can she be brought forth from the grave,

The fortresses must all we overcome,  
If we perhaps can penetrate her prison.

MELCHTAL: Come, lead us forth. We follow you.  
Why leave until tomorrow, what we can today?  
Tell was still free, when we at Rutli swore,  
The monstrous thing had not yet taken place.  
The times now bring about another law,  
Who is so cowardly, to waver now!

RUDENZ: Meanwhile well-armed and ready for the task  
Await the fiery signals on the hills,  
For swifter than an herald's canvas flies,  
Shall you have tidings of our victory,  
And you shall see the welcome flames shine forth,  
Then strike upon the foe, as lightning bolts,  
And smash the edifice of tyranny.

(Exits.)

---

\* SCENE III.

The hollow lane near Kussnacht. One climbs hereunder from behind between  
rocks, and the travellers are seen already on the high ground, before they  
appear upon the stage. Rocks surround the entire stage, on one of the  
foremost there is a projection overgrown with bushes.

---

TELL (enters with his crossbow):  
He needs must come along this hollow lane,  
There is no other way to Kussnacht -- Here I'll do't --  
The opportunity is good.  
I'm hidden from him by yon elder bush,  
And down from there my shaft can reach to him,  
The narrowness o' th' way prevents pursuit.  
Now settle thine account with Heaven, Gov'rnor,  
Thou must be gone, thy time hath run its course.  
I lived a quiet, harmless life-- My shaft  
Was only aimed at forest animals,  
My thoughts were absolutely free of murder --  
Thou hast aroused me from my peaceful state,  
Into a seething dragon's poison hast  
Thou turned the milk of my good disposition,  
Thou hast accustomed me to monstrous things --  
Who took aim at the head of his own child,  
Can just as well strike at the heart o' th' foe.  
My wretched children, in their innocence,  
My faithful wife must I protect before  
Thy fury, Gov'rnor -- Since, when I last drew  
My bowstring -- when my hand was quivering --  
When thou with gruesome devilish delight  
Mad'st me, take aim at th' head of mine own child --  
When I writhed begging helplessly before thee,  
'Twas then I took within my inner self  
A fearful solemn oath, which only God  
Did hear, that my next arrow's foremost target  
Would be thine heart --  
That which I pledged myself

Amid the hellish torment of that moment,  
Is a most sacred debt, which I will pay.  
Thou art my lord, my Emp'ror's Governor,  
And yet the Emp'ror would have ne'er allowed,  
What thou -- He sent thee here unto this land,  
To render justice -- sternly, for he's wroth --  
Yet not, to practice each atrocity  
With murd'rous joy and with impunity,  
There lives a God, to punish and avenge.  
Come thou here forth, thou bringer of bitter pain,  
My precious jewel now, my highest treasure --  
A target I will give thee, that 'til now  
Hath been impenetrable to pious prayers --  
And yet to thee it shall not give resistance --  
And thou, my trusted bowstring, that so oft  
Hath served me faithfully i' th' joys of play,  
Desert me not in this dread earnestness.  
Only be firm this once, my faithful cord,  
Which hath so oft bewinged my bitter shaft --  
Escaped it just now feebly from my hand,  
I do not have a second one to send.

(Travelers pass over the stage.)

Upon this bench of stone I'll sit me down,  
Afforded for the traveller's brief repose --  
For here there is no home -- Each presses past  
The other hastily and distantly,  
And questions not about his pain -- Here goes  
The apprehensive merchant and the lightly  
Attired pilgrim -- the attentive monk,  
The somber robber and the cheerful player,  
The driver with his heavy laden horse,  
Who comes here from the distant lands of men,  
For every road leads to the end o' th' world.  
Each one of them goes forth upon his way  
Concerned with his affairs -- and mine is murder!

(Sits down.)

Before when father travelled forth, dear children,  
There was a joy, when he came back again,  
For ne'er returned he, 'less he brought you something,  
Was it a beauteous Alpine flower,  
Was It an unusual bird or ammonite,  
Such as the traveller finds upon the hills --  
Now he pursues another venery,  
By th' savage path he sits with thoughts of murder,  
The life o' th' foe it is, for which he waits. --  
And yet he thinks alone of you, dear children,  
E'en now -- to fend for you, your lovely innocence  
To shield before the vengeance of the tyrant,  
He now intends to bend his bow to murder!

(Stands up.)

I wait upon a noble beast -- Let not  
The hunter be discouraged, days on end  
To roam about amid the winter's harshness,  
To make the daring leap from rock to rock,  
To climb the jagged slippery mountain walls,



To which his limbs are glued by his own blood,  
-- In order to hunt down the wretched chamois.  
A far more precious prize is here at stake,  
The heart o' th' deadly foe, who would destroy me.

(One hears cheerful music from a distance, which comes nearer.)

Through my entire life have I employed  
The bow -- been practiced in the rules of archery,  
I've often hit the target in the black  
And many beautiful prizes I've brought home  
From joyous shooting -- But today I mean  
To make the master shot and win the best  
Within the whole circumference of the mountains.

(A wedding procession passes over the stage and up the hollow lane.  
TELL observes it, leaning on his bow. STUSSI the game keeper joins  
him.)

STUSSI: That is the cloister steward of Morlischachen,  
Who holds the wedding here -- A wealthy man,  
He hath ten herd of cattle on the Alps.  
He goes to get his bride at Imisee,  
Tonight there will be revelry in Kussnacht.  
Come with us! every honest man's invited.

TELL: An earnest guest fits not the wedding house.

STUSSI: If grief oppress you, cast it from thine heart,  
Bear with, what comes, the times are heavy now.  
Therefore the man must lightly seize his joy.  
Be married here and somewhere else be buried.

TELL: And oft the one comes close upon the other.

STUSSI: So goes the world now.  
Everywhere there is Enough distress --  
A landslide hath occurred  
In Canton Glarn and one entire side  
O' th' Glarnish hath caved in.

TELL: Do even hills now totter too?  
There stands naught firm on earth.

STUSSI: And somewhere else one hears of wondrous things.  
Here spake I to one man, who came from Baden.  
A knight would go by horse unto the King,  
And as he rode along a swarm of hornets  
Encountered him, they fell upon his horse,  
That it for martyr's death sinks to the ground,  
And he proceeds unto the King on foot.

TELL: His sting is also given to the weak.

(ARMGARD enters with several children and places herself at the  
entrance to the hollow way.)

STUSSI: 'Tis said it bodes a great disaster to  
The land, a heavy deed opposed to nature.

TELL: Yet every day brings forth such deeds as this  
No portent is required to make them known.

STUSSI: Yes, happy's he, who tills his field in peace  
And unimpaired sits by his own at home.

TELL: The very meekest cannot rest in peace,  
If some malicious neighbor likes it not.

(TELL looks often with uneasy expectation toward the crest of the  
pass.)

STUSSI: So fare you well -- You wait for someone here?

TELL: I do.

STUSSI: A pleasant journey home to you! -- You are from Uri? Our most  
gracious lord The Gov'rnor we await today from there.

TRAVELER (comes): The Gov'rnor don't expect today. The waters  
Have overflowed their banks from heavy rains,  
And all the bridges hath the stream ripped up.

(TELL stands up.)

ARMGARD (comes forward.): The Governor comes not!

STUSSI: Do you seek him?

ARMGARD: Indeed I do!

STUSSI: Why are you standing then  
Upon this hollow alley in his way?

ARMGARD: He can't avoid me here, he must hear me.

FRIESSHART (Comes hastily down the hollow path and calls upon the stage.):  
Now move out of the way -- My gracious lord  
The Governor comes riding close behind me.

(TELL exits.)

ARMGARD (full of life): The Gov'rnor comes!

(ARMGARD goes with her children to the front of the stage. GESSLER and  
RUDOLF DER HARRAS appear on horseback on the crest of the way.)

STUSSI (to FRIESSHART): How came you through the waters,  
Now that the stream hath swept away the bridges?

FRIESSHART: We've been in battle with the lake, my friend,  
And we fear not before the Alpine water.

STUSSI: You were upon the ship in that ferocious storm?

FRIESSHART: Yes, that we were.  
I shall not soon forget it --

STUSSI: O stay, and speak!

FRIESSHART: Let me, I must away,  
I must announce the Gov'rnor in the castle.

(Away.)

STUSSI: Had virtuous people been upon the ship,

To th' bottom had it sunk with man and mouse,  
This crew can neither water kill nor fire.

(He looks around.)

Where hath the huntsman gone, with whom I spake?

(Exits.)

(GESSLER and RUDOLF DER HARRAS on horseback.)

GESSLER: Say, what you will,  
I am the Emp'ror's servant  
And must give thought, to how I best can please him.  
He hath not sent me to this land, to flatter  
The people and be soft to them -- He wants  
Obedience, the issue is, shall farmers  
Be master in the land or shall the Emp'ror.

ARMGARD: Now is the moment! Now I'll bring it up!

(Approaches timidly.)

GESSLER: I have not had the hat put up as jest  
In Altorf, nor was it to test the hearts  
O' th' people, these I've known for quite some time.  
I have had it put up, that they might learn  
To bend their necks to me, which they hold high --  
I had the inconvenient thing set up  
Upon their path, where they would have to pass,  
That they would meet it with their eyes, and it  
Would bring to mind their lord, whom they forget.

RUDOLF DER HARRAS: And yet the people do have certain rights --

GESSLER: To ponder these, there is just now no time! --  
Far reaching projects are at work and growing,  
The Imperial house would grow, and what the father  
Hath gloriously begun, the son will end.  
This little people is to us a stone  
I' th' way -- this way or that, they must submit.

(They want to pass on. The woman throws herself down before the  
GOVERNOR.)

ARMGARD: Kind-heartedness, Lord Governor! Mercy! Mercy!

GESSLER: Why stand you on the public highway in  
My way -- Stand back!

ARMGARD: My husband lies in prison,  
The wretched orphans cry for bread -- Have pity,  
Severest Lord, on our great misery.

RUDOLF DER HARRAS: Who are you? And who is your man?

ARMGARD: A poor  
Wild hay man, gracious Lord, from Rigiberg,  
Who over the abyss mows down the grass  
Which freely grows from jagged rocky walls,  
To which the cattle do not dare to climb --

RUDOLF DER HARRAS (to the GOVERNOR):

By God, a miserable and wretched life!  
I beg you, set him free, the wretched man,  
However heavy his offense may be,  
His ghastly trade is punishment enough.

(To the woman.)

You shall have justice -- Yonder in the castle  
Bring your petition -- Here is not the place.

ARMGARD: No, no I will not budge from out this place,  
Until the Gov'rnor hath returned my husband!  
Six months already lies he in the tower  
And waits the sentence of the judge in vain.

GESSLER: Woman, would you use force with me, away.

ARMGARD: I ask for justice, Gov'rner! Thou art judge  
I' th' country in the Emp'ror's stead and God's.  
Perform thy duty! As thou hop'st for justice  
Yourself from Heaven, so show it to us.

GESSLER: Hence, drive this brazen people from mine eyes.

ARMGARD (Seizes the reins of his horse.):  
No, no, there's nothing more for me to lose. --  
Thou com'st not, Gov'rnor from this place, 'til thou  
Hast rendered justice to me -- Knit thy brows,  
And roll thine eyes, just as thou wilt -- We are  
In such unbounded misery, that we  
Care not about thine anger --

GESSLER: Woman, hence,  
Or else my horse will trample over thee.

ARMGARD: So let it trample over me -- there --

(She pulls her children to the ground and throws herself with them in  
his way.)

Here I lie  
With all my children -- Let the wretched orphans  
Be trodden under by thy horses' hooves,  
It will not be the worst, that thou hast done

RUDOLF DER HARRAS: Woman, are you mad?

ARMGARD (vehemently continuing):  
Thou hast for some time  
Trampled the Emperor's land beneath thy feet! --  
O I am but a woman! Were I man,  
I would know something better, than to lie  
Here in the dust --

(He hears the previous music again upon the crest of the way, but  
muffled.)

GESSLER: Where are my servants?  
Have them carry her away from here, or I'll  
Forget myself and do what I will rue.

RUDOLF DER HARRAS: The servants can not pass therethrough,

O Lord, The hollow way is blocked up by a marriage.

GESSLER: An all too gentle ruler am I to  
This people still -- their tongues are still. too free,  
They have not yet been tamed, as they should be --  
Yet this shall all be changed, I promise it,  
I will yet break this stubborn mood of theirs,  
The brazen spirit of freedom I will bend.  
Throughout these canton lands I'll promulgate  
A new decree -- I will --

(An arrow pierces through him, he puts his hand on his heart and starts to fall. With feeble voice.)

God grant me mercy!

RUDOLF DER HARRAS: Lord God what is this?  
Whither came it?

ARMGARD (starting up):  
Murder! Murder! He totters, sinks! He's hit!

The arrow's hit the center of his heart!

RUDOLF DER HARRAS (springs from his horse):  
What horrible occurrence -- God -- Lord knight --  
Call on the mercy of your God -- For you  
Are now a man of death --

GESSLER: That is Tell's shot

(Is slid down from his horse into the arms of RUDOLF DER HARRAS and is laid upon the bench.)

TELL (appears above on the top of the rocks):  
Thou ken'st the archer, seek not for another!  
Free are our huts, the innocent are safe  
'Fore thee, thou wilt no longer harm the land.

(Disappears from the heights.)

(People rush in.)

STUSSI (in front): What is the matter? What hath happened here?

ARMGARD: The Gov'rnor hath been shot through by an arrow.

PEOPLE (rushing in): Who hath been shot?

(Meanwhile the foremost of the wedding train come on the stage, the hindmost are still on the heights, and the music continues.)

RUDOLF DER HARRAS: He's bleeding fast to death.  
Go forth, get help! Pursue the murderer!  
-- Unhappy man, so must it end with thee,  
And yet thou would'st not listen to my warning!

STUSSI: By God! here lies he pale and without life!

MANY VOICES: Who's done the deed?

RUDOLF DER HARRAS: Hath madness seized these people,  
That they make music for a murder? Silence.

(Music suddenly breaks off, still more people come in.)

Lord Gov'rnor, speak now, if you can -- Have you  
No more to trust to me?

(Gessler gives a sign with his hand, which he repeats with vehemence,  
when it is not understood at once.)

Where shall I go? --  
To Kussnacht? -- I can't understand you -- O  
Be not impatient -- Leave all thought of earth,  
Think now, to reconcile yourself with Heaven.

(The whole marriage party stands around the dying man with an  
unfeeling horror.)

STUSSI: Behold, how pale he grows -- Now enters death  
Into his heart -- his eyes have now grown dim.

ARMGARD (lifts up a child):  
See, children, how a maniac expires!

RUDOLF DER HARRAS: O insane women, have you then no feeling,  
That you must feast your eyes upon his horror?  
-- Help -- Lend your hand -- Will no one stand by me,  
To draw the painful arrow from his breast?

WOMEN (step back): We touch the man, whom God himself hath struck!

RUDOLF DER HARRAS:  
Curse on you and damnation!

(Draws his sword.)

STUSSI (seizes him by the arm): Dare it, Lord!  
Your rule is at an end. The tyrant of  
The country is now fallen. We'll endure  
No further violence. We are free men.

ALL (tumultuously): The land is free.

RUDOLF DER HARRAS: And is it come to this?  
Fear and obedience so quickly end?  
(To the men in arms, who are thronging in.)  
You see the horrifying act of murder,  
The which hath happened here help is in vain --  
'Tis useless, to pursue the murderer.  
We're pressed by other worries -- On, to Kussnacht,  
That we may save the Emp'ror's fortresses!  
For in this moment are dissolved alike  
All bonds of order and all ties of duty,  
And no man's loyalty is to be trusted.

(Whilst he exits with the men in arms, six BROTHERS OF MERCY appear.)

ARMGARD: Make room! Make room! Here come the Brothers o' Mercy.

STUSSI: The victim lies -- The ravens now descend.

BROTHERS OF MERCY (form a half-circle around the dead man and sing in deep  
tones):  
With hasty step death comes to man,

It hath no respite to him given,  
It strikes him midway in his span,  
Forth from life's fullness is he driven,  
If he's prepared or not, to die,  
He must stand 'fore his Judge on high!

(Whilst the last lines are repeated, the curtain falls.)

---

ACT V. CONTENTS:

\* SCENE I.

Public square near Altorf. In the hinterground to the right the Fortress Keep of Uri with the scaffold still standing as in the third scene of the first act; to the left a view out into many mountains, upon all of which signal fires burn. It is just the break of day, bells resound from various distances. RUODI, KUONI, WERNI, MASTER STONEMASON and many other countrymen, also women and children.

\* SCENE II.

Entrance to TELL'S house. A fire burns on the hearth. The door standing open shows into the outside. HEDWIG. WALTER and WILHELM.

\* SCENE III. The Final Scene

PARRICIDA goes toward TELL with an hasty movement, but the latter beckons him with the hand and goes. When both have left to different sides, the scene changes and one sees in the whole valley bottom in front of TELL'S dwelling, along with the hills, which enclose it, occupied by countrymen, who are grouped as a whole. Others are coming over a high bridge, which leads over the Schachen. WALTER FURST with both boys, MELCHTAL and STAUFFACHER come forward, others press after them; as TELL steps out, all receive him with loud jubilation.

---

ACT V

---

\* SCENE I.

Public square near Altorf. In the hinterground to the right the Fortress Keep of Uri with the scaffold still standing as in the third scene of the first act; to the left a view out into many mountains, upon all of which signal fires burn. It is just the break of day, bells resound from various distances. RUODI, KUONI, WERNI, MASTER STONEMASON and many other countrymen, also women and children.

---

RUODI: See you the fire signals on the mountains?

STONEMASON: Hear you the bells above the forest there?

RUODI: The foe is put to flight.

STONEMASON: The fortresses are captured.

RUODI: And we in Canton Uri still endure

The tyrant's castle on our native soil?  
Are we the last, who do declare we're free?

STONEMASON: This yoke shall stand, which was to force us down?  
Up, tear it down!

ALL: Tear't down! Tear't down! Tear't down!

RUODI: Where is the Steer of Uri?

STEER OF URI: Here. What shall I?

RUODI: Climb up the tower, blow into your horn,  
That it resound afar among the mountains,  
And every echo in the rocky clefts  
Awakening, call all the mountain men  
Together quickly.

(STEER OF URI exits.)

(WALTER FURST enters.)

WALTER FURST: Hold! Friends! Hold!  
We still lack information, as to what hath happened  
In Unterwald and Schwyz. Let's first await  
The messengers.

RUODI: Why should we wait?  
The tyrant is dead, the day of freedom hath appeared.

STONEMASON: Are not these flaming messengers enough,  
Which burn on every mountain top around?

RUODI: Come all, come all, take hold, ye men and women!  
Break up the scaffold! Pull the arches down!  
Tear down the walls!  
No stone stand on another.

STONEMASON: Companions come!  
We have constructed it,  
We know how to destroy it.

ALL: Come! tear't down.

(They fall upon the structure from all sides.)

WALTER FURST: It's underway.  
I cannot stop them now.

(MELCHTAL and BAUMGARTEN enter.)

MELCHTAL: What?  
Stands the fortress still and Sarnen lies  
In ashes and the Rossberg's broken down?

WALTER FURST: Is that you, Melchtal?  
Do you bring us freedom? Speak!  
Have the Cantons all been cleansed o' th' foe?

MELCHTAL (embraces him):  
We've swept them from the soil.  
Rejoice, old father!  
Now at this very moment, as we talk,



There is no tyrant left in Switzerland.

WALTER FURST: O speak, how came the forts into your power?

MELCHTAL: Rudenz it was, who took the fort at  
Sarnen with manly and courageous acts of daring,  
The Rossberg had I climbed the night before. --  
But hear, what then occurred. As we the fort  
O' th' foe devoid, with joy now set on fire,  
The crackling flames already rose to th' heaven,  
When Diethelm, Gessler's boy, rushed out toward us  
And cried, the Bruneck woman burns to death.

WALTER FURST: O righteous God!

(One hears the beams of the scaffold fall.)

MELCHTAL: Twas she herself, was locked  
Up here in secret on the Gov'rnor's bidding.  
In frenzy Rudenz rose -- for we already  
Had heard the beams, the stout supports collapse,  
And from the midst of smoke the piteous cry --  
Of the unhappy woman.

WALTER FURST: She's been rescued?

MELCHTAL: What counted then was swiftness and resolve! --  
Had he been nothing but our nobleman,  
We would indeed have cherished our own lives,  
But he was our confederate, and Berta  
Esteemed the people -- So we staked our lives  
In confidence, and rushed into the fire.

WALTER FURST: Hath she been rescued?

MELCHTAL: She hath. Rudenz and I,  
We carried her we two from out the flames,  
And timber fell behind us with a crash. --  
And now, when she discerned that she'd been rescued,  
Her eyes rose up unto the heaven's light,  
The Baron threw himself upon my heart,  
And silently a compact was now sworn,  
That firmly hardened in the fire's glow  
Will persevere through every test of fate --

WALTER FURST: Where is the Landenberg?

MELCHTAL: Across the Brunig.  
No fault of mine it was, that he who blinded  
My father should escape with his own sight.  
Pursued I him, o'ertook him in his flight,  
And dragged him then unto my father's feet.  
The sword was brandished over him already,  
From the compassion of the blind old man  
He won the gift of life for which he begged.  
An oath of truce he swore, to ne'er return,  
And he will keep it, he hath felt our arm.

WALTER FURST: 'Tis well, you have not put the stain of blood  
On this unsullied triumph!

CHILDREN (hasten across the stage with the wreckage of the scaffold):

Freedom! Freedom!

(The horn of Uri is blown with might.)

WALTER FURST: See, what a festival!  
The children will  
Recall this day as late as in old age.

(Girls bring the hat carried on a pole, the whole stage is filled with people.)

RUODI: Here is the hat, to which we had to bow.

BAUMGARTEN: Instruct us, what we ought to do with it.

WALTER FURST: God! Underneath this hat my grandson stood!

SEVERAL VOICES: Destroy the emblem of the tyrant's power!  
Into the fire with it.

WALTER FURST: No, let it be preserved!  
It had to serve as tool of tyranny,  
'Twill be the lasting symbol of our freedom!

(The country people, men, women and children stand and sit upon the beams of the shattered scaffold grouped around picturesquely in a large half-circle.)

MELCHTAL: So stand we happ'ly now upon the wreckage  
Of tyranny, and grandly is't fulfilled,  
What we at Rutli swore, confederates.

WALTER FURST: The work hath been begun, but not completed.  
We now need courage and firm unity,  
For be assured, the King will not delay,  
In taking vengeance for his Gov'rnor's death,  
And bringing back by force the one expelled.

MELCHTAL: Let him march up with all his army's might,  
If from within the enemy's dispelled,  
We will engage the enemy outside.

RUODI: There are but few approaches to the land,  
These we will cover with our very bodies.

BAUMGARTEN: We are united by eternal bonds,  
And never shall his armies frighten us!

(ROSSELMANN and STAUFFACHER come.)

ROSSELMANN (entering): These are the fearful judgments of the Heaven.

COUNTRYMEN: What is the matter?

ROSSELMANN: In what times we live!

WALTER FURST: Say on, what is it? -- Ha, is't you, Lord Werner?  
What bring you us?

COUNTRYMEN: What is it?

ROSSELMANN: Hear and marvel!

STAUFFACHER: From one great cause of fear are we set free --

ROSSELMANN: The Emp'ror hath been murdered.

WALTER FURST: Gracious God!

(Countrymen become riotous and throng around STAUFFACHER.)

ALL: He's murdered! What! The Emp'ror! Hark! The Emp'ror!

MELCHTAL: Not possible! Whence came this news to you?

STAUFFACHER: 'Tis true indeed.  
Near Bruck King Albrecht fell  
By an assassin's hand -- a trusted man,  
Johannes Muller, brought it from Schaffhausen.

WALTER FURST: Who would have dared so horrible a deed?

STAUFFACHER: 'Tis made more horrible by him who did it.  
It was his nephew, his own brother's child,  
'Twas Duke Johann of Schwabia, who did it.

MELCHTAL: What drove him to this deed of patricide?

STAUFFACHER: The Emp'ror kept his patrimony back  
Despite impatient importunities,  
'Tis said, he never meant to grant it him,  
But with a bishop's hat to pay him off.  
However this may be-- the youth gave ear  
To th' evil counsel of his friends in arms,  
And with the noble Lord von Eschenbach,  
Von Tegernfelden, von der Wart and Palm  
He did resolve, since he could find no justice  
To take revenge on him with his own hands.

WALTER FURST: O speak, how was this monstrous deed achieved?

STAUFFACHER: The King was riding down from Stein to Baden,  
Toward Rheinfeld, where the court was held, to join,  
With him the princes, Hans and Leopold,  
And a large retinue of high-born lords.  
And when they came unto the Reuss, where one  
Can only cross upon a ferry boat,  
There the assassins forced themselves on board,  
That they detach the Emp'ror from his train.  
Thereafter, as the prince rode hence across  
A cultivated field -- 'neath which, 'tis said,  
An old large city stood in heathen times --  
The ancient Hapsburg fortress now in sight,  
From whence the grandeur of his line proceeded  
-- Duke Hans then thrusts a dagger in his throat,  
Rudolf von Palm runs through him with his spear,  
And Eschenbach then splits his head in two,  
So that he sinks thereunder in his blood,  
He's slain by his own kin, on his own land.  
Upon the other shore they saw the deed,  
Yet cut off by the stream they could do naught  
But raise an unavailing cry of woe;  
Yet by the wayside a poor woman sat,  
And in her lap the Emp'ror bled to death.

MELCHTAL: So hath he only dug his early grave,  
Who would insatiably have everything!

STAUFFACHER: A monstrous horror is abroad i' th' land,  
All passes of the mountains are blockaded,  
And each estate doth fortify its borders,  
E'en ancient Zurich closes up its gates,  
The which stood open thirty years, in fear  
O' th' murderers and even more -- th' avengers.  
For armed now with the imperial ban, the Queen  
Of Hungary doth come, the stringent Agnes,  
Who doth not know the gentleness of her  
Frail sex, to venge her father's royal blood  
Upon the murderers' entire line,  
Upon their servants, children, children's children,  
Yes even on the stones of their great castles.  
She's sworn an oath, that she'll dispatch below  
Whole generations to her father's grave,  
To bathe herself in blood as in May dew.

MELCHTAL: Knows one, whereto the murderers have fled?

STAUFFACHER: They fled no sooner had the deed been done  
Their separate ways upon five different routes  
And parted, ne'er to see each other more--  
'Tis said Duke Johann wanders in the mountains.

WALTER FURST: And thus the crime hath yielded them no fruit!  
For vengeance yields no fruit! It is itself  
The dreadful food it feeds on, its delight  
Is murder, and its satisfaction horror.

STAUFFACHER: The murd'rers gain no profit from their crime,  
But we shall pluck with unpolluted hands  
The blessed fruit o' th' bloody wickedness.  
For we are now relieved of a great fear,  
The greatest foe of liberty is fallen,  
And as it's rumored, that the crown will pass  
From Hapsburg's house unto another line,  
The Empire will assert electoral freedom.

WALTER FURST AND SEVERAL OTHERS: What have you heard?

STAUFFACHER: The Count of Luxemburg  
Already hath been chosen by most votes.

WALTER FURST: 'Tis well, that we kept loyal to the Empire,  
For there is cause of hope for justice now!

STAUFFACHER: The new lord will have need of valiant friends,  
He'll be our shield 'gainst Austria's revenge.

(The countrymen embrace one another.)

(SACRISTAN with an imperial messenger.)

SACRISTAN: Here are the worthy leaders of the land.

ROSSELMANN AND MANY OTHERS:  
Sacrist, what is't?

SACRISTAN: A courier brings this letter.

ALL (to WALTER FURST): Open and read it.

WALTER FURST: "To the honest men  
Of Uri, Schwyz and Unterwalden, Queen  
Elizabeth bids grace and all good wishes."

MANY VOICES: What would the Queen?  
Her reign is over now.

WALTER FURST: (reads): "In her great sorrow and her widowed grief,  
Wherein the bloody passing of her lord  
Hath left the Queen, she still remembers well  
The ancient faith and love of Switzerland."

MELCHTAL: In her prosperity she's ne'er done that.

ROESSELMAN: Be still! Let's listen!

WALTER FURST (reads): "And she doth look unto this loyal people,  
Assured that they will righteously abhor  
The cursed perpetrators of this deed.  
Therefore she doth expect from the three Cantons,  
That they will never help the murderers,  
But rather that they'll loyally assist,  
To give them up to the avenger's hand,  
Remembering the love and ancient favor,  
Which they received from Rudolfs princely house."

(Signs of resentment among the countrymen.)

MANY VOICES: The love and favor!

STAUFFACHER: We have received the favor of the father,  
But what have we to boast of from the son?  
Hath he confirmed the charter of our freedom,  
As 'fore him every Emperor had done?  
Hath he passed judgments based on righteous judgment,  
And lent to hard pressed innocence protection?  
Had he but listened to the messenger,  
That we had sent to him in our distress?  
Not one of all these things had e'er the King  
Performed for us, and had we not ourselves  
Obtained our rights with our own valiant hand,  
Our need would not have moved him -- Give him thanks?  
No thanks hath he sown here within these vales.  
He stood upon an eminence, he could  
Have been a father to his people, yet  
It pleased him, to provide but for his own,  
Those whom he hath enriched, may cry for him!

WALTER FURST: We will not shout for joy o'er his demise,  
Nor now recall to mind the suffered evil,  
Far be't from us! Yet, that we shall avenge  
The death o' th' King, who never did us good,  
And those pursue, who never made us grieve,  
That fits us not, and it will never suit us,  
As love's a freely given offering,  
So death absolves from all enforced duties, --  
To him we have no further debt to pay.

MELCHTAL: And if the Queen laments within her chamber,

And blames the Heaven for her savage pain,  
So see you here a people freed of fear,  
To this same Heaven send their thankful prayers  
-- He who will harvest tears, must first sow love.

(IMPERIAL MESSENGER exits.)

STAUFFACHER (to the people):  
But where is Tell? Shall he alone be absent,  
Who is the founder of our freedom? He  
Hath done the most, endured the most severe.  
Come all, now come, let's go unto his house,  
And there acclaim the savior of us all.

(All exit.)

---

\* SCENE II.

Entrance to TELL'S house. A fire burns on the hearth. The door standing open shows into the outside. HEDWIG. WALTER and WILHELM.

---

HEDWIG: Today your father comes.  
Dear children, children!  
He lives, is free and we are free and all!  
And it's your father, who hath saved the land.

WALTER: And I have also been there with him, Mother!  
One must name me as well. My father's shaft  
Went closely by my life, and I have not  
So much as trembled.

HEDWIG (embraces him): Yes, thou art restored  
To me! Twice have I given birth to thee!  
It is foreby -- I have you both now, both!  
Twice suffered I the mother's grief for thee!  
And your dear father comes again today!

(A monk appears at the entrance to the house.)

WILHELM: Look, Mother, look -- There stands a pious brother,  
He surely will be asking us for alms.

HEDWIG: Lead him inside, that he may be refreshed,  
And feel, that he is come to th' house of joy!

(Goes inside and comes back soon with a beaker.)

WILHELM (to the monk): Come in, good man. My mother will refresh you.

WALTER: Come in, rest up and go from here the stronger.

MONK (timorously looking around, with shattered features):  
Where am I now? Pray tell me, in which land?

WALTER: Are you then lost, that you do not know that?  
You are at Burglen, Lord, i' th' land of Uri,  
Just where one enters in the Schachental.

MONK (to HEDWIG, who returns):

Are you alone? Or is your Lord at home?

HEDWIG: Soon I expect him -- what's it to you, man?  
You do not look, as if you've brought aught good.  
-- Whoe'er you are, you are in want, take that!

(Hands him the beaker.)

MONK: E'en as my yearning heart pines for refreshment,  
I'll touch naught here, 'til you have promised me --

HEDWIG: Touch not my garment, step not near to me,  
Stand far away; if I should listen to you.

MONK: Now by this fire, that flames hospitably,  
And by your children's precious head, which I  
Embrace --

(Seizes the boy.)

HEDWIG: Man, what is your intent? Stand back  
From my dear children! -- You're no monk! You are  
Not one! For peace should dwell within this habit,  
But in your features peace doth not reside.

MONK: I am the most unfortunate of men.

HEDWIG: Unhappiness speaks forcefully to th' heart,  
And yet your look ties up my inner soul.

WALTER (springing up):  
Mother, here's father!

(Rushes out.)

HEDWIG: O my God!

(Wants to follow, trembles and stops.)

WILHELM (rushes after him): Here's Father!

WALTER (outside): Th'art here once more!

WILHELM (outside): O Father, my dear Father!

TELL (outside): Here am I once again -- Where is your Mother?

(Enters.)

WALTER: There at the door she stands and can no further,  
So trembles she with terror and with joy.

TELL: O Hedwig, Hedwig! Mother of my children!  
God's helped -- No tyrant shall divide us more.

HEDWIG (on his neck): O Tell! My Tell!  
For thee what fear I've suffered!

(MONK becomes attentive.)

TELL: Forget it now and live with joy alone!  
I am at home once more! This is my cottage!  
I stand again on that which is mine own!

WILHELM: And yet where hast thou left thy crossbow, Father?  
I see it not.

TELL: Thou wilt see it no more,  
It is preserved now in a sacred place,  
'Twill henceforth never serve the hunt again.

HEDWIG: O Tell! Tell!

(Steps back, releases his hand.)

TELL: What hath frightened thee, dear wife?

HEDWIG: How -- how com'st thou to me again? -- This hand  
-- May I take hold of it? -- This hand -- O God!

TELL (heartily and courageously):  
Hath you defended and the land delivered,  
And I may raise it freely up to Heaven.

(Monk makes an hasty movement, he looks at him.)

Who is this brother here?

HEDWIG: Ah, I forgot him!  
Speak thou with him, I shudder in his presence.

MONK (steps nearer): Are you the Tell, by whom the Gov'rnor fell?

TELL: Yes I am he, I hide it from no man.

MONK: You are the Tell! Ah, it's the hand of God,  
The which hath led me underneath your roof.

TELL (measures him with his eyes):  
You are no monk! Who are you?

MONK: You have slain  
The Gov'rnor, who did you wrong -- I too  
Have slain an enemy, who had denied  
My rights -- He was your foe as well as mine  
And I have freed the land of him.

TELL (starting back): You are  
Oh horror! -- Children! Children, go inside.  
Go in, dear wife! Go! Go! -- Unhappy man,  
You would be --

HEDWIG: God, who is it?

TELL: Do not ask!  
Away! Away! The children must not hear.  
Go from the house-- Go far away -- Thou must  
Not dwell beneath a single roof with him.

HEDWIG: Woe's me, what is this? Come!

(Goes with the children.)

TELL (to the monk): You are the Duke  
Of Austria -- You are! And you have slain  
The Emperor, your uncle and your lord.



JOHANNES PARRICIDA: He was the robber of my heritage.

TELL: Your uncle slain, your Emperor! And you  
The earth still bears! The sun still shines on you!

PARRICIDA: Tell, listen to me, ere you --

TELL: Dripping with  
The blood of patricide and Emp'ror's murder,  
Dar'st thou to step into my stainless house,  
Thou dar'st, to show thy face to a good man  
And want the rights of hospitality?

PARRICIDA: From you I hoped that I would find compassion,  
You too took vengeance on your foe.

TELL: Unhappy man!  
Must thou confound ambition's bloody guilt  
With what a father did in self defense?  
Didst thou defend beloved heads of children?  
Protect the sanctity o' th' hearth? Ward off  
The most dreadful, the utmost from thine own? --  
To th' Heaven lift I mine unsullied hands,  
And curse thee and thine act -- I have avenged  
The holiness of nature, which thou hast  
Disgraced -- I have no part with thee -- For thou  
Hast murdered, I've defended those most dear.

PARRICIDA: You cast me off, unsolaced, in despair?

TELL: A horror grips me, when I speak with thee.  
Away! Pursue thy dreadful course, and leave  
My cottage pure, where innocence resides.

PARRICIDA (turns to go): So can I, and so will I live no more!

TELL: And yet I've pity for thee -- God i' th' Heavens!  
So young, of such a noble family,  
Grandson of Rudolf, of my Lord and Emp'ror,  
As fugitive from murder, at my threshold,  
O' th' wretched man, imploring and despairing --

PARRICIDA: O, if you could but weep, then let my fate  
Move you, it is an hideous one -- I am  
A prince -- I was -- and I could have been happy,  
If I had mastered my desires' impatience.  
But envy gnawed upon my heart -- I saw  
The youth of mine own cousin Leopold  
Becrowned with honors and with land rewarded,  
And me, who was of equal age with him,  
Held down i' th' slavish status of a minor --

TELL: Unhappy man, well knew thine uncle thee,  
When he refused to give thee lands and people!  
Thou with thine hasty, savage insane acts  
Hast horribly confirmed his wise resolve.  
-- Where are the bloody helpers in thy murder?

PARRICIDA: Wherever the avenging spirits led them,  
I have not seen them since the hapless deed.

TELL: Know'st thou, that thou art banned by law, that thou

To friends forbidden and to foes allowed?

PARRICIDA: Therefore avoid I every public road,  
I venture not to knock at any cottage --  
I turn my footsteps to the wilderness,  
A terror to myself, I roam the mountains,  
And shrink back shuddering before my self,  
A brook shows me mine own unhappy image.  
O felt you pity and humanity--

(Falls down before him.)

TELL (turning away): Stand up! Stand up!

PARRICIDA: Not, 'til you give the hand to me in help.

TELL: Can I help you? Can any man of sin?  
Yet stand up now -- Whatever horror you've  
Committed -- You're a man -- I am one too --  
From Tell no man should part uncomforted --  
What I can do, that will I do.

PARRICIDA (springing up and grasping his hand with vehemence): O Tell!  
You rescue my poor soul from desperation.

TELL: Let go my hand -- You must away. You could  
Not stay here undiscovered, could discovered  
Not count on refuge-- Whither will you go?  
Where hope you to find quiet?

PARRICIDA: Know I? Ah!

TELL: Hear, what God grants my heart -- You must away  
To Italy and to Saint Peter's city,  
There cast yourself at the Pope's feet, confess  
To him your guilt and thus redeem your soul.

PARRICIDA: Will he not give me up to the avengers?

TELL: What he may do, accept it as from God.

PARRICIDA: How shall I come into that unknown land?  
I'm unfamiliar with the way, dare not  
To join my steps to those of travellers.

TELL: The way I will describe to you, mark well!  
You must ascend, upstream along the Reuss,  
Which from the mountain plunges wildly down --

PARRICIDA (terrified): See I the Reuss? It flows beside my deed.

TELL: The road goes through the gorge, and many crosses  
Mark it, erected to the memory  
O' th' trav'lers, buried by the avalanche.

PARRICIDA: I have no fear of nature's terrors, if  
I tame the savage torments of my heart.

TELL: Before each cross fall down and expiate  
Your guilt with ardent tears of penitence --  
And are you safely through the frightful pass,  
And if the mountain doth not send its snowdrifts,  
Down here upon you from the frozen ridge,

So come you to the bridge, which hangs in spray.  
If it doth not cave in beneath your guilt,  
If you have left it safely to your rear,  
So will a gloomy rocky gate burst open,  
No day hath shone on it -- proceed therethrough,  
It leads you to a cheerful vale of joy --  
Yet must you hurry on with rapid steps,  
You may not tarry, where'er peace resides.

PARRICIDA: O Rudolf! Rudolf! Royal ancestor!  
So comes thy grandson on thine Empire's soil!

TELL: So climbing always, come you to the heights  
O' th' Gotthards, where th' eternal lakes are found,  
Which from the streams of heaven fill themselves.  
There take departure from the German earth,  
Another stream with cheerful course leads you  
Down into Italy, your promised land --

(One hears the cowherd's dance song blown from many Alpine horns.)

But I hear voices. Hence!

HEDWIG (hurries in): Where art thou, Tell?  
My father comes! All the confederates  
Approach in gay procession --

PARRICIDA (covers himself): Woe is me!  
I may not tarry midst this happiness.

TELL: Go now, dear wife. And freshen up this man,  
Load presents richly on him, for his way  
Is far and he will not find any quarters.  
Hurry! They near.

HEDWIG: Who is it?

TELL: Ask me not!  
And when he leaves, so turn thine eyes away,  
That they see not, upon which road he travels!

---

\* SCENE III. The Final Scene

PARRICIDA goes toward TELL with an hasty movement, but the latter beckons him with the hand and goes. When both have left to different sides, the scene changes and one sees in the whole valley bottom in front of TELL'S dwelling, along with the hills, which enclose it, occupied by countrymen, who are grouped as a whole. Others are coming over a high bridge, which leads over the Schachen. WALTER FURST with both boys, MELCHTAL and STAUFFACHER come forward, others press after them; as TELL steps out, all receive him with loud jubilation.

---

ALL: May Tell live long! the archer and the savior!

(Whilst the foremost press around TELL and embrace him, RUDENZ and BERTA also appear, the former embracing the countrymen, the latter HEDWIG. The music from the mountain accompanies this mute scene. When it ends, BERTA steps into the midst of the people.)

BERTA: My countrymen! Confederates! Take me  
Into your league, as the first happy woman,  
Who found protection in this land of freedom.  
Into your valiant hands I lay my rights,  
Will you protect me as your citizen?

COUNTRYMEN: That we will do with life and property.

BERTA: 'Tis well, so to this youth I give my hand,  
A free Swiss woman to this free Swiss man!

RUDENZ: And I proclaim that all my serfs are free.

(Whilst the music strikes up anew, the curtain falls.)

---

The End.

---



## YGGDRASIL'S LINKS

These links are not intended to be endorsements, nor a complete list of web resources that deal with Euro-American culture and politics. If you have not visited one of these sites, I recommend doing so at your leisure. If anyone wants to be featured on this page, by all means drop me an e-mail with the URL and the preferred graphic. All links verified 4/1/98.

### • New links:

Professor Kevin MacDonald's Home Page: <http://www.csulb.edu/~kmacd/>

Germar Rudolph's Revisionist Page: <http://www.vho.org/>



Sobran's Real News: <http://www.sobran.com/>



Fenix Mall's Extra Strength Link List: <http://www.sound.net/~fenix/links.html>

## Wake Up or Die

"Wake Up Or Die" Page: <http://www.wakeupordie.com/>

"Final Conflict" Page: <http://dspace.dial.pipex.com/finalconflict/>

The Tempus Page (French Revisionism): <http://www.abbc.com/aaargh/fran/revu/revu.html>

## • Alphabetical Links:



Air Photos of WW II: <http://www.air-photo.com/>



American Renaissance Magazine: <http://www.amren.com/>

## CODOH

CODOH (Bradley Smith): <http://www.codoh.com/>



David Duke - Online! Report: <http://www.duke.org/>

## ESU

European-American Student's Union: <http://www.sure.net/~esu/>



Michael Hoffman II's Campaign for Radical Truth in History: <http://www.hoffman-info.com/>

## IHR

Institute for Historical Review: <http://www.ihr.org/>

## National Alliance

The National Alliance site: <http://www.natvan.com/>



National Rifle Association: <http://www.nra.org/>

## REVILO PENDLETON OLIVER

Collected works of Revilo P. Oliver: <http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/america/>

## Stormfront

Stormfront's White Nationalist Resource Page: <http://www.stormfront.org/>



Wall Street Journal Newspaper: <http://www.wsj.com/>



Zündelsite: <http://www.lebensraum.org/>

---

## YGGDRASIL'S ENDORSEMENTS



Support our local ISP, DDC Net ... Contact through <http://www.ddc.net/>.



Download the latest version of Communicator from [Netscape Communications](#). Help defeat Microsoft!

---

**BACK**

© 1996-1998 Yggdrasil, except site graphics. All rights reserved.