



ABOUT THE AUTHOR: Dr. Revilo Pendleton Oliver, Professor of the Classics at the University of Illinois for 32 years, is a scholar of international distinction who has written articles in four languages for the most prestigious academic publications in the United States and Europe.

During World War II, Dr. Oliver was Director of Research in a highly secret agency of the War Department, and was cited for outstanding service to his country.

One of the very few academicians who has been outspoken in his opposition to the progressive defacement of our civilization, Dr. Oliver has long insisted that the fate of his countrymen hangs on their willingness to subordinate their doctrinal differences to the tough but idealistic solidarity which is the prerequisite of a Majority resurgence.

SOME QUOTABLE QUOTES FROM *AMERICA'S DECLINE:*

On the 18th Amendment (Prohibition): "Very few Americans were sufficiently sane to perceive that they had repudiated the American conception of government and had replaced it with the legal principle of the 'dictatorship of the proletariat,' which was the theoretical justification of the Jews' revolution in Russia."

On Race: "We must further understand that all races naturally regard themselves as superior to all others. We think Congoids unintelligent, but they feel only contempt for a race so stupid or craven that it fawns on them, gives them votes, lavishly subsidizes them with its own earnings, and even oppresses its own people to curry their favor. We are a race as are the others. If we attribute to Ourselves a superiority, intellectual, moral, or other, in terms of our own standards, we are simply indulging in a tautology. The only objective criterion of superiority, among human races as among all other species, is biological: the strong survive, the weak perish. The superior race of mankind today is the one that will emerge victorious — whether by its technology or its fecundity — from the proximate struggle for life on an overcrowded planet."

AMERICA'S DECLINE

Order No. 1007-S8.50
plus \$1.50 for postage and handling.

376 pp., pb.
ORDER FROM:

LIBERTY BELL PUBLICATIONS, Box 21, Reedy WV 25270 USA

Liberty Bell

ISSN: 0145 - 7667

SINGLE COPY \$5.00

'Anti-Semitism': How to Get Rid of It

by John Tyndall
page 44

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE:

**Taxpayers Demand:
No \$10 Billion Bond Guarantee
for Israel, page 1.**

**Israel's \$10 Billion
Loan Guarantee Request:
Myths and Facts, page 3.**

Letters to the Editor, page 7.

**The U.S.A.: World Judge?
A Contemporary Study of Past and
Present U.S. Imperialism, page 10.**

VOL. 19 - NO. 3

NOVEMBER 1991

Voice Of Thinking Americans

LIBERTY BELL

The magazine for *Thinking Americans*, has been published monthly since September 1973 by Liberty Bell Publications. Editorial office: P.O. Box 21, Reedy WV 25270 USA. Phone: 304-927-4486.

Manuscripts conforming to our editorial policy are always welcome and may be submitted on IBM-, Apple //e-, or Apple/Macintosh-compatible diskette, or in double-spaced, neatly typed format. Manuscripts can not be returned unless accompanied by stamped, self-addressed envelope. Manuscripts accepted for publication become the property of Liberty Bell Publications.

© Copyright 1991

by Liberty Bell Publications.

Permission granted to quote in whole or part any article except those subject to author's copyright. Proper source, address and subscription information must be given.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

SAMPLE COPY	\$ 5.00
THIRD CLASS-BULK RATE-USA only	\$37.00
FIRST CLASS-USA	\$47.00
FIRST CLASS-all other countries	\$52.00
AIR MAIL-Europe, South America	\$63.00
Middle East, Far East, South Africa	\$68.00
Sample Copy	\$ 6.00

BULK COPIES FOR DISTRIBUTION:

10 copies	\$ 22.00
50 copies	\$ 90.00
100 copies	\$150.00
500 copies	\$600.00
1000 copies	\$900.00

FREEDOM OF SPEECH FREEDOM OF THOUGHT FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

The editor/publisher of *Liberty Bell* does not necessarily agree with each and every article in this magazine, nor does he subscribe to all conclusions arrived at by various writers; however, he does endeavor to permit the exposure of ideas suppressed by the controlled news media of this country.

It is, therefore, in the best tradition of America and of free men everywhere that *Liberty Bell* strives to give free reign to ideas, for ultimately it is ideas which rule the world and determine both the content and structure of our Western culture.

We believe that we can and will change our society for the better. We declare our long-held view that no institution or government created by men, for men, is inviolable, incorruptible, and not subject to evolution, change, or replacement by the will of an informed people.

To this we dedicate our lives and our work. No effort will be spared and no idea will be allowed to go unexpressed if we think it will benefit the *Thinking People*, not only of America, but the entire world.

George P. Dietz, Editor & Publisher

Taxpayers Demand: No \$10 Billion Bond Guarantee for Israel!

The government of Israel expects to resettle approximately a million Soviet Jews in Israel and the Israeli-occupied Arab territories during the next four years. These Soviet Jews are not penniless refugees; most of them held privileged positions in the Soviet Union, but with the collapse of communism and the resurgence of Russian nationalism they realize that their era of privilege is finished there. The Israelis say they must raise at least \$10 billion by issuing bonds to cover the resettlement expenses for these new immigrants. They want American taxpayers to put up the money to cover those bonds. Americans, by an overwhelming majority, don't want to do it. The U.S. Congress, on the other hand, usually will do whatever the Jewish lobby tells it to do, and the American taxpayers be damned.

Unlike most cases in the past where Israel has demanded U.S. money, the current demand for Americans to back \$10 billion in new Israeli bonds has become a matter of public debate. Usually Jewish control of the news media and the Congress results in the money being handed over quietly, with the taxpayers not having a chance to raise an objection. In this case, however, the Bush administration has asked Israel to hold off any more cash demands on the United States until after a Middle East peace conference next year. This request for a delay has so angered Israeli officials that they have accused President Bush of being "anti-Semitic." One Israeli cabinet minister, Rehavam Zeevi, whines that Bush is "conducting a political fight on the back of millions of Jews." Jewish leaders in America also have tried to evoke sympathy for Israel's monetary demands by reviving half-century-old gas-chamber tales: "Weren't six million enough?" they ask mournfully, referring to their long-discredited claim that six million Jews were gassed to death during the Second World War.

Such antics would be laughable, if it weren't for the fact that they have worked so well in the past to get the Jews whatever they demanded. The September 30 issue of *Time* magazine points out that nearly all politicians are so frightened of Jewish control of public

opinion that they are afraid to oppose the Jews on any issue. "We don't want to be accused of anti-Semitism," one diplomat is quoted. This fear of Jewish power has resulted in \$46 billion being taken from American taxpayers and given to Israel since 1973. At this time, as President Bush pointed out in his September 12 speech to the nation, the American taxpayers already are being forced to support every Jew in Israel with an ongoing subsidy of \$1,000 a year. Enough is enough, he said, in arguing for holding off on the additional money Israel is demanding.

The average American would say that's not only enough, it's far too much. Why should *any* money be taken from our pockets and put into the pockets of Israelis? Why should we *ever* be forced to cover their bonds with our earnings? It's time for Americans who resent this ongoing theft of their hard-earned money to stand up and speak against more subsidies for Israel.

Remember, Mr. Bush only wants to *delay* for a few months the coverage of \$10 billion in Israeli bonds with our money. He was bold enough to stand up to the accusations of "anti-Semitism" made against him only because he had just finished using the U.S. armed forces to destroy Iraq, which was the most powerful opponent of further Israeli territorial expansion in the Middle East. Now he wants to preside at a Middle East peace conference aimed at keeping things calm for a while in that part of the world. He knows that if he gives the Israelis more of our money before the conference he won't have any leverage over them to get them to make peace with the Arabs.

Unfortunately, Mr. Bush is, after all, a politician, and a brief delay in meeting Israel's monetary demands is all he is bold enough to ask for. He dares not tell the Jews that there will be no more American money for Israel, now or later. No politician in America is that brave. If we want the Israeli monkey off our backs we must shake it off ourselves. We must let the politicians know that if they vote for even one more dollar of our money to go to Israel, we'll vote them out of office.

For more information on the way in which the Jewish lobby uses its power to raid the U.S. Treasury for Israel—and what you can do to stop this theft of your hard-earned money—write to:

NATIONAL ALLIANCE
P.O. Box 90 – HILLSBORO WV 24946

Israel's \$10 Billion Loan Guarantee Request: MYTHS and FACTS

This is **not** a \$10-billion Housing loan guarantee as originally set forth, but rather a \$10-billion-plus-interest "infrastructure gift." The Israeli government has recently changed the ground rules to specify that only 20% of the money borrowed will be used to meet the immediate need of housing for the Soviet Jewish immigrants. Another 20% will be used for job creation. The remaining 60% will be allocated to infrastructure rebuilding. This amounts to a virtual rebuilding of Israel, not simply absorption of the immigrants.

The flood of Soviet Jewish immigrants for which the loans are requested has in fact slowed to a trickle. Israeli predictions of 1 million Soviet Jews resettling in the Zionist nation over five years have proven to be tremendously overstated. At present there are about 350,000 Soviet Jews in Israel. The Ministry of Absorption estimates that half are still unemployed. Many of them view Israel as merely a stopping point, their final destination being the U.S. in most cases. And surely recent events in the Soviet Union do not point to a further "flood" of Soviet Jews to Israel.

Israeli Deputy Foreign Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has declared that it is our "humanitarian responsibility" to "save" the Soviet Jews and provide housing for them in Israel. But Israeli policy is to resettle as many of these immigrants as possible in the occupied territories, thereby tightening the Zionist hold on these areas and displacing the native Palestinian population. Is this "humanitarian"? Israel has also agitated to have other countries—the U.S. and Germany, in particular—to strictly limit the immigration of Soviet Jews, leaving Israel as the only possible destination. In fact, Israeli officials have even appealed to Moscow to prohibit these Jews from going anywhere except Israel. Is this out of "humanitarian concern" for these people?

Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir has stated that linkage of the loan guarantees to either his government's policy of creating Jewish settlements in the occupied territories or to the pursuit of peace negotiations is "unconscionable" and has "no justification." The Bush administration has called these Jewish settlements "illegal," and views them as the biggest obstacle to peace in the Middle East. The newspaper *Ha'aretz* quoted sources close to Shamir, who has vowed never to withdraw from occupied Arab land, as saying he would abandon Loan guar-

antees before halting settlement. Shamir's priorities are obvious.

AIPAC President Mayer Mitchell told supporters in a recent fund raising letter that "we were not asking the U.S. for one red cent in grant aid. We stressed that a loan guarantee will not take one penny away from domestic programs." Preliminary estimates, however, place the cost of simply administering \$10 billion in loan guarantees over 30 years at between \$40 and \$140 million each year over the life of the loans. This fact does not even address Israel's credit risk or the cost if the Jewish state defaults.

The pro-Israeli lobby claims that the Zionist state has always repaid all loans in full and on time. How can they say this? The fact is, Israel has never defaulted because the vast majority of its loans have been either forgiven, rescheduled at favorable interest rates or aid paid back out of increases in U.S. aid directed for that purpose.

In fact, Congress passed a resolution in 1986 promising that total economic aid to Israel will never be less than the total of its loan commitments.

As a credit risk, Israel has been ranked by the U.S. Export-Import Bank as deserving a D rating on a scale of A to F. Israel's long-term government debt not backed by U.S. pledges has received a "triple-B." the lowest rating, by Standard and Poor's investment index. The likeli-

Israel Has Never Repaid a Cent to U.S.

Dallas, Texas
September 29, 1991

Zionists' Letters supporting U.S. taxpayers' loan guarantees of TEN BILLION DOLLARS for Israel is a classic example that Zionists can make untrue statements and the people are so uninformed they go unchallenged!

TRUTH IS: Israel has never repaid a cent to U.S. with its own money! From 1974 when Israeli payments became due to U.S., Congress passed "Bills of Forgiveness." Before 1978 the U.S. would just increase aid and subtract the payments due and MARK PAID. In 1978 Congress passed a Bill which Sen. Charles Percy (WSJ story) said, "Will make the U.S. responsible for ALL of Israel's foreign debts (not just US) in perpetuity."

In 1985 Congress passed an even neater, for Israel, bill: All economic and military aid to Israel would henceforth be ALL IN GRANTS, NEVER TO BE REPAYED! Not even interest, except by US taxsuckers because the US had to borrow the \$3.2 BILLION each year to GIVE to Israel. In 1988 the Cranston Bill passed which guarantees that U.S. aid to Israel will never be less than the interest payments on Israel's foreign debt.

In FY 1991, US will pay more than \$18 BILLION in interest alone on past aid and interest (compounded annually), and we still owe \$130 BILLION as our cost of aid to Israel. And growing each year as new GRANTS AND INTEREST COMPOUND.

Since 1985 Israel has received ALL of its US aid 'up front,' not quarterly as do all other recipients, and no strings attached as to how Israel spends. (There were strings of no new settlements on Arab land on the supplemental \$400 MILLION, but Israel ignored.) That 'up front' on the annual \$3.2 BILLION ups the interest US taxsuckers must pay by \$60 to \$70 MILLION more than quarterly aid installments. Both NYT and WSJ (and others) have written that Israel buys short term US Govt. notes or bills with funds not needed immediately, and the US taxsuckers pay Israel interest on our own money. A double whammy!

Zionist Hyman Bookbinder said that Zionists should HELP Americans think what Zionists wanted them to think. These Letter writers do just that.

Virginia L. Oldham
6008 E. University
Dallas, Texas 75206

From Christian News, 10/14/91
Rte. 1, Box 309A, New Haven MO
63068-9568

hood of default on a loan of such magnitude as the one under consideration, then, is greater than ever. Based on an average interest rate of 8.6% for 30-year loan, the cost of default to the American taxpayer would range from \$112 to \$117 billion.

And this may be just the beginning. Israeli economists estimate this loan to be only a portion of what the Jewish state requires to "absorb" the Soviet Jewish "exodus." Israeli leaders say they need \$40 billion to do the job, of which half is provided in the form of contributions from American and other diaspora Jews. The remaining \$10 billion will be borrowed from other governments, they say. Conveniently ignored in this scenario is the recent downward trend in Jewish American philanthropic giving and the likelihood of getting loans from other financially-strained governments.

The current federal deficit is conservatively estimated at an astronomical \$348.3 billion. If the loan guarantees requested by Israel are authorized or implemented after September 30, 1991, the Credit Reform Act, passed last year to reduce the federal deficit, requires that they be included in the federal budget. What domestic programs Congress would cut to be able to accommodate these loan guarantees to Israel in the budget is anyone's guess.

Even the *Washington Post* and *Wall Street Journal* have noted the mockery of U.S. consideration of these loan guarantees to Israel. The *Post*, in fact, called Israel's bankrupt socialist-welfare system "one of the world's most state-controlled economies outside of the dwindling Communist world." Yet the U.S. has steadfastly refused to consider similar assistance for the Soviet government because it does not wish to support or perpetuate a socialist economy.

* * * * *

NEW AMERICAN VIEW ACTION ALERT

September 1991

At this moment, the pro-Israeli forces are lobbying as never before for the introduction and approval of U.S. Absorption Loan Guarantees to Israel. This legislation would authorize the U.S. government to co-sign Israel's application for private U.S. bank loans amounting to \$10 billion, in \$2 billion installments over the next five years.

No matter how you approach it, approval of the loan guarantees amounts to a massive outlay of U.S. taxpayer money. *We must speak out now against this giveaway!*

Liberty Bell / November 1991 — 5

ACT NOW!

Here's what you can do:

Call Sen. Patrick Leahy (202-224-4242) and Rep. David Obey (202-225-3365). These men are the heads of the Senate Appropriations subcommittee on foreign aid and the House Appropriations subcommittee on foreign operations respectively. They are in the position to either shove through or delay indefinitely the consideration of the \$10 billion loan guarantee legislation.

Leahy has recently demonstrated his willingness to at least postpone consideration of the loan guarantee legislation, although he said he would support the loan request at a later date. Tell these men at the very least to delay consideration of the loan guarantees at this time. Follow up your brief conversation with a short letter reiterating your message and include a copy of the above fact sheet for background information.

Call your senators and your representative. State your name and where you are from, and urge them to vote against the approval of loan guarantees to Israel. (To phone your congressman, call the Capitol switchboard at 202-224-3121 or 225-3121, or consult a handbook on Congress for specific office numbers.)

Immediately follow up your call with a brief letter. Restate your position. Refer to your call and the copy of our arguments which you will enclose, and remind them that their position on this issue will determine your vote the next time they run for office. (You may write to your senators in care of the U.S. Senate, Washington DC 20515.)

Call your local radio talk shows when the opportunity presents itself, and give a brief rundown on why approval of the loan guarantees would be against the best interests of the U.S.

Write letters to the editors of your local papers outlining the same message.

Monitor the local press. If they are not covering the matter, let them know that you consider it important. Contact the proper people if you find their coverage to be one-sided. Likewise, praise them when you can.

Keep on top of congressional activities on this matter. If deliberations are at a critical point, call. A deluge of well-timed phone calls may make the difference.

Copy and distribute this *\$10 Billion: Myths and Facts* sheet to friends and associates, and urge them to follow the suggestions too. Remember, we can make a difference!

New American View
Box 999, Herndon VA 22070

LETTERS to the EDITOR

Dear George,

Please send me 10 copies of Vol. 19, No. 1 (September 1991). Joe Stano's piece ought to have the widest possible circulation. Incidentally, all the Gentiles I ask what they think about the \$10 billion to Israel bristle with fury—except the few (only one) who are so ignorant they never heard of it.

With Best Wishes,
Dr. A.B., New York State

☆☆☆

Dear George:

I'm hoping you can spare 10 issues of August 1991 *Liberty Bell*. Also hoping the check enclosed will cover shipping too. If not put note in package. Some good prospects for your marvelous magazine which has no equal anywhere. Some really outstanding information, even from "Letters to the Editor" and always the incomparable Dr. Oliver.

New subscribers have really no idea how superior *Liberty Bell* is—they have a great treat coming.

All the Best to the Best.

Mrs. K.N., California

☆☆☆

Dear Mr. Dietz,

Enclosed find order for books, check, plus a donation. We find your *Liberty Bell* a welcome relief in contrast to all the other propaganda that passes for news, literature, drama, etc. However I wonder if our people shall ever awake...

Sincerely yours,
Mr. & Mrs. S.W.K., Oregon

☆☆☆

Dear Landsmann:

I have an update on the AIDS situation. Things are moving even faster than I thought in my July letter. The new data comes from the South African financial press. They are concerned about the effect of AIDS on black labor and they obviously quote from the epidemiological curve of AIDS which is still being kept secret from the public. Their statistics say that the black population of S.A. will peak at 40 million in 1996 and collapse thereafter. By 2007, despite new births and immigration, the black population is projected to be a dwindling remnant of 13.6 million and those will be nearly all old or young and nearly useless for labor.

AIDS in South Africa has been even more concealed than in America but one datum allows comparison. In S.A. too more than 50% of new

cases are now heterosexual. This shows that the U.S.A. and S.A. are at the same stage in the epidemic. This means the data for S.A. applies to American blacks as well. By 1995-6 the black population will peak and then crash. By 2007 it will be a third of the 1996 figure. Something to look forward to! I recently spoke to a worker at a largely black hospital in the Bronx. Over 50% of the emergency admissions *now* are AIDS carriers.

We had a very instructive set of comedies in New York City just now. First, a black racist professor dared to mention that the Jews control Hollywood and that they were the operators of the slave trade, both true, of course. The Jews set up their usual filthy howling demanding he be punished for un-kosher thoughts, but amazingly, the blacks refused to grovel and obey like white slaves. While the Jews were still reeling about that, came the Crown Heights incident where a speeding Jew ran a red light and ran up on the sidewalk crushing the nigger kids. This led to an anti-Jewish race riot. What set the blacks off was the special treatment and privileges given to the Jews by the police who literally acted as their servants. The police did not arrest the reckless Jew driver. The special Jew ambulance ignored the crushed children and drove off with the slightly injured Jew. Thousands of police immediately arrived to protect the Jews and only blacks were arrested despite Jews throwing rocks and bottles at negro marchers. In Bensonhurst whites were arrested for daring to shout at negro marchers!

Where the comedy comes in is in the actions of the black racist major of Jew York. He didn't dare offend his Jewish owners but he also didn't dare offend his black racist power base. Thus he dithered and ran around like a chicken with its head cut off. Thousands of police were called out but were not allowed to take any action against the black rioters, merely standing as human shields in front of the Jews. Thus, more police were injured than either blacks or Jews. Dinkins then made a big show of visiting the injured black child at the hospital and an injured Jew who was stabbed but totally ignored 5 cops who were in the emergency room after being hit by bricks. Just as funny were the ditherings of the Jews who tried to go into their usual whining act without offending their pet blacks. Meanwhile, all sorts of stories reached the press about the special privileges accorded the Jews. For instance, the main rabbi has a 24-hour-per-day police guard provided him and his family wherever they go. During the riots police captains and officials were ordered around as lackies by the rabbis. During an earlier incident a mob of Jews broke into a police station, injured about 20 cops and destroyed the interior of the building without single arrest being made. All this showed the "poor, per-

secuted Jews" in a light which, like cockroaches, they prefer to avoid.

Yours truly,
S.R., New York State

☆☆☆

Dear Staff:

I have a special problem I need some help with. I am in prison and have come across a very unusual movement. It is led by Pastors Butler and Franklin at the Church of Jesus Christ Christian in Hayden Lake, Idaho. You may condone what this Church is teaching in the name of white unity, I don't know. What is happening that quite a few young white men are being taught complete falsehoods about—Western Civilization, the Whites' origins, the Jews' origins, and the origins of the Bible.

The Church is saying that the Old Testament is the White Man's origin. Now quite a few prisoners are running around like fools saying that they are the true Israelites or Semites that the Bible refers to as God's chosen people. The Bible, as we know it, is one giant misinterpretation, they say. They say Christ was Aryan and all of the Jews of the Old Testament were Aryan. I've read a lot of their literature and I still have not found them calling themselves Hebrews, but to be a Semite and Israelite is to be a Hebrew. The word Jews wasn't used until the mid-point of the Old Testament. I can show them many places proving Christ was a Rabbi (e.g., Matthew 26:49) and a Jew (Matthew 27:11). Or that the Israelite tribes of Judah and Benjamin were Jewish (Jeremiah 52:28, 34:8-14, Esther 2:5). There are many places I could find if I wanted to waste my time proving common knowledge.

A letter from a Nazi member of some rank should put an end to these guys saying things like "Israel is our homeland". If you could maybe offer some "spiritual" advise, that too would be helpful. I'm an agnostic—I don't believe in things that can't be proven or disproven. I like studying about the Vikings and their Gods, Odin, Thor, etc. I'd like to buy your magazine and books but I should save my money. The police may not let me have it anyway. I'd like to join the Nazis of the Klan or both. The Church gets their anti-Semitic literature in because of its religious cover. The letter I hope you will send need not be long. It could just say that the Nazi Party recognizes all people that call themselves Israelite or Semites as Jews. That should shut them up. You could also say that the Bible is not a misinterpretation on this point. I really doubt if they will try and call you a Jewish sympathizer; that is their favorite tactic if you disagree. Thank you.

Sincerely,
George H. Davis—926739 IMU A-9
Box 520, Walla Walla WA 99362

THE USA: WORLD JUDGE?

A Contemporary Study of Past and Present US-Imperialism

Translation of an eight-part series "Die USA als Richter der Welt? Neue Serie zur Geschichte und Gegenwart des US-Imperialismus," published September 14, 1990 - November 2, 1990, by *Deutsche National-Zeitung*, DZS-Verlag, W-8000 München 60, Federal Republic of Germany.

On their way to standing as world power, none of the nations on Earth have caused a bloodbath comparable to that of the United States of America. The contrast between this and any other nation is so great that it is even immaterial to consider which estimate—the conservative one of 50 million, or the high one of 100 million—most accurately represents the bodies that line the path followed by the North American Empire in the two centuries of its existence. At the same time, no empire in recorded history has concealed its incessant raids with quite as cunning a flood of propaganda as the USA. Beginning with the first extermination campaigns directed at the native Indians in the 18th century, through the so-called crusades against Germany in 1917-18 and 1941-1945, to the now imminent armed encounter with Iraq, it has allegedly always been only 'just' wars which the American Empire has waged. Today, more than half the world must obey the orders of the White House and Wall Street. But the zenith seems to have been passed. There are increasing signs of decline, especially of internal decay, as is typical of empires that deteriorate to infirmity. But there is still enough strength left to do great damage.

Anti-Americanism?

As a relative majority of American citizens are of German descent, the Germans themselves have particular cause to differentiate carefully between, on the one hand, the war and Holocaust policies and the aggressive dollar-imperialism pursued by small power cliques, and the great majority of the American population on the other hand. Anti-Americanism directed against the American population would be not only an injustice itself, as the assignment of collective guilt is immoral. Brought to bear by the Germans, it would also be a national, masochistic perversion.

It was not the 'ordinary settlers' (who in a great, admirable feat opened up and made arable the great American vastness, and of whom a great many came from Germany) who were to blame for the extermination of the American Indians. The great country would have been large enough by far for the long-established native peoples as well as the new arrivals. Rather, it was the ruthless, unconditional claim to power of the small so-called elites that brought about the annihilation of the Red Man's nations.

The War-Mongers

It was not the ordinary American—the farmer of German descent in the Mid West or the Irish barkeeper in Boston or the shopkeeper of Chinese extraction in San Francisco—that longed for America's involvement in both the World Wars to Germany's detriment. Quite the contrary—in both cases, the vast majority of the American people were fundamentally opposed to the involvement of the American armed forces. It required colossal deceptions, and propaganda to the value of a few billions, to put a substantial part of the American population into a warring mood. Cue words: the provocation of the Lusitania and Pearl Harbour incidents. What ever prominent person nevertheless opposed the course towards war pursued by Presidents Wilson and F.D. Roosevelt was often ruined economically—which, due to the inadequate social network of the States, meant the end—or sometimes simply shot by persons unknown (of course). When it was a question of resistance by ordinary citizens—'the man in the street'—such as, for example, the dock workers of the Second World War—the leadership of the 'model country of democracy' even allied itself unscrupulously with the world's most despicable villains, the Mafia, in order to tread out the embers. The Roosevelt Administration's co-operation with the Mafia during the Second World War ranks among the greatest blots on the not-so-very-clean slate of the White House bosses.

The ruling elites in the USA have perfected the art of mass propaganda. Anyone who is capable of convincing the people of a profound difference between Pepsi and Coke is no less a master of his art than those who led the masses to believe in the visions they evoked of a threat to America by the German Wehrmacht in World War Two (Hitler never even achieved the crossing of the narrow English Channel to the end of defeating Great Britain), or those who succeed in persuading public opinion that Panama's Noriega needed to be crushed because of the drug threat he posed (whereas the real overlords of drug traffic are established in New

York, etc.), or those who now make their audiences believe that Iraq, a military dwarf compared to the US with its arsenals cram-packed with ABC-weapons¹, also represents a threat to Mr. and Mrs. Brown in Alabama.

Political naivety may well be helpful to the propagandists of war. Is that the reasons why the Germans make up the relatively largest sector of the American population? As the satirist Shaw put it: "The Germans are a well-organized nation. They have the smartest men of science and most simple-minded of politics." So it is perhaps due to the large German component of the population that it is said of the Americans that already in infancy they have a 12-year-old's grasp of politics, but then that's the way it stays for the rest of their lives.

No-one can say for certain how many Indians lived in the territory of the present-day United States when American imperialism began with its Holocaust on the Red Man. There were perhaps 30 million. If they could have developed relatively undisturbed, as a people have a right to do, there would have been 80 to 100 million of them by the end of the 19th century. But in fact, only 100,000 to 200,000 of them were left. The 'deficit' is the gruesome sum total of the American giga-Holocaust.

Because of their campaigns against the Indians, the Spaniards are portrayed as the Bad Boys of History—a propaganda charge which, in the late 19th century, was pervertedly brought against the Iberians by the United States so that the latter could take their last overseas possessions in America away from them with 'moral justification.'

It is indisputable that the Spanish Empire was also guilty of terrible crimes against Indian nations. But today, umpteen times more people of Indian extraction live in Mexico, formerly colonized by the Spanish, than live in the United States. For each inhabitant with at least one Indian parent, there is one White person in Mexico, but 50 Whites in Canada, and 400 Whites in the USA.

Efficient Killing

The American Final Solution of the Indian Question was carried out under the motto of 'civilizing the savage West,' and that perversion turned into the slogan, 'the only good Indian is a dead Indian.' And in order to increase the number of good Indians, as many as possible had to be dispatched to the happy hunting-grounds. The head-hunt was one of the

1. Translator's note: Atomic, Biological and Chemical weapons.

most efficient means to this end. High rewards were offered and publicly paid. Finally, it proved too laborious, and thus inefficient—un-American, in other words—to collect and count severed Indian heads. From the time of this realization on, it sufficed to produce the head skin—the 'scalp.' Scalping was by no means an Indian invention, but rather an innovation of the American killers trained for efficient murder.

The North American 'Indian Wars' (= extermination campaigns) lasted almost two-and-a-half centuries, with varying degrees of intensity. The American Empire did not even shy away from bacteriological warfare—as well-known cases of blankets infected with deadly pathogens prove. And just as the Western Values Community today is inundated with drugs of all kinds, originating in the United States, and just as British Imperialism in the 19th century overcame the Chinese with drugs in the Opium Wars, so did the cheapest kind of hooch finish off the militarily defeated, demoralized Red Nations.

100 Years Ago...

Exactly 100 years ago, in 1890, Washington waged the last 'Indian War,' against the Sioux. This fight saw a battle at Wounded Knee in South Dakota. About the slaughter there of 'two-hundred fleeing women, children and infants' by soldiers of the American army, a contemporary report of the 'Bureau of Ethnology' states self-critically: "For the researcher into human nature, it is interesting to observe how we condemn the cruelty of other nations and how completely we overlook that which we ourselves are guilty of."

In the last phase of their defence, the American Indians still brought forth good leaders. On orders from Washington, these were killed without exception:

- > Sitting Bull was shot for blood money by a traitor from his own ranks;
- > Big Snake was clubbed to death with rifle butts in the course of a 'peaceful negotiation';
- > Big Foot was left lying wounded in the snow following a slaughter of his unarmed warriors, women and children, and froze to death;
- > Little Wolf was imprisoned in a fort and ruined with whisky;
- > Captain Jack was hung;
- > Chief Joseph died in an American concentration camp.

Faked Pangs of Conscience

An American schoolbook from the 19th century contains the state-

ment: "Germany, England, France, etc.—civilized; The Balkans and eastern Europe—half-civilized; the United States of America—enlightened." But even Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the American Democratic Party, ideologist of that which he considered liberalism, and President from 1801 to 1809, suffered from a guilty conscience: "I tremble for my people when I think of the injustices it has made itself guilty of against the natives." And even this was a lie, in that the man passed all the blame on to 'the people.'

Manifestation of the New Rome

In the Capitol in Washington, the nation's capital city named for its first President, General Washington, the imperial claim of the United States found architectural expression: New Rome! It was left to a German, Thomas Mann, to remark about one of the most significant augmenters of the American Empire, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt: "He had the winning charm of Caesar." And Mann added: "He saw the Western cultural conception realized in a world civilization."

World civilization is a key word to the understanding of American imperialism. It knows no national boundaries, and the immigration nation USA does after all unite, so to speak, all of mankind on its territory. Internationalism as 'national identity.' The catch phrase 'melting pot' is taken from the title of a theater production which the Jewish immigrant to the United States, Israel Zangwill, dedicated to President Theodore ("Teddy") Roosevelt at the start of the 20th century. The play was considered a 'manifestation of Americanism.' However, the frenzy of enthusiasm completely obscured the fact that very soon after, Zangwill 'corrected a misunderstanding': he protested most decidedly against the claim that he also wanted to solve the Jewish problem through amalgamation in the 'melting pot.' Besides, Zangwill wrote many little-known ghetto novels, such as *Ghetto Tragedies* and *The King of the Schnorrers*. In 1922, his work *Chosen Peoples: the Hebraic Ideal versus the Teutonic* appeared in German.

'The Greatest Race.'

Despite the lack of a common popular basis, a strange form of racism with radical claims of elitism took root in the USA. It is the conviction of belonging to the 'greatest race' that 'ever the sun shone on', as the American poet Walt Whitman (1819-1892) put it in one of his poems. Added to this was an unconditional American patriotism which by far eclipsed the

much-condemned, flag-waving patriotism of European days largely past. Just recently, a so-called pop-star from Europe was given stage ban in the USA because he wanted to forego the playing of the national anthem before the start of the concert, as it is usual on such occasions (and even at boxing and wrestling matches). US Commodore Decatur (1779-1820) gave expression to this unconditional States-patriotism with the phrase, "Right or Wrong—my country!"

Imperial Doctrines

It is in accordance with American politics emulating the Roman example that Mr. President, the 'Caesar' in the White House, is accustomed to promulgating 'doctrines' with virtually popish claim to infallibility. Two of these doctrines became the basis for American imperialism. One was the Monroe Doctrine, proclaimed in 1823 by President Monroe. The slogan 'America for the Americans' cloaked the intent to exercise complete control over North, Central and South America. The other was the doctrine of President F.D. Roosevelt (in power from 1933 to 1945), which gave Washington the right to intervene anywhere in the entire world, should it be 'necessary.' Roosevelt had the doctrine proclaimed in March of 1941 by his aide and Minister of Justice, Robert Houghwout Jackson: in the 20th century, there could be no question of wars waged in the tradition of times past. Rather, one had to assume a 'universal civil war' which permitted the United States to take sides at their discretion in any conflict occurring anywhere in the world, and to 'adapt their behavior accordingly.' Jackson later served as American Chief Prosecutor at the Nuremberg Tribunal against the German political and military leadership, which he charged with imperialism, among other things, and whose members were hung by the American executioner Woods.

How Mexico was robbed.

Within the century, the United States had managed to expand from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Each and any obstacle was mercilessly removed: more than one hundred Indian tribes, British, French, Spanish, Russian and Mexican rule. 'Punching our opponents to the ground' could be a leitmotif for the American expansion.

An example of US-imperialism is the way in which the southern neighbor, Mexico, was robbed of areas umpteen times the size of Germany. The method used to get Texas from Mexico was two-fold: in the

frontier territories, fights were picked with Indians, who then 'had to be' persecuted to the point of complete annihilation on Mexican-Texan soil. In this way, American troops seeped in. Then Mr. Samuel Houston, a close friend of then American President Jackson, appeared on the scene in the Mexican province and placed himself at the head of a so-called 'independence movement.' This movement created an 'independent Texan state,' separated from Mexico, which was then soon swallowed by the United States. A major city in Texas is named for Houston.

The American President Polk—who was so devout as to not only keep Sunday holy, but also to observe the Sabbath (though he was not an Israelite), and whom the *Encyclopedia Americana* ranks as the 'most imperialistic of all American leaders'—then set to work snatching further territory from Mexico. He had American troops march in there, which met up with Mexican resistance. As "American blood had been shed on the American soil," Polk pushed in Congress for the formation of a punitive expedition of 50,000 heavily armed men. This expedition attacked the militarily weak Mexico and advanced right to the capital city of America's southern neighbor. 1848 saw the Treaty (= dictate) of Guadalupe Hidalgo: besides Texas, Mexico also had to cede to the imperialists in Washington California and the territories of the later American states of Nevada, Utah, Arizona and New Mexico. For Polk, the annexation of all of Mexico was already in the planning stage, but it was finally agreed upon in Washington to, for the time being, just digest the giant spoils of their exploits. Self-denial as virtue.

'Peaceful Purchase of Land?'

The expansion of the American Empire by means of 'purchase' is a study all to itself: considerable parts of today's US territory were acquired for dollars. This may sound extremely Capitalist, but not as bad as military aggression. In American historiography, however, barely the space of a footnote is granted to the fact that these purchases were preceded by massive pressure.

Example: Louisiana. Napoleon wanted to purchase this Spanish-owned province, which at the time was populated (aside from Indians) almost exclusively by French settlers. In the Treaty of 1763, Louisiana had been granted to France. President Jefferson hastened to threaten France with war. Napoleon, who was involved in numerous conflicts anyhow, backed down. Without the French settlers even being asked (and neither the Indians, of course), Louisiana was purchased from France for \$15 mil-

lion—"in blatantly imperialist and undemocratic fashion," as the American historian Kohn, otherwise an admirer of Jefferson, notes.

Example: Florida. This area was Spanish property. In the same way as Texas later (see previous), the conquest of Florida began with provoked Indian wars. American troops were 'forced' to advance into Spanish territory in pursuit of the 'barbarians.' The Spanish Governor was exiled to Cuba, several Spaniards—who allegedly had collaborated with the Indians—were executed, and by 1817 the area had in actual fact, if not on paper, been taken possession of. The Spanish Crown could consider itself 'lucky' that, afterwards, Washington still paid \$5 million in order to cloak its imperialistic act as 'purchase of land.'

Example: Alaska. As early as the American-British War of 1812, Washington considered taking possession of the entire northern part of America. However, because Britain was among the victorious powers of the Napoleonic Wars in Europe, this plan was rejected, and the interest of the United States was henceforth directed at the Russian possessions along the Pacific coast and in Alaska. One waited for a favorable opportunity. This came when Czarist Russia was weakened by the Crimean War. Realizing that his North American territories could not be defended against the impetuous advance of the United States anyhow, the Czar in 1867 declared himself willing to sell Alaska for \$7.2 million.

One-Way Street into the 'Union.'

From 1861 to 1865, one of the most dreadful wars in the history of the world raged on North American soil. It claimed half a million lives according to low estimates, more than a million to others. The event went down in history as the 'War of Secession,' or the 'American Civil War.'

Its cause was that the American Southern States took the loudly proclaimed slogans of self-determination seriously and took their leave of the 'Union' in order to attain nationhood of their own. At that point, the joke turned serious. In a brutal four-year war, Washington defeated the Confederate States, which were by far outnumbered in manpower and materiel. Scorched earth, concentration camps, unconditional surrender—all these concepts were terrible reality even then.

It is one of the legends of American historiography that this war was one for the liberation of the Negro slaves. Slavery, which stands as one of the darkest chapters of American history and which claimed the lives of millions of Black men, women and children, played a secondary role, and

the Negro Question essentially functioned only as propaganda during the war. In reality, 1861 to 1865 saw a clash over the question over whether, once having belonged to the Union, one could ever again escape the clutches of the American Empire. The result, as Sündermann has aptly phrased it, was "that the United States of America are a republic which a state may join but not leave again."

After the conclusion of hostilities, and after the fatal gunshots at Lincoln—who had been cold and hard-hearted as War President but then was inclined to a conciliatory peace—the hatred against the underdogs found vent. Whoever did not submit absolutely was destroyed economically, and often physically as well. A giant reeducation of the Southern States began. The 'liberated' Negroes were channeled into the industrial North, where a large part of them sank into a new kind of hidden slavery.

American imperialism became ever more greedy. This did not remain without consequences for Europe. Bismarck recognized the dangerous storm front brewing in the USA. On December 2, 1897, half a year before his death, the Iron Chancellor stated: "It is a political necessity to oppose American presumptuousness often and emphatically." Said at a time when most of the persons in power in the Old World had not yet perceived the hissing from the transatlantic nest of vipers.

Twenty years later, in 1917, an American army of millions flooded into Europe. Washington's troops gave the second German Reich, created by Bismarck, its deathblow. And another three decades later, Europe was finished as world political factor. Thanks to the United States.

Following Russia's elimination from the anti-American front in the First World War, the situation looked like a draw, with which the Western world would certainly have been better off. But the American armies under General Pershing, who had beaten down Mexico just shortly before, were the deciding factor against Germany in this struggle of nations. Through its interference in the First World War, the United States, one of the greatest debtor nations of the world, became one of its foremost creditors. In the First World War, the US-bosses made a killing, in the truest sense of the word.

During his term as Chancellor, Bismarck had been deliberately kindly disposed toward the USA. One can assume that the great statesman did not let himself be led by sentimental consideration in this matter, but rather by the realization that it is dangerous to awaken a sleeping lion. The

latter, however, in fact had no intention of sleeping at all. In the Franco-Prussian War, 1870-1871, Washington already had flagrantly contravened its proclaimed neutrality. The United States had cheaply sold considerable amounts of old weapons to Paris. The Prussian ambassador in the American capital protested in vain.

Trying to smooth things over, Bismarck continued to be pro-America. As late as 1890 he declared, almost imploringly, on the occasion of a reception of German-Americans: "Germany and North America number among those nations that are lucky enough not to envy one another anything in their Mutual relations." In fact, however, the dollar-imperialists regarded with passionate envy the world markets of the 'economic miracle nation', the German Reich.

Moses Showed the Way.

Between 1790 and 1890, the powers-that-be in Washington had swept aside with force and extortion anything and everything that had crossed their path from 'sea to shining sea', from the Atlantic to the Pacific: the Indians and the Mexicans, the Spanish and the French, the British and the Russians, as well as the Southern States that had had the gall to take the slogans about the right to self-determination literally.

US imperialism manifested itself with an open arrogance that dwarfed even the presumptuousness of the ancient Imperium Romanum and the arrogance of the British Empire. As early as 1765, John Adams, one of the Founding Fathers of the United States, had written: "I have always regarded the colonization of America with reverence and admiration, as a great beginning and a grand plan of Providence for the enlightenment of the ignorant." In 1783, Ezra Stiles brought up the Bible: "God's Covenant with the Israelites at the time of Moses was a prophecy of the future prosperity and grandeur of the United States of America." Two years later, Jefferson fell into ecstasy: "Oh God! How little my fellow countrymen realize that they have been blessed with the good things in life like no other people on Earth!" Three years after the Confederate States had been destroyed with fire and sword, a message from President Johnson to Congress stated that the principles of the American form of government would "prove to be strong enough to draw all civilized nations of the world into their sphere of influence." And in his work of principle, published in New York in 1886 and bearing the significant title, *Triumphant Democracy*, the American Steel King, Andrew Carnegie prophesied the American people:

“The world will soon lie at our feet.”

At that time, the Big Money had entered into the pact with American imperialism. Never before had the powers-that-be of business and finance had such enormous influence as in the United States at the close of the 19th century. Shortly before the turn of the century, the future President Theodore Roosevelt noted: “In no other nation on Earth had such immense fortunes been accumulated, in no other nation on Earth did the men that had acquired these fortunes wield such power.”

Business tycoons bought politicians and officials as they pleased. There developed an incredible concentration of capital in the hands of a few. Trusts came into being, each of which had more power all by itself than entire nations had elsewhere. A dollarcracy headed the United States. It was the Carnegies and the Goulds, the Morgans, Rockefellers and Vanderbilts who determined the course of political events. Joachim Fernau has described the process as the ‘Take-over of Power by High Finance’.

Into the Wide, Wide World.

After the last of the Indian resistance had been wiped out in ‘the Interior’ (by shooting 15 million buffalo, the Prairie Indians’ means of living had been eliminated) and the remainders of the Indians Nations had been crammed into concentration camps (elegantly termed ‘reserves’), it was off into the wide, wide world.

The United States subjugated Central America: Puerto Rico and Cuba were appropriated after an arbitrarily initiated war against Spain. Colombia was chopped up, the northern half became an American quasi-colony named Panama. In 1907, the Dominican island republic fell under American control. Haiti was occupied by American troops in 1915, and Nicaragua was subjugated in 1916. Mexico was brought to its knees in the course of several invasions.

South America fared no better. Partly through military attacks (e.g. in Chile in 1891-1892 and Venezuela in 1902-1903 respectively) and partly through economic penetration, the half-continent was turned into a half-colony.

Attempts were made on the Pacific-Asiatic regions as well. As early as 1854, Japan had been forced to open itself to US trade. The Hawaiian Island became an American colony in 1893, followed in 1898 by Guam and in 1899 by Samoa as well as the Philippines. Washington participated actively even in the division of China into ‘spheres of influence’ of foreign

powers. The African nation of Liberia came under ‘American supervision’ in 1919. American intervention troops tried to rake in parts of the ‘bankruptcy estate’ of the collapsing Czarist Empire, half a century after Washington had acquired Russia’s North American possessions cheaply by means of a purchase taking advantage of the Czar’s weakness following the Crimean War.

At the beginning of the 1930s, the sphere of influence of dollar-imperialism comprised an area many times that of the USA. Now the colonial powers of France and Britain were the primary obstacles in Washington’s path to being the center of a world superpower. And Japan as well as the again-powerful German Reich suddenly appeared as unwelcome competitors. It was necessary to find a way to kill several birds with one stone: destruction of the European empire abroad as well as the suppression of Germany and Japan. Those in power in the USA put a man into the White House who was capable of this: Franklin Delano Roosevelt, on whose death in 1945 the inimitable German writer Thomas Mann praised: “He had the winning charm of Caesar.”

Smokescreen of Propaganda.

Behind a smokescreen of slogans such as ‘democracy’ and ‘right to self-determination’, the United States, through its intervention in the First World War, rose from a nation ruling the American double continent to an ocean-spanning Great Power. The United States also turned from a nation deeply in debt into the world’s greatest creditor, virtually ‘overnight’. Thirdly, some thousands of American bosses had earned their laurels through the suffering of Europe.

Behind a smokescreen of slogans such as ‘democracy’ and ‘right to self-determination’, the United States, through its intervention in the Second World War, rose from the status of a Great Power to that of a Superpower. Beside the unwelcome economic competitors, Germany and Japan, the world empires of Britain and France—such a hindrance to dollar-imperialism—were also practically finished in 1945. Again, some thousands of American bosses had earned their laurels through the suffering of peoples and nations.

The Master

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Lord of the White House from 1933 to 1945, proved to be master of every kind of propaganda. Never

since Gaius Julius Caesar had a potentate known as well as he how to wrap brutal imperialistic goals in velvety-soft slogans. Mr. President FDR was the most outstanding PR-man whom the clique of high finance and big business had ever placed at the top.

He declared that it was necessary to bring Germany and Japan down in order to create a 'Just World Order'. It is well known what this Just World Order then looked like: an enormous Holocaust committed against the vanquished, division and subjugation of numerous peoples, some 200 wars since May 8, 1945, in at least half of which the United States were directly or indirectly involved. The overall balance of the Just World Order: between 40 and 60 million casualties, far more than 100 million injured and maimed, a quarter billion displaced persons. Not included in this balance is the most terrible product of the spirit that prevailed in 1945: 40,000 children starving to death every day in the Third World (earlier, Africa, for example, could easily feed itself and was even an exporter of agricultural products), as well as some 10,000 children who are killed in the womb every day in the so-called First World. These 50,000 children dying every day are no 'regrettable accident' or 'coincidence', but rather first and foremost the result of the Just World Order promised by Mr. Roosevelt.

Considerable Dramatic Talent

On April 13, 1940, Roosevelt proclaimed "the right of small nations to independence and territorial inviolability and unhindered self-government." The President's theatrical achievement, not to blush red as a beet or to burst out laughing at such hypocrisy during the declaration of this slogan, which is exactly the opposite of what the USA do in practice, remarkable.

On January 6, 1941, Roosevelt vowed that America would implement the 'four freedoms': "The freedom of speech and expression of opinion—everywhere in the world. The freedom of everyone to serve God in his own way—everywhere in the world. The freedom from poverty—everywhere in the world. The freedom from fear." Soon afterwards, Roosevelt unscrupulously entered into agreements with some of the most evil dictators mankind has ever brought forth—such as Stalin and the terrible Trujillo, tyrant of the Dominican island republic, and even with the Mafia-bosses whom Mussolini had thrown out of Italy—in order to implement the 'Just World Order' in a 'crusade for democracy'. The issue was that of winning a 'moral order', FDR continued in his statement of January 6, 1941.

God's Own President

"We believe that every nation, no matter how small, has the innate right to its own national traditions," Roosevelt declaimed on March 15, 1941. A slogan issued by the command center of the Holocaust committed against more than 100 Indian nations and tribes! In this speech in March 1941, Roosevelt charged Germany with an insane claim of status as Chosen Nation; he then exhibited delusions of Chosen status of his own: "We again profess loyalty to our democratic republic, an eternal home of freedom, tolerance and dedication to the Word of God."

This matches Roosevelt's message, broadcast on December 9, 1941: "We are determined to devote our energies to the future good of mankind as well as to the present Evil." References to God and divine powers have always been a proven means of cloaking egoistic goals, for God does not deny them. At least not immediately, and not audibly, in words.

On January 6, 1942, the President stated: "To us, victory means the victory of democracy, of the concept of family, of the simple principles of decency and humanity. It means, to us, the victory of religion." And in the same breath, he defended his coalition with the multi-mass-murderer and destroyer of religions, Stalin: "We fight side by side with the Russian nation which has with almost superhuman strength of will and courage forced the Nazi hordes to retreat." Mr. President continued: "We fight to cleanse the world of old evils and old illnesses. We are filled with a belief which goes back through all the centuries right to the first chapter of the story of Creation: 'God created man in his own image.' We strive to be worthy of this divine inheritance." The head of the American Empire, built on mountains of corpses, as archangel! Compared to that, even the not-exactly-restrained Dr. Goebbels and his slogans shrink to the proportions of a shy little propaganda-schoolboy.

A Global Chicago

On October 12, 1942, Roosevelt vowed that the Allies did not want to "exercise mass retaliation against the populations of Germany, Italy and Japan." At the same time, Los Alamos was the site of feverish work on atom bombs that were to be dedicated to Germany's cities, but which were then instead dropped on Japan, which had long been willing to capitulate.

"The forces of freedom are on their way!" Roosevelt cried on November 11, 1942. And on February 12, 1943, he declared that the first and foremost requirement was the restoration of the sacred rights of the subju-

gated nations," to which end it was allegedly necessary to wage a "total war" (!). On July 28, 1943, the Boss of the White House proclaimed: "The united forces of outraged humanity are on their way."

On August 25, 1943, Roosevelt portrayed himself as Police Chief of the entire world: a 'crew of gangsters', he said, were threatening the foundations of decent human behavior. "We have been forced to call the police in order to take care of this gang and thus purge the community of nations of such mobsters." At this same time, Roosevelt already availed himself of the Mafia to put down strikes by exploited American workers.

Two years earlier, in March of 1941, Minister of Justice, Jackson—who was later to be the American Chief Prosecutor at the Nuremberg Tribunal—had already proclaimed the doctrine that the United States, in the role of global policeman, could interfere in any conflict on Earth. The armed conflicts of modern times were not, he said, wars in accordance with the traditional model, but rather world civil wars, for which reason the United States could intervene wherever they deemed such action appropriate.

"We have tried most conscientiously, often even under considerable sacrifices, to spare religious and cultural monuments, and we will continue to do so in the future," Roosevelt declared on March 14, 1944. At the same time, American and British Holocaust-bombers reduced German and other European as well as Japanese Houses of God to rubble.

One day before his death, on April 11, 1945, Franklin Delano Roosevelt drew up an address in which he stated: "We prepare to give the world the greatest gift that one generation of mankind can give it—a lasting peace."

Which leaves the ambiguous question: was the world freed of its bandits and gangsters in 1945?

Miracle Doctor or Rasputin?

Roosevelt's unscrupulous war-time politics are documented by numerous reports by competent contemporaries and by research done by honest historians. Some topical quotations follow: On December 18, 1940, John G. Alexander, the Representative of Minnesota, said: "The American people are to be subordinated to a small group of foreign leaders whose goal it is to plunge us into war." The American historian, Thomas A. Bailey, an admirer of Roosevelt, noted: "Franklin D. Roosevelt repeatedly deceived the American people... he was like a doctor who tells his patient lies for his

own good." The American historian, Professor Harry Elmer Barnes: "From the captured Polish and French archives, the Germans compiled no less than five volumes of material containing almost exclusively Roosevelt's war-mongering encouragements to the European nations, primarily Poland and France... The materials on Roosevelt's urging in England would most likely fill more than five volumes." The German historian and publicist, Dirk Bavendamm, who, as writer for *Der Spiegel* and author of works against 'neo-Fascists', most certainly ought to be exempt from suspicions of patriotically blinded revisionism, writes that following his years of researches, he had attained certainty that in 1938-1939 it was not Hitler who dominated international events, but rather "that Roosevelt imposed the rules of action and that this is exactly where the deeper reason for the early outbreak of the war and eventually also for Germany's defeat is to be found." Bavendamm continues: "America's liberal-democratic internationalism, which Roosevelt unleashed, proved to be the most powerful force of this century... The rise of the United States to the status of nuclear superpower is the chief reason for the crisis of the international system since the turn of the century."

On June 21, 1941, the American archbishop, Francis J.L. Beckmann, raised serious accusations against war-mongers in Washington: "The mendacious tongues of hypocrites won out. They have maneuvered us diabolically to the brink of war... The present conflict is not a 'holy war' but a war of one imperialism against another, in which godlessness is present on both sides. It is no crusade for Christianity or democracy, despite all the high-sounding phrases."

Vogel's Vision

Dr. Karl Otto Braun, German diplomat in the Second World War and contemporary historian ever since, commented as follows on 'Roosevelt-glorification': "For more than forty years now, a particularly bellicose regime has been perfumed to best appeal. The conviction that what we are faced with is a gigantic game of camouflage whose aim it is to distract us from the shocking truth grows ever stronger. We know today that Roosevelt wanted to kill two birds with one stone: the two birds were Hitler and Churchill, for Roosevelt's course was set for a shared American-Soviet world government, for a 'Coca-Cola-Vodka World Government, so to speak. As early as December 10, 1940, the American industrialist Virgil Vogel had stated in an address in Hollywood, before the 'Union of Invest-

Liberty Bell / November 1991 — 25

ment Banks', that at any rate, the short-term goal would be to get one's hands on the scepter of the British Empire. A prophetic prediction."

"Talent for War-Mongering Propaganda"

After the war, Benjamin Colby, who had been the editor of the pro-Roosevelt *New York Times* during the 1930s, became a severe critic of the American intervention in WWII. He noted: "Whatever Hitler's intentions may have been, conquering England was not one of them, and attacking the United States even less so. That the Americans could be talked into believing in a threat posed to them, to the extent that they could be driven into war, shows the President's talent for war-mongering propaganda. Not only did he think up our war propaganda but also—and this is even more serious—brought about the situation which made war inevitable... The Americans had no idea that less than two weeks before Pearl Harbor, President Roosevelt and his aides had discussed the problem of 'how to manoeuvre Japan into firing the first shot.' And neither did they know that Roosevelt had stated to Churchill that the United States would go to war against Japan even if they were not attacked. As far as Germany was concerned, the American people did not know that at the Atlantic Conference in August 1941, the President had issued orders to American ships to provoke incidents on the Atlantic which would justify war. The German declaration of war was essentially just a long-postponed acknowledgement that the United States were already at war."

The American publicist, Colonel Curtis B. Dall, former son-in-law to President Roosevelt, wrote in his book *American War-Time Policy*² that there is no doubt that "the world financial powers in New York, London and Paris wished primarily to use the Second World War to throttle Hitler's flourishing barter system before it could affect the world market." He continued: "For a long time I believed that Roosevelt developed many ideas on his own and for the good of his people. But that was not the case. The greatest part of his thoughts, his political 'ammunition', so to speak, was carefully prepared for him by the CFR One-World Financial Power Group. Brilliantly and with great zest, he then eagerly carried this 'ammunition' to an unsuspecting target, the American people." The CFR (Council on Foreign Relations) was a committee of influential financiers and politicians with headquarters in New York.

2. Translator's note: The Original title could not be determined at time of re-translation; this rendering may be inexact.

"I Take it Back"

The American politician, Hamilton Fish, for 25 years a member of the U.S. Congress Committee for External Affairs, wrote: "On December 8, 1941, I gave the first radio speech that was broadcast directly from the Congress, and stood up decidedly for the war against Japan. Today, I publicly take back this my speech due to historical proof which became known only later. I am convinced that not only the American people, but everyone who is interested in historical truth, has the right to find out the naked truth, which is that Roosevelt incited Japan to war by provoking that country 10 days before Pearl Harbour with a war ultimatum which was kept strictly secret. In violation of the American Constitution, he had kept this secret from the American people and even from Congress... Representative Clara Boothe Luce was right when she said that President Roosevelt lied us into the war via the Japanese back-door in order to take up arms against Germany."

In his work, *The crime of Our Age*, the American Pastor L.A. Fritsch wrote: "Did our nation, with its 'free' press, know that for more than six months, Roosevelt waged a provocative war of aggression against Germany and Italy, without any declaration of war? Did our people know that Roosevelt and his collaborators consciously and deliberately caused the catastrophe of Pearl Harbour so as then to be able to face his nation and demand revenge for this so-called 'treacherous attack'? Was America sufficiently informed that it was not an issue of an 'ideological' war, but rather of pure egoism, greed and power politics on the part of the Roosevelt Administration?"

"The Whore and The Imperialist"

The historian, Professor H. Gordon of Great Britain, sees an historical continuity in American imperial politics: "From the Roman Empire through the British Empire to the rising Empire of the American, to whom the entire world would ultimately be subject." Since 1937, Roosevelt had actively fanned the flames of war in Europe. The American public did not suspect "that in the fall and winter months of 1939, the President had caused several European attempts to achieve a peace compromise to fail." Gordon: "Even before the first full session of the UN could be held, Roosevelt died of a stroke on April 12, 1945. And this 'Christian soldier' died in the arms of his mistress, Lucy Winthrop, née Mercer, with whom he had an intimate relationship since the 1920s. The whore and the imperialist are

a significant and united symbol of the work of a man who would have been able like none other to play the role of a true mediator in the world.”

Even the contemporary historian, Lothar Gruchmann, though bound by reeducation doctrines, cannot help realizing: “Neither the Nuremberg Trials nor the captured political and military documents of the Axis Powers brought any proof of a military threat to the American continent between 1939 and 1945... On the contrary, Hitler strove to keep the United States out of the European War.”

The American diplomat, Tyler Kent, wrote: “Roosevelt was looking for a cynical way out. He realized that for the United States, which were protected on either side by vast oceans, an expensive war in which the fighting and the dying were to be left up to foreigners would be the ideal means to give the economy a boost. Consequently, as early as the 1930s he secretly supported just those forces in Europe that were for an open war against National-Socialist Germany... Even before the start of the war, it was decided in the Council on Foreign Relations that war would be waged against Germany.

The American flying ace, Colonel Lindbergh, who later was promoted to General, wrote in 1941: “We have been led towards war by a minority of our people. This minority has power. It has influence. It has a loud voice. But it does not represent the American people.”

“Powers That Make Fools of Us”

When President Roosevelt began heading for war, numerous other public figures of the United States beside Lindbergh urged that Washington ought to worry about the injustices cluttering up its own back yard rather than involve itself in far-away Europe. The American journalist and author, Henry Louis Mencken, wrote: “If it is absolutely necessary to crush totalitarianism, then for Heaven’s sake let us begin in Cuba, in Brazil, Mexico, Santa Domingo and in Mississippi.” On August 5, 1946, Mencken noted in the magazine, *Life*: “The British would never have devised the Second World War if they had not been certain of Roosevelt’s help.”

On April 27, 1941, Senator Gerald P. Nye—who since 1934 had headed the investigating committee for American participation in the First World War—stated: “We are being made fools of by the same powers that made fools of us in the world war. Through deception, we are made to believe that we can bring order into the chaos of Europe... If ever we become involved in this war, it will be described by future historians only

with the title ‘The President’s War.’”

On April 4, 1941, the American cardinal, William O’Connor, said: “I know the people want to keep out, but the government seems to ignore their wishes—while still speaking of democracy. Certain secret manoeuvres are taking us ever closer to war. It is not fair of a government which calls itself democratic to act like this.”

Did Germany want to attack the United States? The following is the opinion of the American Professor of International Law, Frederic A. Sanborn: “Tons and tons of German archives, their most secret plans, memoranda and correspondence fell into the hands of the victors at war’s end! These documents were examined and studied painstakingly for months by dozens of investigating officials, in the search for any trace of proof that could be presented to the Nuremberg Tribunal. After long and meticulous searching it became evident that nowhere in those papers proof of any sort of German plans for an attack on the United States was to be found. Quite on the contrary, examinations of these secret papers revealed the embarrassing fact that many months before Pearl Harbour, Hitler had done everything in his power to avoid a conflict with the United States.

Roosevelt’s Symphony of Death

The American historian, Charles Callan Ransill wrote: “The leitmotif of carrying the ideals of the United States out into the world became fashionable again after 1933, and with Roosevelt acting as maestro, the old, macabre rhythms made their way into the homes of the people. In 1941, his orchestra of death waited with bated breath for the sign to begin the new symphony. He had hoped that Germany would supply him with his motive, but Hitler refused to help him with a few introductory aggressions.”

Evidence for Roosevelt’s shared guilt for the catastrophe of Pearl Harbour, which was, after all, the trigger of the war, has been compiled by the American Rear Admiral, Robert A. Theobald, who was at that time Chief of the 1st Fleet of destroyers of the Pacific American forces. He wrote: “Since the American people were so opposed to participation in the war, one of the Axis Powers had to be forced to draw the United States into the fray, and this in such a way that the people would be roused to unanimous conviction of the necessity of battle.”

And finally, the testimony of the American general, Albert C.

Wedemeyer, the Commander of the American troops in China during the Second World War: the Roosevelt Administration had been determined "to get us into the war through the back door." The soldiers in Pearl Harbour, he stated, were sacrificed to this end. Roosevelt "maneuvered America into the war with his openly no longer neutral actions against Germany and with his decisive ultimatum to Japan." With that, the United States became involved in a war "whose consequences could not but have been the spread of totalitarian tyranny over greater parts of the world than Hitler could ever have dreamed of conquering."

The moral of the story finally became clear in August of 1945, when the Powers-that-be in the United States dropped the atom bombs on a Japan that had long declared itself willing to surrender—and those bombs were not by any means dropped on uninhabited areas, which would have been quite sufficient as a demonstration of new atomic might, but on two major cities, an act which brought gruesome death to hundreds of thousand of innocent civilians, mostly women and children. A short time later, at the tribunals in Nuremberg and Tokyo, the United States once again set themselves up as World Judge...

Uncle Sam's Cane

In the Middle East, Washington has now amassed the mightiest attack force since the landing of the Western Allies in Normandy in 1944. That the United States do not dare to go up against Saddam Hussein on their own and also need to enlist their former chief enemies, Germany and Japan, to aid in financing their adventure, shows first of all the inadequacy of the American ground troops which became apparent especially in the Vietnam War, and, second, the more than precarious American budget situation. The all-powerful Uncle Sam needs a cane to walk. His limp is an unmistakable sign of the fact that so far anyone who wished to devour the world has choked on it.

Most of the nations which presently 'help' the United States in the Middle East by supplying troops are not doing this voluntarily, but under the sometimes gentle, sometimes brutal pressure exerted on them by Washington. This was already the case in the Second World War, when the United States pummelled dozens of countries, especially those of Latin America, into the war against Germany.

Other nations that send troops into the Middle East do not do so because they like the (not all that pleasant) looks of the Wall Street bosses,

but rather because they do not want to leave the field entirely to the USA—they want to have their say as well. This is another parallel to the Second World War, where many nations joined the so-called Anti-Hitler Coalition only after the fortunes of war begun not to favour Germany and after it had become clear that a refusal to participate in the war against Germany would be avenged with painful 'punishment'. The classic example for this is Turkey, which did not join the ranks of Germany's opponents until the very end, because Ankara had been threatened openly with Stalin's theft of the Dardanelles, and because Turkey wanted a voice in the then newborn United Nations, which one could at that time join only as Germany's opponent in the war.

In this light, it is complete and utter nonsense to say that the United States now stand at the head of a 'voluntary coalition' of the nations of the world in their fight against the evil Saddam Hussein.

General Schwarzkopf and the Middle East

The name of the Commander-in-Chief of the American armed forces in the Middle East, Norman Schwarzkopf, Jr., is like a synonym for Washington's imperialism. Some sources claim that the General is of German extraction, some say he is Jewish.

Since 1942, his father, Norman Schwarzkopf, Sr., was in command of the police forces of the regime of the Shah of Iran. To give some historical background: Reza Pahlawi, the Shah of Iran since 1925, was pronouncedly pro-German and did not want his country to enter into the war against Germany. In August of 1941, Soviet and British troops invaded Iran and divided the country amongst themselves—a war of aggression and a breach of international law for which there was never a Tribunal à la Nuremberg. The pro-German Shah was forcibly deposed and driven out of his country, into South Africa. In his stead, his 22-year-old son, Mohammed Reza Pahlawi, was placed on the throne. He was the Shah who was overthrown by the Ayatollah in 1979. In the further course of the Second World War, Iran was abused as one of the most important avenues for the American supply of arms to Stalin. In order to keep the upper hand over the Iranian population, which suffered badly under the foreign occupation, President Roosevelt sent a legion of CIA agents as well as specialists for 'internal security' to Persia. These 'troops for the preservation of order' were headed by the father of today's Commander-in-Chief of the American troops in the Middle East.

In 1941, shortly before the attack on Iran, Iraq had also fallen victim to Allied aggression. The Head of State, Prime Minister Rashid el-Gailani—also pro-German, and the leader of the patriotic Arabian-Nationalist Brotherhood—was forcibly deposed, and replaced with a puppet government directed by British bayonets. For this further flagrant violation of international law and the right to self-determination, which was supported partly by the American policy, there was also no Tribunal to bring the chief war criminals to justice. The family of today's Iraqi President Hussein, actively supported the pro-German el-Gailani.

The third Middle East country which became a victim of Allied aggression in World War Two was Egypt. The king there, King Faruk I, who had been in power since 1937, strove for friendship with Germany and Italy, against the British colonial power. The later Egyptian Head of State, Anwar el Sadat, who as an Arabian nationalist worked with Rommel, reports in his memoirs how that situation developed. "On February 4, 1942, the British Ambassador had the royal palace surrounded by British tanks and gave Faruk an ultimatum under whose terms he either had to accept the demands of the British, or to abdicate." Faruk yielded to brute force. Sadat: "That was a humiliation of Egypt, of the army and the people—and through the colonial power!" The Egyptians still refused for a long time to sign the declaration of war against Germany. But following further British and American pressure, the goal was finally achieved in February of 1945.

These were the methods of Germany's oh-so-moral opponents in the War—here described using the example of the Middle East. One could paradigmatically also draw on other regions of the world for comparison.

CIA-Managed Coup

Back to Norman Schwarzkopf, Sr. In 1948 he left the American-subordinated police forces of the Shah and became Commander of the American military mission in Teheran. Barely had the stranglehold of the Western imperialists relaxed a little before nationalist forces arose in Iran which wanted to shake off the foreign influence. Mohammed Mossadegh gained power in 1951 in the capacity of Prime Minister. Mossadegh put the British- and American-dominated oil reserves under State control and set an independent course for his government. The experiment met its end in 1953, in a coup stage-managed by the CIA—and carried out with the participation of the American military mission led by Schwarzkopf, Sr. —

Mossadegh was imprisoned and afterwards was kept constantly under police surveillance.

Horror in Indochina

Norman Schwarzkopf, Jr. won his spurs as Major in the Vietnam War. For one-and-a-half decades, the American military machinery raged in Indochina. The man chiefly responsible for this imperial adventure, which brought death for not only 58,000 brave GIs but also for millions of civilians, was the glorious John F. Kennedy. Originating in an Irish family which had been rather insubordinate to the Wall Street warmongers (his father, Joe, who at the outbreak of war in 1939 was the American Ambassador to England, urged neutrality), John F. Kennedy served as compliant White House Helper towards the fulfillment of the goals of dollar-imperialism. Under Kennedy's rule, the CIA arranged a bloody coup in South Vietnam, which had as its victim the ruler Diem there, who admittedly had been anything but democratic in the Western sense but who definitely had brought a certain degree of stability to the region following the end of French colonial rule. On the orders of Kennedy and his successors, hundreds of thousands of American soldiers flooded into Indochina, allegedly for purposes of defence of the Western Values Community. Gradually, Vietnam's neighboring states were also drawn into the massacre, finally even Cambodia, by virtue of the American invasion of 1975. The soundness of America's sublime goals was revealed in 1975, when the GIs unceremoniously left Vietnam—a Vietnam bleeding from thousands of wounds, and a Saigon which under American rule had degenerated into a gigantic brothel and drug hell. To this day, the Vietnamese, Cambodian and Laotian people suffer severely under the American 'defense of the Western Values Community'. Not only were hundreds of thousands of children crippled by the American terror-bombing (even though the Second World War had already proven the military senselessness of such Holocaust-bombing), but further thousands of children were born severely deformed because the United State had employed chemical weapons on a gigantic scale. By the way, when Washington withdrew from Vietnam in 1975, it took with it the results of the oil explorations in the South China Sea along the Vietnam coast; however, they left behind the list of names of the South Vietnamese collaborators so that the victorious Communists should not have any trouble in 'disposing' of one after the other—tens of thousands altogether. Whoever can call the United States their friend

needs no...

Stars Upon Stars...

In the meantime, our friend Norman Schwarzkopf added stars upon stars to his epaulette. In October of 1983, when Washington initiated 'Operation Urgent Fury' (that was the code name for the attack on Grenada), Schwarzkopf advanced to the position of Deputy Commander of all units taking part in the attack on the Caribbean island republic. It goes without saying that the invasion of Grenada was, of course, only a just American war for purposes of defending the Western Values Community, in order to protect, Dallas, Denver and New York from the menacing threat of ..., ..., and ... (the reader is welcome to fill in the blanks with the usual propaganda phrases).

So now Mr. Schwarzkopf is Chief of the American troops encircling Iraq. The show must go on...

"Chosen by Good to Rule the World"

In comparison to the extreme, all too often downright insane presumptions of selectedness and being chosen to rule the world that are exhibited by leading Americans, even the shrillest claims of Old World chauvinists sound like a kitten's contented purring. One could compile a Britannica-sized encyclopedia of statements of the American 'elite' with respect to America's status as 'God's Chosen', about its alleged divine mission to rule the world, and about the 'inferiority' of other nations and countries. What follows are just a few examples of thousands:

Dean Acheson, American Secretary of State from 1949 to 1953, responsible for America's enormous relief shipments ('Lend-Lease') to Stalin during the Second World War, presumed to declare: "The United States enthusiastically don the cloak of a global leader."

John Adams, the second President of the United States, perceived "the founding of the American nation" as "a glorious plan of Providence for the enlightenment of the rest of mankind." Also, "I have always regarded the colonization of America with reverence and admiration, as a great beginning and a grand plan of Providence for the enlightenment of the ignorant."

Albert Jeremiah Beveridge, Senator from Indiana and for decades an important figure in the US Congress, proclaimed near the end of the 19th

century: "Not in vain has God for an entire millennium raised the Teutonic and English-speaking people to conceited and lazy self-admiration. He has made us the highest organizations on Earth so that we will bring order wherever chaos reigns. He has enabled us to rule so that we may lead the barbaric and senile peoples. Without such a force, this our world would sink back into barbarism. From amongst all the races, God has made the American people his Chosen people." Beveridge also pointed out the dovetailing of economics and politics. "With our merchant ships we will ply all the oceans, and we will create a combat marine that corresponds to our greatness. The American law, the American order, the American civilization will take root on these shores that to this day were bloodstained and lived in the darkness of ignorance, yet they will be blessed and happy under the influence of this power that issues from God." And because it is so deliciously spine-chilling, one more quote from Beveridge: "Fellow Americans! We are God's Chosen People. His hand held us. Abraham Lincoln was His servant, and His was the altar of freedom which the Boys in Blue erected on a hundred smoking battlefields. His great goals are revealed in the advance of our flag. We cannot withdraw from any piece of land where Providence has unfurled our banner. It is up to us to save freedom and civilization."

"The World Will Lie at Your Feet"

Andrew Carnegie, the American 'Steel King', proclaimed to his people in 1886: "The world will soon lie at your feet; the American Constitution will be regarded more and more as model which new nations will adopt and old nations will try to attain."

Mr. Crevecoeur, American preacher and publicist at the end of the 18th century, phrased the American credo as follows: "Wherever one looks, mankind is oppressed by tyrants, absurd laws and misguided Churches. But here we have restored the dignity of man. Here, a new race is being born. Here, man is free."

Stephen A. Douglas, Senator from Illinois, proclaimed in the mid-1800s: "Extend, increase and expand—that is the law according to which our nation is set up. We cannot permit that this great Republic be confined by borders."

Thomas Jefferson, one of the 'Fathers' of the American Constitution, third President of the United States, was not exactly modest either: "We are summoned to act as a bulwark against ignorance and barbarism. The

old Europe will lean on our shoulders and, shackled as it is to clerics and kings, hobble along beside us the best it can." Mr. Jefferson continued: "The world has entrusted us with the keeping of the sacred flame. And the sparks that fly from it will ever serve to kindle it in other regions of the Earth." In 1785, Jefferson waxed ecstatic: "Oh God! How little my fellow countrymen realize that they have been blessed with the good things in life like no other people on Earth!"

Andrew Johnson, 17th President of the USA, who was responsible for the vile treatment of the defeated Southern States, was of the conviction—expressed in 1868 in a message to Congress—that "the principles of the American form of government will prove to be strong enough to draw all civilized nations of the world into their sphere of influence."

Lyndon B. Johnson, that President who further deepened the involvement of his country in the Indochina conflict, where it was already mired knee-deep, dispatched the GIs to Vietnam with the words: "The hopes of many peoples and nations accompany you to the field of battle." And, apparently considering his office to be synonymous with that of High Priest, he added: "God Bless you!"

"The Right to Moral Leadership of the Planet"

John F. Kennedy, whose propagandists even enabled him to become the stylite of the Left, saw "the bright beacon of hope for all the world" shining in his country. It was thus only logical that he claimed "the right to moral leadership of this planet" for the United States.

William L. Langer, historian at Harvard University and supplier of propagandistic key-words for Kennedy, noted in 1960: "The United States must at all times exert their influence in the name of a world order concurrent with American ideals, interests and security. The Americans can do this without egotism because they are convinced that such a world order is the hope of all mankind."

Henry Luce, one of the most powerful of American media bosses, in the 1930s proclaimed his nation as the "good Samaritan of the world." Also, "In 1919 we were offered a golden opportunity, as it has not occurred before in recorded history, to assume the leadership of the world. With out concerted help, we must succeed under Roosevelt [F.D. Roosevelt, President from 1933-1945; ed.] where we failed under Wilson [Woodrow Wilson, President from 1913-1921; ed.]. Within the vision of

America as chief guarantor of the freedom of the seas, as the leader of world trade, is contained the potential for such giant human progress that it makes one giddy. Each and every single one of us is called upon to create the first American century." The news magazine *Time*, from which Luce's media empire had grown, stated in 1961: "To maintain order, and to be able to trade profitably in a free world, the United States must control the seas and serve as the nations' coast-guard."

"Noah's Ark of Freedom"

Captain Mahan, President Theodore Roosevelt's closest advisor, wrote at the turn of the 19th century: "In our childhood, we only bordered on the Atlantic; in our youth, we extended our border to the Gulf of Mexico; our maturity, today, finds us at the Pacific. Do we not have a right, even a calling, to further progress into every direction?"

Herman Melville, the 100th anniversary of whose death was celebrated in a big way in the United States, the man who is considered the epitome of the American novelist, proclaimed: "We, the Americans, represent a unique people, the nation of Israel in our time; we carry the Ark of Freedom of this world."

Richard M. Nixon, President from 1969 to 1974, showed himself convinced that his nation, "led by God", could give the world more than any other: "We can give the world spiritual leadership." It was also a given for him that the peoples of the Earth yearn for the American 'way of life': "Whether we like it or not: we were entrusted with the responsibility of leadership. National pride without the impulse to share that of which we are proud, is selfish." An altruist in the White House!

Ronald Reagan, on the occasion of his inauguration, proclaimed that "God, who showers his blessings upon this nation, has always watched us and led us as the Promised Land." The USA, he said, are the "especially chosen" nation, as well as that "which is the last great hope for that kind of man who has never meant to be second-best, but rather a golden hope for all of mankind." Reagan knew why the United States had been able to rise to the status of as superpower: "Because Americans are far more religious than the people in any other country." On the 100th anniversary of the erection of the Statue of Liberty in New York, in 1986, Mr. Reagan recalled to his nation how it all began: "A small group of Puritans huddled on board, and then John Winthrop, who later became the first Governor of Massachusetts, reminded his brethren that they must hold fast to

their faith and stand by God, that the eyes of the world were on them and that they must never give up the mission God had assigned to them, and that they must be a light for all the nations on Earth—a shining city on the hill.”

“As in the Time of Moses”

Adlai Stevenson, American politician, co-founder of the UN and NATO, saw the role of the United States as follows: “God has entrusted us with nothing less than the leadership of the free world.”

Ezra Styles, American publicist and preacher, proclaimed, following the end of the War of Independence against Britain: “God’s covenant with the Israelites at the time of Moses was a prophecy of the future prosperity and grandeur of the United States of America.”

Harry S. Truman, who in his capacity as President issued the order to wipe out two defenseless Japanese cities with atom bombs, in 1952 expressed happiness “that America has assumed that role of leadership with which the Almighty God has entrusted us.”

Robert Walker, Minister of Finance, had declared 105 years earlier: “Divine power has guided America’s expansion, and watches over us and leads us on to our goal, drives us on and has chosen our great and happy nation as model for all the nations on Earth.”

Aside from President F.D. Roosevelt, who governed in the White House from 1933 to 1945 “with the winning charm of Caesar” (Thomas Mann), no other American ruler was as much an expert at unctuous talk of world power as Woodrow Wilson, who, with his troops, saw to it that a draw in Europe was prevented and that the order of the Old World (with a stable Germany at the center) was smashed. He challenged American entrepreneurs: “Go out into the world, sell goods with which the world can become happier, and convert the world to American principles.” According to Wilson, the interpreter of fate, “Providence has chosen the United States to be the sole idealistic nation on Earth and granted her the prerogative to save the world.” Besides, on assuming the office of Governor of New Jersey (a position which he regarded as springboard to the Presidency), Wilson had referred his grousing election assistant, McCombs, to direct connections to the very top: “Don’t forget that it was God who has chosen me as the next President of the United States.” It is ironic that Woodrow Wilson went down even in European history as the ‘Peace President’, even though he not only broke the neck of the European conti-

nent through his military interference in 1917 but also sent his soldiers off on attacks on Mexico, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Panama, Nicaragua, Cuba, Haiti and Honduras.

“Double Standard With a Clear Conscience”

Finally, a quotation from the American historian Henry Steele Commager of Columbia University of New York: “It is the idea of the moral superiority of the United States and the superiority of her institutions and way of life which enables us to uphold the moral double standard of our international relations with a frank face and a clear conscience.” A truly elegant paraphrase of revolting hypocrisy!

The Verdict of the Tormented

When the great American poet, Ezra Pound, who had been committed to US insane asylums for 13 years for having expressed his support for Mussolini, was finally freed in 1958 and moved to Italy, he declared on his arrival in Europe: “Finally I have escaped from a madhouse inhabited by 180 million inmates.”

Understandable though the harsh verdict of that tormented man may be from a human point view, it is objectively unjust. Not only numerous peoples all over the world, but also the Americans themselves, have become victims of the policies of those cliques in power in the United States.

The Murder Capital of the World

Externally, the United States exhibit gruesome statistics of violence; internally, no less so. In 1990, some 23,000 murders will take place between New York and San Francisco; a new, sad record. A high-ranking police official in Los Angeles has stated: “We have lost the battle for the city.”

The American capital city of Washington is not only the political metropolis of the United States, it is also the murder capital of the world. Relative to its population, 25 times as many people are killed there each year as in Berlin. Particularly the drug scene defies description. Sixty percent of all murders in Washington result from drug trafficking.

In San Francisco alone, the number of heroin addicts has risen from some 5,000 in the early 1980s to now more than 10,000. Robert Matano, drug counsellor at Stanford University: “Drug abuse has become so rooted in our society that even heroin is becoming acceptable again. It’s frightening.”

A study recently commissioned by the UN estimates that large-scale drug dealers earn some \$125 billion annually from the America drug market alone. The drug business has in the meantime become part of established Big Business in the United States. From there, organized gangs with the best of connections to the highest political and economic levels see to the drug supply of the entire so-called Western Values Community. Barely had the GIs attacked Noriega's Panama, allegedly in order to eliminate the drug-dealing Panamanian dictator, before the drug market in that Central American nation flourished all the more. If the Bush Administration thinks that it can combat the drug trade with soldiers and bomber planes, then the leathernecks would have to march into New York and detonate their bombs there! The dealers that have launched a major offensive against the youth of the world, that bring death and misery to millions, and make millions in the process, are largely to be found in the United States of America!

Plague Spots of Decadence

The plague spots of decadence are breaking open everywhere in the United States. Nowhere else on Earth are so many children already killed in the womb as in the USA. Reliable estimates conjecture that of every 100 pregnancies in the US, 40 are 'broken off'. Reports such as the following, from the news agency dpa, are commonplace: "NEW YORK. A not quite four-hour-old baby has been thrown into a garbage compacter of a subsidized housing complex in New York City. That the baby survived is thanks only to the keen sense of hearing of the landlord, who at that time was operating the garbage compacter in the building's basement." The abandoning of children and killing of newborns are the order of the day in the slums of New York and other major American cities.

Another typical press report from the Land of Endless Opportunity: "The fourth toddler in nine days sustained fatal injuries in New York on Monday. Nine-month-old Rayon Jamison was hit by two bullets fired through the apartment door."

According to Louis F. Freech, State Attorney in the district of New York South, far more than 1,000 babies are born each year in New York alone which, as result of the flood of drugs, are addicted to 'crack' at birth.

AIDS-Epidemic

At the present time, the United States suffer from a wave of tuberculo-

sis. Last year alone, the number of newly diagnosed cases in New York rose by 10 percent, by 35 percent in neighboring Newark. AIDS, drug and alcohol abuse, and homelessness are cited as causative factors.

The New York area has the greatest concentration of AIDS cases in the world. An investigation by the Federal Department of Health indicated that 8 percent of all patients tested in New York clinics were HIV-positive. At 24 percent, men between 25 and 44 years of age exhibited the highest rate of infection. The AIDS rate determined in New York thus lies above any reported from Africa.

Almost 100,000 Americans have already succumbed to the fatal immune deficiency disease. That is one-and-a-half times the numbers of soldiers who died in the almost ten years of the Vietnam War. At least 600,000, but perhaps as many as 3 million, persons are already infected with the AIDS virus in the United States. The relatively low estimate was given by the Hoover Institute of Stanford University, the high estimate stems from the Hudson Institute in Indianapolis. Washington officially conjectures 800,000 to 1.3 million infected persons nation-wide.

If the estimate of the Hoover Institute applies, 50,000 acute AIDS cases can be forecast in the USA for 1991. Medical costs will then run to some \$4 billion. If up to 3 million are in fact infected, there will be more than 150,000 acute cases in 1991. Costs then rise to some \$12 billion.

In New York there are already thousands upon thousands of AIDS orphans—children who have lost at least one parent to the epidemic. According to American press reports, 3 percent of newborns in New York are infected with AIDS. The figures are no less terrible in some other large cities. AIDS is the most common cause of death among New York women aged 25 to 35. In American major cities, in the 18 - 21 age brackets, at least every 30th inhabitant carries the deadly virus.

According to an American military physician, AIDS will also become the most common cause of death among the US armed forces in the coming years. Dr. Redfield states that presently more than 5,000 HIV-positive men are known to be in active service in the military.

Moral Rock-Bottom

Not only the American national debt, which has in the meantime resulted in a barely still functional bureaucracy, and not only the balance of trade, which is chronically on the deficit side and signals the decline of the American economy, but also the collapse of the American health care sys-

tem testifies unmistakably to the fact that the Empire is standing on the threshold of infirmity in the truest sense of the word. The news magazine *US News & World Report*, writes that "37 million American are without any health insurance." These people, who gather primarily in the major cities, are not admitted by private clinics, so that they are dependent on the inadequate and totally overcrowded public hospitals, where the patients 'pile up'.

The Bush Administration has commissioned Senator John Rockefeller to investigate the dreadful state of health service and to propose suggestions to its rescue. Rockefeller estimates that health care costs resulting from, among other things, drug addiction, AIDS and criminality will rise from \$600 billion at the present time to \$600 trillion in the course of the next decade. The Senator foresees a "disaster". Professor Reinhardt, of Princeton University: "The United States have sunk to moral depths such as no other nation in the industrialized world has plumbed. This is a nation that holds mothers and children in contempt and leaves them without any insurance." The scales even fell from the eyes of Augstein's *Der Spiegel*: "The American century draws inexorably to a close."

The Shine has Come Off

Economically as well, the shine has come off. The dollar is dropping to unprecedented lows. US banks crash by the dozens and leave behind them tens of thousands cheated out of all their savings. The construction industry is shattered. The budget deficit will soon rise to \$250 to \$300 billion. American historian Paul Kennedy: "The consequences of overextension."

Tremendous sums of money must be raised to get even a partial grip on the debts. Social services, as far as they are provided at all, are grinding to a halt. Through its meddling in two world wars, the USA became the world's greatest creditor nation. An illusory boom. Now they are the greatest debtor.

Less and less actually works in this country where two million children leave public school each year without mastering the fundamental cultural requisites, reading and writing. The best example for this dreadful state is the project which has been America's Number One pride and joy: space flight. Since the rocket experts that were shipped over from Germany have passed away or retired, the USA are no longer on the moon—just in the dark.

May God Have Mercy

Consumed by internal decadence, pock-marked by the most severe social and economic ills, the American giant staggers toward his collapse. He can still hold out for the time being only because the USA are a country richly blessed with mineral resources and because in those areas where decadence has not yet completely devoured honor, soul and society, hard-working and industrious people, often of German descent, give their utmost.

History shows quite clearly that tottering Empires tend to military adventures. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan fell into this category. It is quite likely that the USA are presently thrashing wildly about in the death throes of their Empire.

May God have mercy on those peoples and nations that join their fate with that of the rotting American colossus!

Sources:

Bavendamm. *Roosevelts Weg zum Krieg*

Kern. *Verheimlichte Dokumente / Was den Deutschen verschwiegen wird.*

Milksche. *Das Ende der Gegenwart.*

Stern. *Die Wahren Schuldigen am Zweiten Weltkrieg.*

Winter. *Ami go home — Plädoyer für den Abschied von einem gewalttätigen Land.*

DOES THE WEST HAVE THE WILL TO SURVIVE?

That is the obvious question posed by Jean Raspail's terrifying novel of the swamping of the White world by an unlimited flood of non-White "refugees." But there is also a less obvious and even more fundamental question: Must Whites find their way to a new Morality and a new spirituality in order to face the moral challenges of the present and overcome them? **THE CAMP OF THE SAINTS** is the most frightening book you will ever read. It is frightening because it is utterly believable. The armada of refugee ships in Raspail's story is exactly like the one that dumped 150,000 Cubans from Fidel Castro's prisons and insane asylums on our shores in 1980 — except this time the armada is from India, with more than 70 times as large a population. And it is only the first armada of many. If any book will awaken White Americans to the danger they face from uncontrolled immigration, it is **THE CAMP OF THE SAINTS**. For your copy (Order No. 03014) send \$10.00 (which includes \$1.50 for postage and handling) to:

LIBERTY BELL PUBLICATIONS
Box 21, Reedy WV 25270 USA.

'ANTI-SEMITISM':

How to Get Rid of it

Suggestions for a New Approach to
An Ancient Problem

by
John Tyndall

A FEW WEEKS AGO I watched a television programme on a subject that everyone would probably agree has had an ample airing over the years, sometimes to the point at which it has appeared that the TV people have an obsession about it. Yes, the programme was about 'anti-Semitism,' an area of human study perhaps aptly misnamed because so much else about it is false and misleading. Anthropologically speaking, Semites are Arabs plus that section of Jewry descended from the original Israelites who inhabited the Middle Eastern region alongside them but who are now heavily outnumbered within their own nation by the descendants of the Khazars, a Turco-Mongoloid people whose roots are in Central Asia.

There may be some who would regard this quest for accuracy of nomenclature as 'nit-picking.' It sometimes is, but not in this instance; the choice of the terms 'Semitic' and 'anti-Semitic' to describe things which do not correspond to those appellations is symbolic of the whole atmosphere in which the subject of 'anti-Semitism' is customarily debated in these times. However, having made this point I will oblige the Jews from here on by using their own terminology, if only because such a phrase as 'anti-Jewishism' sounds clumsy, unfamiliar and distracting.

During the programme to which I have referred, one after another representative of the Jewish and pro-Jewish point of view was shown giving his, or her, definition of the psychology of the 'anti-Semite.' At times the viewer might almost have been led into believing that all this amounted to a genuine exchange of views, in as much as not every explanation of what makes 'anti-Semites' tick was the same. Each had a theory as to the roots of the problem, and the theories varied considerably—thus contributing to the image of an actual 'debate.' The impression of debate was heightened by the fact that non-Jews, as well as Jews, were invited to offer their opin-

ions. But at the end of the programme the rational observer could not help but be struck by the thought that something had been missing from it all. What could that something be?

Barely a half a minute's thought sufficed to reveal what it was. Not in one single case had the producers permitted a contribution to the discussion by one of those maligned persons whom the programme was supposed to be all about: the 'anti-Semites'—or, more accurately, those people who adhered to the theory that the Jewish presence in world affairs was not an unmixed blessing for which all mankind should be thankful.

Surely, in the name of reason, in the name of fairness and objectivity—above all in the name of that procedure for handling human affairs to which the Jews, more than anyone, are supposed to be dedicated, namely 'democracy'—a discussion about 'anti-Semitism' should feature, among others, the 'anti-Semitic' point of view. But no! Not a single word was permitted to be said in support of this.

That very fact, more than any of the opinions aired on the programme, ought to tell us something.

BLISSFUL IGNORANCE

Perhaps I can contribute something to this discussion by speaking as one of the missing people on the said programme, one of the considerable number of speakers and writers around the world whom no doubt this TV feature had in mind when referring to 'anti-Semites' but who are almost never allowed to come on television before a large audience and explain the basis for their attitudes on this question.

As a youngster growing up in the South Eastern part of the outer London suburbs in the early aftermath of World War II, I saw very little of Jews. They were not numerous in my area, and the pursuits in which I engaged myself were not such as to be likely to bring me into contact with the few who did live locally.

When I started to take an interest in politics in my late teens I had no views whatever about Jews or 'anti-Semitism.' I had of course heard about such things in Germany during the Hitler period, but I simply didn't understand what it was all about.

If anyone, however, had suggested to me that a particular race of people, or the members of a particular religion, should be especially ostracised, ill-treated or persecuted merely because of what they were, I would have rejected the idea without a moment's hesitation.

My interest in politics at the time derived from my sense of duty towards my own people, the British people. I felt that the British people were on the way down as a nation. I wanted to lift them up. I wanted them to prosper and recover their former greatness; I had no thought of wishing to do harm to any other people, only to do some good for **my** people.

As this interest in, and concern for, the future of the British people developed, I came to the point eventually at which I was driven by a compulsion to seek some outlet for political action. This happened in my early twenties, not a very long time after I had left the army, during which I spent long hours reading and thinking about British and world affairs and becoming more and more discontented with the direction in which Britain was heading. Had I known of an organisation which represented my opinions I would have joined it sooner. At last, however, when I was 22 I did find one, and I enlisted in it and started to become active.

Up to this time, my motives were those of pure patriotism. I did not hate any race in particular; if I had any feelings of hate they were reserved for members of my own race who seemed to be happy to commit acts of treason against Britain if it were to their personal advantage to do so.

But as I started to meet people in, or in some way allied with, the organisation I had just joined, I began to come into contact with the theories of 'anti-Semitism.' People would tell me: "If you want to understand what's going wrong with this country, you've got to study the activities of the Jews." Some books were recommended, and in one or two cases freely given, to me which purported to explain the 'Jewish Question.'

AVOIDANCE OF THE NETTLE

My first reaction was one of doubt and, just a little, of revulsion. I wanted to do something, as I have said, to lift up my own people, not to down others. Probably, some little subconscious voice inside me was telling me that by embracing these theories I was embracing something that had been universally damned, excoriated as the ultimate evil, the doctrine that led to the 'gas chambers'. Every normal human being prompting inside me was such as to counsel me not to touch these ideas with a barge-pole, if only for the fact that it would invite bitter hostility and opposition and deflect attention from the task of promoting ideas that would contribute to the regeneration of Britain.

My study of the subject was not helped, moreover, by the obvious eccentricity of some of the people who were peddling it. That had the look,

and they spoke in the language, of cranks. They blamed the Jews for just about every conceivable human catastrophe, including catastrophes which by no stretch of the imagination could possibly be attributed to the members of that race.

It was not an encouraging start to my quest to understand what lay behind 'anti-Semitism'.

But not all of the literature on the subject was so wildly exaggerated and unbalanced. I had come by this time greatly to admire the writings of A.K. Chesterton, my first real political mentor. Chesterton appealed to me above all because of his blazing British patriotism, not because of his opinions on the Jews. There was no doubt, however, that he had very firm views about the latter subject. Because I believed in his patriotic ideals, and also because I respected his fine intellect and balanced judgement, I felt I owed it to him to study his writing on the Jewish question in a spirit of objective enquiry.

In these writing there were none of the wild rantings of the lunatic fringe of 'anti-Semites'. Chesterton gave the facts about Jewish Power and influence as he saw them, backing these up with ample documentary references. His dominating theme was that of a worldwide Jewish conspiracy to obtain overlordship of the earth. This was rather too much for me to digest all in one gulp, even from such a respected author. But as I had come by that time to know Chesterton personally, and to be sure that he would not take up the cudgels in support of a particular doctrine without sound reasons for doing so, it seemed only right for me to give some careful examination to this idea before rejecting it out of hand.

At about the same time, four other books came my way, which I read carefully and upon which I pondered deeply. They all had in common the fact that, like the writings of A.K. Chesterton, they strongly condemned certain Jewish interests and advanced the theory of a Jewish conspiracy for world conquest.

One of these was *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, of which all Jews and all 'anti-Semites' will be aware. This book is purported to consist of the minutes of a series of meetings of leading Jews at which the speaker (or speakers) outline the alleged Jewish strategy for obtaining control of the nations of the globe. Since its first appearance in Russia early in the present century, the book has been condemned by the Jews as a forgery, probably concocted by the Czarist state security police in order to jus-

tify that régime's measures against the Jews. Having given careful study to the contents of this book over many years, I am inclined to the opinion that this Jewish claim is most likely correct—if only for the reason that the language used by the alleged Jewish elders in their lectures is far too outspoken and explicit to be credible; my knowledge of the semantics of that race leads me to feel that, if such a strategy was being outlined as claimed, it would be shrouded in the customary words of double-meaning, innuendo, euphemism and altruism generally employed by internationalists, both Jewish and non-Jewish, rather than stated as baldly and crudely as is the case in *The Protocols*. This aside, the question must obviously be asked: would such plans be announced and recorded at a meeting of Jews anyway, let alone then allowed to be leaked to Gentile sources.

However, even assuming that some functionary of the Czarist Government conceived the idea for authoring *The Protocols* by drawing on the realms of his own imagination, this invites the contrary question: would he have composed the document as he did unless its revelations corresponded closely with the picture of the activities of Russian Jewry held by a great many people in the Czarist Empire at the time? Supposing, for instance, I were to write and publish a book purporting to be a blueprint for world domination by, say, the Italians. The absurdity of such a theory would be so manifest that the book would not have the remotest credibility anywhere, and therefore there would not be the slightest point in producing it. If I wanted to 'get at' Italian people, it would be common sense to attribute to them racial vices and racial goals that to a reasonable number of people were believable, not to make allegations against that nation that were liable to be laughed out of court by almost everyone.

I therefore have come to the opinion that, though *The Protocols* were most probably fiction there is much reason to credit the idea that they correspond to fact, as perceived by a very intelligent person observing events from a Russian perspective sometime around the turn of the century.

SIMILAR SCENARIOS

Another of the books that I obtained at about the same time as my first introduction to *The Protocols* was *The World Conquerors*, by Louis Marschalko. Marschalko was a Hungarian and had produced his book something like half a century after the appearance of *The Protocols*. What was uncanny was the similarity in the scenarios depicted in these two books—just as these in turn were uncannily similar to that depicted in *The*

International Jew, another book I obtained and studied during this formative period. *The International Jew* was the work of the motor magnate Henry Ford, and consisted of a selection of articles that Ford had written in *The Dearborn Independent*, a paper he had founded in the 1920s after he had seen first-hand some of the practices of certain Jewish interests in the American business world, and the way in which Jewish financial and commercial power was employed to wield political influence. Ford's paper was brought into existence to expose and oppose these Jewish practices, but eventually Jewish pressures on his company forced him to cease publication of the paper and even go so far as to make a public apology to the Jews for the 'distress' he had caused them. This true story, which no Jewish sources have even tried to deny, may tell us something about the famous car-producer's moral fibre. But it also tells us a great deal more about the power and leverage of the forces he tried to fight.

The final book that is worthy of mention among my early readings on the Jewish Question needs no introduction. It was Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. Here again, this time as seen from a German standpoint, was a reiteration of the now familiar themes concerning the workings of Jewry and the alleged Jewish plan for world conquest.

The Hitler book was written at about the same time as the Ford book, roughly a quarter century after the appearance of *The Protocols* in Russia and some thirty or so years before the Marschalko book in Hungary. Here I was able to look at the Jewish phenomenon as seen by men of three different generations and in four different countries. Then to add to this I was able to compare the contents with what was currently being written by A.K. Chesterton in his newsletter *Candour*, which though of international scope was primarily derived from observations of developments in Britain. The similarity of the picture portrayed was remarkable, and it was, to my mind, sufficient justification for my starting to take the subject very seriously.

BOOK BAN

But here another factor intervened, which itself was something of a revelation. Both Hitler and Henry Ford had been people of world renown, whether for good or ill. This being so, surely their writings ought to be of great public interest. In that case they ought to be available straight off the shelves in any library, as well as in larger bookshops. My investigations soon told me that they were not—as was the case also with *The Protocols*

and *The World Conquerors*. Why, in a supposed 'democracy', had such books been virtually obliterated from public view? And why indeed, in times when the subject of 'anti-Semitism' was under constant discussion on radio and television and in the press, and when it was the central theme in so many products of the cinema dealing with World War II, was it not possible to walk into an ordinary bookshop or library and pick up a book explaining the subject from the standpoint of the so-called 'anti-Semite'?

Asking myself these questions, I recalled what had been said to me some little time before one of my acquaintances in the patriotic movement. The Jews, he said, had seen to it that all criticism of them in print was effectively banned by the simple method of pressuring bookshop chains and libraries into withdrawing such books from sale and from view.

Had this man sufficient evidence to support his claim? I did not know then and I do not know now, but one thing I do know is that **someone** quite clearly was able to ensure that these books were withdrawn from circulation through the normal channels, and is able to ensure likewise today. And if so, who? I leave the reader to deliberate over this question; and the question itself takes us right forward to about a month ago, when I watched the TV programme referred to at the beginning of this article. Under whose pressure, and in whose interest, was it decided that such a programme, whose central subject was 'anti-Semitism', should totally exclude any contribution from that quarter from which 'anti-Semitic' doctrines are supposed to emanate? Surely this is like a discussion on feminism which excludes all feminists!

Three years ago I produced my own book, *The Eleventh Hour*. In this book no attempt was made to analyse the Jewish Question in any great depth, as I felt that this had been amply done by other authors. But I did make reference to the strange censorship on the subject that has been described here, saying,

One thing we must take into account concerning the theory of a Jewish international conspiracy and that is that it cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be regarded as an obscure subject. It lies at the heart of that doctrine that the Jews call 'anti-Semitism', and it has been acknowledged by writers on the so-called 'holocaust' as being the theory that underlay the anti-Jewish doctrines of Hitler and the Nazis.

And we are never allowed to forget 'anti-Semitism'. It is hurled at us almost every day of our lives by means of the television screen, newspapers and book trade. If two weeks of TV programmes and films go by without a reference to it, the guardians of the Semitic interest being to become greatly wor-

ried that the public may be in the process of being permitted to forget this the world's most important issue!

Considering all this, might it not reasonably be argued that the theory of a Jewish conspiracy must be one of sufficient public interest for it to be subjected to a thorough public enquiry, to an even-sided public debate in which someone is permitted to speak for those many people of historical importance who might be classed as 'anti-Semites'—from Luther to Hitler, from Shakespeare to Belloc and A.K. Chesterton, from Richard Wagner to Henry Ford?

Surely, if the theory of a Jewish conspiracy underlying 'anti-Semitism' has caused so much misery in the world, the proper way to avoid future misery of the same kind is to knock the theory thoroughly on the head by having an open debate about it and once and for all demolishing it by the power of arguments and facts! Yet it seems that those who control the channels of communication whereby such a debate may be staged are strangely reluctant to do this. Why?

Whether or not there actually is such a thing as a Jewish conspiracy for world domination, there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that there is a conspiracy, being conducted by someone, to place a gag on all public discussion of the subject.

NATURE OF THE OPPOSITION

After having read a number of serious books, as well as a few cranky ones, in which the 'anti-Semitic' point of view was presented, I became convinced that this doctrine certainly could not be airily brushed aside as the invention of mere bigots and 'hatemongers'. I was not yet disposed to accept it completely, however, without putting it to the test of my own further enquiries and practical experiences. I joined the patriotic movement, as I have related, to do something for Britain rather than to promote hostility to other nations or races. When I began speaking, at first on street corners, in 1958, the main thrust of my speeches consisted of a series of proposals for constructive changes of British policy, on economic, social and political questions. I opposed the break-up of the British Empire, and advocated that it was in the mutual interest of the United Kingdom and her mainly British dominions to stick together in close alliance. I opposed the moves to embroil Britain in the Common Market, because they ran contrary to this policy. I advocated economic nationalism through the protection of British manufacturing industry, in a series of speeches and articles that anticipated, many years ahead of time, the industrial collapse that we have seen during the last decade under the impact of cup-price foreign imports. I put forward proposals for an integrated national community of

the British people, with all helping one another, as opposed to the individual-centered society that is the consequence of liberalism. I opposed non-white immigration into Britain, though without hatred for the immigrant races involved. I spoke and wrote in favour of strong defences and for the restoration of national service.

In none of these early activities did I bang the drum of 'anti-Semitism'. Although I was starting to think seriously about the Jewish Question I was, like many others, anxious not to be dubbed a 'Nazi', and I sought therefore to avoid association with Hitler's treatment of the Jews.

Bit by bit, however, personal experiences were leading me to a position in which involvement in this issue could not be avoided.

I found that the people most hostile to our patriotic ideas were, in very large part, Jewish. In arguments with Jews I could not notice the contrast between their attitudes to questions affecting Britain as a nation and to those affecting the interests of their own community and the state of Israel, to which they were all attached. They condemned British Nationalism and patriotism vehemently, yet they were the most passionate Jewish Nationalists. What they would never acknowledge Britain's right to do in defence of her interests they enthusiastically applauded Israel's right to do when her interest were thought to be at stake.

This Jewish hostility towards our ideas was evident at our meetings—at which, as yet, we had not started to mention Jews in any unfavourable context. Jews were the most vociferous protesters and, when attempts to wreck the meetings by physical attack were made, Jews were in the forefront of those involved in the violence.

PARALLEL EXPERIENCES

At about this time I had started to make the acquaintance of some people who had taken part in the Mosley movement in the 1930s, and I also obtained some literature produced by supporters of that movement. One revelation that caught my interest was that Mosley had had exactly the same experience as the people with whom I had now become associated: he started out with a programme for Britain that contained no policies directed against Jews; but the Jewish community in this country immediately organised itself against him and Jews predominated among those found guilty of physical assaults against Mosley's supporters.

I began to read Jewish publications, including the world-famous *Jewish Chronicle*. They were veritably dripping with hatred against any and all

people in this country who took a strong stand for British interests and advocated patriotic policies, quite regardless of whether such people had ever attacked Jews. I was then reminded of a passage that I had read in Hitler's *Mein Kampf* a little while earlier, in which the author said that he had been unable to find any newspaper in Germany under Jewish ownership that could properly be called 'national'.

In the books that I mentioned earlier, and in many others that I had read, it had been alleged that almost the entire Soviet leadership that took over Russia after the red revolution in 1917 had been Jewish, many of the people involved operating under false Russian-sounding names, such as Trotsky, Kamenev, Zinoviev, Sverdlov and so on. It was also pointed out that Karl Marx, the intellectual father of bolshevism, had been Jewish. Was this just 'anti-Semitic' propaganda? In due course I found out that the Jews themselves had never made any attempt to deny such facts but simply explained them away as the result of Jews having been driven towards the revolutionary movement in Russia by the oppression they had suffered under the Czars. Would that have explained the extent of their predominance in the first Soviet State? I think not. Nor would it have explained why, as I myself found out first hand, middle-class Jews from quite prosperous families were to be found disproportionately represented among communists in Britain—a country which had been extremely kind to their race for three centuries. I was able to make these observations on a trip to Russia, sponsored and organised by sundry left-wing groups, to attend the World Youth Festival in Moscow in 1957. I had enlisted to go on that trip after seeing an advertisement for it in a sporting magazine and being struck by how cheap it was: £43 all-in! I went for no political motives but only to exploit a unique opportunity to visit a country that had been shrouded in mystery and which I thought was worth seeing. By going there I did not learn a lot about communism in Russia because we were only permitted to travel within limits laid down by our Soviet hosts. I did learn quite a bit about communism in Britain, however, by acquaintance with the organisers of the 'British' party during a three-day train journey across Europe. I never forgot the impact of the large Jewish presence among these people, particularly at official level.

The Jewish presence in communism today is not what it was, but then neither is communism itself. For many years collapsing under the weight of its own internal rotteness, this system which has been the creator of

most of the misery we have seen in the 20th century is now on its way out, and no longer serves as a magnet for those who want to be at the centre of political power. Nevertheless, among the communist rearguard in East Germany we have seen Jews to the fore, as we also see them in the white intelligentsia of the communist-dominated African National Congress.

THE STATE THAT IS A LAW UNTO ITSELF

If we seek a focal point of Jewish power in the world today, we will find it in the State of Israel and in the mobilisation, through the American political system, of US support for that state in the face of growing international concern at the rampant imperialism and racism that is evident in Israeli policy. Use of these terms is not made with derogatory intent, but only to illustrate a paradox; the most passionate denigrators of imperialism and racism when practised by others, Jews are only too ready to support them when practised by their own kin in the bandit state that was set up in 1948 on foundations of bribery and terror: bribery in the way of favours bought for Jewish support of America's entry into World War I, terror in the way of the methods used against enforcers of the British Mandate and against those Palestinians who have not taken kindly to their traditional homelands being occupied and themselves being driven out of them.

At the beginning of this year a massive military operation was launched under United States leadership to stop the Iraqis annexing Kuwait. And yet it has been this same United States that has not only sanctioned Israeli occupation of Gaza and the West Bank but has continued to provide huge economic subsidies to the state responsible for it and has given implicit guarantees of military security to that state within the framework of its present illegal borders. It will also be remembered that Israeli forces rampaged into Lebanon just a few years ago without any American action to stop them.

All this is a clear indication that Israel is able to get away with things that virtually no other small state, and very few larger states, in the world are allowed to get away with. Israel, in other words, seems to enjoy a special status and to be the beneficiary of the workings of a special power—a power formidable enough to determine United States foreign policy by being able virtually to elect and unelect American presidents and American Congresses. I could go on almost indefinitely citing further examples of this selfsame Jewish power in operation, but space imposes limits, and it should suffice to illustrate this one example to show that the Jewish Nation

expects and enjoys privileges in this world that are given to no other. Yet the moment that anyone draws attention to this and protests that it ought not to be so he is certain to have his name filed away in the archives recording the world's 'anti-Semites', who of course must not be permitted to present their case on British television nor in the British press nor have their ample literature on display in British libraries or bookshops. It is a difficult state of affairs to come to terms with, and some of us simply cannot come to terms with it. Hence we are 'anti-Semitic'!

THE SOLUTION

I think I am correct in deducing from all that the Jews have said on the subject of 'anti-Semitism' that they would like to see an end to it. They may not believe this, but there are many of us whom they label 'anti-Semites' who share that sentiment.

The point at issue is whether the initiative for achieving this needs to come from the 'anti-Semites' or the Jews themselves.

For many centuries the Jews with a few exceptions, have been adamant on this point. It is we who have to reform and not they. 'Anti-Semitism', they claim, is an unmitigated evil and must be eradicated, either by the 'anti-Semites' undergoing a change of heart and learning to love the Jews or by their simply being silenced.

The Jews, in order to accomplish the first object, lay great stress on the value of 'education'—education in the great benefits their race has brought to the world and education in the appalling suffering and persecution to which they have been subjected, particularly under Hitler.

But this education must be a wholly one-way business. The people of the world must be educated, under the tutelage of the Jews and their Gentile supporters, to appreciate the Jewish point of view and understand Jewish suffering.

None of this education may permit the airing of any other point of view, nor may it suggest that Jews anywhere might themselves have inflicted suffering—such as in the bloodstained years of the building of the Soviet State in Russia, in which millions of Gentiles were murdered by decree of a leadership that was, as stated, predominantly Jewish.

I would suggest that it is time for a change in this policy. And I would suggest that that change is as much in the interest of the Jews as of anyone else.

Because for all the howling over the centuries against 'anti-Semitism',

for all the measures used to wipe it out, for all the wars waged to oppose it, it still has not disappeared. Indeed there is evidence that today it is again on the upsurge. My source of this information? Why, the Jews themselves!

So why not a new approach to the problem?

Why not start by accepting that there may be two sides to this argument: that not all the guilt is on the side of the 'anti-Semites', that at least some of the guilt may lie with the 'Semites'? Why not permit an open debate on the matter—in the press, on TV and radio, in the book trade, in the schools and universities?

And why not make public meeting halls around the country available to 'racists' and 'anti-Semites' so that they can speak to audiences and explain *why* they are 'racists' and 'anti-Semites', so that the latter can then make up their own minds?

For surely if there is no reasoned foundation for 'anti-Semitism' the Jews and their supporters will be able to convince the people of this by winning an open and honest debate. In this way they can bury the bogey once and for all.

I challenge them to do this.

SAME TREATMENT

But this is just a start. There are other ways in which the Jews can take steps to put an end to 'anti-Semitism.'

The first is for them to abandon their idea of themselves as a special people, as a 'Chosen Race', as a nation that must be treated differently from other nations.

They might make a start in this by withdrawing from its occupation of territories that do not belong to it and which have only been acquired by the use of naked force.

Then they might continue the good work by dismantling their formidable apparatus of power and influence by which they play a decisive role in the politics of so many other nations. They might, to begin with, abandon their attempts to direct the foreign policy of the United States and leave this instead to Americans.

And they might, similarly, discontinue their efforts to play a disproportionately powerful role in the politics of this country.

As an example, they might withdraw their pressure on the present British Government to push the infamous 'War Crimes Bill' through parliament—a Bill that is causing great offence to many Britons who are not

'anti-Semites', in as much as it amounts to the violation of hallowed British legal traditions and practices at the behest of an ethnic minority.

The Jews dislike the allegations of 'anti-Semites' that they aim to control the British press. Very well, they can demolish those allegations very effectively by persuading their own Sir Robert Maxwell to sell off his newspaper empire and by their never again attempting to influence the editorial policy of any paper by means of the threat of canceling advertising contracts.

And there is another thing the Jews can do.

It is their constant claim that the German Nation is tainted by the record of Nazism and Hitler, and they have always urged that the Germans must for ever stand up before the world and acknowledge their guilt in having given birth to the Nazi movement, and that those Germans must atone for their country's past crimes.

Would it not therefore be reasonable to ask that the Jews acknowledge before the world the predominant role that members of their race played in the creation of Communism, and that they are under some obligation to atone for the sufferings that that system has inflicted on mankind?

This would be just another way in which the Jews could demonstrate to us all that what holds good for other nations and races holds good also for themselves.

There is another way in which the Jews can do this.

They can decide once and for all whether they are nationalists or internationalists.

If, as they claim, they are in favour of internationalism, if they support the demise of the sovereign nation-state and the merging of all nations and races into 'one-world', let them set an example in this regard by abandoning Jewish Nationalism, by dismantling the State of Israel, by handing Palestine back to the Palestinians and themselves either remaining there as integrated members of the Palestinian Nation under Palestinian rule or migrating elsewhere and integrating themselves thoroughly with the nations among which they settle.

If, on the other hand, they choose to be nationalists, to be intensely patriotic towards Israel and to fight doggedly for Jewish national interests at all times, they surely cannot object to other peoples—Britons, Germans, French, Americans and so on—doing likewise. This would mean that they should abandon their bitter hostility and their organised opposition to all

non-Jewish nationalism wherever it manifests itself.

Is this really an unreasonable proposition to put to the Jews?

Should the Jews decide to integrate fully with other nations as part of the 'one-world' ideal in which they profess to believe, no-one would with fairness object to their maintaining their own distinct religion, with their own churches (synagogues) and their own traditions of worship. I certainly, for one, would not.

But Jewish communities would be expected to disband the numerous organisations that they now maintain within the states in which they live which are dedicated to promoting special Jewish interests and which lend credence to the view of many of their hosts that they regard themselves as separate and distinct from the societies around them.

All this amounts to a suggestion that a better way might be found to put an end to 'anti-Semitism' if the Jews themselves change—instead of always insisting that it must be us who must change, and us alone.

The Jews will be the first to remind us that 'anti-Semitism' is far from new but is a phenomenon that has reared its head again and again over the centuries, and in one country after another. Absolutely true, and in acknowledging this in *The Eleventh Hour* I said:

No parallel exists anywhere of movements of opposition to any other race or religious group that have manifested themselves with the same intensity, the same universality and the same repetitiveness as these movements against Jewry. Are we to believe that the people involved in such movements were all lunatics, beasts or sadists, intent on persecuting a racial group just out of the malevolence of their natures? Was William Shakespeare, Britain's and perhaps the world's, greatest dramatist, so wrong in his manner of dealing with this subject, as in *The Merchant of Venice*, while he was considered so right in his observations of practically every other human problem under the sun?

Or did all these people perhaps have a reason for their attitudes towards Jewry? We are surely entitled, if we live in a society in which intellectual freedom is allowed, to debate the matter in a spirit of open enquiry by hearing both sides of the argument. Yet in fact we are only allowed to hear one side. Again I put the question: **why?**

The gist of what I was saying in this passage should be plain to the reader: were all these people, and nations, out of step and only the Jews in step? Is there any particular reason why we should assume that all of them were in the wrong and just the Jews in the right? And if the latter, just why did it all happen? Why this universal and repeated opposition to the Jews and never on any comparable scale to other races?

From this it is pertinent to ask: why the insistence that the remainder

of the world must change? Why is it not at least equally fair to propose that the Jews change?

Will the latter ever happen? I am not a crystal-ball gazer, and I am not given to making such forecasts.

All I can say with certainty is that if it does not happen, there seems little prospect that the Jewish future will be any the less turbulent than the Jewish past.

From *Spearhead* No. 268, June 1991
P.O. Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW, England

MUST-READING FOR INCORRIGIBLE 'ANTI-SEMITES'

01001	Adolf Hitler: <i>Mein Kampf</i> ,	\$12.00
01002	Adolf Hitler: <i>Mein Kampf</i> , hb.	\$ 5.00
01004	Adolf Hitler's Testament	\$ 4.50
	The Education of a Conservative, Prof. R. P. Oliver	\$10.00
01008	A Jew Exposes the Jewish World Conspiracy, Klein	\$ 2.50
01011	Anti-Gentilism	\$ 3.00
01012	The Anti-Defamation League and its Use in the World Communist Offensive, Maj. Robert Williams	\$ 3.50
01016	A Straight Look at the Third Reich, Dr. A.J. App	\$ 4.00
01018	A Real Case Against the Jews & Commissary to the Gentiles, Marcus Eli Ravage	\$ 3.00
01037	Aryan Asses, Paul Knutson	\$ 3.50
02001	Behind Communism, Britton	\$ 4.50
02002	Blasting the Historical Blackout, Prof. Barnes	\$ 3.50
02003	Bolshevism from Moses to Lenin: A Dialogue between Dietrich Eckart and Adolf Hitler	\$ 3.50
02004	Bolshevism in Theory and Practice, Dr. Goebbels	\$ 3.00
02005	Bolshevism is Jewish	\$ 1.50
02010	By Way of Deception, Hoy/Ostrovsky, pb	\$10.00
03002	The Cause of World Unrest	\$ 8.50
03004	The Curse of Anti-Anti-Semitism, Dr. A.J. App	\$ 4.00
03007	Communism with the Mask Off, Dr. Jos. Goebbels	\$ 3.50
03014	The Camp of the Saints, Raspall	\$ 8.50
03016	The Case Against the Holocaust	\$ 2.50
05002	The Enemy of Europe (F. P. Yockey) and The Enemy of Our Enemies (Prof. R.P. Oliver)	\$ 8.50
06003	For My Legionaries (The Iron Guard), Codreanu	\$10.00
08004	The Hidden Hand of Judah	\$ 2.50
08005	The Hidden Tyranny, Ben Friedmann	\$ 3.00
09003	The International Jew, abridged, Henry Ford Sr	\$ 9.50
09004	The Intl Jew: The World's Foremost Problem, Compl. 4-vol set as origin, published in the 1920s, 1000 pp.	\$30.00
10002	Jewish Anti-Communism	\$ 2.50
10008	The Jew in Review	\$ 8.50

10009	The Jewish War of Survival, Arnold Laese	\$ 5.00
10011	The Jewish World Conspiracy, Bergmeister	\$ 2.50
10013	The Jews and Their Lies, Dr. Martin Luther	\$ 3.00
11001	Know Your Enemy, Maj. Robert Williams	\$ 3.50
14004	New Light on the Protocols	\$ 2.50
14006	The Nameless War, Capt. Ramsey	\$ 5.00
16008	The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion	\$ 4.00
16009	The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion with detailed notes	\$ 8.50
17019	Russian Jews and Gentiles	\$ 4.00
18007	The Secret Driving Force Behind Communism	\$ 5.00
18006	The Secret Powers Behind Revolution, de Poncin	\$ 6.00
18009	The Secret World Government, Count Spiridovich	\$ 9.00
19001	The Talmud, Writings from containing the Midrashim, the Rabbinicalana, The Cabbala, Proverbial Sayings and Traditions, 395 pp.	\$20.00
19002	The Talmud Unmasked, Father Pranaitis	\$ 4.00
19004	The Thirteenth Tribe, Arthur Koestler	\$ 9.00
19006	Today's Greatest Problem: The Jews	\$ 3.00
19008	The Truth about the Protocols	\$ 2.50
20001	The Ultimate World Order, Maj. Robert Williams	\$ 4.00
20002	Uncovering the Forces for War, C. Grieb	\$ 5.00
22011	Why are Jews Hated?	\$ 2.50
22014	The World Conquerors	\$ 7.00
23001	You Gentiles	\$ 6.50
24002	The Zionist Role in World Affairs	\$ 3.00
24003	The Zionists, Armstrong	\$ 6.00
24005	Zionism Rules the World, H. Klein	\$ 2.00

FOR POSTAGE AND HANDLING: ON DOMESTIC ORDERS: please include \$1.50 for orders under \$10.00, 15% for orders over \$10.00, for UNINSURED shipment by Fourth Class Mail. No replacements will be made for orders lost in the mails unless you include an additional \$1.00 for INSURANCE. Please include STREET ADDRESS for UPS delivery. West Virginia residents must include 6% for Consumer Sales Tax.

ON FOREIGN ORDERS: please include \$2.00 for orders under \$10.00, 20% for orders over \$10.00, 80% for AIR MAIL delivery. No replacements will be made for orders lost in the mails and/or confiscated by postal/customs authorities. Insurance is not available for BOOK RATE shipments, but only for PARCEL POST shipments. IF INSURED shipment is desired, a *detailed list of contents* must be affixed by us to the package. Please include \$10.00 extra for Insurance. Order from:

**LIBERTY BELL PUBLICATIONS
BOX 21, REEDY WV 25270 USA**

KEEP THE LIBERTY BELL RINGING!

Please remember: *Our* Fight is *Your* fight! Donate whatever you can spare on a regular—monthly or quarterly—basis. Whether it is \$2., \$5., \$20., or \$100. or more, rest assured it is needed here and will be used in our common struggle. If you are a businessman, postage stamps in any denomination are a legitimate business expense—and we need and use many of these here every month—and will be gratefully accepted as donations.

Your donations will help us spread the *Message of Liberty* and *White Survival* throughout the land, by making available additional copies of our printed material to fellow Whites who do not yet know what is in store for them.

Order our pamphlets, booklets, and, most importantly, our reprints of revealing articles which are ideally suited for mass distribution at reasonable cost. Order extra copies of *Liberty Bell* for distribution to your circle of friends, neighbors, and relatives, urging them to subscribe to our unique publication. Our bulk prices are shown on the inside front cover of every issue of *Liberty Bell*.

Pass along your copy of *Liberty Bell*, and copies of reprints you obtained from us, to friends and acquaintances who may be on our "wave length," and urge them to contact us for more of the same.

Carry on the fight to free our White people from the shackles of alien domination, even if you can only join our ranks in spirit. You can provide for this by bequest. The following are suggested forms of bequests which you may include in your Last Will and Testament:

1. I bequeath to Mr. George P. Dietz, as Trustee for Liberty Bell Publications, P.O. Box 21, Reedy WV 25270 USA, the sum of \$ for general purposes.

2. I bequeath to Mr. George P. Dietz, as Trustee for Liberty Bell Publications, P.O. Box 21, Reedy WV 25270 USA, the following described property for general purposes.

**DO YOUR PART TODAY—HELP FREE OUR WHITE
RACE FROM ALIEN DOMINATION!**