



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—\$8.50
plus \$1.00 for post. & handlg.

376 pp., pb.
ORDER FROM:

LIBERTY BELL PUBLICATIONS, Box 21; Reedy WV 25270 USA

Liberty Bell

ISSN: 0145-7667

SINGLE COPY \$3.00

ANTI-AMERICANS

by Foreign Correspondent Jim Taylor

page 21

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE:

POSTSCRIPTS, by Professor Revilo P. Oliver: Why the Constitution Failed, page 1, A Moral Problem, page 8; No Comment Needed, page 13; A Neat Problem, page 13; Social Engineering, page 15. THE NORDIC PRESS: Aryans Observe Kink Day, page 41; The Tarnished Emblem, page 42. The Aryan Family: Our Most Formidable Weapon for Survival, page 43. RUDOLF HESS: Prisoner of Vengeance, by Colin Jordan, page 47.

VOL. 14 — NO. 5

JANUARY 1987

Voice Of Thinking Americans

LIBERTY BELL

The magazine for *Thinking Americans*, is published monthly by Liberty Bell Publications, George P. Dietz, Editor. Editorial Offices: P.O. Box 21, Reedy WV 25270 USA - Phone: 304-927-4486.

Manuscripts conforming to our editorial policy are always welcome, however, they cannot be returned unless accompanied by stamped, self-addressed envelope. Manuscripts accepted for publication become the property of Liberty Bell Publications.

COPYRIGHT 1984
by Liberty Bell Publications

Permission granted to quote in whole or part any article except those subject to author's Copyright. Proper source credit and address should be given.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

SAMPLE COPY with several reprints	\$ 3.00
THIRD CLASS - U.S.A. only	\$25.00
FIRST CLASS - U.S.A.-Canada-Mexico only	\$32.00
FIRST CLASS - All foreign countries	\$35.00

AIR MAIL - Europe-South America	\$45.00
Middle East-Far East-So. Africa	\$49.00
Sample Copy	\$ 4.00

BULK COPIES FOR DISTRIBUTION:

10 copies	\$ 18.00
50 copies	\$ 65.00
100 copies	\$110.00
500 copies	\$400.00
1000 copies	\$700.00

These prices apply only to our standard 52-page editions.

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 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 the 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

POSTSCRIPTS

by
Revido P. Oliver

WHY THE CONSTITUTION FAILED

It is a truism that we are mortal and that the ineluctable necessity of death is inherent in the biotic structure of our being: *nascentes morimur*. But oddly, perhaps, we Aryans also have an instinctive longing for a changeless eternity: *Doch alle Lust will Ewigkeit*. And since reason forbids us to hope for personal survival, we want our works to endure when we are no more, and to be, if not eternal, at least diuturnal.

We cannot without sorrow reconcile ourselves to a universe which, by its very structure, forbids permanence. Nations that are not degenerate intend to endure to the last syllable of recorded time. But that they cannot do. Herodotus wondered at the mysterious fate that ordains that states and empires, like men, are born, flourish, and die. Our history is a long succession of nations that rose, waxed mighty, declined, and fell, as did the greatest of them, the Roman Empire. Other races have fared no better. Egypt left her pyramids as her memorial, and here and there throughout the oecumene shattered stones remain where once there were great cities and, for a time, the pride of empire.

Round the decay
Of that colossal wreck, boundless and bare
The lone and level sands stretch far away.
And almost every year archaeologists open the graves of dead civilizations and exhume the pathetic remains of forgotten nations that once thought themselves deathless.

We cannot, however, acquiesce in passive fatalism, and our historians necessarily strive to ascertain the cause of each nation's decline and fall, hoping to learn from the past the secret of national mortality. For the great mutations of history the causes are always multiple. In his almost comprehensive survey, *Why Rome Fell* (New York, 1927), Edward Lucas White lists twenty principal causes, including, of course, the spiritual pestilence called Christianity.

We have not yet joined the past. Our race is sick, perhaps mortally, but, proverbially, so long as there is life, there is hope.¹ Prudent men ascertain the causes of their malady and the errors in their own conduct that brought it upon them, for they hope thus to discover a means of regaining health or, at least, obtaining knowledge that will preserve their progeny from their mistakes.

We ponder the failure of the American Constitution to avert the decline and fall of the American Republic, which it was designed to establish and preserve. The document must have borne within itself the seed of its own dissolution, and, as historians, we must identify what political forces the authors of the document overlooked or did not foresee. Furthermore, we who have survived the ruin of the successor state established in 1865, still hope, perhaps desperately, to recover the land that once was ours, and, on the chance that we may do so, it behooves us to understand the errors of our forefathers so that we will not doom ourselves to repeating them.

The Constitution was a compromise. If one reads the discussions of the committee that framed it, we learn that some of the gentlemen foresaw the cardinal flaw that, as we can see with retrospective wisdom, eventually destroyed the Republic.²

Gouverneur Morris (of Pennsylvania) proposed that the Constitution restrict the franchise to freeholders, that is to say, to persons who owned land as an estate in fee. He was most warmly supported by the Chairman, John Dickinson (of Delaware), who stated that he "considered them [freeholders] as the best guardians of liberty; and the restriction of the right [of franchise] to them as a necessary defence against the dangerous influence of those multitudes without property and without

1. Cicero quotes the proverb as *dum anima est, spes est*. The jingle *dum spiro, spero* must be Mediaeval, but I do not know when it first occurs and do not have a corpus of Mediaeval *Sprichwörter* at hand. Many of my readers will think of Goldsmith's amarulent or cynical paraphrase:

To the last moment of his breath,
On hope the wretch relies,
And e'en the pang preceding death
Bids expectation rise.

2. The discussions at the Constitutional Convention may conveniently be found in *Documents Illustrative of the Formation of the United States*, edited by Charles Callan Tansill, and published as House Document 398 by the Congress in 1926. It is out-of-print at the Government Printing Office, but was reprinted by Spencer Judd, P. O. Box 39, Sewanee, Tennessee, in 1984, with a brief introduction by Frederick Tupper Saussy.

principle with which our Country, like all others, will in time abound."

It is likely that a majority of the Committee agreed with him 'in principle.' James Madison (of Virginia) understood that the restriction of suffrage was fundamental, and that "the freeholders of the Country would be the safest depositories of Republican liberty. In future times a great majority of the people will not only be without landed, but any other sort of, property. These will either combine under the influence of their common situation; in which case, the rights of property and the public liberty will not be secure in their hands; or what is more probable, they will become the tools of opulence and ambition, in which case there will be equal danger on another side."

John Mercer (of Maryland) saw the fatal defect of a large electorate: "The people cannot know and judge of the characters of Candidates. The worst possible choice will be made." He even foresaw that there might arise "in the towns" such pernicious things as political parties that would choose a candidate in their own interest and procure his election by concocting propaganda to make him popular with the ignorant populace.

The prudence of true statesmen was defeated. There was some talk about sailors and others who had fought bravely in the Revolutionary War, and some of the delegates thought the several states would insist on retaining their right to determine who should vote, but the real opposition, naturally, came from New England.

No one in the Convention, needless to say, was such a fool that he thought of letting an entire populace vote on matters of national interest, and all, I am sure, assumed that the limitation of the franchise to the owners of property was so obviously a part of political prudence that it would never be abandoned. The various states, however, differed in defining 'property.' Some limited the franchise to freeholders, but others required a certain amount of taxable property or even property of any kind. The mercantile and financial class, largely centered in New England, naturally insisted that money in the bank was as good as, and no doubt much better than, real estate as a test of a man's stake in the state. And it was commerce and speculation that put lots of money in the bank. But even they perceived the necessity of maintaining the limitations on the franchise.

Since the right to vote was a privilege that few enjoyed and which therefore bestowed distinction on those who did, we are

justified in assuming that in the first Congressional elections almost every holder of the franchise voted. They amounted to less than 4%, and possibly only 3%, of the civilized population of the country.³

Although all members of the Convention were probably agreed in principle, with minor variations (Franklin, for example, seems to have thought that the franchise should be extended without qualification to men who had served honorably in the Revolutionary War), the conflict between suffrage determined by landed property and suffrage determined by fluid capital obtained from commercial and financial enterprise appeared irreconcilable. Consequently, the limitation of the franchise to freeholders was not incorporated in the Constitution of the Republic it might have saved.

What if the prudence of Morris, Dickinson, and others had prevailed? One can, of course, speculate endlessly about what history would have been, had a given event not occurred.

I think it likely that if the saving limitation had been incorporated in the Constitution, the proposed federation would not have been ratified by the New England states. As it was, they accepted it only reluctantly and as a stop-gap to give them time to impose their will on the rest of the country.

One can, of course, argue the question and perhaps soon lose himself in analysing the declared and unexpressed purposes of, for example, the members of the Essex Junto, but I think it probable that the states that almost seceded from the Federal Union at the time of the Hartford Convention (Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and Vermont)⁴ would have rejected the Constitution and formed a federation of their own. They would probably have taken Maine with

3. Niggers and Indians were naturally excluded from the count of the population. There is some slight uncertainty about the figures for the total population and for the votes in some states; the actual number of voters was probably around 3.5%, although little more than 3.0% is shown by the statistics.

4. The right of secession is, of course, implicit in the Constitution and was properly recognized by the New Englanders when it coincided with their own financial interests; their zeal for that right evaporated when their profits from the War of 1812 began to roll into the counting houses. Years later, with characteristically Puritanic hypocrisy, the same people, threatened with loss of their lucrative exploitation of the South, claimed that the Union was sacred and indissoluble, and they eventually found and elected a backwoods politician who was willing to "save the Union" by a war of aggression that was fought with a barbarity that horrified the

them, and might (or might not) have prevailed on New York and Pennsylvania to join them. Thus there would have been three Anglo-Saxon nations: Canada, New England, and the United States. The last would have been dominated by the culture and traditions of the landed gentry of the South.

The aversion from the principles of the Constitution in the prosperous parts of New England sprang from two forces that were then, as usual, complementary: greed and godliness. The Puritans of New England, it must be remembered, were the Puritans of the Commonwealth they established by revolution in England, where their power was based on commerce and industry, on London and other cities that concentrated mercantile wealth and the rabble that served it. They were too pious and avaricious to want freedom for anyone but themselves, and they abhorred the superior culture of a landed aristocracy, believing that proper social superiority could be measured in ledgers.⁵

The Puritans' conception of what they wanted the newly formed Union to become is most clearly shown by a memorial they addressed to President John Adams (I have italicized the most revealing phrases):

"We,...citizens of Boston, in the State of Massachusetts,... beg leave to express to you, the Chief Magistrate and *supreme ruler over the United States*, our fullest approbation of all the measures..you have been pleased to adopt, under *direction of divine authority*."

That emphatic repudiation of the concept of republican government was, of course, a repudiation of the Constitution itself, which they had promptly begun to subvert by forming the Federalist cabal and thus creating political parties, the agents of corruption foreseen by John Mercer, but evidently a

civilized world—and, when successful, spread a moral and mortal infection to Europe. — I need not add, of course, that not all descendants of the Puritans participated in the general hypocrisy; in many towns of New England, the rabble-rousing Abolitionists were given a very short shrift.

5. For an enjoyable antidote to the adulation of the Puritans that you heard in school, see the learned work of the British historian, A. L. Rouse, *Reflections on the Puritan Revolution* (London, Methuen, 1986), which especially emphasizes their barbarous fanaticism. If one wished to argue in the "Liberal" manner, one could insist that the Puritans were anti-Christian: their real god was the vicious old Jew of the "Old Testament" myths, and, as we all know, they sent troops to raid the homes of persons suspected of celebrating Christmas.

danger underestimated by the other members of the Convention.⁶ The Puritans thus began to exploit the rest of the nation with tariffs, absurdly imposed in addition to the natural tariff that was sufficient to encourage honest industry (i.e., the high cost of transportation across an ocean) and with banking monopolies to loot the general public. All this exploitation was doubtless sanctified in their minds by an intent eventually to attain such dominion over other Americans that they could start kicking them into righteousness.⁷

At the time of the Hartford Convention, the New England states did not secede (as, of course, they had every right to do, although they later denied that right to people who were less righteous than they) because they would no longer have been able to exploit the other states. If they had rejected the Constitution when it was proposed, they, of course, could not have started the exploitation in the first place. And they would have had no opportunity to foist on the nation their ideal, a dic-

6. Everyone knows that George Washington in his farewell address emphatically warned the young nation against foreign alliances and idiotic participation in the rivalries of other nations, but few remember that he as emphatically warned against the disastrous consequences of permitting the formation of political parties, of which he had already seen the beginnings in 1796, for New England was already seeking to capture the nation with 'Federalism.' Again, we must note that we cannot indict all descendants of the Puritans. One of our earliest women of letters, Mercy Otis Warren, whose *History of the American Revolution* (1805) is an important historical source, saw in the Federalists a proof that the Republic had already failed through "selfishness and avarice."

7. The Puritans, it is true, abandoned Calvinism for Unitarianism and the like, but they retained their priggish self-righteousness, and their descendants eventually drowned in the flood of 'democracy' they helped start. It is true they did eventually develop a kind of aristocracy of culture—when it was too late. Around 1946 I became acquainted with a lady then in her sixties. She came from an old family in Boston and told me that as a child she was sent to a very select girls' school, where she met a classmate whom she liked and wished to invite to her home. Her mother told her tactfully, "I am not disparaging your young friend, my dear—I'm sure she's a very nice girl—but you see, if you invite her to our home, we would be in an impossible situation, because we would have to recognize and consult her parents. You see, my dear, although your young friend is, I am sure, a very nice girl, her father is a Senator, and we simply cannot know such persons socially." For all their discriminating respectability, the lady's parents seem never to have inquired *why* thieves became Senators. Marquand's *The Late George Apley* is merely a superficial and somewhat pathetic story; he could have made it a tragedy.

tatorship like Cromwell's.⁸

What then? Would New England have enticed some other northern states to join the mercantile federation? Is it not likely that, deprived of exploitation through a federal government, the Puritans would have sought foreign allies and attempted an armed conquest of the other states long before they succeeded in destroying the Republic with the iniquitous and calamitous war they contrived in 1860? And if they failed to subdue the United States then, what heights of true culture might not our people have attained, assuming they had the wisdom to retain an obviously necessary limitation of the franchise written into a Constitution that, conceivably, might be today the framework of a great and independent nation?

You may be certain of one thing: with the franchise thus prudently limited, the United States would not have become the political and racial cesspool it is today, and decent Americans could still own property. (It is true that many witlings today think they have property because they rent houses and land from the usurers and tax-collectors of the vast engine of organized crime that governs them and tells them what to 'think.') And, obviously, the systematic liquidation of American farmers would never have been begun in 1920 in conformity with the Judaeo-Communist principle, so clearly enunciated by the mongrel who called himself Lenin,⁹ that priority must be given to the ruin of farmers, whether peasants or landed proprietors, because the possessors of land can provide for their own sustenance and so cannot be reduced to total slavery and

8. Much has been made of the "Mayflower Compact" and the Puritans' 'democracy.' It is true that they opposed to monarchy a government by a parliament of elected representatives, but, of course, with the proviso that if the elected representatives voted wrong, the Army would go in, as in Pride's Purge, and purify the parliament by hauling out all members who didn't know what Yahweh wanted. One is reminded, appropriately, of the odious hypocrisy of Abraham Lincoln, who professed that he would never think of interfering with the government of the sovereign state of Maryland: he merely sent his army to surround the state's legislature and drag off to prison legislators who voted wrong. The Puritan dictatorship in England was prevented from reaching an unmitigated tyranny by internal factions that partly neutralized one another. For example, the Levellers, who would have instituted an indiscriminate and total communism, were strongly opposed by property-owners and especially by the advocates of polygamy (polygyny, needless to say), who twice came reasonably close to making the system of marriage approved by Yahweh in the "Old Testament" legal and righteous in England.

9. His mother was a Jewess, his father, a Tatar. He had no Russian blood.
January 1987

abject dependence on the whims of their alien rulers.

You may wish to speculate further on what might have been.¹⁰ This note is intended only to show that the prime cause of the failure of the Constitution was not overlooked by the more prudent members of the Convention that drew it up.

* * *

A MORAL PROBLEM

Among the numerous evangelists who have been pitching the woo¹ for Jesus and the Jews over the boob-tubes, a certain "Pat" Robertson has gained preeminence by having enlisted in an effort to lodge him in the White House a large number of simpletons, whom he has evidently convinced that in that office

10. It is safe to assume that an independent South would have carried out Jefferson's Louisiana Purchase, would have expanded into Texas, and would have fought and won the Mexican War, the only rationally justified war in our history. As for the War of 1812, shipping (including the slave trade) would probably have been in the hands of New England and other foreign nations. But you must take into consideration the factors that might have ruined the Southern Republic. Even under the economic dominion of New England, the South developed a very respectable industry of her own; freed from such dominion, Southern industry would have become much greater: would the manufacturing interests have tried to overthrow the political supremacy of landowners? What would have been the results of the conflict of interests between the restless, untutored, and often mutinous people of the Frontier and the stable population of the Seaboard states, dominated by a cultured aristocracy? Other considerations will occur to you to moderate a confidence that the South would be today what it might (perhaps!) have become, if the Constitution had contained the indispensable restriction of the franchise.

1. In the argot of the evangelical racket, the term 'pitching the woo' has, I am told, almost entirely replaced the older term, 'putting on the razzle-dazzle,' as a designation of the oratorical technique that so confuses and befuddles the minds of auditors that such powers of ratiocination as they may possess are put into abeyance by effective paralysis of the brain's neocortex, leaving the individual actuated by uncontrolled emotions excited in the limbic stratum of his mammalian brain. 'Pitching the woo' must be distinguished from 'making the pitch,' for which it prepares the victim, who is so reduced to blind emotionality that when the pitch is made, he 'comes to Jesus' by writing a cheque. (In the old days, before the time of television, the victim walked in his stupor down the 'sawdust trail' to the evangelist, who was waiting in person to pick his pockets. It is true that some amateur evangelists seem to have believed their own rant, but they were never bright enough to compete with professionals and get into the big-time.)

he would have the power to compel all Americans to revere his Jew-god and to stop believing in scientifically ascertained facts.

According to a scandal recently disseminated by the press, the champion salvation-huckster was a commissioned officer in the Marine Corps in 1951, and when he found he was on his way to Korea, he called his daddy, who was a Senator, and daddy called the Marine Corps and had his darling boy transferred to a nice post in Japan, where there was no danger that the Chinese might scare him by shooting in his direction. This scandal is intended so to discredit him as to abort his candidacy for the job of front-man in White-House shows. It is taken for granted that the conduct described was dishonorable; one journalistic hack has even called it contemptible.

No one will suspect me of the slightest sympathy for holy rabble-rousers, but I suggest that we should not thoughtlessly disregard the moral problem with which the scandal confronts us.

All nations depend for their survival on an ethos that requires their men, especially their young men, to fight and, if need be, die to defend the nation against its enemies or to expand its territory and resources. Nations therefore necessarily and justly stigmatize men who ignore or evade that social imperative.

All healthy societies admire for their bravery men who risk their lives from a spirit of adventure, including those who, as filibusters or soldiers of fortune, engage in warfare in foreign lands, but no one has ever suggested that a man has a duty to do so, and men who do are often reprehended as foolhardy or ruthless.

The only morally justified war that the United States as a whole has fought since 1781 was the Mexican War of 1846-1848, which greatly augmented our territory with the rich states of the southwest, which the alien government in Washington is now tacitly preparing to return to Mexico as the first step in the dismemberment of the country that once was ours. A case could be made for the Spanish-American War on the assumption that its real purpose was to acquire Cuba and Puerto Rico and open up those territories for American settlement and exploitation, but the fatuous moralism and itch to meddle in the affairs of Spain that accompanied the war and the even more fatuous failure to annex Cuba after the easily won victory over a weak opponent negate that assumption.

In 1917, the crackpot whom the Jews had installed in the

White House shipped American men to Europe for a holy war that facilitated the Jewish capture of the Russian Empire. The crackpot was sustained by the madcap enthusiasm of an ignorant multitude that was suffering from the delusion that old Yahweh had appointed them custodians of the whole world with a Christian duty to spread righteousness with fire and sword. There was also a considerable number of persons so imbecile that they believed preposterous propaganda to the effect that Germany, if victorious, would or could invade the United States. The crazed mob² stigmatized as "slackers" men who evaded the draft, an epithet that certainly could not be applied to any man who was intelligent enough to see that no national interest could conceivably be at stake, since the gabbling energoumenon in the White House had specifically proclaimed that the United States was not fighting for territorial conquest or its own advantage, but just for the fun of killing and destroying to demonstrate its righteousness. No man can conceivably have had a duty to risk and perhaps lose his life in an insane holy war, which was utterly immoral by every rational standard. In the Moslem jihads religious fanaticism was similarly used to excite bellicose zeal, but the Semites were not idiots and they thereby effected territorial conquests for their nation and race.

In 1917, when the United States was still a nation (although

2. 'Crazed' is the *mot juste* here. Everyone should familiarize himself with the manifestations of national insanity that accompanied the war of 1917-1918. Here is a typical example. In a southern state a mob was with difficulty restrained from hanging a young man of Italian origin, who, like many other young men at that time, was fascinated by wireless telegraphy and had built himself an apparatus that had a range of perhaps three hundred miles under favorable conditions. The mob reasoned that since the young man was Italian, he must be a Catholic, whence it followed that he was using wireless telegraphy to betray to the Pope in Rome, for transmission to the Satanic Germans, all the vital military secrets he had learned by spying in a 'one horse' country town of a few thousand inhabitants. In a northern town, a German confectioner was almost killed by a mob convinced that he, obviously an accomplice of the demonic Kaiser, was putting *undetectable* ground glass in his candy. It was frightfully unpatriotic and perhaps treasonous to eat sauerkraut, unless one called it 'Liberty cabbage.' All public high schools and many low-grade colleges immediately suspended the teaching of German, lest the diabolic language corrupt the pure minds of young nincompoops. I especially commend a study of American mores in 1917 to 'conservatives' and 'right-wingers' who like to encourage themselves by believing that the decay of American minds began in 1941 or even fancy that the present state of imbecility was caused only by the systematic poisoning of water supplies with fluorides after 1950.

already deeply invaded by Jews), we first had to confront a clear moral problem. Men had an imperative duty to fight for their nation, but they obviously cannot have had a duty to fight in a war "to end wars" or to prevent winter from following autumn. If an intelligent man knew that, he was, without question, morally justified in evading by any means in his power the inconvenience and risk of military service that was idiotic. It is true that there is some mass feeling that it was somehow unfair for him to escape the lot of men who were conscripted for that asinine crusade or forced into it by social pressures from the mindless majority.³ A moment's reflection will show how baseless that is. In panics, it is *sauve qui peut*, and no one may censure a man who swims ashore from a sinking ship (e.g., the *Morro Castle*) on which many perish, unless by so doing he abandons women or others with whom he had close personal ties or to whom he had an overriding obligation. If a hundred persons are compelled by financial or social pressures to embark on an airplane that you know to be unsafe, you have no duty to join them.

In 1917, the "draft-dodgers" belonged to the most intelligent and morally sound segment of the nation, *if* they understood the real nature of the crusade on which the delirious nation had embarked.

In the 1950s, the rulers of the United States found in Korea an ideal sewer down which to pour the money extorted from taxpayers, and a pretext for both greatly increased taxation and

3. What purports to be part of a "top secret" training manual for an inner core of select élitists in the Air Corps has recently come to light in circumstances which, if correctly reported, would create a presumption of authenticity. It is in any case a clear introduction to the thinking of the big-brained pragmatists who now have power over us—the mentality that C. S. Lewis accurately portrayed in *That Hideous Strength* (1945). The manual of "social engineering" quite frankly recognizes that the American people must be induced by economic manipulations and contrived wars voluntarily to reduce themselves to total and mindless slavery, as is now being done with well-timed gradualism. The manual takes for granted that nations are obsolete and makes no mention of them, as is quite understandable, since, as Professor Andrew Hacker pointed out in 1970, the United States has unquestionably ceased to be a nation and has become merely a geographical area temporarily held together by the greed of the numerous economic groups and social classes, each of which strives to exploit all the others more than it is exploited by them. It is interesting, therefore, that the concluding section of the part now known was based on a sociological study of the way in which American men were forced, largely by their own families, into the army in 1917.

for multiplying the income of the usurers. Furthermore, the comic opera called the "United Nations" and nitwits' enthusiasm for "world peace" and pie in the sky offered a perfect disguise for undertaking, in concert with the Soviet, an operation to kill young Americans wholesale, bleed our country of its resources, and eventually inflict on the United States a shameful defeat and advertise to the world that Americans had become half-witted hypocrites.

That is what we in retrospect know the "war" in Korea to have been, and no American could have a moral obligation to serve in a war which was really a war against the American people waged by their alien-dominated government.

The purpose of the "war" in Korea, however, was by no means apparent in 1951. Far from it. In 1951 the American people still had a country of their own in the sense that they could quickly have recovered control of it, had they been so minded. The pretense in Washington that the government was opposed to the Judaeo-Communist conquest of the world was not the obscene absurdity that it is now, after the United States has served for three decades as the battering ram that opened one nation after another to the enemies of civilization. Many sagacious men, including ranking military officers on active duty and seasoned members of our intelligence service, believed that we were really going to fight a war in Korea, and, as we all know, General MacArthur believed that, although forced to fight under great handicaps, he was engaged in a war, and he continued to believe he was fighting for the United States until he was fired by the Sheeny in the White House.⁴

In 1951, many men of some perspicacity were taken in by craftily disseminated "secret" information that the war begun in Korea was the first stage of a planned attack on the Soviet Union, which was thus to be made to provide a publicly convincing *casus belli* by aiding the Chinese invaders of Korea. Such a war would certainly have been in the American interest, and could furthermore have been justified on the grounds that we had a moral obligation to eliminate the rabid savages we had loosed upon the world. The destruction of the Soviet Union would have benefited us immeasurably, and if we took no territory from it, would have indirectly won us colonies in

4. Strictly speaking, Truman was not a Jew according to the Jews' definition of their race, since his mother was a white woman, but it is surely permissible to apply to him the more elastic term 'Sheeny' to describe his moral character.

desirable parts of the world. We could, for example, have taken Korea as a strategically located base in the Orient for both military and commercial purposes.

The moral question about Robertson's evasion in 1951 therefore resolves itself into an unanswerable question: what did he know or suspect about the purpose for which our army was sent to Korea? His father was a Senator and probably familiar with many of the inner secrets of the District of Corruption and the fauna who infest it. He may well have known the real purpose of the "peace-keeping" slaughter in Korea, and I think we should give his son the benefit of the doubt. The expert shaman with presidential ambitions is detestable for many reasons and perhaps dangerous, but we should nevertheless do him the justice of disregarding the efforts to make a scandal out of an act that could have a not pejorative explanation.

* * *

NO COMMENT NEEDED

On Sunday, the twenty-eighth of December, the members of the American Philological Association, assembled for their annual meeting, will listen with bated breath while paymasters from the National Endowment for the Humanities explain what "New Directions in Graduate Education" will be endowed with hand-outs from the pockets of the American serfs. The names of the paymasters are, in order of appearance, Katz, Abramovitz, Menke, and Katz.

* * *

A NEAT PROBLEM

A feature article in the *Midland* [Michigan] *Daily News* was reproduced photographically in the *Christian News*, 20 October 1986, accompanied by a commentary intended to prove that good old Jesus administers heartbalm to the afflicted and sorrowing.

The facts are that a man and woman had a daughter, seemingly normal at birth, but after a few months the child began to die slowly from a progressive decay of the brain. The parents

then engendered a second child: same result. It is stated that expert pathologists made comprehensive tests for every known disease, including, presumably, the one that first comes to mind, and discovered nothing. Dissection of the brain showed what areas had rotted away, but gave no clue to the cause.

Two successive occurrences of the same phenomenon make coincidence unlikely. If all other efforts to ascertain the aetiology of the dire malady have failed; an obviously possible cause calls for investigation, since a genetic incompatibility between parents is known sometimes to produce a wide variety of malformations, physical as well as psychic, in the offspring. The parents are White, as shown in photographs, and the names suggest they are Aryan. That however does not exclude a latent ethnic or even racial diversity that could result in the birth of physiologically defective children.

So far as one can tell from the articles, no such investigation of the genetic antecedents was made, as would have been done automatically in the early part of this century, when the study of eugenics had not yet been forbidden by the Jews, who had not yet taken over the United States. They have now ordained that a study of heredity and ethnology is evidence of a wicked presumption in the lower races and will be punished informally by personal pressures and attacks on the culprits until God's Race has enacted laws by which they can send Federal goons to haul off the insubordinate Aryans to prisons in which they will be condignly tortured.

I note the problem in genetics for its obvious importance and relevance. The Christian commentary is only what one would expect. The parents are pious True Believers, profess to believe all the grotesque tales in the Jew-book, and claim that the crucified Jew-boy assuaged their sorrow. Why he did not heed his devotees' prayers to save the children, as, according to our shamans, he could have done with a snap of his fingers, is presumably one of those "mysteries" that theologians talk about when they cannot imagine a plausible answer to an inescapable question. And, of course, no one even thinks of asking why he should have afflicted children and parents so atrociously, although he, according to his dervishes, manages the whole universe and nothing happens—not even to swallows—without his notice and permission.

* * *

Robert Conquest's *The Harvest of Sorrow*, published in this country by the Oxford University Press in New York, is a comprehensive, vivid, and lucid account of a spectacular feat of Social Engineering that has been an inspiration to all true "Liberals" and Communists. Thought of it glows in their idealistic minds and warms their humanitarian hearts, but they will be embarrassed or angry, if you ask them about it.

Iosif Dzhugashvili, alias Stalin, almost certainly was not a Jew,¹ but he assimilated much of the Jewish mentality with which he was in close and intimate contact from his time as a student of Christian theology, throughout his long career as a bandit and assassin, and, most of all, when he became the colleague of two Jews, Ulyanov, alias Lenin,² and Bronstein, alias Trotsky, and eventually succeeded to the power of both.

As all egalitarian social reformers well know, a proletarian paradise cannot become fully operative until all of its inhabitants have been reduced to constant and total dependence on the whims of bureaucrats who are, in turn, dependent on their own masters. The slaves may be given an illusion of freedom, such as Americans now have, but they must be induced to put themselves utterly in the power of a Hellfare State, such as the one to which we have subjected ourselves, which has thus far tactfully left unused some of the crushing powers with which the boobs endowed it.

1. I do not know the etymology of Dzhugashvili's name, but the first one or two syllables sound something like 'Jew' or 'Judas,' and that, I suspect, is what gave rise to the story that his name means 'Jew's son.' He was born in the territory that we, through a series of misunderstandings it would be tedious to recount, call Georgia, although it is called Karthli by the natives, and given other names in Russian and Persian. That land, ancient Colchis (the land of their Golden Fleece), a part of the Caucasus, the mountainous region between the Black and Caspian Seas, is filled with the debris of the many races and sub-races that passed through it or ruled it for a time, but it may well be that Dzhugashvili was a real Georgian, and that his name has some meaning in Karthli, their language which, written in a peculiar alphabet, is not Indo-European, but belongs to the odd group of related languages called Caucasian, which are unrelated to other known languages, except insofar as they were influenced by the languages of more civilized and dominant nations that ruled them or were important neighbors.

2. Ulyanov's mother was a Jewess, so that makes him a Jew by the Jews' orthodox definition of their race.

Given human cupidity and stupidity, it is easy to expand governmental powers over a few decades to the point at which all urban inhabitants, rich as well as poor, are totally dependent on their masters' whims. The one obstacle to a *regime of perfect*

on their masters' whims. The one obstacle to a régime of perfect social justice is, as Lenin saw, the agrarian part of a population, for they who own land can always feed themselves and survive, no matter what happens to the rest of the country. Lenin therefore laid down as a law of revolution the necessity of eliminating farmers and owners of land, the most odious and reactionary kind of property.

In the United States the liquidation of the farmers has been entrusted to the Federal Reserve swindlers, who, of course, enjoy the zealous coöperation of the Jew-owned government. It seems likely that this reform will be completed satisfactorily in a few more years, and that all arable land will pass into the possession of large corporations owned by one or another tribe of our domestic enemies. It will then be possible to start starving the White urban population, just for the fun of it. Unfortunately the process does not seem to promise much of the fresh blood that, ever since the French Revolution, has been as heady a stimulant to world-improvers as is champagne to other revellers.

At the time of the Judaeo-Communist seizure of the Russian Empire, large landowners were quite satisfactorily and joyously tortured before they were shot or their skulls were caved in with iron bars. It was not thought feasible, however, to deal immediately with small farmers and peasants, who, by the way, had been cozened with promises that the disguised Jews who were directing the take-over would kill the Jewish usurers who had so long battered intolerably on the common folk. It thus fell to Stalin to complete the Jewish revolution, although he was not a member of God's Race.

Stalin had the happy idea of using a new technique to carry out the work: he would send his counterpart of our Federal Marshals to confiscate "for the common good" all the harvests and foodstuffs on the farms, with the piquant result that the farmers would starve to death on their own land, while the grain that had been taken from them was stored under tarpaulins and left to rot. That really was a novel idea in what "intellectuals" call social engineering, and they have always honored Stalin for it.

The number of reactionaries who were thus eliminated to facilitate progress in society has been variously estimated as from seven million to twenty million, and cannot be precisely determined, since no one kept a count of the corpses that rotted in the fields or were packed into railway cars for disposal in isolated quarries and other large garbage-dumps.

For a memorable account of Stalin's innovative work in social engineering I must refer you to Mr. Conquest's book.³ Such things cannot be summarized. You must form your own impressions and draw your own conclusions from a plethora of judiciously selected and typical details. You will find the reading painful, unless you are a real enthusiast for equality and a glorious One World, but you will also receive a lesson you are not likely to forget when you consider the world in which you must live and its probable future.

I mention Stalin's feat here only to complete your lesson by pointing out that he merely made an ingenious modification in a system of social engineering that has been known for many centuries and whole-heartedly approved by all good Christians. It would be most unfair and unjust to censure Dzhugashvili for having followed a time-honored precedent that was emphatically endorsed by the Christians' god.

One of the episodes in the filthy collection of tales called *Genesis* in the Jew-book has as its hero a clever young Sheeny named Joseph (YWSF, which probably meant 'the extra [son],', i.e., the youngest). The story is larded with motifs common to folk-tales throughout the world (e.g., elder brothers' jealousy of a favored younger son; a libidinous matron's desire for presum-

3. A good supplement to, and confirmation of, Mr. Conquest's book is *Execution by Hunger, the Hidden Holocaust*, published by Norton in New York. The author, who writes under the name of Miron Dolet, was a fifteen-year-old boy in the Ukraine in 1932-1933 and an eyewitness of Judaeo-Communist social engineering, which had the incidental purpose of exterminating large numbers of Ukrainians. — Incidentally, as a minor linguistic point, I remark that since *ukraine* is a word meaning 'frontier,' the proper construction in English is 'the Ukraine,' since it designates a geographical region, like 'the Sudan,' 'the Punjab,' 'the Southwest,' and innumerable others. The proper name for the country is *Ukrania*, and from it is derived the ethnic term 'Ukranian.' I remark on this obvious fact only because some time ago a friend of mine, who sent me photocopies of articles and letters in the *Ukranian Weekly* and other publications, informed me that, for some inexplicable reason, the Ukrainians in this country seem offended by the definite article in 'the Ukraine' and want to change the fixed usage of the English language, rather than use the correct term for their nation, 'Ukrania.'

ably safe and easy copulation with a handsome young servant or slave; a family's inability to recognize a supposedly lost member who has risen in the world; etc.), but the real substance of the tale is Chapter 47.

The young Kike, taken to Egypt as a slave,⁴ crawls upward and, presumably with the help of his tribal god, acquires a reputation as an oneiromancer and so reaches a King of Egypt named 'The Big House.' The King is obviously an imbecile, unless we assume that the Jew-god softened his brain, just as on a different occasion he hardened an Egyptian King's heart so that he could entertain his Chosen Predators by torturing the Egyptians in every possible way before his Chosen swindled the hated and gullible *goyim* and escaped with their loot.

The wily Kike tells the feeble-minded monarch one of the hard-luck stories that Jews habitually use to arouse compassion and folly in the stupid *goyim* and make them pity the poor dears who are always so persecuted. Hordes of Jews swarm into Egypt as 'refugees,' and the crazy loon on the throne gives them "best of the land" in all Egypt, the region called Goshen, which will always remain fertile—and in any case, Joseph will see to it that his fellow parasites will always be fed at the expense of the stupid *goyim*.

The swarm of Jews, who poured into Egypt just as they poured into the United States, having obtained privileged status from their victims, undoubtedly settled down to swindling the fools who were kind to them, as they always do, so that it was unnecessary to mention that detail specifically in their exemplary tale. And, of course, they find offices in the bureaucracy as economic administrators ("rulers over the cattle"). Thus they help Joseph, whom the enthroned idiot has given supreme power over the Egyptian economy, carry out his master plan. And Joseph does, in six neat stages, viz.:

1. He uses the power of the state to confiscate all the Egyptians' crops and harvests, and he thus attains an absolute monopoly of all the food in Egypt:

2. When the famine starts (and, you may be sure, God's Own continue to feast on "the fat of the land"), Joseph forces the starving Egyptians to buy back from him the very food they

4. That reminds one of a trick that the Jews used to great advantage in the Roman Empire, in which they had a virtual monopoly of the slave-trade. A venal Roman would, for a small fee, 'buy' a nice Jew from a Jewish slave-merchant and then legally 'liberate' his new slave, thus making the Jew a Roman citizen.

raised themselves. He thus acquires *all* the money in Egypt.

3. Then, having neatly impoverished his victims, he forces them to trade for food all their cattle (which have miraculously survived without fodder and without giving ideas to their owners).

4. Next, since Joseph has all their cattle, the poor wretches have to give him all their land in exchange for a little food to nourish themselves a little while longer.

5. Finally, the wily Kike makes the starving Egyptians sell their own bodies, all that they have left, into slavery for a dole of the food which they, remember, raised in the first place.

6. Then Joseph consolidated his good work by hauling the slaves from their own homes to distant parts of Egypt, thus breaking up families and placing individuals among strangers, to avert the possibility that they might exchange ideas with their friends. The Egyptian victims were thus uprooted and became totally helpless. This final device is proof of Yiddish foresight and prudence, as was Joseph's policy of giving the Egyptians' professional holy men a cut in the racket and making sure that their bellies remained plump, so that they would know their native gods wanted them to cooperate with the aliens who had taken over their country.

This, as you will have seen, is a fair summary of the pseudo-historical fiction, stripped of adventitious decorations and digressions. It's all in Chapter 47.

This is the story that has inspired Jews ever since they invented it⁵ about twenty-four centuries ago. It is also the

5. The source of the Jews' fiction was, of course, the Egyptian story about seven years of famine during the reign of Djoser (whom you remember as the builder of the famous step-pyramid). This may be only a folk-tale, comparable to the canard about young Washington and the cherry tree, but it may have been suggested by the historical famine during the reign of Unas at the end of the Fifth Dynasty, which must have been caused by inadequate inundations of the Nile in several successive years. (In later ages, Unas was an almost forgotten monarch, while Djoser was remembered as one of the great early kings.) The prosperity of Egypt depended on the annual flooding of the Nile, the source of water in a rainless climate. If the inundations were below normal, the harvests were small, and paradoxically a very high flood could have much the same result by destroying the irrigation system. From our earliest records, the most important officials in the Egyptian kings' administration were charged with the collection of taxes in kind and the storage of foodstuffs for later use, and this system naturally evolved into one of assurance against low inundations by the storage of food in normal years. The parasitic race flourishes by filching ideas and myths as well as property, and it is quite

story that Aryan Christians have read in their Jew-book for fifteen centuries and more, never feeling in their tender humanitarian hearts the slightest pity for the Egyptian victims, but instead chortling with piety as they saw how their ferocious god takes care of the wily swindlers and gangsters with which he has Chosen to afflict civilized mankind.

So when you read Mr. Conquest's book, remember, if you are horrified, that you must not censure Stalin for having ruled by famine and, with only a small modification, in the very way Christians have always approved, and must approve now, for although Stalin was himself a 'gentile,' God's Own profited by the work he did for them.

And I don't see any reason for pitying the Americans. They had all read the Jew-book and should have learned much from real history, and they were not even starving when they threw away their freedom by acquiescing in the White Slave Act and putting it in their tattered Constitution, by subjecting themselves economically to the Federal Reserve swindle, and, a little later, by admitting a swarm of six million more Jews, newly arisen from their ashes in Germany, into the country they then handed over to God's Master Race.

Americans are now content to enjoy the freedom of chickens in a chicken-yard, who are free to run about the yard, scratch, and cackle while they lay eggs for the profit of their owners, who reward them with a handful of chicken-feed now and then. The chickens never perceive that they live at the whim of the owners who potentially have them by the neck. And when their necks are wrung, it will be too late for chickens and Americans to squawk.

Aryans have always admired lions, who fight, to the death, if need be, to defend their families and their territory, but no one has ever admired a chicken.

possible that the tale about Joseph was devised to claim for the Jews credit for the administrative system of the Egyptian kings. If it seems improbable to you that so crude a story, evincing so little knowledge of Egyptian life and history, could have been seriously intended to deceive contemporaries when it was composed, remember that in our own times the Jews have concocted such crude hoaxes as "Anne Frank's Diary" and the "Holocaust." There are no assignable limits to their racial impudence.

ANTI-AMERICANS

by
Jim Taylor
Foreign Correspondent

Do you want to know why every Jewish member of Congress, plus the ultra-liberal "lifeguard" fanatic, Senator Edward Kennedy (D-Mass), fought so furiously to prevent William Rehnquist from becoming chief Justice of the Supreme Court?

It's quite simple. Although they could uncover nothing at all of any substance against Mr. Rehnquist, they denounced him anyway. Their reasons for their totally unfounded accusations against Mr. Rehnquist had nothing at all to do with any challenges of "minority" voters. It was also not because of any restrictive "Whites only" clause in any property deeds he may have signed. Their hatred and bitterness toward this man had nothing to do with his record or his character. No, sir! These vindictive people wanted to prevent him from holding the highest judicial post for only one reason: because Mr. Rehnquist is an American. A real American! And that's why these Zionists, with their guilty and bloody hands, wanted to bar him. The last thing on earth these internationalists wanted was to have a patriotic American like Mr. Rehnquist installed as Chief Justice.

The irony of it all is plain enough for everyone to see and to understand. Imagine how it galls the Zionists who run Washington for a true American, who does not put Israel and Zionism first, to lead the court. So, all in all, Mr. Rehnquist's only crime or flaw is that he happens to be a charter member of a vanishing breed of men in this land of ours—a champion for American interests. For this the man will never be tolerated, let alone forgiven. He will continue to be hounded, harassed, and belittled during the rest of his career, if not for the remainder of his life. Television talk shows, network news announcers, and politicians under the Zionist banner will always make snide remarks about him in public. That, my friends, is the price one has to pay these days for being a genuine American leader.

Justice Rehnquist's foes in Congress dredged up some of the crummiest characters they could locate to "testify" against him, including a former Phoenix shyster and courthouse bum

who said he could remember when voters were harassed 25 years ago by Mr. Rehnquist. Now ask yourself if you can recall verbatim a conversation you had at work 25 years ago. Hardly possible!

In their zest to lie about Mr. Rehnquist, some of the people hired by the international Zionists to defame him even said he was at a polling place in Phoenix where he never worked, as records show. In 1962, the strict voting-rights laws requiring that every voter be able to read and write the English language had not yet been thrown out by the Warren Supreme Court. So, at that time, if Mr. Rehnquist had questioned voters about this, he would have been legally correct and would have broken no laws, whether technically or otherwise. Even Louis Meyer, the Jewish former chairman of the Arizona Democratic Party in 1962, stated that he did not see Mr. Rehnquist harass voters. Then foes of the new Chief Justice changed their dates to the 1964 elections in an effort to find something against the man, after most of the state voting laws were made null and void.

Next, this motley band of inquisitorial Congressmen, who are all viciously anti-American and pro-Israel, tried to charge that Mr. Rehnquist had stolen money from a trust fund that he set up to assist his disabled brother-in-law. When an FBI report proved this accusation to be false, the Senators tried another tack.

Believe it or not, these people then tried to make the public believe that Justice Rehnquist was some sort of drug addict. They informed the press that the man had taken too many sleeping pills from 1977 to 1981, which made him a confirmed dopehead. But a check of medical records revealed no such conduct. The only drug he took was one prescribed for him by Dr. Freeman H. Cary, the Capital physician, who had placed his patient on the very mild drug Placidyl.

There were four chief tormentors in the Senate, all in the pay of Israel. Besides the aforementioned Senator Kennedy, the other three culprits were first-class rabble-rousers, Senator Howard Metzenbaum (D-Ohio), Senator Paul Simon (D-Illinois), and Senator Alan Cranston (D-California). Two of the three are Israeli-first Jews while Senator Cranston is the well-known pet monkey of the Zionists in California.

Now some of the financial dealings of these four Senators would fill a book. So, to prove the old adage that "people who live in glass houses should not throw stones," I will concentrate on the leader of this infamous Gang of Four, Mr. Ted Kennedy,

the alcoholic toad from Massachusetts whose wife divorced him because he tried to put the make on every young girl from Washington to Paris.

This particular Kennedy brother, the youngest and the least intelligent of the lot, was caught cheating at Harvard and had to go down to the University of Virginia to obtain his law degree.

His exploit on the beach at Chappaquiddick Island, although not necessarily intentional or planned, nevertheless resulted in the death of a very naive and young Pennsylvania Catholic girl, who was entranced by the Kennedy name and Washington politics in general. And if this had happened in any state except the one where the powerful Kennedy family enjoys both diplomatic and personal immunity covering any and all crimes, Mr. Kennedy would now be residing in some state prison for manslaughter instead of being the most highly publicized member of the United States Senate. Almost any member of the Kennedy clan of Camelot could shoot up an entire town and get off in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, much as the Zionists do in Washington, where they steal every secret from every department of our government, but are never tried when caught.

Since Ted Kennedy was never athletic, as were his older brothers and sisters, it is very difficult for anyone to believe the outlandish swimming feats he claimed to have accomplished the night of the incident at Chappaquiddick. The clan's baby boy grew into a fat and lazy slob, who looks the part. Yet this individual with the dissipated physique told police and friends that he swam across the treacherous bay against the strong currents on a dark night fully clothed, not once but several times. (He doesn't remember how many). Despite the fact that he must have been in a somewhat dazed condition from the accident, his prowess as a swimmer did not seem to be hampered. According to Senator Kennedy, he did his best to save Mary Jo from the watery grave after he missed the bridge and drove into the water. In Massachusetts, they believe without question anything a Kennedy says. They would have believed him even if he had said that he swam the Atlantic a couple of times that night.

But, according to newspaper reports, several Olympic class swimming stars state that they could never have duplicated the feat attributed to Senator Kennedy, who had been drinking heavily before the accident. Even Johnny Weismuller would

have been hard-pressed to swim that far under those conditions. Of course, Kennedy's companion was already dead before this alleged long-distance swimming feat took place.

The victim of Senator Kennedy's indiscretions, little Mary Jo, was portrayed as a very innocent girl, the product of strict Catholic upbringing. This was hardly true when she worked in Washington. The nuns in her day did not teach girls to go off on drunken sprees as playthings for married men whose wives were back home in the Washington area. In those days, the nuns didn't even allow the girls to attend school unless their clothing covered their elbows. I never did figure out just what was considered so sexy or so forbidden about elbows. The nuns also insisted that parochial school girls not wear shiny, black patent leather shoes, because boys might see the reflection of their panties on them. I tested this personally and all I ever could see reflected were the walls of the buildings. If this girl who drowned had still held to her strict Catholic teaching, as her mother implied, she would not have made the trip to a secluded countryside jamboree.

But by far the most reprehensible act on the part of Senator Kennedy, financial or otherwise, took place when he accompanied his very frivolous sister-in-law, Jacqueline Kennedy, on a trip to get Aristotle Onassis, the Greek shipping magnate, to sign a pre-nuptial legal paper in the biggest shake-down of a wealthy client in the memory of modern man. The Senator was the legal adviser to see that Jackie got her millions of dollars for selling her body to a dying tycoon in what at best could only be correctly termed as "legalized prostitution." It simply involved sex for cash by the wife of a former president of the United States.

This made Jackie the highest paid "legalized prostitute" in the world. It also made Teddyboy the number one pimp of the universe. At the time of their trip to meet Mr. Onassis, they were described in one British newspaper as the "TWO HIGHEST PAID PERFORMING CIRCUS INTELLECTUAL DWARVES IN THE WORLD." I don't know exactly what that implies in British humor, but I am sure it was not meant to be complimentary.

The Greek newspapers at the time had a field day interviewing friends and relatives of Mr. Onassis, including his ex-wife, Tina Livanos, and her sister Eugenie, who was Mme. Niarchos, wife of Stavros Niarchos, head of another Greek shipping dynasty, who owned the private island of Spetsapoula in the

Aegean. Their words about Jackie could not be printed in any family publication and would make an old Etonian Greek scholar blush. Suffice it say that one of the milder adjectives used means "common" when translated from Greek. There was also a description of a welcoming party where the chief decoration was a nude British model with a lighted candle placed in a strategic position. Whether this is actually true or merely an exaggeration by jealous relatives, I don't know.

Now, I'd like to mention briefly Senator Kennedy's involvement as one of the founders of a Communist-front organization known around Washington as the Nicaragua Network. If you call the Nicaraguan Embassy in Washington and ask for information about the country, you will be given the phone number of the National Network in Solidarity with the Nicaraguan People, popularly known by the shorter designation of the Nicaragua Network.

Just what is the Nicaraguan Network? Well, according to information developed by the respected Council for Inter-American Security and the syndicated columnist Ralph De Toledano, it is the Sandanistas' major propaganda and disinformation arm in the United States, and although it functions as an agent of a foreign government, it is not registered as such, as is required by U.S. laws. (Generally, our laws are waived for Communists and/or Zionists.) The Nicaragua Network was founded by Sandy Pollack, a member of the national council of the Communist Party (USA) until her death in Cuba last year. Working through the United States Peace Council, an official subsidiary of the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council of Helsinki, Finland, the network was able to enlist as sponsors and founders the following well-known American Leftists: Senator Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.); Senator Howard Metzenbaum (D-Ohio); Actor Ed Asner; Representative Pat Schroeder (D-Colo.); Saul Landau of the Communist Institute for Political Studies; Mrs. Jesse Jackson; Representative Ron Dellums (D-Calif.); Representative Tom Harkin (D-Iowa); and Senator Mark Hatfield (R-Oregon).

According to a former official of the Sandanista Ministry of the Interior, Alvaro Baldizón, the purportedly independent U.S.-based Nicaragua Network receives its policy directives from the Sandanista International Relations Department in Managua.

The Network works closely with Communist organizations in the U.S. and throughout Latin America, lobbies Congress on behalf of the Sandanistas and against American aid to the

Contras, organizes anti-U.S. demonstrations, and carries out an extensive direct-mail campaign against America. The CIA's study on the Nicaragua Network is appropriately titled "Managua's Communist Agents on Capitol Hill," a pretty apt description.

It is inconceivable that any Marxist-Leninist régime in the world would ever allow a democratic government to meddle thus in its internal affairs, but the Sandanistas have learned well to play the propaganda game by using people like Senator Kennedy for their own purposes.

All of this brings me inevitably to the ironic conclusion that the most despicable man ever to sit in the Senate, with the lowest moral standards of conduct, led the drive to impugn the character of Justice Rehnquist, who had already distinguished himself by having served 15 exemplary years on the Supreme Court. All this while his chief accuser and detractor was flopping around in a cesspool of lies and deceitful conduct. At best, Senator Kennedy embodies the unfettered banality of our times. People stare at me in disbelief when I state that Senator Kennedy backs Communism and they ask how could anyone in his family do this? Well, I don't know the reason. I have given you the facts. Why don't you ask Mr. Kennedy why he does these things? But, don't let him lie to you and tell you he didn't do them.

* * * * *

In various parts of the country where I have been giving talks, I have been absolutely amazed to find that a large segment of the American people subscribe to a very naive and false religious theory about why they believe that the Communists will never take over this nation.

These "born-again" Christians are actually a powerful force and destructive element in our society. The Christians who believe all that stuff about the Chosen People are now culture-destroyers, solidly embracing the egalitarianism of Karl Marx. Sadly, millions of Western simpletons are sucked into the whirlpool of utopian liberalism as enunciated by clerics and pseudo-intellectuals. They defy history. They do not read enough history to learn that a few Jews lived in the Holy Land for a mere 200 years while other people lived there for 10,000 years.¹ Who would you say has the better claim to that territory?

1. Maps that show how very few Jews were settled in Palestine in 1878 are

These fine and upstanding religion-oriented folks told me that they aren't in the least worried about the Communists' numerous backers in Congress and elsewhere, especially in the churches and universities. Here are some of the direct statements made emphatically to me as pronouncements which they claim cannot be challenged:

"I don't have to do anything about the Communist threat because God will never allow such a society in America."

"God will never allow America to turn Communist. It is ridiculous to believe it could happen."

"I know that God is protecting me from Communism, so why should I do anything to halt the spread of it?"

In those words, fine, upstanding church people informed me that it is not necessary for them even to oppose the creeping Socialistic and Communistic threats now reaching all of our country. God will fight that battle for Americans, who can just sit back and relax and do nothing to halt it.

Some of the "most religious" people did tell me that they sometimes say a brief prayer or they light a candle at their parish church for America to be prevented from turning to Communism. I just didn't have the heart to remind them that the brave Poles, Hungarians, and Czechs burned several hundred thousand candles in their churches, and uttered as many prayers. But all this did not prevent Communism from engulfing them, now did it?

God didn't save the Russian people from Communism in 1917.

God didn't save the people of Lithuania from Communism.
God didn't save the people of Latvia from Communism.
God didn't save the people of Estonia from Communism.
God didn't save the people of Albania from Communism.
God didn't save the people of Poland from Communism.
God didn't save the people of Hungary from Communism.
God didn't save the people of Azerbaidzhan from Communism.

God didn't save the people of Armenia from Communism.
God didn't save the people of Ukania from Communism.

reproduced from Israel's official *Atlas* in Richard H. Curtiss's *A Changing Image* (Washington, D.C., American Educational Trust, 1982), p. v. A map showing how small a part of the total population was Jewish even in 1931, after the massive Jewish immigration that followed the Balfour Declaration, is reproduced from the same Israeli source on p. ix.

God didn't save the people of Czechoslovakia from Communism.

God didn't save the people of East Germany from Communism.

God didn't save the people of Rumania from Communism.

God didn't save the people of Bulgaria from Communism.

God didn't save the people of Yugoslavia from Communism.

God didn't save the people of China from Communism.

God didn't save the people of North Korea from Communism.

God didn't save the people of Vietnam from Communism.

God didn't save the people of Laos from Communism.

God didn't save the people of Cambodia from Communism.

God didn't save the people of Ethiopia from Communism.

God didn't save the people of Tanzania from Communism.

God didn't save the people of Angola from Communism.

God didn't save the people of Zambia from Communism.

God didn't save the people of Zimbabwe (Rhodesia) from Communism.

God didn't save the people of Mozambique from Communism.

God didn't save the people of Botswana from Communism.

God didn't save the people of Cuba from Communism.

God didn't save the people of Nicaragua from Communism.

God didn't save the people of Panama from Communism.

And God is not doing anything to save the people of the Republic of South Africa from impending Communism.

And God is not doing anything to save the people of the Philippines from the Marxist Madonna who is rapidly leading them into the Communist fold with the aid of American tax dollars.

And God doesn't seem to be able to prevent the people of Hong Kong from soon living under the Red Banner of Communism.

And God is not trying to save Singapore from a Communist fate.

And God is not going to prevent the U.S. government from turning South Korea over to the Communists very soon.

And God is not disposed to halt the spread of the Communist doctrine in Mexico, where Soviets and North Koreans are working in large numbers toward that end.

So, in view of all the historical facts I have just listed, I have an important question for all you people who still maintain that

you don't have to do anything to prevent Communism in America because the Almighty is going to do it for you. Since God in the blue sky didn't do one single thing to help people anywhere in the world ward off the evils of Communism, just why do you believe that some Heavenly power has plans to save you? Why are you so special? Why would God save you but not the very religious people in Poland, for instance? Why are you so special, so secure and so insured against the plague of Communism, when no other people on earth ever received such Divine protection? What is so very different about Americans?

I am not against people saying prayers and lighting candles. And I am not against religion, *per se*. As very intelligent scholars have generally concluded, if we didn't have a religion it would be necessary to invent one. People need it. Even Lenin was inclined toward some form of worship, though he said it was the opiate of the common people.

My point is that you had better do something more to prevent creeping Marxism in America. As the misguided white missionaries found out in the wilds of Africa and South America, religion works among savages only when backed up by the barrel of a rifle. Otherwise, those pious preachers made a fine dinner for the natives to chew on around a boiling pot. Communists may not be cannibals, but they are savages.

The comparison with the situation today in America is rather obvious. Either you stand up and fight for your country or you lose it. There is no neutral or in-between stance for you. You can't hide. You will be free or a slave by your own actions. The Almighty in Heaven, you will have to admit, doesn't have a very good track record at saving people from Communism. There are no victories for God but the Commies have rolled up an unbeaten string of them. I'm sure you'd never bet your life savings on a football or baseball team which had never won a game. However, you're doing just that when you depend upon Heavenly Power alone to save you. Divine Providence has yet to win a significant battle against Marxism.

As regular readers of my column know, I usually avoid writing about religious matters. But while I am on that subject, I might as well take up the tragedy of God's little helpers in America. I refer to the millionaire religious hucksters who peddle faith for profit on television in the manner of Rev. Jerry Falwell, Rev. Pat Robinson, and that well-known faith healer down in Tulsa, Rev. Oral Roberts.

I have visited the campus of Oral Roberts University. It is

impressive. It is garish. And it has a prayer tower and the usual gimmicks to encourage contributions of tax-free dollars. But one of the real money makers is the "Laying On of the Hands" business wherein cures for all afflictions known to mankind are waiting for the faithful who have a checkbook in their pocket. And if you can't make it in person, no need to worry. Don't despair. This is something for you. You can order by mail a Xerox copy of the reverend's hand print for only fifty dollars. And from then on your ailments will supposedly be a thing of the past.

I'm sure that if I tried to make money through the mails by selling imprints of my right hand, I'd soon be arrested for fraud, and rightfully so. But no one is going to stop those people.

I had to mention these television salesmen and con artists because a lady told me that Jerry Falwell was going to save her from Communism. I wonder how he is going to accomplish such a miracle, especially since he is so closely aligned with the Zionists of Israel, who invented Communism. Oh well, as the TV preachers say, "How 'bout a big handclap for Geeezus!"

* * * * *

I have been asked by several readers why an "American" journalist named Nicholas Daniloff of *U.S. News & World Report* was framed by the Soviets as a spy. Of course, the U.S. government put out the idea that Mr. Daniloff was framed in a classic example of what the KGB does best. But I am not convinced that it was a frameup at all. I have not been in Moscow recently and I have not investigated the case; but I can give you some facts and figures based on my knowledge of the Soviet Union and how our State Department operates in such circumstances.

To begin with, both the Soviet and American governments lie. And they lie consistently and almost constantly. It boils down to which one of these highly deceptive bodies you want to believe.

Without even knowing the circumstances under which Mr. Daniloff was arrested, the U.S. declared it a classic frameup. That in itself is not logical. He may well be innocent and maybe he was framed. But how do we know this, especially when several times previously this same man had come under scrutiny by Soviet officials? Twice he had been accused of trying to take out of the Soviet Union valuable jewelry, includ-

ing a gold pocket watch which he had not declared his property, as required by law, when he entered that country.

Four years ago, he was detained for the same alleged spying rôle and was released due to lack of concrete evidence. This time the Soviets claimed to have caught him red-handed, if you will pardon their pun.

The publication he works for in the U.S. is run by Russian Jews with American citizenship. And there are Russian Jews in the KGB. Now you must decide which bunch of Russian Jews you wish to believe—ours or theirs. In the case of the recent arrest of the alleged Russian spy, Gennadi Zakharov, in New York under the same circumstances, the Soviets claim he was framed. Was he or was he not framed? I do not know any more than I know if Mr. Daniloff was framed in Moscow. But don't the Russians have as much right to maintain that their man was framed as Americans have to claim that Mr. Daniloff was? It works both ways. Both were released as always. It is just a game.

Also it is interesting to see how quickly all the vast array of agencies of the United States government went into action quickly to obtain Mr. Daniloff's release. The White House escalated pressure on Moscow as though the arrest of this man was the highest priority on the international front. Yet in Lebanon, where American citizens have been held prisoner for years, no effort at all has been made by the U.S. to free them. Why the difference? The "American" arrested in Moscow is Jewish. The Americans in the Lebanese prisons are not. There is your answer. As a sage Congressman once told me, some Americans are more equal than others. Right on, man!

Former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance was sent to Moscow to effect the release of Mr. Daniloff. Who has been sent to Lebanon to obtain the release of those being held there?

So if you're ever arrested in Moscow, you'd better have a Star of David in your pocket and claim to be Jewish. That way you'll get released quickly.

When Mr. Daniloff got to the American Embassy in Moscow, from his prison cell, he must have felt right at home. Our Embassy there is loaded with recently-naturalized "Americans" of Russian-Jewish extraction. One "American" diplomat at the embassy by the name of Murat Natirboff was thought to be the chief of the CIA's Moscow station by most foreign observers at the various legations. And, I might add, he is also a long-time friend and associate of Mr. Daniloff. Mr. Natirboff's official

embassy title was "counselor for regional affairs," whatever that may mean. Strangely enough, Mr. Natirboff left for the States quickly just before Mr. Daniloff was shipped to the embassy for safe-keeping.

The last time I visited the American Embassy in Moscow, I momentarily thought I'd walked into an office at the Kremlin by mistake. There were so many Russian Jews working in the place that I didn't hear much English spoken—just Russian, Hebrew, and some Yiddish. One secretary was speaking in German over the phone.

When I asked in a joking manner if anyone there spoke English, no one laughed. They also didn't think it was amusing when I asked if there were any Americans employed at this so-called United States Embassy.

In spite of such a comedy of errors as happened in Moscow last fall when both the U.S. and the Soviets yelled foul because their respective "spies" had been framed, one never knows which side to believe—if either. Personally, I think that what goes on at the American Embassy is about as foreign and un-American as any business at the Kremlin.

The controlled American press played Mr. Daniloff up as a new star, a sort of cross between Rambo and St. Francis. From the rock-bound coast of Maine to the fern-dotted dells of southern California, not one U.S. newspaper dissented from characterizing this flimsy "journalist," previously known as Mr. Milktoast, as some sort of suddenly heroic figure. For instance, this wimpish and weak-willed individual was passed off as a superman by the *Arizona Republic* in Phoenix, a newspaper not usually given to immature theatrics. He received a full page in the Sunday edition on October 12 with a headline in two-inch type overlaid across his photograph of four columns reading: "A STAR IS BORN". In slightly smaller type below was the following direct quote: " 'NOW WE HAVE TO BE SET UP BY MICKEY MOUSE?' RUTH DANILOFF DEMANDED OF A DISNEY PUBLICIST."

Lloyd Grove of the *Washington Post* news service stated in one of his articles, "Nicholas Daniloff, having survived a close call with the Soviet secret police, found himself trying to escape the clutches of Mickey Mouse." And this was no laughing matter at all, but very serious business for the entire Russian-American family of the erstwhile Moscow "correspondent" with the imprimatur of the White House and the blessings of his

Leftist editors of the un-American journal known as *U.S. News & World Report*.

Since he, and especially his very crude and loud-mouthed wife and daughter, considered any part of Disney World as too American for them, he did not want to accept an invitation to appear at the Florida park with former Chief Justice Warren Burger. But urged by the White House, he reluctantly accepted the invitation to honor the bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution.

Now to me, and I'm sure to other Americans, Mickey Mouse and the late Walt Disney are as American as apple pie. The harmless characters at Disney World are also non-political but very pro-American. And this is why they and the entire park are so detested by the Daniloff family.

Before Mr. Daniloff and his critical, hardline, Soviet-thinking family members would attend the celebration, he asked for an explicit understanding that he would not be thrust face to face with any of those horrid Disney characters. To this Soviet-oriented "American," it was beneath his dignity to shake hands with Mickey Mouse, the official greeter at the park. But Mr. Burger, who is far more dignified than any of the cast-off Soviets such as the Daniloffs, didn't mind meeting Mickey Mouse at all. Several U.S. presidents have been greeted by Mickey and even photographed with him. But not the Daniloff family—too American for them. His New York Jewish backers would never have forgiven him for such an indiscretion.

The Disney organization even sent a corporate jet to New York for Mr. Daniloff and his family, who complained all the way. They spent a free night at the Disney-owned hotel. But unappreciative of all this luxury, this very foreign family threw a fit of raging anger over an innocent matter of no consequence to most people. At the Civic Center, as they waited backstage for Mr. Burger to introduce them as supreme stars of the universe, they noticed something terribly wrong—in their estimation.

"There was that ridiculous Mickey Mouse lurching backwards and forwards with his hand out," Mr. Daniloff explained.

His daughter Miranda, he said, "went out of her gourd with anger." His vile-tempered wife Ruth was even angrier. She shared her thoughts crudely with the Disney people by shouting madly in their faces, "Get that God-damned mouse off the stage."

Mickey was discreetly shuffled aside. Mr. Daniloff then bolted past him with sheer hatred showing in his eyes.

Mrs. Daniloff continued to curse out the Disney executives loudly, as she roared, "After one month of dealing with the KGB, now we have to be set up by Mickey Mouse?" No one was able to learn why Mickey Mouse should be classed with the KGB.

"It was a mix-up," replied the Disney man.

"That," she countered, "is what the KGB said."

And for this group of hateful people the U.S. threatened to call off the "Summit" meeting if Mr. Daniloff wasn't released. Maybe the Daniloffs would like to send Mickey Mouse to the KGB.

Poor old Mickey must be feeling pretty sad by now. He has been greeted and admired openly by kings and presidents. But he just was not good enough for these Zionist Daniloffs. Maybe he wasn't foreign enough. Should he start learning Russian or Yiddish? The elitist Daniloffs are hard to please.

"The most famous reporter in the world" was the title Ted Koppel, host of ABC's Nightline, gave Daniloff, undoubtedly on orders from his Zionist bosses.

Nicholas Daniloff was a meek and mild writer with less than average ability and intelligence, but he has now come out a superstar glittering in the hearts of Americans. His literary agent closed a six-figure deal for his book about his great-grandpappy, a traitor who led the Decembrist uprising against Czar Nicholas I, and the book will now bring in 10 times more cash because of Daniloff's newly-discovered cachet.

This previously ordinary and even insignificant journalist with a big inferiority complex was interviewed in Iceland more often than either Mr. Reagan or Mr. Gorbachev.

Saturday Night Live, Dick Cavett, Regis Philbin, and Johnny Carson begged him to be a guest on their respective talk shows. A lecture agent has lined up \$150,000 worth of speaking engagements. Lorimar, creator of "Dallas" and "Falcon Crest," wants to make a television movie about this newly-discovered star.

U.S. News has logged over 500 requests for guest appearances for this Russian-thinking man who dislikes everything about America, except the easy money he makes in New York. The work of making a celebrity of Mr. Daniloff is going along at a rapid pace.

You have probably read about some of this. But there is another mysterious side of the Daniloff case which you will never read in your daily newspaper. The European press has

printed a different story with much emphasis upon Mr. Daniloff's carefully hidden activities in Moscow. He is now suspected of having been a double agent, spying for both sides and, of course, being paid by both sides. And it is anybody's guess as to where his true loyalties lie. It certainly does not lie with Walt Disney World or any other strictly old-fashioned American enterprises. Such things are too American for him. But the Daniloff family does not mind accepting American money for praising the Bolsheviks and the overthrow of the Russian Czarist government. That isn't beneath their dignity. Personally, I'd take Mickey Mouse for company over Mr. Daniloff and his Bolshevik ancestors any day of the week. And I think Mickey is more intelligent.

I have been told by very reliable sources that the U.S. had to get Mr. Daniloff released quickly because he had threatened to tell the KGB everything he knew about the CIA operations in Moscow and elsewhere. It appeared he was on the verge of going over to the side of his beloved homeland and defecting when they got him out and whisked him back to New York.

In assessing the Daniloff case, one should bear in mind that his great-grandfather was one of the Jews who tried to murder Nicholas I, and his grandfather was one of the gang of Bolshevik Jews who murdered Nicholas II, the last Czar of Russia. There is certainly something amiss and under the table about a situation which places the grandson of a man who was a friend of Vladimir Lenin and Leon Trotsky in a Communist jail, however briefly. What would his old grandpappy think about this strange turn of events?

* * * * *

I believe that most readers will be interested in what transpired officially in 1982 when the U.S. put the pressure on Libya at the United Nations in violation of both American laws and the signed regulations governing the U.N. body of nations. From the office of Dr. Ali Treiki, Libyan Ambassador to the U.N. in New York, I have copies of one appeal to the American press from Mr. Mahmoud B. Sokni, the Libyan press attaché at the time and a personal friend of mine, and three diplomatic notes from the government of the United States signed by Jeane Kirkpatrick who was then U.S. Ambassador to the "United Nations."

Naturally, the closed U.S. press did not print Mr. Sokni's

appeal for fair play. Only the now defunct *American Sunbeam* did.

Please notice that the American government even required the Libyan Ambassador to notify the State Department 48 hours before calling a doctor to attend him. How many people know 48 hours in advance when they are going to become ill or perhaps break an ankle? If Dr. Treiki were to be seriously injured in an automobile accident, he might die before the 48 hours elapsed so he could legally receive medical treatment in this free country of ours. Most people who read the following diplomatic notes ask the same question: "This is America? God forbid!"

TO the American press in general:

I regret to forward you the attached note, which is considered as yet another affront similar to the U.S. Administration throwing stones at the face of the Statue of Liberty.

I trust you would agree that the enclosed diplomatic Notes to the Libyan Mission by the U.S. Mission to the United Nations constitute a flagrant violation of all international laws and customs adopted by the world community, especially the United Nations Headquarters Agreement and the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Privileges and Immunities.

One can understand the existence of political differences between the position of our respective governments, a matter regarded as commonplace within every international forum. Such a situation, however, does not justify under customary international norms, this unacceptable position which is incompatible with all the principles and fundamentals of which the U.S. Administration claims to uphold, while it strives to maintain its leadership in human rights and of the free world.

What is most surprising is that this most restrictive Memorandum has come immediately following the vote on the U.N. Resolution on the U.S.-Israeli Strategic Agreement. It appears as though Libya is to be punished for the independence of its position. Imagine Libya's Permanent Representative, H.E. Dr. Ali A. Treiki, has been requested to obtain the State Department's approval 48 hours in advance, each time he wishes to use his official residence or even to call a physician to his residence. The same requirement is applicable even to personal visits, as well as for visits by members of the Libyan Mission; a truly intolerable and unacceptable condition.

I ask you in the name of the freedom you defend and that is the cherished hallmark of America to cite a single incident where a visit to even the most vicious and violent criminal in prison had been barred. It is no secret that all prisoners are permitted, even under the strictest of wardens, to receive

visitors. How, then, could an Ambassador/Representative of a country, which is a full member of the United Nations, be denied a right available even to prisoners?

In spite of our differences of opinion, attitude or ideology with some countries, the Representatives of Member States in United Nations have categorically condemned this most unusual action. I cannot imagine that you would abandon the principles of freedom that America has been upholding and for which you are justly proud.

Once again, it is indeed regrettable that I felt compelled to bother you with this grave injustice. However, the provocation was so great that I could not help it.

I wish you and your excellent publication staff a fine year, in which, hopefully, only global peace and prosperity will prevail.

Yours very sincerely,
[s.] MAHMOUD B. SOKNI
Head of the Press Section
THE LIBYAN MISSION
TO THE UNITED NATIONS

UNITED STATES MISSION
TO THE UNITED NATIONS
1. DIPLOMATIC NOTE

The United States Mission to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Permanent Mission of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations and, with reference to the Mission's purchase of real property located at 440 East Palisade Avenue, Englewood, New Jersey, has the honor to inform the Mission as follows:

Pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary of State under the laws of the United States and upon careful consideration and review of all of the relevant factors pertaining to the property in question, the United States Government hereby advises the Mission that the following conditions will be applicable to the use of the property in question.

The Mission is authorized to provide for maintenance of the premises by persons other than the members and staff of the Mission, including a resident maintenance person if desired. The Permanent Representative and his immediate family are authorized to use the property solely for recreational purposes, subject to the establishment of conditions approved in advance by the United States Government. The Mission, in addition, may submit to the United States Government for approval any other proposed use of the property by persons not referred to herein.

Jeanne Kirkpatrick
Ambassador

UNITED STATES MISSION
TO THE UNITED NATIONS
2. DIPLOMATIC NOTE

The United States Mission to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Permanent Mission of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations and acknowledges receipt of its note [1. DIPLOMATIC NOTE], stating its intention to utilize the property at 440 East Palisade Avenue, Englewood, New Jersey, as the primary and official residence of its Ambassador and Permanent Representative to the United Nations, whereas it had previously requested only limited use of such property. The United States regrets that it is unable to approve such change of use and refers the Mission to its diplomatic note [1.], which describes the use which has been authorized for the property in question.

The United States Mission to the United Nations avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Permanent Mission of Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations the assurances of its highest consideration.

In view of the foregoing, the United States Government regrets that it must require the Permanent Mission of Libya to refrain immediately from any and all use of the aforementioned property, except as specifically provided above.

The above requirement shall apply to all members and staff of the Libyan Permanent Mission to the United Nations and to any Agency or employee of the Government of Libya, and shall preclude any use by such persons of the property in question, including but not limited to uses for business, residential, entertainment, or recreational purposes, and without regard to whether the use is personal in nature or is for official government purposes.

The above requirements will not, however, preclude the Mission from transferring the aforementioned premises to third parties by sale, rental or other disposition, provided that any such proposed transfer is first approved by the United States Government.

The United States Mission to the United Nations avails itself of this opportunity to convey to the Permanent Mission of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations the assurances of its highest considerations.

Jeane Kirkpatrick
Ambassador

UNITED STATES MISSION
TO THE UNITED NATIONS
3. DIPLOMATIC NOTE

The United States Mission to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Permanent Mission of the Socialist

People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations and, with reference to the Mission's purchase of real property located at 440 East Palisade Avenue, Englewood, New Jersey, has the honor to inform the Mission as follows.

The United States Mission again refers the Libyan Mission to its note [1. DIPLOMATIC NOTE], which outlines the authorized purpose for which the property may be utilized, and its note [2. DIPLOMATIC NOTE], which does not accept the Libyan Mission request to increase the use of the property in question.

Pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary of State under the laws of the United States, the United States Government hereby establishes the following conditions applicable to the use of the property.

a) Use would be authorized only when the Permanent Representative and/or his wife are physically present there;

b) Use would be authorized for a maximum of two weekends a month;

c) Weekend is defined as 5:00 p.m. on a given Friday to 10:00 a.m. the following Monday;

d) An advance request of forty-eight hours must be made to the United States Government by the Permanent Mission of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations for each weekend the Permanent Representative would like to use the property;

e) If the Permanent Representative is to be accompanied or visited by other personnel of the Permanent Mission of the Socialist People's Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations, their names are to be provided in the Permanent Representative's request to the United States Government at least forty-eight hours in advance of the visit;

f) A resident maintenance person is authorized, although such may not be a member of the Permanent Mission of Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations;

g) Other than the foregoing specified uses and conditions no other use of the property is authorized.

Jeane Kirkpatrick
Ambassador

This article first appeared in the January 1986 issue of *Liberty Bell*. Annual subscription \$25.00. Sample copy & booklist \$3.00. Reprints of Jim Taylor's articles are available at the following prices: THE NEXT VIETNAM (Sept. 1986 issue): 4/\$1.50 - 10/\$3.00 - 50/\$13.00 - 100/\$25.00. HAMMERING THE U.S. (Oct. 1986 issue): 5/\$1.00 - 50/\$9.00 - 100/\$16.00. BUSH AND ZION (Nov. 1986 issue): 3/\$1.50 - 10/\$4.50 - 50/\$20.00 - 100/\$35.00. REAGAN AND ZION (Dec. 1986 issue): 2/\$1.50 - 10/\$6.00 - 50/\$25.00 - 100/\$45.00. ANTI-AMERICANS (Jan. 1987 issue): 2/\$1.50 - 10/\$6.00 - 50/\$25.00 - 100/\$45.00. For Postage and Handling include \$1.00 for orders under \$10.00, 10% for orders over \$10.00. Order from: Liberty Bell Publications - Box 21 - Reedy WV - 25270 USA

ORDER FORM

Liberty Bell Publications

P.O. BOX 21 • REEDY WV 25270 • USA

PHONE: 304 - 927 - 4486

NAME: _____ DATE: _____

ADDRESS: _____ PHONE: _____

CITY/STATE/ZIP: _____

QTY.	ORD. NO.	TITLE	EACH	TOTAL
		Subscription to <i>Liberty Bell</i>		
		Donation to <i>Let's get the Truth Out!</i>		
		<i>Lib. Bell sample, book list</i>	\$3.00	


 CARD NO. _____
 SIGNATURE: _____
 VISA M/C EXPIR.

No. COD orders accepted. Please send, check, money order or cash (by certified mail) with order, or charge to your Master Card and add 3.1% surcharge to order total. Payment for foreign orders must be made in U.S. currency, by check with domestic computer numbers imprinted and drawn on U.S. bank, or international postal money order. Order with confidence—satisfaction guaranteed.	SUB TOTAL	
	POSTAGE & HANDLING	
	5% WV SALES TAX	
	M/C SURCHARGE 3.1%	
	TOTAL AMOUNT	

PLEASE ORDER TITLES BY NUMBER!

THE NORDIC PRESS

ARYANS OBSERVE KINK DAY

It isn't too early to begin your planning to make the holiday a complete flop for ZOG but a victory for Aryans. Yes, plan now for you and your family to boycott the 1987 observance of national kink day. When ZOG imposed the observance of a national holiday to honor Michael King, aka Martin Luther King, they expected the country to join in the festivities honoring a communist dupe. Aryans, though, will have different plans.

As the Jews, kinks and other down-breeds unite in your community to slavishly honor communism's hero, make certain you and your family are counted out! January 19 will be the day of America's shame in 1987, and if your children's school is to mark the occasion, make certain your children are absent. If your place of employment is to slobber over the commie kink, then the Aryan "flu" will keep you at home.

There are many, and there will be many more, articles in our racial journals outlining the role played by King in our country's disgrace and degradation, we will not cite chapter and verse here. This message is one of joy, count yourself out of any semblance of participation. Let the kinks and kikes unite in a day of "chittlins" and bagels, but, let them look in vain for an Aryan face in any of their gatherings. Let them look in vain for any Aryan money or support. Let each Aryan and each Aryan family unite to remember the martyrs of our racial cause now incarcerated by the ZOG courts and to pay homage to those who have fallen.

Let each Aryan community hold a solemn but joyful ceremony in which the names of the martyrs are remembered and their deeds retold for the education of each adult and child attending. There can be no more fitting resistance to ZOG and the kink/kike connection than the gathering of Aryans to mark their own heroes, and to gather communal strength and resolve for the Aryan struggle which is now upon us. We find joy in the knowledge we have the Aryan warrior's spirit within us, and strength in the knowledge our Aryan comrades are at last uniting in common cause. Aryans, Awake, Resist-United we shall prevail!

“Political parties are prone to enter compromises; but a Weltanschauung never does this. A political party is inclined to adjust its teachings with a view to meeting those of its opponents, but a Weltanschauung proclaims its own infallibility.”

Adolf Hitler

* * * * *

THE TARNISHED EMBLEM

Anyone engaged in a battle against seemingly impossible odds finds, on more than one occasion, feelings of frustration, even despair. I felt those feelings today as I held a metal cap badge in my hands. Its metallic surface was dark and tarnished. The stern eagle, grasping in its talons a wreath-encircled swastika, was barely visible. It was as if the dreams and ideals of those who had created this symbol had gone, forever, leaving but a tarnished bit of stamped metal behind, as an artifact of a time gone by.

What could I, one individual, do to salvage those ideals? The tiny eagle in my hand was a far cry from the massive eagles once adorning the public and party edifices in Germany to reflect the concept of Aryan purity and unity. Their ideals, their Weltanschauung, represented by the eagle and the swastika it proudly carried, were, it seemed, as distant from me in time and reality as the days and people of nearly half a century ago who lived for those symbols and those ideals. Here I sat, alone, holding an SS symbol of glory and honor now deemed abhorrent by a large portion of the Aryan people. A sense of futility nearly overwhelmed me. What can I, one individual, with no power, no means of influencing others, hope to do in this time of darkness?

Then, by habit, I found my old Blitz cloth and began to rub the surface of the badge. In a few moments it glowed with life. Its gleaming surface no longer carried the accumulated tarnish of neglect, the proud eagle once more said, “Aryan, Awake!” Perhaps none but I now hears its message, but I hear it. As I hear it, then I can share it with others. The sharing may be no more than my living my life as an Aryan, shunning the services and products of the destroyers of my race and culture, and honoring my family, my blood and the soil which nurtures us.

The time of depression passed and, for me, the glorious dawn of the New Order again brightened the horizon. The

success or failure of the New Order depends upon one person, and one person alone—me! If I am true to the Blood of my race, then my race will continue. If I boycott the products and services of the Jew who would destroy me, then I make him weak and strengthen my own race. If I honor and support my family, insuring their well being and education, then the Aryan family is alive and well. If I do nothing to contaminate the soil, water, and air which gave me birth, while shunning the products of the contaminators, then there is still one patch of Mother Earth dedicated to the natural order of Aryan life. My circle of influence may be small, but it is real. The eagle and its precious burden flourishes here!

One man, Adolf Hitler, carried the same vision, the same dream for an Aryan future. His struggle, too, was uphill, blocked at nearly every turn by those he came to lead. But, through his genius, his determination, he gained a foothold in history, he placed the New Order upon the plane of the attainable—he showed, through his life’s work, what I, too, may obtain. The New Order is not dead. It lives and flourishes in me!

“The will, the yearning and indeed the strength of thousands of people are in each individual.”

Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*

* * * * *

THE ARYAN FAMILY IS OUR MOST FORMIDABLE WEAPON FOR SURVIVAL.

The values seem small, of not too much importance in the great world of today. We look about us and we see the absolute necessity for a new and larger car, for a vacation in some “exotic” part of the globe, and for that bit of plastic which will provide it all—and thralldom as well. What can fleeting memories of a mother’s love, or a father’s guidance and care mean? Nothing, of course, if you have had little of the former and none of the latter.

Reflect upon your own life. If you grew to be an adult in a home with a mother and a father, you are becoming something of a novelty in Western lands today. If you lived in one home with your parents all during your childhood, then you are even more of an oddity, for we have become a population of wanderers. We seek the phantom of not only new and better mates

but new and better jobs, houses, cars, all of the material things of this world which our society tells us are the important aspects of our life. Success is judged by the amount of one's acquired wealth.

We look down upon the family with several children whose father toils each day to provide the necessities for his brood while his wife is forced into the menial role of "housewife." The poor woman's entire life is ruined because she is tied to her children, to their daily care, to their education. We blame it on today's hectic pace when our own children are found to be drug users, our daughters are either the bearers of bastard children or are aborted by the friendly folks at the neighborhood abortion mill—financed by our tax dollars. We do not see the loving family circle about that other humble table as the family strength of our race as they unite to share a meal prepared by loving hands.

Nor do we look into the subject matter force-fed into our children at the public schools. Life is too short to be wasted on such trivials as understanding the contents of the textbooks, or investigating the background of the teachers, or the philosophy of the national organizations which now have complete—well, nearly so—control of classroom education. More important is our meeting on the golf course or attending the cocktail party where booze, dope, and sex reflect the fact we have "arrived" and are part of the "today scene."

We take it for granted that man and wife must both work, must both bring in a pay check, for how else can the necessities of life be assured? How can the payments on the two cars, the jet ski, and last year's drunken binge at the beach resort be paid for? How indeed? Life has become so simple. It is devoted to the acquisition of material signs of affluence, emotions are regulated by the intake of narcotics, and the care of our children can mercifully be left to the state. It is life in the fast lane—leading to oblivion!

As the material world comes crashing down, as the dopers and race mixers of the 20th Century look upon the world through the distortion of reality prompted by their governments, they just might see the passing of the Aryan family. Such is the goal of those who are nearly complete in their task of destroying the strongest bastion of Aryan strength—the family. The family has brought the Aryan through from the misty times of the past to today. It was within the family circle the lessons of love, honor, responsibility, and faith in our folk were learned. When

we pass those responsibilities into the hands of the Jew-communist doctrinaires infesting the government and schools we have abrogated our racial heritage. Those who have lost the family have lost their reason for living.

Look closely at your own life. What have you given to your family? The new car does not count, nor the flashy clothing or television, nor any of the material trappings of our tinsel society. Have you given of yourself? Have you taken time to be with your children, to understand what they are reading, what they are being taught, and correcting the errors which the system drums into their receptive minds? Have you assured they have a home filled with love and care where they can escape the degradation of the materialism of today? Have you taken steps to insure they have Aryan children with whom they may play and associate, that your Aryan friends and their children may come into your home for an evening or day of wholesome recreation? These things cost nothing.

Your Aryan friends will not judge you by the outer trappings but by the inner strength of your life. They will rejoice with you in the warmth and love radiated by your Aryan family, they will find strength in the wholesome food which graces your table. Remember the simple fare of Adolf Hitler and the honor given to the family by the National Socialists in the Germany of the Golden Era. No higher honor was attained than the recognition given to Aryan mothers in that time. No value was placed upon the false, the unworthy. The value of one's life was reflected in service to family and to folk, to the fulfillment of Aryan destiny—the betterment of our race through the purity of our blood.

The National Socialist of today must simplify. Reduce your material possessions to the absolute minimum which will insure good health and comfort. Escape the cycle of credit buying and you free yourself and your loved ones from the yoke of the Jew. Teach your children by example and guide them in the study of the lessons of our Aryan people and our accomplishments. Show them the true meaning of the Aryan's love for family by example. A home where the mother raises her young securely, where all of the family come with joy at the ending of each day to share in the warmth and love of one another. Where the father is grateful for the opportunity to be responsible for the material, educational, and spiritual guidance of his family and shares these responsibilities with his wife who teaches the graces of love and sharing to her children. Sharing

in the duties of the home, sharing in the obligations of one to another today, and through life.

The Aryan family is the most dangerous threat to the world view of the Jew. The Aryan family is rapidly moving to extinction by the deliberate manipulation of government. The government has already destroyed the Negro family in the United States, and the Aryan family is nearly gone. The route to survival lies in the family. Within the family the Aryan blood is secure, within the family is the hope for our future. There will be no "Aryan Nation," no "New Order," no tomorrow at all for the Aryan if the family is allowed to die.

Aryans group together not as individuals, we group together as extensions of our respective families. If we do not have Aryan values inculcated in the home from childhood, then the individual's chance of random encounter with those who possess the Aryan spirit become slight. It is an Aryan community which has been our bulwark, for from the Aryan family come Aryan warriors. From Aryan warriors will come the survival of our race. As the Aryan family is deliberately destroyed, so too is the Aryan warrior. Only you, today, can stop the process which otherwise will destroy us. The survival and strength of the Aryan family is crucial. If the battle is won, we survive as a race, if lost, we sink into the oblivion of racial miscegenation and are one with the mud races.

"He who would live must fight. He who does not wish to fight in this world, where permanent struggle is the law of life, has not the right to exist."

Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*



To bear witness to the truth

LIBERTY BELL NETWORK

NOTHING BUT HARD FACTS!
NO GAMES - NO FICTION!
NO I.D. REQUIRED - FREE ACCESS

COMPUTER INFORMATION NETWORK AND DATABASE

300/1200 BAUD SERVICE

ON-LINE 24 HOURS

The Hot-Line

304-927-1773

RUDOLF HESS: PRISONER OF VENGEANCE

THE STORY OF A MAN WHO MADE MORE
SACRIFICES FOR WORLD PEACE IN OUR CENTURY
THAN THE REST OF MANKIND PUT TOGETHER,
AS TOLD

by
Colin Jordan.

THE PLANE sought refuge from its pursuers in the evening haze—for it was German, they were British, the date was 10 May 1941 and the war was 1½ years old. Escaping the two Spitfires, the Messerschmitt 110 continued its 900-mile flight, crossing the Northumberland coast, dipping dangerously low over fields and villages to avoid detection, its fuel, barely enough for the one-way trip, dwindling alarmingly. Entering Scotland and reaching the vicinity of its objective, the home of the Duke of Hamilton, the plane's pilot, all alone, made in the darkness his very first parachute descent.

The man was the Deputy Leader of Germany, Rudolf Hess. He had risked his life and staked his freedom in a feat of flying which Luftwaffe expert Colonel Udet had told Hitler was impossible. He did it, not to wreak some special destruction on Britain, but to bring peace between two brother nations who, together in alliance, could have assured the security and prosperity of the white peoples of this globe for many generations to come. History holds few, if any, more momentous occasions or more daring acts of benevolence. No-one deserves the Nobel Peace Prize more than this man.

Anglo-German accord within a European settlement had been the bedrock of belief with both Hitler and Hess throughout their political lives. Both were appalled when Britain declared war on Germany in September 1939, on the spurious pretext of an agreement to defend Poland against wholly 'unjustifiable German demands' for the return of German territory. This pretext simply masked Britain's subjection to those sinister forces who were intent on destroying Germany and Britain

in a fratricidal war, and it was anyway shown to be pure humbug when later the Russians moved in on the eastern half of Poland—and Britain did nothing.

HITLER'S PEACE PATH

Hess, as Hitler's Deputy, was no newcomer to moves for peace. At the very outset of his coming to power, Hitler, in the Reichstag on 17 May 1933, had proposed general disarmament. Despite no response, he had next proposed on 4 October of that year at least some limitations on armaments. Despite no response again, he had on 21 May 1935 again proposed limitation, including the restriction of bombing to actual battle zones as preparatory to banning all bombing. Despite yet again no response, he had on 31 March 1936 put forward a peace plan including limitations on bombing and shelling. Yet again there had been no response from Britain and the other 'democracies.' Nevertheless, at the height of the Polish crisis Hitler, on 24 August 1939, had proposed an agreement which included a promise to help protect the British Empire. Britain, in the greatest act of folly in her history, had answered this with the commencement of a calamitous war which led to the ruin of that Empire.

Having quickly defeated the Polish stalking horse, Hitler, on 6 October 1939, had called for a peace conference, and on 9 October the German Government had said it would accept American mediation with Washington as the venue. Three days later Britain had intimated rejection. Having next defeated France and caused the British Expeditionary Force to depart from the shores of that country, Hitler, accompanied by Hess, made in the Reichstag, on 19 July 1940, what he called "an appeal once more to reason and common sense in Great Britain," saying, "I see no reason why this war should go on," and demanding no forfeitures from the foe for her defeat on the Continent. One hour later Sefton Delmer, in charge of German-language programmes for the BBC, had given the following answer, endorsed by the Government in Parliament: "Mr. Hitler. . . let me tell you what we here in Britain think of this appeal of yours . . . we hurl it right back at you, right in your evil-smelling teeth."

CHURCHILL WANTED WAR

Churchill, that catastrophic conjurer of patriotic emotions for alien interests and inimical ends, had by now become Prime Minister, thanks to the war he had so long worked for as his necessary theatre for fame. When, the month after Hitler's peace speech, he had found that 3 of the 6 members of his Cabinet were inclined to peace, he sought to scotch this un-toward development by ordering an air raid on Berlin at a time when Hitler had ordered that British cities should not be bombed.

When informed in 1941 that Hess had come to Britain to make peace, this prime cause of the "blood, toil, tears, and sweat" which his war cost the British people retorted that this arrival (of a truer friend of Britain than he ever was) would not interfere with his enjoyment of a film featuring the Marx Brothers.

Thus, instead of responding sensibly to Hess's mission, and thereby saving millions of lives, and preventing the seizure of half of Europe by Moscow, bewitched Britain, under the spell of the bloodthirsty drunkard of Downing Street, misdirected a magnificence of national spirit to the cause of killing as many of Hess's compatriots as possible, and destroying as much of their country as possible, to the enormous delight of the foul fraternity who behind the scenes pulled the strings of political puppetry.

HESS UNDER TREATMENT

From Scotland Hess was brought South, incarcerated briefly in the Tower of London, and then taken to Mytchett Place, a requisitioned mansion near Alderson. There he was subjected to various forms of 'treatment' designed to extract information from him, and to mould him to the propaganda purposes of the Churchillian warmongers. This accounts for their allegations that he required 'psychiatric observation,' as it does for Hess's faked loss of memory as a measure of self-protection against the interrogations, and his complaints that chemicals were being put in his food and drink; and it explains their subsequent depiction of him as 'deranged' when they failed to get what they wanted out of him.

As an example of the abuse of one who, if not accorded the courtesy of an ambassador of peace, at least deserved the rights of a prisoner of war under the Geneva Convention—which

forbade the solitary confinement accorded to him, Hess was confronted with a faked copy of the *Daily Telegraph* of 20 June 1941 containing a report of an interview Hitler gave to a former U.S. Ambassador in Belgium, doctored to give the impression that Hitler had spoken of Hess as a madman. The hope was that this forgery would turn Hess against Hitler, and cause him to give away information in retaliation.

Described in the *Daily Telegraph* of 22 March 1971, this trick, which completely failed, was the bright idea of the same Sefton Delmer we have encountered earlier. He headed a special unit for the use of deceit in the cause of democracy, the arch-deceiver. In his memoirs, *The Germans and I*, he testified to the unlimited skulduggery practised by his band of 'truth-benders,' as they were known.

Hess's son, Wolf Rüdiger Hess, in his new book, *My Father Rudolf Hess* (£15.50 postfree UK, £16.00 abroad, from *Gothic Ripples*, Greenhow Hill, Harrogate, N. Yorks. HG3 5JQ, England) tells of another of Delmer's forged newspapers, this one reporting that Frau Hess had told the Berlin police that she had drugged her husband to put him under the influence of British hypnotists to cause him to come into British captivity. Delmer, having been a Fleet Street journalist, was well trained in the way in which truth can be bent in the 'free press' of a democracy.

COMPLAINT TO THE KING

Such was the maltreatment of Hess that in June 1941 he tried unsuccessfully to commit suicide, and in November 1941 he wrote these words to King George VI: "I came to England banking on the fairness of the English people . . . Could I not expect all the more to be met by fairness, having come not as an enemy—especially as I came to England unarmed, at the risk of my life, to try to end the hostilities between our two peoples."

Hess also composed a memorandum at that time, which, with prophetic insight, stated: "A victory for England would be a victory for the Bolsheviks. A victory of the Bolsheviks would mean sooner or later their advance into Germany and the rest of Europe . . . If England's desire to weaken Germany were fulfilled, the Bolshevik State would become the strongest military power on earth. . ."

These two items are culled from the papers of Lt. Col. A.J.B. Larcombe (disclosed in the *Sunday Telegraph*, 13 De-

ember 1981) who in 1945 escorted Hess to Nuremberg; for when, after four long years of further slaughter, Churchill's blood lust was finally satisfied in the infinite misery of Germany's unconditional surrender, Hess went home to Germany, not as an honoured peacemaker, not as a released prisoner of war, but instead as an alleged criminal—victim of vengeance, which under Churchill's V sign, was the accompaniment of a democratic victory.

VENUE FOR VENGEANCE

Nuremberg was carefully chosen as the venue for this particular act of vengeance. Over the roofs of its medieval quarter Hitler's plane had been wont to descend on its arrival for the gigantic processions through the streets of the city of the exultant manhood of a Germany reborn. So, with true Old Testament spite, high explosive and incendiary bombs had been generously rained down on that architectural treasure house to destroy the setting for the great spectacles of National Socialism; and so now to Nuremberg Hess and the other captured leaders were conveyed for a festival of vengeance masquerading as an exposition of justice, opening in November 1945 and extending a whole year till October 1946.

While outside the courtroom of the International Military Tribunal the gaping craters, the hillockss of rubble, and the remnants of homes all testified for Hess against his accusers, inside the place he who had sought to save Europe from all this was charged and convicted of crimes against peace and conspiracy to commit such crimes, and was sentenced to imprisonment for life. Of the other two counts in the four-count indictment against Hess, namely of war crimes and crimes against humanity, even that crooked caricature of a court had to stop short of conviction. Those proceedings at Nuremberg, which have been the sole basis for the caging of Hess for half a lifetime, were nothing less than a complete perversion of justice which, in reality, condemned not the accused but the accusers.

UNDER JEWISH MANAGEMENT

"It was the World Jewish Congress which had secured the holding of the Nuremberg Trials at which it had provided expert advice and much valuable evidence," boasted Congress spokesman Rabbi M. Perlzweig in the *London Jewish Chronicle*, 16

December 1949.

Members of Rabbi Perlzweig's triumphant tribe were abundant on the staff of the Nuremberg Tribunal and its associated agencies, ranging from Col. B. C. Andrus, in charge of the emaciated prisoners kept in unheated pens under the harshest conditions and with floodlights shining on them all night, to the hangman, John C. Woods, who, on a Jewish feastday, killed with a slow-death-drop 11 of the 23 defendants, ensuring that, for example, Field Marshall Keitel took 24 minutes to die (*Nuremberg: A Nation on Trial*, by German historian Werner Maser). The bodies of the dead were then cremated at Munich, birthplace of National Socialism, and the ashes were dumped in the River Isar.

Hess and the others sentenced to imprisonment were then taken to the execution room and made to clean up the mess made by the deliberately prolonged murder of their colleagues.

The charges against Hess and his associates were inventions without precedent, unknown in German and other European penal codes, incompatible with the theory and usage of international law, and applied retroactively and thus contrary to all normal legal practice. They were additionally invalid because applied with perverted partiality by this victors' tribunal whose eight judges included, along with two each from Britain, France, and the U.S.A., two from the Soviet Union, a country which had been expelled from the League of Nations for its aggression against Finland in 1939—precisely the kind of offence for which Hess was convicted—and which, furthermore, put more people in concentration camps and exterminated more opponents than any other country in modern times. One of the Soviet pair was none other than I. Nikitchenko, who had been in charge of Stalin's show trials.

ONE-SIDED 'JUSTICE'

This Allied tribunal, however, had concern only for the alleged wrongdoings of the Germans, and none whatsoever for any comparable conduct by its own side. Thus, for example, in relation to Hess's conviction no cognisance was taken of the British invasions of Iceland in 1940 and Syria and Iran in 1941, or Britain's plan to invade Norway in 1940.

Commented Lt. Col. Liddell-Hart in his *History of the Second World War* (pages 58/59): "One of the most questionable points of the Nuremberg Trials was that the planning and

execution of aggression against Norway was put among the major charges against the Germans . . . Such a course was one of the most palpable cases of hypocrisy in history."

The truth is that Germany got to know of *British* plans to invade Norway and thence Sweden in order, among other things, to stop the vital supply of Swedish iron ore to the German armament industry, and the Germans got into Norway to prevent this just hours ahead of the British. British Cabinet and Foreign Office papers, newly released to the Public Record Office, were shown by the *Daily Telegraph* of 1 January 1971 to disclose that, as far back as December 1939, Britain and France plotted to send regular troops, in the guise of volunteers to aid Finland against Russian aggression, but with the real aim of stopping the Swedish supplies of ore to Germany. This particular violation of neutrality was prevented by the Swedish refusal to signify sanction for the transit of the bogus 'defenders of Finland' across Swedish territory, but it did not stop Churchill, then First Lord of the Admiralty, continuing to scheme to the same end, and to dispatch an invasion force to Norway which was beaten to its destination by the German counter-move.

ALLIED ATROCITIES CONDONED

While Hess was charged unsuccessfully, and others successfully, with crimes of war and crimes against humanity, the atrocities of the Allies were treated as inadmissible as evidence by their judicial hirelings at Nuremberg. Yet former tank major Desmond Flower, MC, then Deputy Chairman of publishers Cassell & Co., was quoted in the *Sunday Dispatch* of London on 15 April 1956 as stating that during the invasion of Europe British soldiers shot prisoners of war and civilians, and looted and wantonly destroyed civilian property; and more recently, Max Hastings in his *Operation Overload* recorded that the shooting of German prisoners was a common Allied practice.

The defence was barred from mentioning such shootings, and from introducing the British Army Manual of Irregular Warfare, which advocated the same activity the defendants were charged with and punished for. Similarly, the defence was barred from citing the deliberate mass slaughter of German civilians at Dresden, Hamburg, and elsewhere in Germany by the British and American bombing raids. Summarising the disqualifying double-standard demonstrated by the tribunal, even Robert H. Jackson, the chief American prosecutor, ad-

January 1987

mitted in a letter to the then President Truman: "The Allies have done or are doing the very same things we are prosecuting the Germans for." (*Justice at Nuremberg*, Robert E. Conot, p. 68).

HANDICAPPED DEFENCE

Not only were the purview and composition of the tribunal a travesty of justice, so too were its ways and means. The London Agreement which set it up laid down that its constitutionality could not be challenged. Its Article 19 decreed that "The Tribunal shall not be bound by technical rules of evidence"—so that it could dispense with the normal safeguards against injustice. Article 21 of the same document decreed that "The Tribunal shall not require proof of facts of common knowledge"—so that it could treat as unquestionable contentions advantageous to the prosecution.

Defense staff had to work in a dimly lit room under constant surveillance by American military police, faced continual obstruction in collecting evidence, and were not allowed to see prosecution material before its submission. Werner Maser, above cited, showed that among other measures designed to pervert justice prosecution witnesses were beaten until they gave the desired 'evidence,' many defence witnesses were not allowed to appear, agreements to advise the defence of topics to be examined the next day were not kept, the defence was not allowed to have copies of many prosecution documents of evidence, defence documents had to be sifted by the prosecution before they could be submitted, and many of these documents were confiscated or stolen.

Hess was not allowed to conduct his own defence, despite provision in the tribunal's charter, and, when he sought to exercise his right to make a closing statement, he was cut short with the ruling that he must be brief.

PROSECUTION FORGERIES

Falsified material was used by the prosecution to secure the convictions of Hess and the others. The private file of the chief American prosecutor revealed that newsreels shown as evidence were doctored by his staff (David Irving, *The War Path*)

Allied prosecution exhibit USSR-378 was the book by Herman Rauschning, *Hitler Speaks*, purporting to be Hitler's

most intimate views and plans as revealed through a great many private conversations with the author, including the intention to incorporate Africa, South America, and eventually the U.S.A. in a global empire, and the statement, "Do I propose to exterminate entire nationalities? Yes, it will add up to that . . ." Swiss historian Wolfgang Haenal, after 5 years' investigation, has revealed that this almost unknown provincial official only met Hitler four times and never alone, and the material is pure fiction. The German magazine *Der Spiegel*, 7 September 1985, called it "a falsification, an historical distortion from the first to the last page . . ."

Another falsification was prosecution exhibit 386-PS, the Hossbach Protocol, used to prove that Hitler planned aggressive war, and thus that Hess, as his Deputy, was culpably a party to it. West Berlin lawyer, Dankwart Kluge, has shown in a book published in 1980 that the Allied authorities got hold of a copy someone else made of a note made by a Col. Hossbach of the proceedings of a conference with Hitler that he and others attended in 1937, and substantially altered it. In his eventual memoirs Hossbach admitted that Hitler did not outline any war plan at the conference, and British historian A.J.P. Taylor (*An Old Man's Diary*, 1984), rejecting the Nuremberg exhibit as a forgery, said: "No evidence that Hitler planned an aggressive war has ever been produced." Thus Hess's conviction was counterfeit.

HESS'S BIRTHDAY

Forty years after the Nuremberg festival of vengeance, the pale light of the early morning brought to sight the bare furnishings—bed, table, and chair—of a small barred room in Spandau Prison, West Berlin, where on 26 April 1986 Rudolf Hess reached his 92nd birthday, and at 6 a.m. the guard obliged him to rise. There were no birthday cards from the public to greet the old man, for these, Christmas cards and all other mail, are denied him, apart from a single letter per week to and from his family.

He may have a visit from his wife or son for a single hour each month, but needs to remember the rule to keep two full yards away from his loved one. Never must he touch his visitor. With that visitor will also attend the British, French, American, and Russian prison commandants, and, for the benefit of the latter, every word uttered will be loudly translated into Russian, *January 1987*

so the prisoner must always remember to speak slowly.

Hess spent his birthday trying to read the four newspapers he is allowed daily, and one of the four books he is allowed monthly; a difficult matter despite the combination of spectacles and a magnifying glass because he is now blind in one eye and has a detached retina in the other one which is inoperable because of his age, and increasingly reduces his sight; so he must make the most of his remaining time before total darkness is added to his imprisonment. His reading matter must exclude anything relating to his case, his past, or National Socialist Germany in general, and any notes he makes are taken away and destroyed.

For him to watch television, a concession now allowed him but similarly censored, he needs to apply a week in advance, specifying the desired programme. News bulletins and programmes of contemporary history are not allowed.

Weather permitting—and despite oedema of the legs and a weakness in the thigh bones which causes his knee joints to give way so that he falls and cannot get up unaided—he could go down to shuffle around the exercise ground, where he has already walked the equivalent of three times around the world, or to tend the garden plot which gives him pleasure. While so doing he could cast a glance in the direction of the prison basement where already his coffin stands waiting for him, destined for immediate cremation, his ashes to be denied to his family, and disposed of secretly.

SPANDAU'S SECRECY

The four custodial powers maintain to this day a secrecy concerning Hess's prison conditions and the state of his health which can only be seen as a cloak for culpability. Thus the British Foreign Office replied on 5 March 1985: "Mr. Jordan asks five specific questions in his letter. I regret that I cannot supply him with specific answers on the conditions of Hess's imprisonment. The Spandau Prison regulations are confidential. The consent of the Four Powers, including the Russians, would be needed for their publication. The same applies to details of Hess's medical condition."

When on Hess's 92nd birthday this writer asked the British Foreign Secretary if he would mark the occasion by asking the other three powers to end this secrecy—and at the same time to agree to end restrictions on Hess's mail, reading, and tele-

vision—the reply was: "It is not possible, in Hess's own interests, to give details of Allied proposals." Thus secrecy concerning secrecy is the name of their game.

A fortnight following our last look at Spandau's solitary prisoner, it was 10 May 1986, and the 45th anniversary of his flight to Britain. Even after more than 16,000 days of imprisonment he can still sharply remember his feeling as the plane left German soil at Augsburg around 5.45 p.m. When his feet next touched ground a few hours later in Lanarkshire, it was to start nearly half a century of captivity.

LETTER TO THATCHER

On the same anniversary in 1986 this writer yet again tackled the British Government regarding the release of Rudolf Hess, writing the following letter to Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, which so far has only received bare acknowledgement:

"I write to you this day, the 10th May, the anniversary of Rudolf Hess's flight to Britain in 1941, and thus the completion of 45 years of his imprisonment, to ask if you will mark this occasion by making another approach now to the Soviet Union to agree to the release of this very old and partly blind prisoner whose 92nd birthday took place a fortnight ago.

"I appreciate that the British Government maintains that it has made a number of such approaches over the past years without success, but I do put it to you that Britain has a special responsibility in the matter in that Hess first lost his liberty in consequence of his endeavour to make peace between our country and his through a singularly courageous feat of flying. I therefore submit that it will be shameful for Britain, if she fails now, while there is still time, to urge in the strongest possible way the Soviet Union—which she contents is the only one of the four custodial powers objecting—to agree to Hess's immediate release, and instead wait and allow the problem to be removed by his death which cannot be far off.

"In conjunction with this, I wish here to ask you to reconsider the British Government's present decision to keep its papers on Rudolf Hess secret till the year of 2017, and instead authorise public access to those papers as a gesture of good faith in accord with its claim to favour Hess's release; since otherwise the maintenance of this secrecy can but give rise to the belief that the Government has something damaging to hide by this secrecy."

BRITAIN'S EXCUSES

The British Government maintains the pose that, while favouring the release of Hess, it cannot during one of the months when, in rotation with other powers, it has control of Spandau, either free him, or in lieu place him in some other and more comfortable custody, because this would be to break an agreement with the Russians which would be immoral, and also inexpedient in jeopardising to our detriment other agreements with them. This argument is unconvincing. Firstly, it is morally preferable to break a wrongful agreement than to continue it—and Hess's continued imprisonment at his age and after so many years on account of a wrongful conviction at Nuremberg is beyond question monstrously wrongful—while the Russians, on account of the number of agreements they have broken at their convenience, including, according to the *Washington Enquirer* (21 September 1984), 17 arms control commitments between 1958 and 1983, are hardly entitled to invoke integrity in their favour.

Secondly, the Russians, being by doctrine and practice devoted to keeping agreements only if and as long they suit their purposes, would not be likely to let their huffing and puffing over the release of Hess without their approval ultimately interfere with their disposition concerning other agreements. One is therefore led by this reasoning to view the British Government's decision to keep its Hess papers secret till 2017—and thus till after not only Hess is dead, but almost everyone else who was an adult at the time of his flight—as a powerful clue to false pretences on its part. Indeed this writer believes, not only that those papers are likely to show something of potentiality for peace still prevailing in Britain in 1941 as a response to Hess's mission, which Churchill and his cronies were intent on suppressing in their lust for war, but also the fact that, just as Hitler only narrowly forestalled by hours Churchill's plan to violate Scandinavian neutrality in 1940, so too a year later he only narrowly forestalled by days Stalin's plan to launch a surprise attack on Germany in violation of the pact between them.

HESS SILENCED

Did not Hess—aware from German intelligence of the Russian preparations to attack then proceeding, necessitating

the swift German counterattack then being planned—time his flight when he did in the knowledge that the great struggle for Europe against Bolshevism was about to begin, a struggle in which Britain should not figure on the side of the latter?

Did not Churchill realise that this was his chance to destroy, with the help of Stalin's hordes, the hated champion of European Civilisation, and thus to realise his consuming ambition to strut across the pages of history as a conquering warlord? Had he not already conspired with Stalin to this end in his approaches starting in 1940, just as he had conspired with the Czechs and taken their bribes in 1938 to help bring the war about (David Irving: *The War Path*, p. 136), and had conspired with Roosevelt to bring American into it, as coding clerk Tyler Kent discovered—later being silenced by imprisonment?

Did not Churchill determine to silence Hess by confinement, and have not successive British Governments kept the Hess papers secret, and in league with their wartime allies kept Hess imprisoned, precisely because this prisoner of peace knows too much and could tell too much, destroying their fictions of rectitude, and thereby exposing their crime in detaining him?

Are they not, one and all, despite their pretences, determined to keep Hess caged in Spandau until the day death silences him forever—because, if freed and free to talk, he would as a result be acquitted by all fair opinion, while Churchill would be condemned and the conception of his 'just' war against Germany would collapse? Democracy's misrulers could not withstand the damage thus done to the very foundations of their essential edifice of lies.

HIS VICTORY

Within the prison walls of Spandau the subject of our speculation will tonight have his spectacles removed at 10 p.m. lest his fumbling fingers beneath the bedclothes manage to break the glass, and use it to end his torment prematurely. Throughout the drab procession of days and nights across the dreary decades his sustaining strength has been the satisfaction of knowing that, despite everything, he has beaten them because he has kept faith. As against all uncertainties concerning him stands the certainty of his steadfastness. Had he been a mere fellow traveler, like technocrat Speer, or some lesser believer or weaker character, he could perhaps have bought his release by penitential recantation, plus an undertaking to be silent on what

his captors desire to be kept secret. Democracy and its cousin Communism would dearly love to release and parade a beaten and repentant Hess, as a token of their 'compassion,' and have him recite all their proclaimed evils of National Socialism.

But they are doomed to disappointment. He who uttered the following words of defiance to the judicial vultures of Nuremberg amid the ruins of Aryan renaissance will never give in, and, in his triumph of the will, holds high a torch of honour to the remembrance, redemption, and revival of that renaissance:

"It has been my privilege to serve for many years under the greatest son to whom my people has given birth in its thousand years of history . . . If I were to begin all over again, I would act just as I have acted, even if I knew that in the end I would meet a fiery death at the stake."

Stunde ich wieder am Anfang
würde ich wieder handeln
wie ich handelte.
Auch wenn ich wüßte,
daß am Ende
ein Scheiterhaufen für
meinen Flammentod brennt.
Gleichgültig was Menschen tun
dereinst stehe ich vor dem
Richterstuhl des Ewigen
ihm werde ich
mich verantworten
und ich weiß:
Er spricht mich frei!

Schlussworte von Rudolf Hess
Stellvertreter des Führers
vor dem Nürnberger Tribunal 1946

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, stickers, and—most importantly—our reprints 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!**