Goldhagen's Gaps
In a decade ago countries like Poland or Soviet republics like Estonia were less autonomous than Kansas is today. Now our shores. There was never any chance that our intervention would accomplish anything there. When the refugees again increase from a trickle to a flood, instead of supine acceptance, Joe Sixpack may wonder why Haitians would want to leave their country after tens of millions of U.S. dollars restored “democracy” there.

- Haiti is a bit of Africa, unfortunately much closer than the Dark Continent to our shores. There was never any chance that our intervention would accomplish anything there. When the refugees again increase from a trickle to a flood, instead of supine acceptance, Joe Sixpack may wonder why Haitians would want to leave their country after tens of millions of U.S. dollars restored “democracy” there.

- I nominate former Lt. Kelly Flinn for Majority Renegadess of the Year. She managed to become the first woman to fly a B-52 bomber (maybe a little affirmative action at work here!), then decided she was somehow privileged, could ignore military’s regulations against fraternizing, and carried on an affair with a minorityite. Now she whines she should have only been given a “letter reprimand,” precluding her from future promotions in the military. Majority women like this we don’t need.

- If I were Ted Turner, I’d donate a billion-dollar sweetener to Instauration, not just the three digits of their zip code.

- If Europeans had left them alone, Watusis, Hutus, Pygmies and Zulus would have built their own skyscrapers, computers and spacecraft. Right?

- If, as we are often told, the white race is the root of all evil, then how can all races be the same?

- Two reasons we should boycott Wal-Mart: Hillary Clinton is on the board of directors; Sam Walton’s daughter, Alice, contributes stacks of money to Bill.

- She took a married man away from his wife, disobeyed an order to stop fooling around, then lied about that. Congress, hell! Kelly Flinn’s presidential material!

- Easy for Clinton to push affirmative action. Neither he nor any member of his family has ever been harmed by it.

- As any gringo resident of Florida or the Southwest must realize, Israel’s borders mean more to us than our own.

- Clinton is obviously Majority Renegade of the Year. But he’s also Majority Renegade of the Century.

- Miami Beach has a high number of “outrageous” queers. When I saw a 6'3” transvestite, with red hair and freckles, wearing a miniskirt, I thought that was as bad as it gets. I was wrong! The next day I saw the same guy on the beach in a bikini!

- Civil war or anarchy can’t happen here! Would you have said that only a few years ago if asked whether the President and Vice President would promote homosexuality? Would you have said that if you had known our schools would soon be teaching first-graders that gay is at least as good as straight? What can’t happen here?

- Nixon could have avoided resignation if only he had thought of three little words: “Everybody does it!”

- I lived in Mexico for two years. Though the U.S. is often berated for its treatment of Mexican legal/illegal immigrants, they get far better treatment than Mexicans give their immigrants. There is no bilingual movement in Mexico: Spanish, that’s it. It’s against the law down there below the Rio Grande to disrespect Mexican culture. Illegals have no rights and are lucky to be thrown out of the country alive.

- It’s trendy to be gay, but trendier to be transgendered. For the National Organization of Women (NOW) the rights of the transgendered is the issue. Next to the writer-protagonist, the most attention in Midnight in the Garden of Good and Evil is given to “the Lady Chablis,” a black transvestite. Much less space is focused on the victim or the accused killer. He/she/it has almost no connection with the plot, but evidently Clint Eastwood thought all the perverted stuff would spice up an otherwise very dull film.

- Clinton has never liked that. It really means, “You should think as I think.”

- A decade ago countries like Poland or Soviet republics like Estonia were less autonomous than Kansas is today. Now they are sovereign states. The same scenario probably lies ahead for the U.S., whose devolution will be speeded because the states have their own National Guards. Also, there is a big, big precedent for secession. Let’s hope our breakup will be as peaceful as was the Soviet bloc’s.

- If, as we are often told, the white race is the root of all evil, then how can all races be the same?
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You who create Instauration are

Although he richly deserves the title, I wonder how many of his adoring fillies or you’re a Nazi.

Considering the woeful twists and turns of U.S. foreign policy, a prime requirement for the Cabinet position of Secretary of State should be that the occupant must be a native-born American.

Long, long ago some of our most respected scholars unwittingly betrayed us by minting a sinister hyphenation, “Judeo-Christian.” Why not just call our religion the Christian religion and be done with it? Judaism, an ethnic religion, is miles away from Christianity, a universal religion. If Jews don’t believe in the Christian part of Judeo-Christian, why should non-Jews believe in the Jewish part?

I nominate Bob Dole for Majority Renegade of the Year. His pusilanimous pandering to every minority and Chosenite in his disgusting run for the presidency is only overshadowed by his coupling with Clinton on a well-publicized trip to Bosnia. He’ll do anything to keep in the spotlight. I really prefer Clinton to this jelly fish.

Although he richly deserves the title, I know Bill “Minorities Created the West” Moyers will once again fail to make the grade as Majority Renegade of the Year. Ergo, may I nominate him for Honorary Majority Renegade of the Year?

Only innocence and unexpected examples of moral courage are worth bothering about. Everything else in human behavior is wretched.

You who create Instauration are worthy whose monthly product gladdens my heart when it arrives, at which time I am “officially unavailable” for as long as it takes to digest it. The mag has benefited me in three unanticipated ways: (1) it has sharpened my talents of writing if not thinking; (2) the act of drafting an article has become a joy, something like spending an afternoon with canvas and oils. Best of all; (3) I have a chance to voice opinions that are verboten elsewhere.

Since the opposition has effectively destroyed the credibility of such words as “Aryan” and “white,” why not use the word “Borean?” Meaning northern, it was used by philosopher-historian Fabre D’Olivet in the early 19th century, when tracing the conquest of all Asia, including India and as far as the Pacific by a northern European white, blue-eyed race led by a man named Rama and others. He referred to that race as the Borean. Let’s see how “they” handle that word!

Whatever you think about homosexuality, can you deny that the media campaign in its favor is a propaganda barrage without precedent?

I look forward to receiving Instauration. I’m sorry it’s not a weekly.

At Bayfront Park in downtown Miami there is a monument to the locals who were killed in WWII. Only a sprinkling of Hispanic names are listed. How times change! The same park has a statue of Anton Cermak, the Chicago mayor who was killed in the 1933 assassination attempt on FDR. Reportedly his last words were, “I’m glad it was me and not you.” I beg to differ.

Recently I dreamt my girlfriend and I had a serious talk as we tried to reconcile following our split. Finally we seemed to reach a point on the verge of reunion. It was then I asked, “Will you give up the Negroes?” She thought for a moment, then replied, “No.” I quit dreaming and woke up.

JFK is now reported to have had an incurable venereal disease. One can only wonder how many of his adoring fillies he infected as they splashed around poolside or traipsed through the august chambers of the White House. Clinton is reported to have Peyronie’s disease, often the result of excessively strenuous sexual calisthenics. In view of this irresponsible behavior on the part of young men elected to the highest office on the basis of their charm and cunning, Congress might well consider raising the required age for a candidate to the presidency to be 65. Raging hormones should have subsided a bit by then.

I nominate Princess Diana for Majority Renegade of the Year. Her Nordic beauty notwithstanding, she was a testable, politically correct, vapid, high society race-mixer.

Although I find Christianity to be a lot of hocus-pocus, it still rankles me when the Chosen spits in the face of the religion most Majority members adhere to (even nominally).

Majority renegade families are not too cohesive. Now that one of Gore’s daughters has married a Chosenite, it may not be long before we hear miscegenating wedding bells ringing for Chelsea.

Benedict Arnold betrayed his country. Clinton is busy betraying his own kith and kin.

Who is a greater renegade than Ted Turner, who married the personification of all that he once detested?

He’s at it again! Abraham Foxman, head of the ADL, has launched another attempt to censor the Internet of “hate.” Over the years Foxman’s endless efforts to censor “hate” may be certified as censoring anyone or anything on the planet that dares to disagree with the almighty, all-powerful, omnipotent Foxman. In short, it’s another crude ADL assault on the First Amendment, the foundation of our Constitution and all our freedoms.

To the late Supreme Court Justice, William O. Brennan, the dean of activist judges, “the genius of the Constitution rests not in any static meaning it may have in a world dead and gone, but in its evolving character.” According to Brennan, because the Constitution evolves, there can be no fixed rights and no permanent law, and the people who get to decide when and how laws “evolve” are, of course, people like Brennan.
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No mention of Jewish racism as a cause of Nazi anti-Semitism

Goldhagen's Gaps

A ny fair-minded reader of Daniel J. Goldhagen's *Hitler's Willing Executioners* must concede that it cannot be dismissed as just another Germanophobic product in the 50-year growth industry of "Holocaustamania." It's too well-documented for that. Besides establishing beyond question the many massacres of Jews committed by the SS and the Police Battalions of the *Ord­nungspolizei*, the author amply supports his thesis that there was widespread complicity among ordinary Ger­mans in the cruelties of the Holocaust.

How could the Holocaust have happened? Philoso­phers and theologians have discussed that question for half a century without making much sense. Isn't this because "political correctness" has made them shy away from mentioning certain contributory causes? To hold that German fear and hatred of the Jews was entirely irrational is to uproot its historical context and leave it hanging in the air as if totally uncaused—a motiveless malignancy! We find similar gaps in Goldhagen's book. True, he cites Nazi propaganda and Christian anti-Semitism as prime causes of German behaviour towards the Jews. But anti-Semitism flourished in Germany long before Hitler, as Goldhagen himself points out. An age-old antagonism be­tween Nordic and Jew may have existed even before Christianity—all the way back to the confrontation be­tween Moses and a Pharaoh of Nordic descent. (Zionist pioneer Moses Hess wrote around 1870, "In the entire hu­man organism, there are nowhere two peoples who attract and detest each other more than the Jews and the Germans.")

As for why so many other peoples, and even many Jews themselves, should have been anti-Semitic, Goldhagen offers no answer. In his eyes, as for so many other "Holocaustamaniacs," the Jews could do no wrong. They were the eternal innocents, forever persecuted for no rea­son other than some inexplicable evil lurking in the hearts of Gentiles.

In the whole of *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, there is no hint that Jews might have contributed to the Holocaust by their own attitudes or ever harboured a racism of their own. Yet the Talmudic heart of their religion holds that Moses certainly did not in­vent racism. But only his people have made it an article of faith and carried it into the 20th century as the very core of their culture. Whoever doubts this can find it dramati­cally exposed in *Jewish History, Jewish Religion* by the Is­raeli human-rights activist and Holocaust survivor, Dr. Is­srael Shahak. Goldhagen complains that Nazis defined the Jew as a *Fremdkörper*, an alien body within German soci­ety, but haven't believers in the Talmud always so defined themselves? And since other peoples naturally resent be­ing relegated to second-class status, isn't it reasonable to suggest that historical anti-Semitism just might have something to do with a virulent anti-Gentilism on the other side? Most Jews may be innocent of that. But when their leaders embrace it, as so many rabbis and members of the Likud political party do, the stain is bound to spread.

Goldhagen's failure to acknowledge Jewish racism as a factor leading to the Nazi Holocaust is not his only distor­tion of history. There is also the question of scale. Though nobody should deny the scope of Hitler's assault on the Jews, this was *not* the single greatest crime of our century. That distinction belongs to the *Ukrainian* Holocaust. In his *Harvest of Sorrow*, Dr. Robert Conquest estimates that some 7 to 9 million people, including 4 million children, were systematically sacrificed in Stalin's *Terror Famine* of 1932-33. Adding the 3 or 4 million others lost to Ukraine in the preceding four years of *dekulakization*, this Holo­caust far exceeds even the questionable Six Million figure. Yet that number for the last 50 years has been trumpet­ed (and exploited for enormous sums of money) as the greatest crime in all of human history—"Unique in the annals of man's inhumanity to man!" Far greater losses at the hands of Stalin have been so systematically ignored that most people today have never heard of them. Simple justice requires that these atrocities be acknowledged.

Most of the Nazis' excuses for the Holocaust don't stand up, such as the Jews' betrayal of Germany in WWI and their influence in shaping the ruinous Versailles Peace Agreement. German Jews had proved their loyalty by 13,000 fatalities and winning 36,000 Iron Crosses. Many were quite patriotic, none more than the much-maligned Max Warburg, head of the great Hamburg merchant bank which had done so much for the Kaiser's war economy. Max had even offended Allied negotiators in Paris by in­sisting that England had caused the War by denying Ger­many's need for *Lebensraum*!

As to the Versailles Treaty, nobody knew better than Jewish financiers that destroying the German economy could destabilize the whole of Europe. Given the virtual monopoly of European banking enjoyed by their much-intermarried "aristocracy of money," Jews had as much or more to lose than any other group from a Bolshevik takeo­ver. (When a Bolshevik general poised to assault Warsaw in 1920 cabled Lenin for further instructions, he was told, "Don't stop until you get to the Rhine!") Goebbels was es­pecially unfair in calling it "The Warburg Peace Agree­ment" when the only Warburg bankers at the Paris Peace Conference were Max and his partner, Carl Melchior,
both urging Weimar to reject the Agreement. The truth is that those “jewish international financiers” indicted by Nazi propaganda had not only opposed Versailles but worked for years afterward to make the reparations bearable. The greatest contribution came from Paul Warburg, Max’s emigrant brother, who had become a partner in Jacob Schiff’s New York banking powerhouse Kuhn, Loeb. It was Paul’s initiative in launching the International Acceptances Bank in 1921 that put German industry on the road to recovery by providing short-term credits through the international banking network which the Warburgs knew so well how to use. As Ron Chernow observes in his monumental family biography, _The Warburgs_, “Since the Nazis later accused Jewish bankers of sabotaging the German economy, it is worth noting that Paul and Max acted as a critical conduit of Wall Street money at a time when credit was scarce.” Without their efforts, Hitler would not have had much industry to work with!

The point of real substance in Nazi propaganda against the Jews concerned their role in Bolshevism. This was the more effective because Jews and Communists, ever since Marx, had gone together in the public mind like fish and chips. (If they still do for some of us, this is because anyone involved in the current struggle to defend freedom of speech cannot help seeing that the main assault on it comes from that alliance.) Unfair as the Nazi equation Jew = Bolshevik may have been to most Jews, it cannot be denied that the Bolshevik leadership was largely Jewish. Though Stalin had steadily reduced their power after the death of Lenin, Jews in 1933 still held top positions in every major ministry from Finance to Foreign Affairs. They ran the secret police and its military arm, the GRU, whose political officers accompanied all Soviet units. Arkady Vaksberg, co-founder of the Russian branch of PEN, wrote in _Stalin Against the Jews_ that of 12 major Gulag complexes, 11 were run by Jewish commissars. He says of these “monsters” that the secretly anti-Semitic Stalin could take pleasure “in knowing that the Jewish sadists who served him elicited the disdain and loathing of their millions of slaves.” Even after the purges of 1936-38 had rid him of many “Old Bolsheviks,” Jews still flourished in Stalin’s administration. (“We need their minds,” Uncle Joe said.) And the atrocities of his system—where the monstrous Lazar M. Kaganovich for years stood second only to the Soviet dictator—were well-advertised in Germany. Goldhagen says nothing about this.

Goldhagen speaks of Hitler’s concentration camps as though they had no precedent in history, although the Bolsheviks had already been running theirs for 15 years when Hitler came to power! Der Führer himself admitted he had learned from them: “There is more that binds us to Bolshevism than separates us from it.” If the Soviet dictator could get away with murdering 8 million in Ukraine, why should Adolf blink at a million in Poland? A couple of quotations will show that the two tyrannies shared many of the same ideas: While Goldhagen tells of Herman Goering dismissing Christian and Enlightenment morality as “those stupid, false and unhealthy ideals of humanity,”8 Conquest quotes Soviet boss Mendel M. Khatsyevich as telling his enforcers of the Terror Famine, “Throw your bourgeois humanitarianism out of the window; act like Bolsheviks worthy of Comrade Stalin!”

Goldhagen’s one-sidedness here also shows in his indictment of the SS’s Ukrainian and Baltic accomplices. In stressing their brutal anti-Semitism, he ignores the equally brutal reason for it—namely, their having experienced the horrors of Bolshevik occupation in which Jewish officers of the KGB and GRU played leading roles. Dreadful things were done there, and done again when the Soviets returned later in the war. Though this cannot excuse, it helps to explain the 1941 “orgy of killing by Lithuanians in Kovno on the heels of the retreating Soviets.”10 And to some Latvian survivors of that era, the Soviet and German occupations were “as different as night from day.” In short, German knowledge of Bolshevik atrocities was bound to increase their acceptance of Nazi propaganda.

Another factor ignored by Goldhagen is how much of that propaganda originated from Jewish writers and politicians. As Alan Abrams puts it in _Special Treatment_, “Far more important than the actual involvement of Jews as members of the Nazi Party was the role they played in the formation of Nazi ideology.”12 Hitler himself was influenced in the writing of _Mein Kampf_ by Austrian Nazi leader Dr. Arthur Trebitsch, who blamed his fellow Jews for the loss of WWI and held that civilization could accommodate only those “who had recovered from their Jewishness.” Another was Bavarian lawyer Dr. Max Naumann of the reactionary _Verband Nazionaldeutsche Juden_. Calling for all Ostjuden to be expelled as economic parasites and “creatures not quite human,” he endorsed the Nazi Party in 1932 as the only one able to inspire “a rebirth of Germandom.” Nazi ideologues, in short, drew some of their “best” lines from the pens of “self-hating” Jews condemning their own people, as Jonas Wolk did in the SA’s _Der Stürmer_.

Western Jews looked down on their poorer Eastern cousins as dirty and primitive. For people who had increasingly striven through conversion and mixed marriages to be accepted as German rather than Jewish, the Ostjuden with their dreadlocks and ghetto background could only be an embarrassment. For bankers in particular, he was a painful reminder of their own remote past, when Schiffs and Rothschilds had shared a house in a Frankfurt ghetto, where any Gentile urchin could order a Jew to step into the gutter and bow to him. Given their desire to put all that behind them, it is not surprising that the Viennese Rothschilds should have been among the heaviest contributors to _Heimwehr_, the Austrian Nazi movement.

Jewish factions in America were also divided. While some of their bankers were urging American banks and oil companies to support Hitler, the World Jewish Congress’s declaration of war against him in 1933 was a boon to Nazi propaganda. So was the subsequent Zionist-led boycott of German goods. Complicating matters still further,
Abrams tells us that two Warburg partners in Kuhn, Loeb—Max’s emigrant son Eric and nephew Jimmy—"personally convinced President Roosevelt [that he should not back the boycott because] tales of Jewish persecution under the Nazis were greatly exaggerated.”15

On the other hand radical Zionists seized upon the Holocaust as a priceless gift to their own cause, which indeed it proved to be. Whereas Zionism is now the paramount force in World Jewry, in 1933 it was only a splinter group shunned by Jewish bankers on both sides of the Atlantic because they feared the stigma of “dual loyalty.” Said Jacob Schiff: “Speaking as an American, I cannot for a moment concede that one can be at the same time a true American and a loyal adherent of the Zionist movement.”16 (How amazed he would have been to learn that 7 of 11 seats on the U.S. National Security Council in 1994 would be held by Zionists!) It would also have amazed Georg Kareski, the rogue banker who founded Germany’s National Zionist Organization. He told the Goebbels’ paper, Der Angriff, in 1935 that he endorsed the separation of races and the ban on intermarriage ordered in Hitler’s Nuremberg Laws. So keen was he to have German Jews forced into leaving for Palestine that he suggested they all be made to wear a yellow star to increase their visibility, a suggestion promptly adopted by the infamous Reinhard Heydrich.

Among other contributors to the Nazi cause whom Goldhagen fails to mention were the 340 prominent Jews whom Hitler accepted as “Honorary Aryans” for their services to the Reich. Max Warburg was one of them. So was Nobelist Otto Warburg (chemistry). Banker Waldemar von Oppenheim was recruited by the Abwehr in 1941 and used as an intermediary in 1945 when Himmler was plotting peace behind Hitler’s back. Polish industrialist Prince Radziwill (looking after the Harriman interests) had the run of the Third Reich throughout the War. Among the traitorous Dutch Jews classified by the Gestapo as Ongedig (invaluable) was Bernard Katz, who survived very comfortably by ferreting out Old Masters for Goering’s collection. Yet another Honorary Aryan was Gustav Hertz, director of research for Siemens, a major employer of Jewish slave labour until 1945, when he went East to work on the Soviet atomic program.

Hertz was actually a Mischling, a child of mixed Aryan-Jewish parentage. This was another category of Jews spared from the Holocaust. According to Abrams, there were several hundred thousand Mischlinge, whose parents were also often spared. Hitler’s brawling chauffeur and early SS commander, Emil Maurice, was one; Reinhard Heydrich another. So was a top man in Goering’s Luftwaffe, Feldmarschall Erhard Milch. Many other Mischlinge served in the Wehrmacht. One survivor too young to serve told Abrams, “I might have been a Nazi, but they wouldn’t let me into the Hitler Youth.”16 Such verhindernde Nazis were not rare among Mischlinge. (Nor among full Jews, for that matter, many having been attracted to right-wing causes because of their own authoritarian background. Thus when the youths of the Zionist Deutsche Vortrupp, including two seminary students who later became rabbis in America, were forbidden to join the Hitler Jugend, they copied its uniform.)

Though Mischlinge did not have to wear the yellow star, their position of being neither German nor Jewish was not a comfortable one. As another survivor told Abrams, “To the Nazis we were practically Jews, but to the Jews we were goyim.”16 Indeed, many Orthodox Jews remained as opposed to “miscegenation” as the Nazis themselves. In the custom called “sitting shiva,” they would mourn a son “lost” to intermarriage as though he were dead. British poet Siegfried Sassoon’s grandmother had been so upset by her son’s marrying a shiksa that she placed a curse upon their offspring. Even in 1984, Brooklyn’s rabbi Halberstam could lament, “Intermarriage has done to Our People the same damage our enemies sought to inflict four decades ago.”17

Goldhagen makes only fleeting reference to the German Resistance, and none at all to the Allied indifference to it. An eloquent voice here is that of Christabel Bielenberg in The Past Is Myself.18 An Irish-English girl married to a fervently anti-Nazi young German she’d met at Oxford, Christabel spent the whole War in Germany. She shared in the ordeal of Allied bombing, made worse by the struggle to feed her three little boys. She saw how effective Nazi propaganda was in causing the natural kindliness of many Germans to be suddenly switched off by any mention of “Jews.” But she also saw how much Hitler’s earlier measures had benefited working people and dissolved class barriers to make ein Volk a vibrant reality. She realized how inevitably the majority of any land will “go along” with the ruling power so long as it does not push them too hard.

Moving from Hamburg to Berlin in 1939, the Bielenbergs saw how many decent Germans longed for the removal of Hitler. Rebels like retired General von Beck, Colonel Hans Oster and the famed Gördeler family were conspiring with veteran bureaucrats to achieve this goal. Their neighbour, lawyer Carl Langbehn, continually put himself at risk by acting for people in trouble with the Gestapo. He had met many top Nazis such as Heydrich, Kaltenbrunner and Gestapo Chief Müller, finding them to be cold, clever, utterly ruthless “liquidators” of all opposition. Nor had he any illusions about Hitler, “a cunning, dangerous, homicidal lunatic with some strange but compelling mystique.” But the “lunatic” seemed to bear a charmed life! As all attempts to get rid of him failed, the hopes of the Bielenbergs and their friends also dimmed. The worst blow to the German opposition, writes Christabel, was the Allied demand after Stalingrad for unconditional surrender. This gave Goebbels the tool he needed to persuade Germans to fight to the bitter end. (Wir müssen wohl ausharren!) This hardening of attitudes isolated the Bielenbergs even more. Christabel was often lonely when her husband...
was away, but whom could she trust? She tells of attending a house-party given by Mischlinge whose conversation so impressed her with what good Nazis they would have made that she left without saying goodbye! This prompts the question, Would Germany’s Jews have followed Hitler if his target had been some other people? If allowed to stay, would they have supported Germany as enthusiastically in WWII as they had in WWI?

We see no reason to doubt it. Most were conservative by nature, no more inclined towards communism than either Schiff or Max. It is true these and other Jewish financiers had supported the moderate Menshevik revolution which toppled the Czar while a surprised Lenin was still sitting in Zurich. But none could welcome the Bolshevik tyranny which he would impose once the Kaiser’s “sealed train” had injected him into Russia, as Churchill said, “like a plague bacillus.” If they later did a lot of business with the Soviet Union, as when Kuhn, Loeb financed Stalin’s first Five Year Plan, that was passed off as just business. So long as he tolerated them, living under Hitler’s dictatorship would not have unduly bothered a people whose own religious tradition, as Dr. Shahak makes clear, had scant respect for such liberal values as freedom of speech. Patrician Jews like Max had never cared much for either democracy or trade unionism. Hadn’t Max recognized early that National Socialism had its positive aspects? He wrote in March 1933 to nephew Jimmy, “It is a pity that this movement, which has so much good in it is encumbered with so much rubbish and that its anti-Semitism makes it impossible for us to line up in formation with it.”

If people of Max’s class had been able to line up with it, most German Jews would surely have followed their leadership. Germany was their home. Hadn’t they made great gains there since the Emancipation of 1848? In 1930, some 200 of them signed an advertisement saying, “We regard ourselves, along with the overwhelming majority of German Jews, as members of the German, not the Jewish, people.” Since Talmudic racism haunts even the minds of “converted” Jews, most could easily have rationalized what Hitler would do to the Poles and the Slavs. Some would have protested, of course. But how many Israelis have seriously protested the brutal dispossession of the Palestinian Arabs? Don’t many of them still idolize the mass-murdering Dr. Baruch Goldstein?

This brings us to yet another gap in Goldhagen’s picture of German guilt. For the saddest aspect of Christabel’s story is that private emissaries to Allied governments, pleading for a peace offer which might have emboldened the many dissident-but-wavering generals to oust Hitler, drew absolutely no response. Of the months before the Allied invasion she writes, “It was incomprehensible to me that the British and Americans had not been able to see that they had nothing to lose, and perhaps months of warfare and thousands of lives to save, by encouraging an opposition to Hitler within Germany.” Poor Christabel—soon struggling to shelter her children and rescue her husband from the Gestapo—was not the only person baffled by this insouciance. Reichsbank President Hjalmar Schacht’s secret attempt in October 1939 to arrange a peace proposal via President Roosevelt was not encouraged, but actually scuttled by London. Chernow comments, “Instead, the British Government managed to complete its perfect record of ignoring overtures from authentic members of the German Resistance.”

It was as though the Allies were in a conspiracy to let Hitler run his dreadful course! Though the location of the Wolf’s Lair at Rastenburg was well known, neither we nor the Soviets ever attempted to bomb it. Nor were our bombers allowed to attack some German factories owned by big American corporations, even though these plants were vital to Hitler’s war economy. This is documented in Dr. Antony Sutton’s Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler, which also details how many Western financiers contributed to Himmler’s “Circle of Friends,” known as the Keppler Circle.

Like the rest of us in those days, Christabel was only a pawn in a game whose rules she never really understood. For it appears that various big-money people had spent the 1930s building up both the Third Reich and the Soviet Union. It was like fattening two birds for a cockfight. Perhaps the answer to her question is that those people had no interest in seeing the fight interrupted?

PETER J. LORDEN
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To Holocaust revisionists

A Lift of the Eyebrow, A Tip of the Hat

There are good and bad sides to the prominence of Holocaust revisionism. It is impossible to overlook that revisionists concentrate on an historical footnote (as the Frenchman Jean-Marie Le Pen has testified, at considerable personal loss) to a war now half a century behind us. It must also be conceded that they chiefly defend the honor of a nation whose present leaders and most of its people furiously reject, indeed outlaw, Holocaust revisionism.

Holocaust revisionism is virtually all that remains, at least in America, of a once flourishing movement. Only a few decades ago revisionists were recruited from leading historians, journalists and men of affairs. Their concerns embraced the full range of the diplomatic and military history of WWII. Consequently it is both odd and troubling that the resistance to the "kosher" history of that war has been effectively reduced, to cite revisionist historian James Martin, to the investigation of "Polish potato cellars" (the alleged gas chambers). The critical study of the orthodox history of the war that ushered in both the eclipse of our race's domination of the planet, and the onset of an unprecedented threat to its survival, can be said to have shrunk to chafing academic Talmudists on how many Jews can expire on the head of a pin. In other words revisionism has shriveled from a blooming garden to a wrinkled seed. But what a mighty seed it has proved to be!

The method of the Holocaust revisionists—critical, scholarly, precise—has enabled one discovery after another, toppling Jewish fabrications lie after lie. That method has allowed its proponents to keep calm and objective while the defenders—whether scholars or "survivors"—of the theory that the Germans deliberately annihilated millions of the Chosen continue to go ballistic.

At its best, Holocaust revisionist scholarship has remained concrete, concerned with evidence, records and facts. The localization and regionalization of revisionism has had its benefits: Holocaust revisionists need not argue about who started the war or the virtues of the political regimes that waged it. Holocaust revisionism affords detachment. You don't have to be a Nazi or even an anti-Semite to challenge the gas chambers.

Holocaust revisionists have not yet claimed victory (by their own demanding standards), but they have been winning concessions steadily over the past decade, embarrassing their enemies and forcing them to resort to punitive measures. The knights errant against the Auschwitz saga have made a head-on, dead-on assault on a central Jewish taboo. They have been clever enough to cast themselves as martyrs, and brave enough to carry it off.

While the connection between disproving the gas chambers and the fate of today's shrinking Majority—in America and abroad—is generally left unspoken in revisionist writings, it's there, either in the background or as an unstated motive of its adherents. By now it must be clear that whatever undercuts the power and credibility of organized Jewry, including undoing their conversion of the war from one that rocked and bled the white world to one that chiefly enshrines their own martyrology, is to be welcomed. And, make no mistake, a successful interdiction on questioning the Holocaust will shortly mean the same restrictions on the rest of our history, wherever it brushes up against the concerns of the Jews.

Revisionists and other proponents of the American Majority may find the study of the Holocaust revisionist methodology as interesting as investigating the Holocaust question itself. By a kind of (no pun intended!) ju-jitsu, the revisionists have been able to seize the dagger aimed at the heart of Western, Christian, Aryan values and hurl it back against the hurlers.

It is worth noting that Majority partisans of late have had little success in instigating a similar public debate on the race question, however framed. It is also worth wondering why.

Unless I'm overlooking something, the burning issues of race have either been pushed out of the public eye or so watered down by the caution of their exponents or through the co-optation by (generally Jewish) "neo-conservatives" that they have had little of the impact or resonance of Holocaust revisionism.

The comparative success of the revisionists should move us of the Majority to consider why the racial issue has proved, in recent decades, difficult to promote for public debate. Has the mercurial pace of the terms of the debate (that is, the advances and changes in the science that underpins it) stymied its promotion? Has the complexity of those underpinnings (the mathematics of racial differences) made it too forbidding for popular consumption? Most formidably, has the configuration the racial question in our everyday lives—that is, the stigmatization of public dissent from the equality myth, coupled with the opportunity to escape to the suburbs, private schools and other melanin-free zones—made open discussion of race differences, and thus the future of the Majority, both inoppor tune and (seemingly) unnecessary?

If the last is so, and it seems to be, hitting upon a popular formula for presenting the issue of race differences won't suffice. Here Majority advocates will need to recognize that one of their great social institutions, the public rallying of our peoples—on the great fields and forums...
where the men of our race gathered for politics and war—is today no longer a reality. For the time being, as Instaurationists know as well as anyone, devising the strategy and tactics of survival is an endeavor undertaken by a handful of scattered individuals—fragmented, furtive and largely private.

Perhaps the methods of the revisionists, as well as their findings, make pretty good sense. By attending with infinite patience to the heart of the racial issue, by exploiting the capabilities of such tools as the Internet, they—like so many of the best scientists and inventors of our race—have proved to be good "nerds" and "wonks" in their isolation. Nor have they shrunk from braving public persecution of the type doled out to Galileo (and not far short of that meted out to Giordano Bruno). Worthy of our admiration, the Holocaust revisionists are worthy of our emulation as well.

MORIARTY

In Memoriam

The name of Henry Fairfield Osborn is obscure to most Americans, and controversial to those few who remember him as a founding member of the American Eugenics Society (1922). Author of a book on evolution, From the Greeks to Darwin, he was an avid partisan of the movement to restrict immigration. Once, while referring to the results of intelligence testing carried out by the Army during WWI, he stated:

I believe those tests were worth what the war cost, even in human life, if they served to show clearly to our people the lack of intelligence in our country, and the degree of intelligence in different races who are coming to us, in a way which no one can say is the result of prejudice. ... We have learned once and for all that the Negro is not like us.

Years before, as a member of the Faculty Committee on Outdoor Sports and Professor of Comparative Anatomy at Princeton, he donated the money for the construction of what came to be known to generations of Princeton athletes as The Osborn Clubhouse.

Today it serves as home base for The Third World Center, created in 1971 when University trustees decided to admit racial minorities to this last great bulwark of Angloism. Once a great, elitist school, Princeton now suffers the ignominious fate of being on a cultural par with Trenton and Camden to the south and New Brunswick and Newark to the north.

In the centuries of its existence before minorities were embraced, Princeton proudly guarded its magnificent campus of neo-Gothic chapels, leafy quadrangles and inspired residential buildings that were symbolic testimonials to a racial ethos. With the Anglo tradition greatly diminished, few among the minorities who attend Princeton and tramp through The Third World Center know of the insult which has been delivered to Henry Fairfield Osborn. And to us.

I.H.

Women Pilots

Being an airline captain is serious business, one which used to be entrusted to capable men. Suddenly women have appeared as interlopers, demanding and receiving special consideration in hiring and extra training time. Even so, they "pass" tests with scores that would fail a man. The old saw, "Don't send a boy to do a man's job," has been down-graded by feminists to, "Send a girl instead."

The simple stunt of some wag who placed a doll on the pilot's seat was a potent reminder of why women don't belong in the cockpit. Does the traveling public want the captains of their planes to be someone blessed with a physiology that includes PMS, menstrual cycles, postpartum syndrome, anorexia, bulimia, hot flashes, yeast infections, timidity, a tendency to panic, an IQ nine points less than a man's and four million less brain cells?

Pilots used to weed out misfits by their performance, either in training, cockpits, wardrooms or ready-rooms. When the misfit is a woman, today's politically correct constraints stymie the traditional winnowing process.

The forced inclusion of women pilots in the U.S. Air Force and Navy has gone a long way in destroying the moral of male flyers, resulting in mass resignations, cancellations of readiness tests and a weakening of our military resources, all for the sake of some malcontented women who insist on playing G.I. Jane.
THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JUDSON THE Scribe TO THE

CAUCASiANS

Grace be unto you and peace, my palefaced brethren, at the behest of whatever God or gods you worship.

2 After reading your missives in the Safety Valve and Backtalk, it has become obvious to me that though your beliefs are as staunch as ever, many of you are wavering in your faith. You seriously doubt our ability to overthrow our overlords. “It’s too far gone!” you cry. “They’ve got it all!” “We’re surrounded!” “It’s over!”

3 O ye of little faith! Can you not see that our afflictions, numerous as they are, whatever else they may be, are first and foremost a test of your faith? The Instaurationist is like a man tunneling out of prison with a spoon. Each spoonful of sludge removed seems insignificant—a trifle, a mere bagatelle.

4 Yet each spoonful, insignificant though it may seem, represents progress. That next spoonful may be the breakthrough. Daylight may shoot through the wall and your deliverance will be at hand. Or that spoonful may be merely the next in a chain of thousands—or millions.

5 If you get discouraged, if you lose hope, if you give up, then you will surely remain imprisoned. Ah, but as long as you keep digging, hope remains alive—and will sustain you. Know this: a breakthrough is imminent even though it is not given to you to know the exact date.

CHAPTER 1

1 Yet even as I foresee our eventual triumph, O Instaurationists, I cannot offer you any formula for achieving it, despite your numerous exhortations of “What’s to be done?” “Give us concrete suggestions!” “Show us the way!” I understand the source of such cries. You are the children of a “How to” culture leavened with quasi-socialist entitlements.

2 You read bestsellers on every topic—from how to get a job, to how to land a mate, to how to buy a used car. But you are in a struggle that isn’t amenable to formulas. No one can outline a step-by-step program for you to follow. Indeed, I cannot recommend a particular plan of action, for it would merely give you a false sense of security and ultimately disappoint you. I cannot say that if we (a) throw away our television sets, (b) move to Montana and (c) live off the land (just try it in the dead of winter!), then our enemies will admit defeat and slink away. I reiterate: you are involved in a test of faith.

3 Now you might suppose I am going to exalt faith as opposed to works. Actually, I maintain that if you take care of the former, the latter will inevitably materialize. But if you attempt the latter without the former, your efforts will be fruitless. Desirable as it may be, however, faith is not an end in itself but a means to earthly ends.

4 An act of faith flies in the face of the odds, which are, after all, lifeless abstract numbers. We know that each sperm cell has a minuscule chance of fertilizing an egg. Yet your very existence is proof that it can happen, does happen, indeed must happen.

5 Have you not heard of the battle of Blood River when a group of less than 500 Boers took on some 10,000 to 12,000 Zulu warriors in a two-hour engagement? Some 3,000 Zulus were killed, but not one white man.

6 Now how would a Jewish oddsmaker have sized this battle up? The Boers interpreted the result as proof that their God had designated them a chosen people—not the Chosen People, mind you, but a chosen people. It’s a distinction worth making.

CHAPTER 2

1 Fellow Instaurationists, I am not here to thrust Christian doctrine upon you, far from it! The maintenance of faith—any kind of faith—is a natural law. Though I would not presume to enter the consciousness of beasts, I suspect that their instincts are similar to what we would call faith.

2 Instinct drives them on, even when conditions seem less than favorable, to hunt for their accustomed prey, though none is in sight, to dig for water, though they don’t know how deep they must go.

3 Even in their less than sublime consciousness the beasts of the earth realize that, if they stop, there will be no breakthrough, and if there is no breakthrough, then they will die. Once the will to live is extinguished, life itself follows suit.

4 Faith is not just an impetus for works. It is also essential in your quest for a breakthrough. Breakthroughs are a form of illumination—the Eureka effect—a facet of Western consciousness going back to Archimedes, if not farther.

5 All of your heroes, Newton, Edison, the Wright Brothers, Watson and Crick—all of whom were responsible for breakthroughs of a Promethean magnitude—exemplify the importance of keeping the faith.

CHAPTER 3

1 Enlightenment does not come at predictable intervals like the rising and setting of the sun. It comes when he who experiences it is ready for it, when he has not only kept the faith but has done his homework.

2 Those who follow Buddhism, sometimes called the
Aryan Way, know that enlightenment or satori comes only to those who are steadfast and resolute in their devotions. In other words, it only comes to those who keep the faith (though that is not a word a Buddhist would likely use).

3 Have you not experienced this phenomenon of enlightenment before—in attempting to accomplish some task on a computer or in attempting to understand a math concept?

4 You try everything and nothing works. Yet just when you think you have exhausted all possibilities, just when you have given way to despair, you go back and try one more time—and presto!

CHAPTER 4

1 I maintain that this seemingly sudden intrusion of enlightenment is a salient feature of your Caucasian consciousness. This is not to say that the other races are totally obtuse. The industrious Asian with his robot-like work style is particularly adept at experiencing round-eyed breakthroughs. Even the Negro can be trained to do a variety of tasks.

2 The psychometric sages tell us about the power and influence of rote learning. But true enlightenment, which is as much a product of being as it is of training, is a phenomenon that pervades every sinew, every cell, every synapse. The aptitude for true enlightenment is not synonymous with IQ.

3 The Jew thinks quickly, but not necessarily profoundly. He manipulates expertly, but does he really comprehend what he is doing? If he did, would he have championed the Negro for so many years?

4 That he continues to do so in the face of decades of depredations by Negroes—even against the Jews—can only make one wonder if the Jew truly comprehends the simple yet profound notion of cause and effect. He seems obsessed with pursuing his abstract notions of an egalitarian social order despite mounting evidence that social suicide is the likely result.

5 Since the Jew is by nature a malcontent, it is hardly surprising that he pursues spurious goals that fly in the face of nature. In the long run, nature always wins, so his malcontent status remains assured. Though it must be admitted that his discontent drives him to overachieve, I would not go so far as to deem it divine discontent, which is a gift from the gods if one knows how to make use of it.

CHAPTER 5

1 The Jew's achievements may redound to his personal well-being, perhaps to that of his race or his beloved Israel. But only rarely do these achievements redound to the good of his adopted country.

2 Divine discontent is the feeling that the status quo can be improved. Jewish discontent is the feeling that the status quo must be subverted or perverted.

3 But while I aver that divine discontent is important, I would also advise you, 0 Caucasians, that good cheer is almost as important as good faith. I realize that repeated contact with those of a darker hue or of a Semitic mindset makes it difficult to keep one's spirits up.

4 But it must be done, for there is always the danger that the understandable enmity you feel towards them will metastasize into a free-floating hostility that will saturate you with bitterness and cause your downfall.

5 Now good cheer does not include Monday Night Football, melanin-drenched heavyweight fights, rock concerts, six-packs of beer, rock and roll or kindred heathen pursuits. If your recreational goals fall into the category of bread and circuses, eschew them! Good cheer means the ability to derive joy from life itself.

CHAPTER 6

1 Believe me, nothing grates our enemies more than our ability to feel joy—not, of course, from the Chosen's TV shows and movies and certainly not from the Negro's touchdowns and terpsichorean spasms in the end zone.

2 The Negro in his childishness has at least some inkling of joy, while the Jew, almost by definition, is a joyless creature. He has power, he has riches, but he is never satisfied. Even if his power and his riches were quadrupled, he would be incapable of joy.

3 It irks him profoundly that you have the capacity to experience joy and he does not. The Jewish psychiatrist prescribing Prozac and the Jewish or Jewish-trained psychologist spouting psychobabble batten off your depression. Merely by existing as a robust, joyful, functional human being, you render superfluous the Jewish headshrinker and all that he represents.

4 What hath the Jew wrought? As a child of the mid-century, I often marvel at the world he has worked so hard to bring about.

5 Men lying with men as they would with a woman! Women lying with women as they would with a man! Barbarians at the gate are invited inside rather than repulsed!

6 The barbarians who already reside within the gates prosper. All manner of wickedness has been institutionalized. Dost the Jew not see that if we die a slow, painful death, his own fate will be just as agonizing?

CHAPTER 7

1 Believe me, O Caucasians, when I ponder our beloved country and its morals, its finances, its culture and its customs, I cannot help but wonder: what is holding it up? Why hasn't it collapsed before now? I must counsel patience! Nothing worthwhile was ever accomplished without it.

2 Our breakthrough could happen very soon—within the next decade or the next year—perhaps between the time I write these words and the time you read them!

JUDSON HAMMOND
Jewish Dualism in 20th-Century Russia

Writing in the controversial opposition newspaper, Zavtra, Russian political analyst Alexander Dugin attempts to explain—objectively and analytically—how and why in 20th-century Russia it was possible for Russian and international Jewry to establish the Communist regime and later to destroy and replace it with the current capitalist government.

Dismissing both anti-Semitism and Zionism as meaningless emotional attitudes that explain nothing, Dugin examines Jewish political activities in modern Russia as the product of the Jewish psyche and intellect, evolved over the millennia and characterized by its complexity and diversity. Both anti-Semites and Zionists, Dugin emphasizes, delude themselves by assuming that Jews, wherever and whenever they may reside, somehow share an innate, subconscious unity in outlook and purpose. This false, even dangerous, premise blinds its adherents to the obvious diversity in Jewish thinking, a diversity, Dugin insists, that manifests itself in a recurrent and persistent dualism.

Dugin credits Eurasian writer Yakov Bromberg with being one of the first to define the dualism that divides Jews into two major categories, which he refers to as Eastern (Eurasian) and Western, the two mainstreams of Jewish thought. The Eastern or Eurasian group embraces the Hasidic, traditionalist philosophy characterized by mysticism, religious fanaticism, extreme idealism, sacrifice and messianism, coupled with scorn for materialism, greed and rationalism. Bromberg is joined by Mikhail Agursky with the view that this Oriental streak in the Jewish mentality welcomed the Bolshevik Revolution and communism, sincerely believing a better world order was in the making.

Bromberg describes the second mainstream of the Jewish psyche—the Western—as being essentially rationalistic and bourgeois, espousing Maimonides, the Talmudists, assimilation and the Rabbinate, while rejecting the cabalistic, mystical, exclusionist aspects of Eastern Jewry, together with its false Messiahs and misdirected messianism. Foremost in opposition to the Hasidim, Dugin recalls, were the Mitnaggedim of the 18th and 19th century, who advocated an intellectual, legalistic approach to Judaism and strongly opposed the emotional leanings of the Hasidim. Although not sharing the Eastern Jews frenzied support of the February Revolution, the Western Jews also supported it, seeing it as modern, progressive and rational.

Summing up the Bromberg-Agursky identification of Jewish factions, Dugin writes: "Jewry, while essentially an ethno-religious entity, nonetheless is divided into two camps that in certain situations not only differ one from the other but can be hostile to each other as well." A consequence of the two mainstreams may occur at certain critical times as, for example, during the "Russian" revolution. Many Jews, Dugin continues, saw in Bolshevism their first opportunity since Biblical times to leave their ghettos and establish their own particular world. Bolshevism was to be Jewish messianism realized. To accomplish this, the Jews were perfectly aware of a similar Russian messianism, also built on religious emotionalism and best expressed by the Russian proverb, "Moscow is the third Rome and there will not be a fourth." Superficially, Jewish Hasidic fundamentalism and Russian spirituality would seem to have nothing in common with atheistic communism. In actuality, however, Russian-Jewish messianism combined with communism to create a secular religion.

One ought not think that the suffusion of Jewish and Russian messianic fervor and religiosity in building a materialistic utopia would have precluded the use, and even the institutionalization, of mass terror. Religious wars, as history demonstrates, are often the bloodiest.

Dugin gives several historical examples where the divergent factions in Jewish thinking clashed. Considering Marx a typical Eastern messianic Jew and Lassalle a typical Western rationalistic Jew, he restates the bitter "anti-Semitic" criticism levied by the former against the latter in his article, "On the Jewish Question." The truth is, some of the most telling criticism of Jews has been made by other Jews.

An equally revealing clash between the two schools of Jewish thought occurred in medieval times when the Zoharic cabalists converted to Christianity en masse to distance themselves from the Talmudists, whom the Zoharic Jews accused of having shed innocent Christian blood. These various historical episodes should provide, Dugin believes, sufficient evidence to show that Jewry's internecine clashes, caused by an underlying dualism or dichotomy in Jewish thinking, are nothing new in Russia. Its latest manifestation is the transition from communism to capitalism with Jews prominent in both movements. To quote Dugin:

The spiritual conflict of the medieval contemplative mystics, the gnostics, the myth-makers, the fanatics and the clairvoyants against the religious moralists, the advocates of a pure rite and religious formalism gradually and inconspicuously manifested itself again in modern times in the confrontation between socialists and capitalists, between the Bolsheviks and the liberal democrats.

Because most Jews were united in their opposition to the Tsarist government, the convergence of the two some-
times warring factions in supporting, indeed instigating, the February Revolution was logical and proved triumphant. Dugin explains:

The Jewish Bolsheviks invested all their energies, all their talents, all their spiritual force into the creation of the mighty Soviet State, an empire of social justice, the Eurasian heartland of continental geopolitics. And for decades, numerous elements in the Jewish diaspora in Europe, America, and Asia, emigrants from the same Eastern, Eurasian religious and mystical milieu, became the structural support of the Soviets, true agents of influence of Great Eurasia, the apostles of Bolshevik messianism.

The year 1948, Dugin insists, became another critical point in the history of the Jewish Eastern Eurasian faction. In that year, Stalin came to the conclusion that the establishment of the state of Israel, which the Soviet government had at first supported, was a mistake and that Israel in the hands of bourgeois Western capitalists was a threat to Bolshevism. Moreover, Zionist tendencies were spreading in the Soviet Union itself. It didn't take Stalin long to take steps, some actually serious missteps, to curb Jewish, and not just Zionist, influence. Previous to this point in the history of the Soviet Union, Stalin had never shown any hostility to Jews per se. Quite the opposite, for the first three decades of communism Jews, presumably of the more fanatical Eastern messianic type, were prominent in all aspects of Soviet life.

According to Dugin, the elimination of the Jewish Anti-fascist Committee, which was composed exclusively of Eurasian types loyal to Lavrenty Beria, was a fatal mistake and the death-blow in the eyes of convinced Jewish Bolsheviks to the messianic, utopian idea of world communism. Although Beria put an immediate end to the so-called “Jewish Doctors Plot” and Stalin’s latter-day anti-Semitism, it was too late.

Some Russian historians, Oleg Platonov, for example, attribute Stalin’s late-blooming anti-Semitism to other factors. Platonov maintains that Russian troops during WWII had, among other things, “liberated” German files dealing with the extent and power of Freemasonry and the relationship between masonry, Jews and Zionism. When read by Stalin, they presumably undermined his confidence in the loyalty of Soviet Jews. Eventually he began to suspect them of duplicity and treachery.

Gradually, however, whatever the causes, around 1950 ethnic Russians and Ukrainians began to replace Jews in the higher echelons of Soviet life, culture and government. It was at this time, Dugin believes, that the spark and impetus of the revolution went out of Bolshevism and stagnation began to set in. In the Soviet Jewish community itself, the Eastern Hasidic-type zealots gradually disappeared while the Western Jewish rationalists were in the ascendancy. The stereotypical Jewish Bolshevik was replaced by Jews of the Talmudic, capitalist cast.

Although Eastern Eurasian Jewry, Dugin concludes, is currently being squeezed between anti-Semitic Russian nationalists and Western Talmudic capitalist Jewry, it has not been a stranger to adversity in the past and can be expected to ride out the present situation without too much difficulty.

Notes:

1. Zavtra, Nov. 25, 1997. Zavtra is the main newspaper opposed to the Yeltsin “reform” program in Russia. Its contributors may best be described as national Communists or Socialists, most of whom are Communists of the old school. All believe Russia has been sold out to international banking interests.

2. Alexander Dugin’s most recent books are The Principles of Geopolitics: The Geopolitical Future of Russia; The Metaphysics of Good News; The Conservative Revolution; and Eurasian Mysteries. He identifies with the Eastern (Eurasian) Jewish faction.

3. Yakov Abramovich Bromberg is the author of Russia, the West, and Jewry, written in 1931.


5. The author uses the term “dualism” to refer to the different Weltanschauungs of the two factions in Jewry. When the two mainstreams agree or converge on a particular topic, the term dualism is perfectly correct. However, in those cases where the two mainstreams diverge and oppose each other, it might be preferable to refer to a “dichotomy.”

Howard Stern and the Black-Jewish Rift

Howard Stern, the nation’s most revolting radio shock jock, claims half-Jewish parentage and employs Robin Quivers, a black woman of no discernible talent, to cover his rear against charges of racism whenever “Stern-the-racial-baitmaster” rears his unhandsome head. Howard Stern, far more than any other “pimp to the proletariat,” who slanders the black race for fun and profit, recognizes that the bulk of his audience is composed of adolescent working-class white males whose daily experiences with minorities are generally, if not uniformly, nonproductive. Though much of his verbal dreck is obvious buffoonery, the sheer intensity is so compelling it has provoked all manner of complaints, including heavy Federal Communications Commission fines against the company that syndicates the drool. For Stern, of course, all this publicity is only money in the bank. Big money! He takes home in excess of $10 million a year.

The son of a lower middle-class couple (Jewish father, Irish-Catholic mother), Stern grew up in a largely black section of Long Guyland, learning to like, not hate, the darkish people he now vilifies. Why then does he torment blacks today? Because he, if not his entire Tribe, believes that it is the role of the black and Jewish minorities to use any means whatever to bilk the Majority. Howard has intoned this cynical doctrine everlastingly to audiences of O’Malley, Catafesas and Smiths who simply don’t savvy what he’s saying. Blacks and Jews diverge from the mainstream—that’s the vision Stern brings to his listeners.

But what of sidekick Robin Quivers, the middle-aged black lady who serves Howard-the-Negro-basher? Does she really agree that it’s “us [blacks and Jews] agin’ them,” “them” being nothing less than you and me? Or does she keep her own opinions about blacks, Jews and whites from the prying ears of her radio boss for obvious reasons? The question is asked not to plumb the psyche of Quivers per se, but to focus on what is going on more broadly in black-Jewish affairs nationwide. The indication of a rift is so unmistakable that polls of both hues are desperate to prevent what may become an inevitable, traumatic separation. The obvious source of this conflict lies in the enormous, growing disparity in the income and wealth of the two groups, which blacks often see as a betrayal of the sacred oath of equity imbedded in the Lord’s Prayer of social liberalism, and which Jews interpret as the inevitable consequence of blacks not signing on to the “immigrant’s commitment” to hard work, study and investment.

Historically, Jews have been the exploitive employer of blacks in grocery, liquor, drug and department stores, as well as in their homes. In all these occupations blacks have replied in kind by stealing Jews blind. The blood, consequently, is bad on both sides.

In recent years Jews have chosen (apt word) to throw their formidable political support in favor of free trade and NAFTA, a trick of the capitalists to import a happy flood of hard-working legal or illegal Latinos to take low-paying jobs in those shrinking areas of opportunity blacks have long considered to be their special province. As it has now become all too clear to their one-time black neighbors, Jews have abandoned the inner city for the leafy abodes of the lily-white suburbs. They educate their children in tony prep schools and expensive colleges, and generally lead lives very much in the manner of the elusive Anglo elite.

Finally there is the matter of Israel. Nothing much was thought by blacks about the “brave little enclave of Zionism” stuck out there in the desert sands of Araby. But with so many, and perhaps the most militant of all blacks, having decided to embrace the faith common to all of North Africa and most of the Middle East, another point of conflict between blacks and Jews has been established. This conflict is underlined and highlighted by the rhetoric of 19th-century anti-Semitism that views Jews as blood-sucking exploiters of the Muslim underclass worldwide, Jews as defilers of mosques, Jews as Western interlopers who bring with them the abracadabra of compound interest. So, from coast to coast arise deep thoughts of anti-Semitism among the pious Muslim underclass and a hatred of the people who once provided the legal and financial moxie to fight the white man, open up his schools, his lunch counters and his workplace all to benefit the black race, to ultimately dominate Democratic politics and watch the black man rise to a position of influence in every public administration of every city from Boston to Los Angeles.

Whatever anyone might say or do, the Majority should pay close attention to the black-Jewish rift. It could signify the opening whistle in the long-awaited second-half comeback in which the white race attempts to reclaim its lost rights. Whatever happens, won’t it be delightful to hear Robin Quivers deliver the infamous, “What do you mean ‘us’ white man?” line to brother Howard when blacks finally break down the door of Stern’s radio studio?

IVAN HILD