



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 \$1.50 for postage and handling.

376 pp., pb.
ORDER FROM:

LIBERTY BELL PUBLICATIONS, Box 21, Reedy WV 25270 USA

Liberty Bell

ISSN: 0145 - 7667

SINGLE COPY \$4.00

CONCERNED VOICES ON THE "GULF CRISIS"

page 28

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE:

Professor Revilo P. Oliver

POSTSCRIPTS:

A Fatefully Failed Alliance, page 1; *Those Awful Protocols*, page 3; *Playboys at Work*, page 16; *Correction*, page 23.

Concerned Voices on the Gulf Crisis

Stop the Middle-East War, Colin Jordan, pg. 28; *What is Behind the Kuwait Affair*, Manfred Roeder, page 40; *Why War?*, Dr. Wm. Pierce, page 43; *Whose "New World Order" Are We Fighting For?*, Dr. Wm. Pierce, page 48; *A Salute to a Valiant Nation*, H. A. Covington, page 50.

The Leuchter Congress, page 54

A Short, Irreverent History of the World, by A. N. Outsider, pg. 55.

VOL. 18 - NO. 7

MARCH 1991

Voice Of Thinking Americans

LIBERTY BELL

The magazine for *Thinking Americans*, has been published monthly since September 1973 by Liberty Bell Publications, George P. Dietz, Editor. Editorial-office: 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 1988

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	\$ 4.00
THIRD CLASS-BULK RATE USA only	\$35.00
FIRST CLASS-USA	\$45.00
FIRST CLASS-all other countries	\$50.00
AIR MAIL - Europe, South America	\$60.00
Middle East, Far East, So. Africa	\$65.00

BULK COPIES FOR DISTRIBUTION:

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

FREEDOM OF SPEECH – FREEDOM OF THOUGHT FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

The editor/publisher of *Liberty Bell* does not necessarily agree with each and every article in this magazine, nor does he subscribe to all conclusions arrived at by various writers; however, he does endeavour 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, and ultimately it is ideas which rule the world and determine both the content and structure of our Western culture.

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

A FATEFULLY FAILED ALLIANCE?

I have not yet succeeded in procuring a copy of a book by Lenni Brenner, *The Iron Wall: Zionist Revisionism from Jabotinski to Shamir*, which was published in London by Zed Books in 1984.¹ According to the German periodical, *Recht und Wahrheit* (Bad Kissingen), the book contains the text of a proposal made to Adolf Hitler by the present Prime Minister of Israel, Yitzhak Shamir, in January 1941. The periodical published a German translation of the English text, and the German translation was translated into French by G.-A. Amaudruz, who is publishing it serially in his invaluable *Courrier du Continent* (Case Ville 2428, Lausanne).

From the installment published in the December 1990 issue of the *Courrier*, which has just come to hand, it is clear that Shamir proposed to Hitler an offensive and defensive alliance between Germany and Jewry against Great Britain.

Shamir begins by pointing out that the objectives of German National Socialism and Zionism are complementary and virtually identical. The Germans want Germany, and eventually Europe, to be *Judenfrei*. The Zionists want Europe

1. The title refers to Vladimir Jabotinski, a Jew from Odessa, who went to England to help promote the infamous Balfour Declaration and organize a Jewish army for eventual seizure of Palestine. His terrorism in Palestine, where the British were half-heartedly trying to protect the Palestinians, resulted in his conviction by a British tribunal, which sentenced him to fifteen years in prison—but, of course, world Jewry began to wail and the faint-hearted British released him. In 1923 he founded the more openly violent branch of the Zionists, the World Union of Zionist-Revisionists, and soon formed the famous secret army of terrorists and murderers called *Irgun Zvai Leumi* ("Nationalist Military Organization"), now generally known as 'Irgun.' He died in the United States in 1940, and his corpse was later entombed on Mt. Herzl (!) in Jerusalem. It is typical of the Jews' continual dissimulation that *Webster's Biographical Dictionary* describes Jabotinski as "British."

cleared of Jews by transferring all the Jews to Palestine, and Irgun is working actively to that end. Therefore, Hitler's Germany and the Zionists are striving to achieve the same result, and an alliance between them is logically indicated.

An alliance between Germany and the new Hebrew Empire, founded on the same racial, nationalistic, and totalitarian basis as National Socialism, would guarantee German interests in the Near East. The new Jewish state, once formally recognized by Germany, would ally itself militarily with Germany and enter the World War as her ally.

The new allies would consider the opening of a Second Front in Palestine, where the Jewish armed forces, directed by Irgun and, no doubt, supplied with weapons by Germany, would purge Palestine of the Palestinians and British.

The alliance, furthermore, would make obvious to the whole world the high and undeniable moral basis of the New Order in Germany and the rest of Europe.

The excerpt closes with praise of a recent address in which Hitler announced his determination to defeat Britain. (By 1941, of course, Hitler had learned with chagrin that the English, whom he had always admired and with whom he had hoped to form a close alliance based on the two nations' common racial interest in preserving the British Empire, were too crazed to perceive their own best interests, and too morally obtuse to appreciate his chivalrous act in permitting the British Army to escape from Dunkirk, instead of annihilating it and thus effectively ending the War against Germany.)

Hitler obviously refused the proffered alliance. What if he had accepted Shamir's proposal?

We need not ask whether Shamir was sincere in proposing that alliance. We may be sure that he was as sincere as his race ever is in dealings with the despised and stupid *goyim*. That, however, does not mean that it is inconceivable that Shamir would have thought it expedient to form the alliance and act upon it. Germany could thus have been used to destroy the British, whom the Jews equally hated, and there would have been a reasonable basis for the alliance

between Soviet Russia and Germany into which Hitler did enter, though reluctantly. It is even conceivable that the foul monster in the White House would have organized a "lend-lease" program to assist Germany, since he is known to have hated the British (including, of course, his half-English stooge, Winston Churchill) as much as he hated the Germans.

As soon as I have located a copy of Lenni Brenner's book and obtained photocopies of the relevant pages, I shall suggest to the editor of *Liberty Bell* that he publish the full text of one of the most remarkable diplomatic documents of modern times. It is a proof of what I have always stressed, the common interest, in present circumstances, between the American people and the Zionists, *provided* that the Zionists *really* intend to carry out their proclaimed purpose to free the Aryan peoples of the Jews now parasitic upon them.

THOSE AWFUL PROTOCOLS

You will be glad to know that the courageous French periodical, *Révision*, which I mentioned in June (pp. 52-59), continues publication despite constant harassment¹ by the Jews' governor of France, Mitterand and his gang. I have received the issue for November 1990.

Révision published in May 1990 an important article on the famous *Protocols* by the editor, Alain Guionnet. Before I report on it, however, I should summarize what is indisputably known about that document.

(1). In the last days of August 1897 the first Zionist congress met in Basel, Switzerland. It was evidently so successful that in the following week the organizer and chairman of

1. One cute trick was to invoke against the magazine the laws against pornography and pretend that truth would corrupt the minds of French moppets. The same excuse was used by the German traitors in Bonn when they first restricted dissemination of Professor Arthur Butz's fundamental *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* and the German translation of it, *Der Jahrhundert-Betrug* (Richmond, Surrey; Historical Review Press, 1977). These are facts that should be pondered by those who are now clamoring for foolish laws against pornography.

the meeting, Theodor Hertzl, in a highly confidential letter, boasted: "In Basel, I founded the Jewish State."² The proceedings of this Congress or such part of them as it was deemed expedient to make public were published in Vienna by a firm called "Erez Israel" under the curious title, *Protocols*. The word was evidently used with its common meaning: an informal statement of the points which have been agreed on in a conference or diplomatic negotiation and which are to be embodied in a formal treaty between the contracting parties.³

(2). Sometime after the Congress and before 1901 at the latest, through channels that are variously described,⁴ a manuscript reached Russia and was said to be the secret part of the *Protocols of the Congress at Basel*. The manuscript may or may not have borne the title, *Protocoles des sages de Sion*, by which it became subsequently known.

2. "In Basel habe ich den Judenstaat gegründet."

3. The word originally designed a strip of parchment that was glued to the first page of a manuscript or, if it had been bound, its cover, listing its contents. From this was derived the Table of Contents of modern books. The term was also used in diplomacy (1) to list and limit the subjects that were to be discussed in a conference, and (2) to formulate the diplomatic etiquette to which ambassadors and other diplomatic representatives were expected to conform. The word is sometimes used to designate what is to be taken for granted in a written discussion or in a meeting (e.g., in this country, *Robert's Rules of Order*), whence the peculiar American use of the term in the southwestern states, where, in abstracts of title under the American government, the *protocol* is the original grant of land to an individual by the Spanish Crown, which is thereby recognized as the basis from which the legal title is derived.

4. The most common and plausible account is that given on pp. 100-102 of the larger of the two English editions I shall cite below. There are many variants, some probably arising from the habitual practice of intelligence agencies to conceal their sources. Some may have been devised to discredit the revelation of Jewish strategy. That must account for the wild story that the text was found, and translated from, a parchment written in Hebrew (a mistake for the Rabbinical dialect of Aramaic?), found in a library in southern Russia—unless the story arose from a confused recollection of a letter, anticipatory of the *Protocols*, similar to a letter written by the Prince of the Jews to rabbis in Spain in 1489, which I shall mention shortly. Such a letter, written to Jews in the Ukraine, might well have been in Rabbinic.

It was written in French, purportedly the language of the original.

The document is no longer available. It and all copies of it were probably destroyed when a Jew, whose real name may have been Adler (depending on whether or not his mother had been legally married to his father) but who disguised himself by taking the name of the stupid Russian who had married his mother, Kerensky,⁵ wormed his way into the position of Prime Minister in 1917 to prepare the way for the Bolsheviks under Lenin. He immediately used the powers of the Russian government to silence opponents of his predatory race and suppress whatever documentation they possessed. He is known to have destroyed all copies of the book by Nilus, which will be mentioned below.

It is significant that the document was in French. That creates a certain presumption of authenticity, for all of the leaders of Zionism, Herzl, Wolfsohn, Kellner, Weizmann, et al., all wrote and spoke German for serious communication,⁶ and the Zionist periodical, *Die Welt* (a title which foreshadows a determination to occupy the whole world, not merely a small part of Asia Minor), was published in German in Vienna. Anyone undertaking to forge such a document (e.g., the Russian Secret Police) would naturally have produced it in German, rather than use an unlikely language, French, which would immediately raise questions about a document attributed to persons who normally and almost exclusively wrote in German. (Modern Hebrew, which

5. The Jews have attained such effective control of even responsible publications that, for example, two of our most common reference works, *Webster's Biographical Dictionary* and the *Columbia Encyclopaedia*, lie to their readers and call "Kerensky" a Russian.

6. Yiddish, which is a dialect of German corrupted with words and expressions taken from the dialect of Aramaic current among Jews in the Middle Ages and perhaps from Hebrew, is too crude a language to be used in discussion of topics requiring philosophical and intellectual terms. Educated Jews naturally used German in writing on such subjects and even in their diaries and personal letters about trivial matters. See, for example, Herzl's *Tagebücher* (3 vols., Berlin, Jüdischer Verlag, 1922-1923).

is now used, in addition to English and Rumanian, by many Jews in Israel, was not invented until later. It is more commonly written than spoken.)

(3). The French text was translated into Russian, perhaps by Mlle. Justine Glinka, who is said to have purchased the French text from a Jew and transmitted it to General Orgevsckii in the Czar's Ministry of the Interior, reportedly in 1885 (obviously long before Herzl convened his Zionist Congress at Basel in 1897!). The French text may or may not have been the text of secret proceedings at that Congress which is said to have been obtained for the Russian Secret Police by Eno Azev, a rabbi who had defected from his race and eventually became a Christian monk in a monastery in Serbia, where he is said to have vigorously insisted that he *knew* that the *Protocols* were genuine and gave only an outline of the world conquest that Jewry was systematically carrying out. That text, in an unspecified language, was presumably translated into Russian by Eno Azev or another. I have no information that would enable me to discriminate between the two original versions of the *Protocols*, assuming that there were two.

(4). A Russian translation of the French *Protocols*, presumably Mlle. Glinka's, was given by her to a Russian nobleman, Sukhotin, in 1895 (note date) and privately published, *s.a.l.n.t.*, by one of his friends at Orel in 1897. No copy of this anonymous publication is known to exist, but the fact of publication was attested by the amateur publisher, who escaped from the Judaeo-Bolshevik seizure of Russia and executed an affidavit to that effect. This is the Russian version that Professor Sergius A. Nilus inserted in his book on Jewish influences, published in 1901. Professor Nilus again published this translation in 1905, and he or someone else sent a copy of this second edition to the British Museum, where it was received and catalogued in 1906.

(5). Nilus's text was translated into English by Victor E. Marsden, who had been the representative of the *Morning Post* (London) in St. Petersburg, and who escaped from the

doomed land only with great difficulty after torture by the enemies of mankind.⁷

Marsden's English translation was first published in London in 1920 under the title, *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*. This text has been reprinted many times.

A copy of Nilus's book also reached Germany and the text was translated into German by Gottfried zum Beek, if I am correctly informed, and published under the title, *Die Geheimnisse der Weisen von Zion*, in 1919. The *Protocols* have been translated into many languages, including Japanese, and some years ago I was sent a copy in Turkish. I assume that most or all of the translations into other languages, with the possible exception of the French, were translated from either Marsden's English or Herr zum Beek's German.

(6). Two English reprints of Marsden's text are available from Liberty Bell Publications, viz.: (a) a booklet of 72 pages, *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, containing only the text without commentary and a few pages of excerpts from other Jewish manifestos of similar purport; \$3.50 plus postage. (b) A book of three hundred pages, *The Protocols of the Meetings of the Learned Elders of Zion, with preface and explanatory notes*; \$8.00 + postage. This edition, first published in 1934, is much later than the booklet and contains a wealth of material illustrative of the application of the Yids' strategy and tactics to the date of publication. Everyone who is interested in the possible survival of our race or even in his own chances of dying a natural death should have a copy of the *Protocols* at hand for reference, and this is the edition which I now recommend—unless you read Spanish with ease.

(7). I owe to a generous reader of this magazine a copy of what is by far the best edition of the *Protocols* known to me: *Los Protocolos de los Sabios de Sión, 1898-1990, comentados*

7. It seems that he had prudently sent his Russian wife to England before the Jews took control of Russia, while he remained, hoping, perhaps, that the Bolsheviks would have some wish to imitate the behavior of civilized nations to foreign visitors.

por Joaquim Bochaca Oriol (Bogotá, Colombia; Editorial Solar, 1990). The text was probably translated from Marsden's English, but Señor Bochaca, in his commentary after each paragraph, has abundantly and cogently illustrated the operation of the Jewish strategy during the past ninety-two years, and has considered (pp. 511-521) even the now fashionable comedy of 'perestroika' and 'glasnost' with which Gorbachev and Bush entertain "conservative" children and excite frenzied applause from simple-minded "intellectuals," with, of course, the coöperation of all the newspapers and boob-tubes. This vaudeville act, which has inspired some intellectual mammothrepts to assure us, for the *n*th time, that the Sheenies have lost control of Russia, is simply a phase in the gradual consolidation of the two principal techniques of subversion, Communism and Capitalism, in preparation for the New World Order clearly planned in the *Protocols*, to establish which our War Lord proposes to use our weapons to blast the whole world into bloody and "peace-loving" submission to our enemies.

Señor Bochaca has added an excellent preface in which he frankly confronts the obvious problem: Are the Jews, who have devised and so successfully applied the methods described in the *Protocols*, a race so mentally and socially superior to our own that we Aryans, despite all the courage and all the scientific prowess of which we gave abundant proof in past centuries, will necessarily undergo the fate of all inferior species in the struggle for life that is the only law of the planet on which we live? If that is so, then we, as Aryans, may regret and deplore our irremediable inferiority, but, as members of the only race capable of philosophical objectivity, we may also not only recognize the inevitable but even approve it as probably a stage in the eventual progress of our planet to the Jews' Biblical ideal of a "desolation of desolations," such as we now find on all the other planets of our solar system. I commend Señor Bochaca's thoughtful discussion to you with the hope that the exiguous grounds for hope that he gives us may prove to be substantial.

(8). Ever since the first publication of the *Protocols* in a European language, the Sheenies have been yelping that they are a "forgery," i.e., not actually composed by Jews. That contention, of course, is, for all practical purposes, irrelevant. If we are given a map that purports to be taken from the London Time's great atlas, whereas it was compiled by someone else and is thus a forgery, all that will really matter to us is whether or not the map is accurate.

Whoever wrote the *Protocols* produced a minutely accurate description of the Jews' conquest of the world by deceit. A cogent argument in favor of their authenticity is the obvious fact that they show an attitude toward *goyim* that is precisely that of the Babylonian Talmud and the authoritative epitome of it, Caro's *Shulhan 'Aruk*, Jewish scriptures of which no one can dispute the authenticity.⁸

That contemptuous hatred of *goyim* appears in many other Jewish compositions, not all of which, surely, can be dismissed as forgeries by nasty Aryan pigs.

The Jewish plan of world conquest by economic looting and by using hirelings and dupes to befuddle Aryans is certainly not an invention of wicked "anti-Semites" in the Nineteenth Century. It has been attested long before that, for example, in a letter of instructions written by the Prince of the Jews, who then resided in Constantinople, to the Jews in Spain in 1498, when there was already prevalent the popular sentiment that resulted in the expulsion of "unconverted" Jews by Ferdinand and Isabella four years later, in the year of Columbus's fateful rediscovery of the Western Hemisphere.

A facsimile of what is probably the first printing of this letter, in a book published in Spain in 1608, will be found following page 98 in the edition of the English *Protocols* that I recommended above. The letter is in Spanish, as is natural,

8. For a convenient conspectus of some characteristic passages in the Talmud, see the *Christian News Encyclopaedia*, which I cited in *Liberty Bell*, November 1989, pp. 1-7. It reproduces those passages photographically from the Jews' official English translation. So far as I know, there is no English translation of the epitome, but it was translated into German by Dietrich Hoffmann, *Der Schulchan Aruch* (Berlin, 1895).

since the Jews of the Mediterranean lands all spoke Ladino, a Jewish dialect of Spanish, just as Yiddish is a Jewish deformation of German, while educated members of the international tribe used Spanish for serious writing.⁹

The letter, as I have said, anticipates the essentials of the *Protocols* and attests the vampire race's determination to exploit and ultimately destroy the hated *goyim*. The Sheenies will wail, of course, that there is no proof that their Prince actually wrote that letter in 1498, but that is irrelevant, because the orders given in the letter, whoever wrote it, were in fact followed by the Yids in Spain at that time.

The Prince, for example, orders his subjects in Spain to feign conversion to the religion of the stupid Aryans, and then slither upward into positions of power in both church and state so that they can dominate Spain and drive it to destruction. That is precisely what most of them did.

The majority of the Jews in Spain obeyed their Prince's command and masqueraded as converts to Christianity. That is made absolutely certain by the fact that in one typical small town, Borja, almost all of the c. 300 Jews infesting it professed the religion of their hated Spanish hosts to avoid emigration; see Miguel A. Motis Dolader, *Los Judios de Borja en el siglo XV* (Borja, Centro de Estudios Borjanos, 1987), based on the municipal records. One nice detail is the conduct of some of the Yids: they apparently intended to emigrate, sold their property to Christians, and left the town, but, probably on the advice of their superiors, changed their minds, had themselves sprinkled with the Christians' magic water, and returned to Borja to reclaim their property.

Yahweh's race, from their first appearance in history, perpetually snivel about the "persecution" they have suffered

9. It is curious and perhaps significant that the version of this letter published in the Rothschilds' *Revue des études juives* (of which an English translation appears on p. 7 of the shorter edition of the English *Protocols*) oddly and implausibly substitutes the King of France for the "Rey de España" of the original. There was an obvious reason why the Prince should give sage instructions to his subjects in Spain in 1498, but he had no reason to advise the Jews who were battering on the French in that year.

(and richly deserved) in every civilized nation into which they have penetrated, but the next time you hear them wailing about the cruel "expulsion of Jews" from Spain in 1492, just remember that (a) it was the expulsion of c. 5% of the Jews who then infested Spain, (b) the five percent went to Holland (where, by the way, they continued to speak and write Spanish among themselves) and became suddenly wealthy; and in the next century Holland, having become Protestant, revolted against the Hapsburg monarchy in a civil war that bled Spain for a century, and (c) the 95% who remained in Spain so successfully masqueraded as Christians that we need not wonder why Spain, after becoming the richest nation in Europe and the dominant world power, lapsed into the irremediable economic, moral, and intellectual decadence that was most perceptively and bitterly described by the great Spanish satirist and moralist, Francisco Quevedo.

Quevedo, who, by the way, was a close and loyal friend of the great Jesuit, Juan de Mariana, the most learned Spaniard of his time,¹⁰ understood what had been done to his nation. In the "Isla de los Monopantos," the thirty-ninth and penultimate chapter of his *Hora de todos* (not later than

10. Mariana, the son of a ranking ecclesiastic by his concubine, is best known for the stylistic brilliance of his *Historiae de rebus Hispaniae libri* (first edition, Toleti [= Toledo], 1592; augmented edition, Moguntiae [= Mainz], 1605; reprinted with supplement, Hagae Comitum [= The Hague], 1733). His essay, "De monetae mutatione," one of his *Tractatus VII* (Coloniae Agrippinae [= Cologne], 1609), may have been the first treatise on economics to expose the irremediable defect of fiduciary currency: it inevitably leads governments to swindling their citizens (as, of course, it has done in the United States). It earned him the hatred of the Spanish Prime Minister and the bureaucratic gang. Mariana's sound views on education (as distinct from brainwashing), set forth in his *Discursus de erroribus Societatis Jesu* (placed on the Catholic Church's roster of forbidden books in 1627; I do not know of a trustworthy translation) earned him the hostility of his own order, which therefore did nothing to obtain his release when the Dominicans, with the cordial assent of the Spanish government, threw him into the dungeons of the Inquisition and then into a monastic prison, in which he suffered and languished until he was released, a broken old man of 75. He received the usual reward of intelligence that is not inspired by knavery.

1636),¹¹ Quevedo describes the looting and corruption of Spain by an alliance of Jews and financiers, and attributes to the Jews precisely the purposes set forth in the *Protocols*.

In the transparent fiction of the "Isla de los Monopantos," Quevedo first describes a C6ngress of leading rabbis from all parts of Europe, who have met in Salonica (then Turkish territory) to plot further means of destroying European civilization. The rabbis were evidently the leaders of Jewry in their respective countries at that time, and Quevedo gives them names that are anagrams of their real names or significant references to them.¹² To the Jewish Congress come the *Monopantos*, who are the international sect (Quevedo's term) of governmental ministers and financiers who dominate all the nations of Europe and are in fact the masters of the kings in whose names they rule. The Spaniards among them are designated by anagrammatic names or transparent allusions.¹³

The governmental financiers and thieves are an international sect because they have rejected Christianity and become atheists after the example of Machiavelli (Quevedo was a staunch Christian),¹⁴ and their purpose is to rob their subjects

11. It is likely that this, like many of Quevedo's other works, circulated in manuscript for years before his final revision of it was printed.

12. Luis Astrana Mar6n, in his thorough study of the works he edited, says that the names of the Jews are "imposible hoy de descifrar," but if there is a *goy* who has made a study of the intrigues of Sixteenth-Century Jews, I wish he would try to identify some of the rabbis who could have written their own set of "protocols" at Salonica.

13. E.g., Pragas Chincollos = Gaspar de Guzm6n, Conde-Duque de Olivares, one of whose territorial titles was Z6niga y Conchillos. Then Prime Minister, he was believed to be at least partly of Jewish descent and is known to have favored many Marranos. Phil6rgyros ('lover of money') is obviously Guzm6n's henchman, Juan Bautista S6enz. Danipe = Juan de Pineda. Etc.

14. Quevedo's philosophical premises were fairly close to those of the famous Bishop Berkeley, and on this basis he refused to doubt Christianity as taught by the Catholic Church, and saw in application of it the only means of maintaining collective and individual morality. His political opinions were formed by Roman history; see his essay on Marcus Brutus, which takes the form of a commentary on the biography by

and reduce them to penury and hence slavery. Their purposes are thus sufficiently close to those of the Jews to permit the two groups to conspire together against civilization. Each party mistrusts the other, of course, but the Jews intend to use the financiers for their own ends and then betray them, while the atheistic politicians, better called Argyrotheists because their god is money, intend to use and betray the Jews in the same way.¹⁵

One could compile a very long list of sagacious Aryans who have perceived and identified some of the Jews' operations against our race and culture, and a very short list of Jews who have defected from their race and exposed, at least in part, its hatred of us, but well-trained Americans will shudder at the thought that there could be persons so evil that they do not adore the innocent darlings of God's race, who are so vilely persecuted just because they are incapable of wrong-doing.

If one examines the *Protocols*, which obviously must have been written before 1901, one finds a detailed exposition of events that have taken place long after that date. The plans for looting a nation through a central bank, for example, are almost a blueprint for the Federal Reserve, which was devised by the Jew, Warburg, who conspired with greedy financiers of our own race to grab control of our currency in 1913. Consider the plans for an "international Super-Government" and compare them with the "New World Order" that Bushy is creating by

Plutarch (it was written in Spanish, but a Latin translation, published in 1660, was widely circulated in Europe); it to some extent supersedes his earlier *Pol6tica de Dios*. The greater part of his numerous writings consists of mordant satires directed against the moral corruption of all ranks of Spanish society in his time.

15. It is a curious coincidence that Quevedo satirically predicts a rupture of the criminal alliance, as was recently done by Hans Schmidt in the December issue of his *GANPAC Brief*, in which he advances a theory that Bush's invasion of Saudi Arabia and projected attack on Iraq is in the interests of the "Trilateral" financiers and adverse to the interests of the Sheenies, with whom they were formerly allied, so that "the Jews have been had." Whether Schmidt is right will doubtless become apparent early in 1991.

making the "United Nations" the arbiters of peace and war and of our daily life. And who could have imagined in 1901 that a nation would ever fight a war without intending to win it, as the American cattle have done in Korea and Vietnam?

I shall not argue that the *Protocols* were an authentic map of what was in the future when they were written. Read them and judge for yourselves.¹⁶

☆☆☆

Having thus summarized, I hope adequately, the problem of the *Protocols* as I understood it, I come to the two important amendments made by *Révision*.

First and most significant is the finding that there were two independent Russian translations of the *Protocols*, the one published by Nilus and another, differing in some particulars, published by a man named Boutmi in 1905.¹⁷ It is the latter from which was made the French translation published by *Révision: Protocols des sages de Sion* (1989).

It is obviously of the utmost importance to collate the two versions, and I confess with embarrassment that I have not done so. A letter to the French periodical either miscarried or

16. There is only one passage which may arouse misgivings. It is the statement in Protocol 2, "Think carefully of the successes we arranged for Darwinism, Marxism, Nietzsche-ism. To us Jews, at any rate, it should be plain to see what a disintegrating importance these directives have had upon the minds of the *goyim*." This may seem like Christian propaganda, such as a "fundamentalist" holy man might have inserted in a forged document. The English is somewhat awkward—remember that you are reading a translation of a Russian translation from the French—and you should not take 'directives' literally. There is no implication that our enemies invented or inspired the doctrines of Darwin and Nietzsche, and it is quite true that those doctrines, intellectually sound as they are, did serve to increase the disruption of a society that had befuddled itself with Christian superstitions. The Jews, you must remember, are not in the least interested in the truth or falsity of ideas, only in their potentiality for use as weapons to destroy us. There is a highly significant declaration in Protocol 5: "Nowadays it is more important....to catch up and interpret the ideas of others than to eradicate them." You should ponder that statement, especially if you share my dismay at the present state of scientific knowledge and research.

17. Cf. the English edition I have recommended, p. 101, where it is stated that Boutmi merely republished the text used by Nilus.

was intercepted by the Jews' government of France. I shall continue to seek a copy of the translation from Boutmi's translation, and, if I succeed, I will collate it with Marsden's version and report on the result. In the meantime, I thought it much more important to call attention to the existence of two Russian translations of the same text.

Second, M. Guionnet discounts all reports about the existence of a text of the *Protocols* before 1897, including, of course, the accepted story about Mlle. Glinka I mentioned above (unless the dates given in that story are erroneous). He further proposes that the French original was the manuscript or a stenographic record of a discourse, delivered in sections on 30 August 1897 and the following day by Theodor Herzl, who simply explained to the other Zionists what they would have to do. He spoke in French because during the four years he spent in France he had come to do his political thinking in that language,¹⁸ and perhaps also because he wished to be understood only by the minority of Zionists who were competent in French but would explain his discourse to the others. That is what happened, according to an author whose identity is prudently concealed under the pseudonym, l'Aigle Noir, and who claims to have been present at the Congress in 1897 and, one assumes, must therefore have been a Jew.¹⁹

This account does not really exclude the possibility, which may have occurred to you, that Herzl, instead of reading a discourse of his own composition, read one naturally composed in French by Isaac Moïse, alias Adolphe Crémieux, who held high office in several French governments, and who

18. "Le fait qu'il ait reçu sa véritable formation politique en France a dû l'influencer dans son choix [de langue]."

19. L'Aigle Noir is quoted from an unspecified source as having written that when Herzl "commença à donner ses directives," he spoke slowly and with attention to each word. "Dans l'auditoire nombre de congressistes ne comprenaient que des bribes des phrases qu'il prononçait. Mais il leur suffisait d'attendre pour avoir les explications nécessaires de leurs coreligionnaires qui parlait français, à l'occasion des nombreuses pauses qui eurent lieu durant ces deux jours pendant lesquels fut prononcé le discours aujourd'hui connu sous le nom de *Protocole [sic] des sages de Sion*."

founded in 1860 the Alliance Israélite Universelle with a programme of achieving eventual world dominion, or by his successor, Narcisse (!) Leven, who succeeded him in 1880. In that event, Herzl's discourse "était bien celui d'un autocrate" because he was speaking, not in his own name, but in the name of a Jewish monarch whose orders had been transmitted through "Crémieux."

In any event, you will have seen immediately the drastic implication of the claim that the *Protocols* are the text of Herzl's discourse in Basel. The *Protocols* obviously contemplate the conquest and ruin of the whole world, not the occupation of a shabby piece of unattractive territory in Asia Minor. That means that Zionism is itself just a gigantic hoax, like the "Holocaust," devised to cover and facilitate policies designed to liquidate our race and annihilate the civilization it created.

Forward, to the abyss!

PLAYBOYS AT WORK

If you are no longer young, you may have read as a child a book about the aborigines of the Western Hemisphere, who entered a new world at a time when the level of the oceans was lower and it was possible to walk across the gap that is now the Bering Straits. And you probably learned that those first immigrants had, like the famous Cro-Magnon people of Europe who were our ancestors, artistic instincts, as witness a sketch drawing of a mammoth on a whelk shell known as the Holy Oak Pendant.

If you are a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and receive their general periodical, *Science*, you saw that "pendant" reproduced on the cover of the issue for May 1976 to introduce the lead article, by two American anthropologists, who rejoiced that the 'Palaeoindians,' as they are now called, had artistic talents,¹ and who

1. It was, strictly speaking, the only evidence of the Indians' capacity for the mimetic arts, which are efforts to portray realistically in painting or sculpture living beings or natural scenes. The Indians of North America produced more or less geometrical designs on wampum or blankets, and the far more advanced Mayas and Aztecs did produce

thought the precious artefact must be at least eleven thousand, and might be forty thousand, years old.

The precious "pendant," according to the records, was discovered in Delaware, at a place called Holy Oak, in 1864 by a young American, precociously interested in the vestiges of the aborigines, who did some excavating a few years before he went to Paris to study fine arts and archaeology. He returned to this country and was Dr. Hilborne Cresson when he became a member of the staff of the famous Peabody Museum at Harvard in 1887. In 1889 he gave his treasure, the engraved whelk shell, to the curator, Professor Frederic Ward Putnam, who accepted it for the Museum but did not become greatly excited by the discovery, although it was proof that (a) "palaeolithic" Indians had reached this hemisphere before the mammoths became extinct, and (b) that they resembled the palaeolithic Cro-Magnons in one uncommon characteristic.

Although the matter was in doubt in 1889, it is now known that, at least in the western part of North America, Indians coexisted with mammoths for a fairly long time before the latter became extinct about 10,500 years ago. Some anthropologists, indeed, credit the "Clovis people" with having hunted the great animals to extinction. The shell, therefore, retains significance only for the drawing on it.

The discoverer of the artefact was born, at a date of which there is no record, as Hilborne Jones and must have had parents who could finance his years of study (and, no doubt, pleasure) in Paris. In 1875, however, he replaced his too common gentile name with the more distinctive and "aristocratic" name of the girl who was attached to the money he married, thus becoming Hilborne T. Cresson. He was the assistant director of field work for the Museum and presum-

representations of human figures, all of which, with the exception of some examples that are the subject of debate about possible visitors from the Eastern Hemisphere, are so grotesquely distorted that they are symbols rather than art. The Mochica of Peru are admittedly exceptions: their pottery, now famous, perhaps because so much of it depicts sexual activity, does essay to portray human beings and animals, and their Nazca conquerors may have learned from them.

ably flourished, both scientifically and socially, until he was discharged for theft of some of the artefacts discovered in excavations. In 1894, evidently brooding over his disgrace, he blew out his brains, leaving a note that stated that he was being hounded by the Secret Service, which suspected him of counterfeiting.

The article in *Science* aroused the scepticism of William Sturtevant, Curator of North American Ethnology in the Smithsonian Institute. He and his younger associate, David Meltzer, undertook an investigation and noted that the drawing of the mammoth on the unique pendant was practically a copy of drawings made by the Cro-Magnons, and, on the basis of other evidence, suggested that the whelk shell probably dated from c. A.D. 1000. They expressed their doubts in 1985, to the indignation of the authors of the featured article. The shell was then dated by the technique that was used to prove that the "Holy Shroud of Turin" was a hoax, i.e., by spectrometry to fix a radiocarbon date, at a laboratory in Zürich. The whelk formed its shell around A.D. 885 or possibly, given the margin of error in the determination, as late as c. A.D. 1000. That, of course, settles the question; Jones-Cresson, like the manufacturer of the "Piltdown man,"² was a forger who sought eminence by perpetrating a hoax.

The determination of the date was published in *American Antiquity*, July 1988, and the affair was summarized by David Meltzer in the *New Scientist*, 14 July 1990. The authors of the feature article in *Science* were polemically irate in 1988 and presumably still are. That will tell you something about the present state of scientific research.

Jones-Cresson forged to make himself prominent. There is, so far as I know, no indication of a purpose to exalt the aborigines. That acquits him of a more serious offense, complicity in efforts to denigrate our race by lying about the achievements of savages, a kind of mental poison that I shall consider on another occasion.

☆☆☆

2. Cf. *Liberty Bell*, September 1990, pp. 10-19.

In my article on the Piltdown hoax I expressed the opinion that Professor Smith Woodward was probably the dupe, not an accomplice, of the forger. I am glad to see that opinion confirmed in a letter to the editor of the *New Scientist*, published in the issue for 24 November 1990. The writer quotes from an article published in that magazine in 1981.

One of the persons on the margin of the Piltdown affair was a shrewd young man named Martin Hinton, who was not deceived by the hoax, but whose efforts to expose it were ignored because he lacked the academic credentials to qualify as an expert and partly, no doubt, because he did not behave with the courteous respect for others' opinions that was required by gentlemanly exercise of scientific investigation.

Hinton finally procured a leg bone of an extinct species of elephant and carefully carved it in the shape of one of the bats used in playing cricket, the British analogue of American baseball. (The bats used in cricket are more distinctively shaped than the ones used in baseball.) He then planted it where Professor Smith Woodward would be sure to find it.

Hinton, we may be sure, expected Woodward to explode in wrath as he recognized the obvious hoax, and also, on reflection, to become more cautious in joyously accepting such "finds" as the Piltdown skull as authentic.

What happened was that Professor Woodward "found the artefact, just as he was meant to, but instead of turning red with chagrin or apoplexy, he solemnly pronounced it to be 'a supremely important example of the work of palaeolithic man.'" What is more, the learned scientist not only accepted the hoax but "went to great length in describing its details, and even thought he had found the remains of a hole pierced through it in which a thong had been threaded to hang it from the imagined Piltdown man's waistband"!

"At which point," the writer of the letter remarks sardonically, "Hinton gave up the unequal struggle with the experts."³

3. I wish it were known whether or not Hinton's hoax and exposure of Woodward's gullibility to those who knew of it was reported to the one first-rate scientist who, given his belief in the integrity of Dawson and

That is more than an amusing story: it exemplifies a phenomenon that is all too common. There are many men in whom an accumulation of knowledge in their own field of study blights their common sense and renders them far more gullible than observers who have only a superficial acquaintance with their subject. Of this we have had many recent proofs; probably honest men of scientific training have been bamboozled by the tricks of such charlatans as the clever Jew boy, Uri Geller,⁴ and it was necessary for a real magician, notably the indefatigably incredulous James Randi, to expose the swindle. The moral to be drawn is that we should never lightly trust a specialist.

We must, however, sympathize with poor Martin Hinton, whose best efforts to restore common sense were unrewarded.



According to the myths in the "Old Testament"—and we need not here inquire what substratum of historical fact underlies those tales—the twelve tribes of God's Chosen, after they got possession of Palestine, split into two kingdoms, Israel⁵ and Judah, the former containing ten tribes and the latter, two, much holier than the others.

The ten tribes of Israelites were deported by Sargon II of Assyria in 721 B.C. and became "lost."⁶

courteous respect for the work of Woodward, was deceived by the Piltown forgery, Sir Arthur Keith. (Cf. *Liberty Bell*, September 1990, pp. 17-18.) I like to believe that if Sir Arthur had learned how gullible Woodward was, he would not have had to confess in his old age that the hoaxers had "made a fool" of him.

4. Cf. *Liberty Bell*, June 1987, pp. 4-5.

5. There was a kingdom called Israel: it is mentioned on the famous Moabite stone as having been defeated by the King of Moab.

6. This is nonsense, of course, an early manifestation of the mentality that creates Holohoaxes. Sargon deported only the ruling class, a small fraction of the population; his purpose was to halt the endless trouble created by the pests as they professed loyalty to him and intrigued with the Egyptians

In Jewish story the ten tribes are usually lost, but pop up again when needed. In the Christians' favorite horror story, the Apocalypse attributed to a John, each of the twelve tribes contributes its share to the swarm of 144,000 male homosexual Jews for whom old Jesus, after he has smashed up and junked the whole universe, will create a new, all-male Paradise, in which they can have fun endlessly without those nasty animals, women.

Ignorant Christians believed the tale about the oddly "lost" ten tribes, and discovered them in all sorts of distant regions. In 1644 a Jew who called himself Antonio de Montesinos (his real name was Aaron Levi) turned up in Holland with the exciting story that he had found the Lost Tribes; they were the Indians of the Western Hemisphere; in proof whereof he claimed to have found in Ecuador a tribe that spoke Hebrew. The story was probably just a typical hoax,⁷ but it was believed, at least for its value as propaganda, by Manasseh ben Israel, a Jewish scholar who participated in the negotiations with Cromwell for the readmission to England of undisguised Jews, who then joined forces with the horde of Marranos who had infested England ever since the expulsion of the "unconverted" Jews by the great English king, Edward I.⁸

Manasseh ben Israel, calculating the probable effect on gullible Englishmen, published Levi's discovery in 1650, first

to invade Assyrian territory. If you yearn to meditate on the "lost tribes," you may do so at great length with Professor Allen H. Godbey's *The Lost Tribes, a Myth* (Durham, North Carolina; Duke University Press, 1930).

7. There is a bare possibility that Levi was deceived by the fact that tones of the voice and gestures often convey meaning when words are not understood. That is one explanation of the well-known report that the Mandan Indians understood some words of Welsh. Since the tribe is now extinct, verification of the story is impossible and we cannot determine the accuracy of the lists of Welsh words that are said to have been in use by the tribe. If you are interested in the possibility that Welsh colonists reached North America long before Columbus, see Richard Deacon, *Madoc and the Discovery of America* (New York, Braziller, s.a. [1966]).

8. Cf. *Liberty Bell*, May 1985, pp. 7-10, 13; November 1985, pp. 24-28.

as *Esperança de Israel* in Spanish for the benefit of his fellow Sephardim,⁹ and then in Latin for general distribution in England. He thus set off a landslide of fantasies, including Joseph Smith's *Book of Mormon*.

Now if ten tribes of God's Own really hid themselves to the Western Hemisphere as soon after 721 B.C. as they could get away from the wicked "oppressor," Sargon, they must have left memorials of their identity, and it was only a work of piety to provide the necessary artefacts.

In 1860 one David Wyrick, who had a revelation that the numerous Indian mounds in the Ohio Valley must be the work of the Ten Tribes, duly "discovered" a number of small stones, inscribed with Hebrew characters.¹⁰ A few more stones, all bearing short inscriptions in Hebrew letters, were promptly discovered by others, two by a man named John H. Nicol.

Since the wondrous little inscriptions were found near Newark, Ohio, they are known as the "Newark Holy Stones" and viewed with awe by the credulous. Notably among our contemporaries, Professor Robert Alrutz of Denison University uses the Holy Stones to prove that the Holy Race discovered the Western Hemisphere, although he prudently refrains from hauling in all the savages who peopled the two continents before the coming of our race.

I learn from the *Skeptical Inquirer*, Winter 1991, p. 118, that Professor J. Huston McCulloch of Ohio State University has recently read two of the Holy Stones, which evidently

9. Although they spoke Ladino among themselves, they understood Spanish, for Ladino was, for all practical purposes, just a dialect of Spanish, as Yiddish is of German. I have not seen either the Spanish or the Latin text of the little book.

10. I have not seen the stones. If, as is likely, the letters are the square letters used in printing Hebrew today, that is sufficient to reveal the fraud. Although derived from the Aramaic alphabet when that language replaced the Canaanite dialect of Old Phoenician ("Hebrew") as the common language of Jews in Palestine, the square characters came into use in the Eleventh Century and were not really standardized before the introduction of printing in the Sixteenth Century. The Israelites (Ten Tribes) would have used the alphabet you have seen in pictures of the Moabite Stone.

contain the inscribed Hebrew letters Y H NCL. Now the Hebrew letter which is now represented by Y was earlier represented by J in transliterations, and, as you know, in most Semitic languages only consonants are written, thus making possible endless hanky-panky in altering Biblical texts without even changing the spelling, e.g., in the well-known fraud by which the name of the mythical conqueror of Palestine, 'Jesus,'¹¹ became 'Joshua' in most English Bibles.

The Holy Stones have doubtless given rise to many learned translations by holy men who were impressed by them, but Professor McCulloch simply supplied the right vowels. The two stones read J. H. N(i)C(o)L.

Poor Mr. Nicol! I do not know how old he was in 1860. He seems never to have had the satisfaction of hearing some learned divine expound the abstruse meaning of that stone in Hebrew and then torpedoing the fakir by reading his own signature. But perhaps he heard such a disquisition with a knowing smile and enjoyed a tacit laugh in his own bosom. I hope so.

CORRECTION

In what I write for publication I strive to be strictly accurate in all statements of fact. I shall, therefore, devote a little space to correcting an error that some readers will think trivial.

In *Liberty Bell*, March 1987, pp. 19-20, writing from memory, I remarked on some internal contradictions in the works of renowned authors, and adduced as a particularly impressive instance Edgar Allan Poe's *Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym*, in which Pym is made to say, early in the story, that he received certain information from his friend, August-

11. 'Jesus,' needless to say, is the English form derived through Mediaeval Latin and correct Latin from the Greek approximation of the sound of the Hebrew YSW^c. (For clarity, I use ^c instead of ' in transliteration; neither character suggests the guttural sound that Aryans cannot utter, except, perhaps, after long and unpleasant practice.) The Greek alphabet no longer had a letter that corresponded to the Semitic Š, a sound which did not occur in Greek; hence s instead of sh in 'Jesus.'

tus, only long after the conclusion of the adventures that he will describe, and then proceeds to a chapter in which he recounts the harrowing death of Augustus at the very beginning of that adventure.

I am satisfied that my explanation of the amazing discrepancy was substantially correct. The early chapters of the *Narrative* were published serially in the *Southern Literary Messenger* while Poe was its editor, and I believe that although Poe had undoubtedly outlined and even elaborated the whole plot of the story in his own mind, the chapters which he published in the journal were all that he had written before he severed his connection with it.¹ When he decided to complete the long story, he reconsidered its plot. When he wrote the chapters in the *Southern Literary Messenger*, he had intended Augustus, Pym's schoolmate and closest friend, to accompany Pym in a voyage to the South Pole, but when he took up the story to complete it, he decided, for any one of the several reasons that may be conjectured, to make Pym's only companion a crude and ignorant sailor, Peters, a half-breed, ugly and deformed, but prodigiously strong and with some of an Indian's peculiar instincts. He accordingly killed off Augustus early in the continuation of the narrative.

After having given the explanation that I consider almost certainly correct, I tried to account for so remarkable an oversight in the work of a writer of unsurpassed critical acumen, and I proceeded to suggest how the inconsistency might have occurred, speculating about the channels through which Poe's manuscript could have reached England, where the *Narrative* was published as a book that enjoyed considerable success and was reprinted more than once.

1. This inference is corroborated by the fact that his *Journal of Julius Rodman* was left incomplete at the episode it had reached before Poe severed his connection with *The Gentleman's Magazine*. Unlike the tale of Pym's marvellous adventures in the then unknown Antarctic, the *Journal* is a story that did not give Poe scope for his greatest talents and it must have been undertaken only as part of his editorial responsibility, which, that day, included writing part of each issue of a periodical.

In thus speculating, I relied on my recollection of the monumental Virginia edition of Poe's works by Professor James A. Harrison, who provided a critical apparatus in which he recorded every variation, even of punctuation, in the several versions of each work published during Poe's lifetime or, in important editions, after his death. Professor Harrison printed the text of the British book and could collate with it only the chapters that had been published in the *Southern Literary Messenger*. He believed that Poe's book had been published only in England.

In making the assumption on which I based my speculations, I also relied on other recollections of my youth. Before I entered college, I had read all seventeen volumes of Professor Harrison's edition and had examined the critical apparatus for Poe's poems and great short stories to learn how Poe revised his work before he published a later edition of it, and I had been particularly impressed by his meticulous attention to every detail of diction and characterization. I was therefore especially interested in Poe when I was in college, and read and heard the investigations of an American scholar who was reading through the principal British periodicals to ascertain how Poe's work first became known in England, including the unknown circumstances of the publication of the *Narrative* in that country.

When I speculated in the pages of *Liberty Bell*, I would have been more cautious, had it been a matter of a short story, for I knew that some of Poe's work had first appeared in American periodicals of which Professor Harrison had been unable to find a surviving copy, but it did not occur to me that a book published in the United States could have escaped the researches of Harrison and others. I was sadly in error.

as well as selecting contributors and judging their contributions. He accordingly did not consider it worth completing after he left the magazine, although I suspect that the plot he had sketched in his own mind was to terminate in some highly dramatic episode for which his preliminary depiction of Rodman's character (like Pym's, suggested by his own) was a preparation.

Poe's *Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym* was first published in the United States by Harper & Brothers in 1838. The book was evidently unsuccessful and copies of it are now quite rare. One copy, however, was obtained by one of the two gentlemen who lent their collections of Poe's writings for exhibition in the library of Yale University, recorded in the catalogue of that exhibition,² which I did have at hand when I wrote but did not think of consulting.

This, of course, cancels my hypothesis. The British volume was simply copied from the book published by the Harpers.³ Since so respectable a firm would not have resorted to piracy and could not have done so without detection and exposure by Poe, it follows that Poe almost certainly read and approved the proof-sheets of his book before publication.

One could, of course, conjecture that the Harpers, respectable as they were, did not send to the author proofs of a book that was to be published anonymously, or that the proof-sheets somehow miscarried, or that the printers ignored corrections made by Poe, but all of these desperate hypotheses are extremely unlikely.

We must conclude, therefore, that Poe, despite his undoubtedly great critical acumen and attention to detail, overlooked in his own work a glaring inconsistency and internal contradiction⁴ that he would infallibly have detected and

2. *The Yale University Library Gazette*, XXXIII (1959), pp. 138-190; simultaneously published as a booklet.

3. This, however, raises another problem. The compilers of the Yale catalogue state that the American edition has a conclusion that was omitted in the British reprint. But the concluding paragraphs of the story are quoted by Professor Arthur Hobson Quinn (*op. cit. infra*), presumably from the American edition, and they agree verbatim with the corresponding part of the British edition as reprinted by Professor Harrison. If I could spare the time, I would obtain photostats of the last pages of Harpers' edition, and, if I found that the compilers of the catalogue were mistaken, speculate about the likely causes of such a blunder.

4. In Chapter V of the *Narrative*, Pym, referring to the events of the night of 29-30 June, says: "Many years elapsed, however, before I was aware of this fact. A natural shame and regret for his weakness and indecision

ridiculed in a novel that he was reviewing. That is astonishing, but it will tell you something about the operations of even the best human minds.

This, however, brings us to something that is even more astonishing. Since I like to believe that what I write in *Liberty Bell* is of some service to my few contemporaries who want to understand the present plight of our race and culture, I cannot suspend that activity for two or three or four months to read all of the books and articles about Poe published in recent decades. I have, however, consulted the two biographies that are works of diligent research and have established for the first time many crucial facts about Poe's career: Hervey Allen's *Israfel* (New York, Farrar & Rinehart, 1934) and Arthur Hobson Quinn's *Edgar Allan Poe, a Critical Biography* (New York, Appleton-Century, 1941). I have also looked at the most recent biography, William Bittner's *Poe* (London, Elek, 1963 [=1962]). Without reading each of the large volumes from cover to cover, I have looked up and examined every reference to the *Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym* listed in the indices. Each writer has much to say about Poe's methods of composition, but, so far as I can tell from the works I have cited, no one of them seems to have noticed the flaw in the narrative that I have not improperly called astonishing. So far as I know, I am the first to comment on it. That, of course, is most unlikely—is incredible,—but, as I have said, I cannot now take the time to read everything that has been published about Poe since I was in college, long ago. □

prevented Augustus from confiding to me at once what a more intimate and unreserved communion afterward induced him to reveal." In Chapter XIII, two months later, on the first of August, the already putrescent remains of Augustus are thrown overboard and devoured by sharks, thus effectively precluding confidences to be given *many years* later.

CONCERNED VOICES ON THE "GULF CRISIS"

STOP THE MIDDLE-EAST WAR!

by
Colin Jordan

Since August last a deadly dementia, a Middle-East madness, has taken hold of Britain at large, as of the U.S.A., drawing these countries into a mental maelstrom the most likely outcome of which is hideously unnecessary carnage and enormous economic disaster.

Nothing short of derangement indeed can account for the fact that a Britain normally given to denouncing as despicable any manifestation of warlike ardour; seemingly incapable of resisting the invasion of her shores by virtually every non-European breed under the sun, and the dictation of her affairs either by Hebrews within the country or the same tribesmen plus other aliens outside; so short of cash that her National Health Service has had to give up 4,500 hospital beds to economize, which can cause the waiting list to reach one million; and seemingly incapable of mustering the strength to exterminate the murderous I.R.A., is at the same time a Britain which has deposited some 25,000 of her young men, plus all their martial equipment, at a cost exceeding £300 million and expected to reach £600 million by March (Armed Forces Minister, reported in the *Daily Telegraph*, October 16, 1990) way out in the sands of the Middle-East ready for battle.

Alongside them in the desert languish several hundred thousand Americans condemned to the same crazy enterprise, and with them in dusty array an assortment of Saudis, Syrians and others. Behind them and bestowing its blessing is that misbegotten offspring of World War II, the United Nations Organization, whose Security Council at the end of November issued an ultimatum by way of its Resolution 678 which authorized the use of force by the U.S.A., Britain and their allies, if their aims are not achieved by other means by mid-January. What, then, is this fast approaching date with death in the desert really all about? Such is the gravity of the situation, and the importance of this question, that we feel no apology is due for departing from our original schedule of contents for this issue in order to deal principally with it.



To begin with and thereafter to demolish the official answer in all its simple superficiality, it all began on August 2 last when Iraq, under Saddam Hussein, invaded and occupied Kuwait, thereby perpetrating a monstrous aggression menacing the stability of the region, and affront the moral code of mankind; and will all end when this monster either withdraws, or is driven out by force most righteous, in fulfillment of United Nations decisions; and the Emir of Kuwait, its former ruler, is restored. Bush and his British satellites insist that it is just as plain as that; nothing else involved. The truth, the whole truth, is as you might expect something much further reaching than this.

Flaws in the Anglo-American fabric of self-justification are readily discernable and numerous. To start with, what of the credentials of the sanctifying body, the United Nations? It is 23 years since its Security Council called on Israel to withdraw from the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Israel has never complied, but nothing has ever been done about it. Israel invaded Lebanon. Israel annexed the Golan Heights. There was no ultimatum then, and no Anglo-American force to secure compliance. The ultimatum now against Iraq is thus peculiar, partisan, and as such unwarranted.

What of the chastity of the U.S.A. as an avenging angel of the national sovereignty of others? This line of investigation could take us through quite some space, so suffice it to refer to Panama in 1989 which America invaded in order to overthrow its ruler and assert its dominance. Then the argument was different because the invader was.

What of the virtues of those for whom and with whom Britain proposes to fight? Kuwait under its Emir, Sheik Al-Sabah, was a feudal plutocracy with no political parties allowed. His wealth is reputed to include \$100 billion invested overseas; his wives number 50 and his children are so numerous he does not know their names. All his 200 male relatives are called "princes" and are multi-millionaires, mainly playboys with villas in Monte Carlo where they work hard at night, gambling at the casinos. One of them was recently reported to have lost \$12 million in just one night playing black-jack, while the ordinary Arabs of Kuwait struggle to survive in squalor. Is this regime worth the death of thousands of Britain's and America's young men to restore?



ISRAEL'S GRIM-REAPER

Says a statement before us from the Iraqi Ministry of Information in a leaflet it has issued: "The government of Iraq is prepared to allow the inhabitants of Kuwait to decide for themselves via a plebiscite whatever state they wish. We will allow international supervision and pay indemnity to families which suffered war damages." This sounds to us more in keeping with the professed and pretended principles of democracy than the despotism of the Emir.

Of Saudi Arabia, the West's ally, the *Sunday Telegraph*, August 12, 1990 said "... the West's armoured columns are now lined up to defend the most anachronistic and incompetent of all the Arab regimes, the house of Saud."

Alongside Saudi Arabia, arm in arm with the Anglo-Americans, are troops of President Hafez Assad of Syria, President Bush's past denunciations of his misdeeds cheerfully put aside in favour of the current enterprise. With Syria, political opponents are hanged from lamp-posts, public demonstrations suppressed by tanks, and teams of highly trained terrorists sent to roam the world assassinating those exiles who dare to criticize. Do these sort of allies look to you like fitting representatives of a noble crusade for decency and democracy against a satanic Saddam? Their presence proves Anglo-American hypocrisy.

President Bush on a visit to the troops in the Middle-East told them that Iraq's potential for developing nuclear weapons was one reason for the confrontation (*Daily Telegraph*, November 23, 1990). This is yet another misleading partisan argument. Washington has supported nuclear deterrence between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., but will not countenance the Arab world having a similar counter to Israel which is reputed to have an arsenal of 50-200 nuclear weapons, and which, in 1981, committed clear aggression against Iraq without any Anglo-American interference, bombing a nuclear power station near Baghdad which it claimed was intended to produce weapon-grade plutonium, an allegation which Iraq denied, saying the purpose of the plant was entirely peaceful.

Play is made of an alleged threat to American oil import, as though Iraq wants to deny oil to the U.S.A., instead of merely charging more for it. However, when O.P.E.C. imposed big price rises on the West in 1973 and 1979 there was no rush to arms, so evidently higher prices are acceptable when they enrich feudal sheiks who expend the money in Western hotels and casinos and on call-girls, but intolerable when Saddam Hussein, who has shown no interest in Western fleshpots, wants to keep the price up in order to develop his country.

From this much alone it is amply evident that the "just war" projected by the West is a phoney one, the real reason for which we have to look for

elsewhere than in the self-laudatory effusions of its protagonists. What does the other side, Iraq, have to say about it?

Iraq presents an historical claim to the territory of Kuwait. It argues that during the 400 year rule of the Turkish Ottoman Empire up to the First World War territories which later became the states of Iraq and Kuwait were joined, the latter being subordinated to Basra Province and its Turkish Governor. In 1899 Britain concluded a secret agreement with Sheik Al-Sabah of Kuwait which asserted British influence in that territory (where back in 1775 the British East India Company had received Turkish permission to establish a trading post); Britain to control Kuwait's foreign policy, and Kuwait not to relinquish any of its territory without British approval; this in return for protection, trade and an annual payment. However, says Iraq, in 1900 Britain was brought to acknowledge Ottoman sovereignty over Kuwait, and in 1913 Britain and Turkey signed an agreement granting self-administrating rights to Kuwait, but under the Ottoman flag, which was not ratified when the First World War broke out a year later and involved both countries as enemies with Turkey being defeated and losing its Arab lands to Britain.

Iraq was then created by Britain from the former Ottoman provinces of Baghdad, Mosul and Basra, and its boundary with a separate state of Kuwait laid down by Britain, but continually disputed by Iraq. Delay in agreement as to the boundary persisted till and through the 1930s, the Iraq Defence Ministry being opposed on strategic grounds to the inclusion of the islands of Warba and Bubion in the territory of Kuwait. (Saddam Hussein has built a new oil terminal port at the head of the Gulf, but has not hitherto controlled the sea approaches because of Kuwait's possession of Bubion.)

In 1932, the year in which Britain at the insistence of the League of Nations gave Iraq independence, a letter of the then Iraqi Prime Minister conceded the British view of the Kuwait boundary, but Iraq today contends this letter was no valid commitment since constitutional procedure was not fulfilled through ratification by the then legislative authority; and the same applies to a joint Iraq-Kuwait statement in 1963 centred on the 1932 letter. In 1939 Iraq formally approached Britain for re-adjustment of the border and annexation of the two islands to provide a deep-water anchorage, but Britain refused. Various discussions thereafter between Iraq and Kuwait led to no agreement, and there were brief Iraqi incursions into Kuwait in 1961 and 1973. In 1990 Iraq revived its claims and Kuwait first of all stalled on talks, later agreed to hold them, and then in July refused Iraq's claims.

Britain contends that Kuwait, ruled from 1756 by the Al-Sabah dynasty which she appointed, was, while nominally subject to Basra Province, in practice virtually autonomous under the Ottoman central authorities; that the

1899 agreement with Britain rendered it virtually independent, and that this was formalized in 1914 when Kuwait became a British protectorate, later being granted independence in 1961. What can be here added by us is that in 1938 oil was discovered in the desert there where hitherto few had lived, and British Petroleum and the Gulf Oil Company acquired exclusive rights and became de facto rulers for the West behind the Emir and his extensive brood of gluttonous parasites. So much for Gulf freedom and democracy per the West! Whatever the otherwise balance of historical argument between the two sides, the fact is that Iraq took to deciding the matter of Kuwait by force, this being the means by which Britain had acquired this and other territory from Turkey who in turn had earlier acquired it by the same time-honoured means, so in this respect there is nothing to choose between them, and contention to the contrary is a matter of hypocrisy.

Not territory alone but oil is part of the Iraqi case also. During the Iran-Iraq war the latter suffered the virtual destruction of Basra and the oilfields around the city. The combination of Iranian attacks and Syria's closure of a pipe-line to Baniyas caused Iraq's oil revenue to fall from \$29 billion in 1980 to \$7 billion in 1983. Foreign debts soared to between \$60 and \$80 billion; the greatest debts being to Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. Yet Iraq's economic situation, while grave, was not desperate providing there was no big slump in the price of oil on which revenue it so heavily depends to repair and expand the economy after the war with Iran.

But within O.P.E.C., the association of Middle-East oil-producing states, there were interests and demands contrary to those of Iraq who—producing well within its production capacity—wanted a price increase, whereas Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates—with a higher production capacity than their export quota—wished to maintain the existing oil prices or even reduce them. Early in 1990 Iraq lobbied the Gulf states to lower production and increase the price, but this they refused to do. Kuwait, says Iraq, sought to flood the market with excessive oil production contrary to O.P.E.C. quotas, thus to cause a sharp fall in prices to the disastrous detriment of Iraq while to the delight of American consumers; and to this end announced that an increase in production quotas would be sought at the next O.P.E.C. meeting in October 1990.

There has also been the matter of the Rumaila Oil Field, one of the largest in the world, part of which extends from Iraq two miles under Kuwait, and which Iraq claims in its entirety, but from which Kuwait, sitting on only 10% of the oil deposit, has nevertheless been draining 50% of the oil by way of B.P., thus stealing, says Iraq, several billion dollars of oil. In this connection, the *New York Times* September 23, 1990 reported that the U.S. Ambassador to Iraq, April Glaspie, led Saddam Hussein to

believe he could, without American resistance, move his forces 20 miles across the border and seize the rest of the Rumaila Oil Field. (See *The Truth At Last* No. 345)

Having perceived by now some considerable part of the story behind the Iraqi seizure of Kuwait last August, sufficient at least to discredit the Anglo-American polarized presentation of unsullied and unselfish virtue on their side and overwhelming wrong on the other, we now have to uncover the great, albeit veiled, instigator of the crisis. That is Israel.

Israel became a state by the theft of Arab land with the connivance of those powers now in the forefront in menacing Iraq, namely Britain and the U.S.A. where today to a decisive extent Jewry rules the roost. Consider the U.S.A.! President Bush says: "The whole world knows that the U.S. has a very special relationship with Israel" (*Jewish Chronicle*, November 16, 1990). His Secretary of State, James Baker, says: "This administration remains committed to Israel's security, you can count on that!" Israel receives more U.S. aid than any other country in the world: more than \$3 billion each year, and \$45.8 billion in direct aid since 1948. Bush is preparing to transfer \$1 billion worth of advanced weapons to Israel to buttress it against Iraq, this on top of \$1.8 billion of military aid planned for this year before the seizure of Kuwait. This is because Jews, adherents of Israel, so dominate the U.S.A. today as to call the tune, frightening opposition into silence, commanding the avenues to office, bullying and bribing politicians into servile submission to their interests and service of their overseas offshoot.

While quite content at an earlier stage to use Iraq against Iran in the well-proved policy of divide and conquer, Israel has since scheduled Iraq as its No. 1 target precisely because Saddam Hussein has shown the capacity to unite Arab peoples against the common enemy, which is expansionist Israel, in their midst, appealing directly to the Arab masses against their mercenary, dynastic exploiters, and aspiring to make Iraq the centre of a pan-Arab union. With the Palestinian Arabs betrayed, dispossessed, dishonoured and degraded, no wonder the overwhelming majority of them, along with ordinary Arabs in general elsewhere, look upon Saddam Hussein as a hero and possible saviour.

Thus it is that the former head of Israeli military intelligence, Major General Shlomo Gazit, has declared "Saddam Hussein has to be destroyed ... Someone has to find him in his bunker and kill him," and "Israel is urging the United States to take decisive military action against Iraq, even at the cost of risking the lives of Western hostages" (*Daily Telegraph*, August 23, 1990). Echoing the sentiments of their spiritual homeland, we have American Hebrews in plenty slaving their bloodthirsty desires, such as Henry Kissinger calling for "a surgical and progressive destruction of Iraq" and

Washington Post columnist Richard Cohen (September 11, 1990) declaring "I want Baghdad bombed instantly." Naturally these extraterritorial Israelites in stars and stripes, while manifesting their tribal talent as fight promoters, do not propose to be around in the front line when their war starts.

Israel is no peace-loving, benign and beneficent haven of "Holocaust" sufferers as gullible, Gentile Jew-lovers have been programmed to believe. Instead, it is a vicious product of terrorists, headed today by former Stern Gang stalwart, Yitzhak Shamir, boss of its global terrorist organization, the Mossad secret service, which, as just one item from its copious catalogue of skulduggery, in 1954, with the approval of the then Prime Minister, Pinhas Lavon, sought to bomb a U.S. Consulate library in Egypt and place the blame on Egyptians in order to turn American public opinion against Egypt, then standing up to Israel as does Iraq today. Shamir, as did his preceding fellow gangster, Menachem Begin, stands for an expansionist "Greater Israel." His government is committed to "a State of Israel between the Mediterranean and River Jordan" (*Jewish Chronicle* November 23 1990) for the benefit of future millions of new, Jewish immigrants. The Soviet Union, which one research writer has recently estimated to have 3.5 million Jews despite the "Holocaust," is viewed as a main source of supply. Jets have recently been arriving in Israel bringing 300-500 Jews a night from all over the Soviet Union, and the Knesset (parliament) immigration committee has calculated that 200,000 Russian Jews will arrive before next April. So far 140,000 have arrived (*Daily Telegraph* November 21, 1990).

Behind the scenes Israel is the ultimate cause and catalyst of the Middle-East crisis, acting through its British and American lackeys, and with the aim of supremacy in the Middle-East as a base for Jewish supremacy throughout the world. Naturally it seeks to keep its hand hidden as far as possible. Hence President Bush insists on concentration on the simple fact of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, regardless of all prior and attendant circumstances, whereas the Iraqi case is that this must be seen, discussed and settled within the context of an examination and settlement of the problems of the Middle-East in general, including the anti-Arab aggressions and repressions of Israel. Hence, also, the evident agreement between Israel and the U.S.A. that at least at this stage Israel must keep a low profile so as not to give the game away, and so the renegade Arab elements in the Middle-East who have been wooed to join the anti-Iraq front will not be alienated. With the U.S.A. slipping into recession and the national debt growing at \$380,000 a minute and his popularity plummeting at the opinion polls, Bush has happily grabbed at the opportunity to serve his Jewish masters through the classic distraction of a martial exercise abroad.

We now come to a matter which has ranked high and raucous in the tirade of Western denunciation of Saddam Hussein: that of the Western "hostages." Iraq was a signatory to the four 1949 Geneva Conventions. Under them foreign civilians may be interned, but the taking of hostages is prohibited under Article 34 of the fourth of these, and "under no circumstances should internees be transferred from occupied territory to the territory of the occupying power," says Article 49; and they "may not be used to render certain points or areas immune from military operations," says Article 38. On the face of it, this puts Iraq in the wrong. However, it may be questioned whether these stipulations apply to citizens of countries other than Kuwait, which countries have not as yet become involved in war with Iraq, and whose citizens will only be placed in jeopardy as hostages in fact if their countries make war on Iraq and so place them in that category. Whatever the fine interpretation of international law on this point, Iraq has at the moment of writing decided to release those detained.

Sanctions against Iraq while initially proclaimed with ardent confidence, and while certainly by now causing shortages of food and medicine and other things have now been seen by the servants of the Zionist design to be incapable of bringing proud and resolute Iraq to its knees soon enough, meaning before—with the 30-day Moslem ritual of Ramadan coming up in March to handicap operations, and followed by the start of the desert summer to handicap even more—sand and sun shrivel the enthusiasm and capacity of the Western servicemen, and the waiting corrodes the will to war of the Western civilians at home. Thus, notwithstanding the hardships of sanctions, time is on the side of Saddam Hussein, if hostilities can be delayed. Hence the anxious procurement of the mid-January U.N. deadline, accompanied by the initiative of Bush for talks with Iraq, calculated to give the advantageous semblance of peace-loving negotiations to avoid war as a justification in the event of war, while in substance only intended to serve as an instrument for demanding unconditional surrender under threat of immediate war.

Thus on present showing the stage seems set for an onslaught on Iraq in the second half of January as Zionism's New Year gift to mankind. Since it is now conceded by the U.S. Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence that, contrary to initial disparagement, the Iraqi army is "one of the best equipped and most combat-experienced in the world ... distinguished by its flexibility, unity of command and high level of mobility" (*Sunday Telegraph*, November 11, 1990), Colonel David Hackworth, America's most highly decorated soldier of the Vietnam War, may well be right in forecasting at least 50,000 casualties among the attackers during the first two weeks. Warmonger Bush now claims that a tremendous air strike initially will quickly settle the

matter and avoid such casualties, but one thing which is certain is that he will find it far easier to start than to stop a conflict which will sooner or later mobilize the bulk of the Arab world against the West.

As if this prospect is not awesome enough, we have to contemplate as the price of confrontation amid more than half the world's oil resources, the destruction of huge stocks of oil which the West needs; and with the raging refinery and oil well fires providing an environmental catastrophe, and the reduced supplies causing prices to rocket, trade and living standards to decline, and the world to be plunged into the deepest recession since the 1930s.

Thus it is imperative that we do all we can to stop this threatened Middle-East War starting, or, if and when started, continuing. Saying that does not imply that we vainly imagine our ability to influence events is more than minute, but it does imply that we do see even a minute opposition from us to be worthwhile as well as being an absolute necessity of integrity better by far than doing nothing, and better by further still than the deplorable attitude of the remnant of the National Front in this country whose latest issue of its *Vanguard* magazine (No. 32) says that, if hostilities break out, "and Britain is at war, and our servicemen fighting and dying ... then ... we as patriots must stand by our armed forces once committed to conflict." This purblind, petty nationalism is exactly the same ideological inadequacy which caused Mosley at the outbreak of the Second World War after so rightly telling his followers for years how abominable the old parties and their system were, and how wrong it was to go to war with National Socialist Germany, whose great achievements he upheld, then to turn round and tell them that, because war had broken out, they should do nothing against the country and its war effort, meaning a country under the sway of the Jews waging war on behalf of the Jews and thus a "country," a "Britain," a distortion of nature, which no true National Socialist could identify with and uphold. It was this concept of misidentified "country" before and above the conclusions of the creed and the community of the race which caused many Mosleyites to accept, even volunteer for, service in the British Forces of avenging Jewry, and so to go and fight and kill on behalf of the real enemy those who in reality were their comrades of cause and race.

It is appalling that British soldiers should be in the Middle-East today for the purpose in mind, and horrifying that they may be killed and mutilated for that purpose. It is also horrifying that they may kill and mutilate for the benefit of Israel soldiers of Iraq who are anti-Israel. The inescapable and overshadowing fact is that the British Forces in the Middle-East are there in an utterly wrongful cause. However much we feel sympathy for them in their situation, this cannot lead us for one second to give support to them in

it for which they have their own responsibility of participation to bear. We help them best by fighting to prevent or to stop the Middle-East War, not by aiding and abetting a wrongful war as the National Front advocates.

In the 1930s we were plunged into a war for Jewry which proved a genuine holocaust for the Aryans. Again today we are being manoeuvred into a war for the benefit of the same people in the shape of Israel. The tabloid press of the Jews Murdoch and Maxwell, with a flourish of kosher patriotism, is urging on the conflict as did their predecessors half a century back. The *Sun* has run a frontpage in red, white and blue with screaming headlines on the background of a Union Jack "Our boys go in; paras to take on madman; ships, planes on their way." Not to be outdone, *The Star* has published a colour photograph of a mushroom cloud and promised Iraqis "We'll nuke you!" Saddam Hussein is labeled another Hitler in the best traditions of the Hollywood caricature of the latter, and has been told he may be put on trial, as were German leaders at Nuremberg, if war comes and the West wins. The musical merry-go-round on the circuit of death and destruction is in full swing as these lines are written. Can sanity yet prevail?

The real war mongers, who want to expend the lives of American G.I.'s to destroy Iraq and seize the oil wealth of the Near East, are Israel and a clique of Zionist-controlled politicians in the U.S. government (like oil-rich George Bush) and the prostituted mass media. These ruthless cynics have utterly no respect for human life and wish to erect a global super-state under U.S. hegemony. Real patriots cannot sympathize with such goals. (Part of a message from Saddam Hussein and his government in a leaflet issued by Iraq's Ministry of Information, particularly addressed to the American people.)

From Gothic Ripples, No. 24, December 1990

☆☆☆

Reflections on the Moral Aspects of George Bush's War Against Iraq!

by
Dr. Charles E. Weber

21 January 1990

As an American I am deeply concerned about the moral culpability of my country in its unprovoked military measures against Iraq, a country of modest size which was no military threat to the United States. To many people throughout the world, but especially in the Islamic countries, Americans now seem like brutal, irrational bullies who are intent on seizing the property of other countries by force. ("Blood for oil.") Such a crime is commonly called robbery. Bush's vulgar, sadistically uncompromising, hypocritical posturing about having our armed forces in Arabia for the purpose of undoing "aggression" is so disgustingly absurd that even a ten

year old child could see through it when the facts are fairly presented. The United Nations had long ago condemned Israel for its annexations of territories of its neighbors, but the United States did not act upon the resolutions of the United Nations, although it could easily have done so simply by cutting off the huge contributions of arms and money which it has been giving to the parasitic Jewish state in Palestine since 1948. There have also been the aggressions in Tibet and Afghanistan, against which our supposedly idealistic government did little or nothing. Such obvious hypocrisy and inconsistency must be an embarrassment to any thinking American with a conscience and moral sensibility.

The origins of the annexation of Kuwait by Iraq go back centuries, but more recently they are rooted in the rôles played by England and France after the defeat of Turkey during the First World War, after which very extensive parts of the former Ottoman Empire came into British and French hands as mandated or occupied territories. These included Palestine, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, (Trans-)Jordan, Egypt and Kuwait. The boundaries of these predominantly Islamic states were more or less arbitrarily drawn by the British and French, who largely disregarded historical, ethnic and economic realities. With the later development of the exploitation of petroleum reserves in the region, the economic aspects were even further distorted, since the oil reserves were not evenly distributed in the earth. Even more recently Kuwait exploited oil deposits belonging to Iraq by larcenous drilling procedures. The ruling family of Kuwait squandered the huge income from its oil production by vulgar spending, which must have been especially irritating to poor Arabs in the region. Iraq claims that its government would have permitted a supervised plebiscite by the Kuwait population as to whether it wanted to regain its independence or to remain part of Iraq. To many Arabs, Saddam Hussein appears as an heroic figure, as personally ruthless though he might be.

As far as the American government is concerned, it must also be held responsible for the origins of the annexation. According to an article in the *New York Times* of 23 September 1990, the American ambassador in Baghdad, April Glaspie, told Saddam Hussein that the United States had no defense treaty with Kuwait and regarded the quarrel between Iraq and Kuwait as not being its business. Was this simple honesty on the part of the American ambassador or was it bungling or was it part of a deliberately dishonest representation of American intentions to the government of Iraq in order to tempt it to use force to resolve its quarrel with Kuwait? Perhaps bungling is the most likely explanation, but be that as it may, the annexation of Kuwait by Iraq is now being used as a pretext for a destructive and costly war whose real purpose is the destruction of one of the main enemies of the

Jewish state in Palestine, which had already committed an unprovoked act of war against Iraq by bombing its atomic energy facility in 1981. Iraq claims that this facility was intended for peaceful purposes. The feeble bombings of Israel (notably of Tel-Aviv) which have taken place during the past several days could very well be justified as an act of retribution, if they were indeed committed by Iraq. (It seems strange that they caused no deaths. Could they have been done by the Israelis themselves for their propaganda effects?)

The unprovoked bombing of Iraq in 1981 seems to symbolize the arrogant, self-righteous deportment of the Jewish state in Palestine, which assumes that it is the only state in the region entitled to have atomic weapons and which, alas, has so much influence by means of Jewish control of the American media (especially television) and Jewish control of the American Congress. (See the very important and now especially timely book by Paul Findlay, a former member of Congress, *They Dare to Speak Out*.)

The war has already brought forth a plethora of atrocity stories and even a book to discredit the government of Iraq. Perhaps some of the stories are true, some exaggerated and others simply well calculated lies. In any event, though, Saddam Hussein had a good enough moral character for the United States to support him over a long period of time during his war with Iran.

There is a striking contrast between the manner in which the Jews' media (especially television) portrayed the war in Vietnam and the manner in which the war against Iraq is now being portrayed. The frightening aspect of this contrast lies in the power of television to influence public opinion that is thus being revealed. Our efforts in Vietnam were effectively sabotaged by the media Jews and their despicable hirelings, the Jane Fonda types. Those who control television were able to make our military efforts in Vietnam so unpopular that they made young Americans who had served their country in good faith in Vietnam the objects of reproach, while they are now making our actions in the Gulf region a popular amongst the unthinking masses who have been seduced into thinking that the war has something to do with keeping the price of gasoline low.

Perhaps the greatest immorality of all is to be found in the personal and political motivations of George Bush himself. One of his sons is involved in the oil business in the Arabic region. A war also provides George Bush with an ideal opportunity to distract attention from the troubles of his son, Neil Bush, who is involved in a banking scandal, and to distract attention from the present economic developments in the United States which threaten to cause a severe recession or even depression. In 1939 (or earlier) to 1941 Roosevelt's efforts to provoke a war in Europe and get the United States

involved in it were no doubt an immoral attempt to overcome massive unemployment by means of war, a war from which the Aryan population of the world has suffered immensely and is still suffering. The long-range results of Bush's war against Iraq can still only be a matter of conjecture, but they can hardly be good for the already heavily taxed and demoralized Aryan component of the population of the United States.

The moral responsibility of the people of the United States is alleviated to some extent by virtue of the many impassioned protests against the war that have been made in various parts of the country even before the body bags have started to come back and by the fact that there was a rather close vote in the Senate on the authorization of military force against Iraq, a relatively poorly armed country with a quite limited capacity to produce highly advanced weapons. As of this writing, however, the defense forces of Iraq might still be able to inflict painful, economically costly losses on the United States, which had been obtaining a mere 2% or so of the petroleum it was consuming from Kuwait.

No matter how short or how long the war, no matter how few or how many Americans killed or maimed for life, the war represents the triumph of the objectives of Zionism over the interests of the American people as a whole.

☆☆☆

What is Behind the Kuwait Affair?

by
Manfred Roeder

I am writing this letter on the day the ultimatum for Iraq ran out, nobody knows what the situation will be when you get this letter. But the crisis will last for some time to come and will somehow influence all of us, the least will be the price of oil.

What is behind the Kuwait affair? Certainly not what the press and our governments tell us. It has nothing to do with defending international law or stopping a dictator. There have been much better opportunities to do that. What happened when Stalin invaded the Baltic states? Nothing. On the contrary, he became the darling of President Roosevelt. What happened when China invaded Tibet? No breach of international law? No brutal dictatorship? And what about the annexation of East Germany by Russia and Poland? Why all that moralizing quibble about Iraq? Just to turn the attention away from the real reasons.

There are two different questions: why did Hussein invade Kuwait? And why did America jump onto that relatively minor issue and concen-

trated a bigger military force against Kuwait than it did for the landing in Normandy 1944?

Saddam was worried about three things: the massive immigration of Soviet Jews into Israel, the enormous Israeli arms build-up, and the increase of oil production in Kuwait. All this was a direct threat to Iraq. If up to a million Jews would come to Israel, the population pressure would rise to a point where Israel would look for more land and never give up the occupied part of Palestine. Israel is a constant threat to all the Arabs around, for Israel has robbed other peoples' land and is thirsty for more all the time. It is obvious that one day Israel would expel the Palestinians or attack Jordan or any other Arab country. Besides, Israel will attack any Arab country that might get too strong, and it has already done so with air raids against Baghdad and Libya.

Israel has secretly amassed \$25 billion of 'washed' drug money from Panama and elsewhere to build up a new arsenal of nuclear and chemical assault weapons against Iraq from submarines. Two of those boats are now under construction in Germany, ready in 1992. In addition, the Bush administration stopped the export of electronic devices to Iraq at the same time Israel got 810 of such krytrons that can be used as detonators in nuclear bombs from a Jewish firm in California.

The third thing that got under Saddam's skin was that Kuwait suddenly started pumping oil like mad far above their OPEC quotas, thus pushing the price down from \$18 to \$12 per barrel whereby Iraq was losing \$1 billion a year for each drop of \$1 in the world price. Kuwait's provocation was caused by a conspiracy between the Sheik of Kuwait and CIA director Webster at the end of November 1989, a few weeks after the opening of the Berlin Wall.

Saddam was in a trap: if he did nothing, the Israelis would build up their war potential and sooner or later attack him or Jordan. And Kuwait was causing his economy a disastrous loss every day. If he did something, he risked an Israeli or U.S. reaction. So he inquired in America and heard that there was no interest in this affair. A colossal lie to provoke him.

Why did Bush want to make this little Kuwait affair his own? The main reason: America is looking for another chance to demonstrate strength as a world power. In order to do that, you need an enemy. Gorbachev was no good for that anymore. He released the East European satellites from the Moscow yoke and gave the green light for the re-unification of Germany, thus demolishing the status quo of 1945. Disarmament was under way and sooner or later most of the military might in Europe would be there without any purpose and would have to be withdrawn, or at least reduced. Then what? Back to America at high costs? Never. Destroy it? Very costly. Well,

isn't there a tiny little Hitler, a very, very small one we could name? Yes, of course, there is one. Saddam! Hallelujah! Let's call him a new Hitler and mobilize the whole world (and all our useless war equipment) to put him in his place. Huge quantities hardware could be sold to the Saudis (what a profit!) and lots more could be shipped to the Gulf. Even more important probably is: America could take the lead in a world action and proclaim its moral and military leadership as never before. For the first time all the nations united, including the Soviets and most Arabs. Is this not the idea of a genius?

Let us not talk of the personal profit for Mr. Bush, who has his shares in one of the biggest oil companies and got his share as soon as the crisis was declared and the oil price went up and up. And, do you expect that all this war materiel will be withdrawn from the desert once the crisis is over? You can be sure that for years to come America will keep its foot in the Middle East door, especially after satellite photos have shown the biggest oil fields in the Arabian desert, the biggest in the world, a supply for decades.

America was rapidly driving into a great economic depression as a result of Reagonomics. The richest country and creditor has become the greatest debtor. Now, a new push for the industry, at least the war industry, is coming. What a fallacy! Of course, some firms will make big profits, but you cannot cure a sick nation with a war. And America is sick to the core, and not just its economy. Instead of looking for foreign enemies and world leadership the president and all those who love the country should deal with the drug and crime issues, juvenile delinquency, and racial slums. And, most of all, the Jewish stranglehold on the country should be broken and freedom of speech should be restored. If you are openly against Jewish control and race-mixing you are a dead man in America. What a freedom! There is more freedom of speech in Russia on these points. Try it!

I repeat it again and again: *Gorbachev is in a mess and he may fail, but he is sincere* and he is selfless and stands high above all other politicians in the world. And what he is doing to the Baltic states is a trifle compared with what Bush does against Iraq. Gorbachev has released all Communist satellites, he has agreed to German unity, has broken up the Berlin Wall, has stopped financing Communist countries and parties around the world. And he has generally agreed to autonomy of the various states, but he cannot do it overnight without causing a military revolt.

Would Bush allow any American state to proclaim its sovereignty as is laid down in the Constitution? Never. What happened when the South seceded? The bloodiest war in American history. Why didn't they let them go? Why does Britain hold on to Northern Ireland? There are so many

English. But the same goes for Latvia; there are already more Russians than Latvians. Don't get me wrong: I am all for restoring freedom to the Baltic or other states who want to be free. But don't start pointing fingers, there are three pointing back at you.

And what kind of freedom do we have in the West when I or Mr. Tyndall or a former officer in the German army or Mr. Waldheim or any businessman is refused entry into the land of the free? To hell with Western democracy and human rights if this is the result. Russia will go through years of utter misery. But what do you expect after 70 years of Bolshevik tyranny and hundreds of years of the Czarist whip? They never had a free society but may create one. But we are rapidly losing all the freedom we once enjoyed. Let us stop arguing about Gorbachev and let us change the conditions and governments in our own countries. That's the real thing that matters, nothing else does!

*From Teutonic Unity #1-January 1991
Haus Richberg, W-3579 Schwarzenborn
Federal Republic of Germany*

☆☆☆

WHY WAR?

by

Dr. William Pierce

Why is George Bush hell-bent on war against Iraq!

He has given us four reasons:

- Saddam Hussein, by invading Kuwait, has threatened America's supply of imported petroleum, and we must force him out of Kuwait to safeguard that supply—and with it the oil-dependent American way of life.
- Saddam Hussein committed an act of aggression by invading Kuwait, and America is obliged to punish acts of aggression whenever and wherever they occur.
- Saddam Hussein is a brutal dictator of unparalleled malevolence—a new Hitler, Mr. Bush has called him—who has kidnapped hundreds of American citizens, tortured Kuwaiti prisoners, and done any number of other nasty things, so that any right-thinking American should want to squash him like a poisonous spider.
- Saddam Hussein has built up Iraq's military capacity—including weapons of mass destruction—to the point where Iraq threatens the stability of the entire Middle East. Saddam Hussein and Iraq's military capability must be eliminated now for the sake of future peace in the region.

Depending upon the circumstances and his audience, Mr. Bush switches from one of these reasons to another. The American people, however, are having a hard time believing any of them is a sufficient reason for going to war—or that any of them is Mr. Bush's *real* reason for threatening a war and sending hundreds of thousands of American troops to the Persian Gulf to back up his threat.

When we examine his arguments for war one by one, they are seen to be manifestly hollow. In the first place, Saddam Hussein did not and does not pose a significant threat to America's supply of imported oil, either before or after his annexation of Kuwait. Iraq's principal source of revenue has come from its export of petroleum to America and other countries. It is hardly conceivable that Saddam Hussein would voluntarily cut off that source of revenue. He might with more justice be accused of wanting to force Kuwait to stop producing more than its OPEC-allotted quota of oil, thus cutting into Iraq's share of the export trade. But even if he shut Kuwait's oil production down completely, he could hardly threaten the American way of oil consumption: America was importing just *one per cent* of its total petroleum consumption from Kuwait before Saddam Hussein's invasion, and just another 2.6 per cent from Iraq.

One might theorize that Saddam Hussein could eventually follow up his annexation of Kuwait with attempts to take over Saudi Arabia and other oil-exporting countries in the region. Even if he controlled *all* the oil flowing from the Arab countries of the Persian Gulf to the United States—Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates—that would be only 11 per cent of US consumption. He might be able to force up the price of oil a bit—although it is hard to see how he could be more successful at doing that than OPEC is now. In any case, the theoretical possibility that Iraq might at some future time control 11 per cent of the petroleum we use, perhaps hiking the price we pay for gasoline and forcing us to conserve energy, switch to other sources, or develop our own reserves, is not a compelling reason to start a war.

We import many commodities, some of them critical to our economy. Is it to be our policy to go to war against any country which we suspect may raise the price it charges us for its exports? The United States is entirely dependent on other countries for its supply of chromium ore, for example. Without chromium much of American industry would grind to a halt. Zimbabwe, headed by a thuggish Black dictator-for-life, is our principal supplier of this essential mineral. Does anyone imagine that Mr. Bush would send an invasion force to Zimbabwe if that country announced that it intended to double the price it charges us for chromium?

Certainly, the damage now being done to the U.S. economy by the Persian Gulf crisis is not the result of Saddam Hussein's denying us Kuwait's oil. He would be only too happy to sell us that oil, but Mr. Bush has instigated an embargo to prevent his doing so. And Saddam Hussein did not force up the price of oil by annexing Kuwait; the oil wells there remained undamaged and in production. It is the prospect that Mr. Bush will start a major war in the Persian Gulf and thereby disrupt the output of oil from the entire region which has led oil speculators to raise prices. If the recession the United States is now entering becomes much worse, it will be due in part to the tens of billions of dollars being drained from the U.S. economy by Mr. Bush's troop buildup in Saudi Arabia, in part to the increased cost of energy this disruption of the oil market has caused, and in part to the enormous bribes he is paying from the U.S. Treasury to keep his anti-Iraq coalition together (seven billion dollars to Egypt alone, and more than two billion dollars promised to Turkey). The loss of jobs by American workers will be George Bush's doing, not Saddam Hussein's.

The excuse that it is America's responsibility to punish Saddam Hussein's "aggression" by starting a war against him is even more anemic and shows George Bush up as a liar and hypocrite. The boundary between Iraq and Kuwait was drawn in 1923 by British colonial administrators, who did not leave the region and permit full self-government there until 1961.

Iraqis have long considered the territory designated by the British as Kuwait to be part of Iraq, and the annexation of that territory is not aggression in the same sense as, say, Israel's 1982 invasion of Lebanon or Israel's continued military occupation of seized Palestinian land. Perhaps Saddam Hussein should have gone about rectifying this relic of British colonialism in a more diplomatic way. No matter how he did it, he would have made some people angry—at the very least the Kuwaiti Al Sabah ruling family. But, really, a Middle Eastern squabble of the sort existing between the government in Baghdad and the Al Sabah clan is not a very good cause for moral posturing about "aggression" by the politicians of the West. It certainly is not a good excuse for George Bush to send 400,000 troops to the Persian Gulf to start a war.

Is Saddam Hussein a nasty fellow? It's hard to guess where the truth lies when Bush calls him a "new Hitler" and the media eagerly recite the atrocities and brutalities he supposedly has committed. If we judge by the general rule for leaders in that part of the world, however, he probably is a mean, tough S.O.B. He probably has ordered the execution of political opponents. His secret police interrogators probably torture prisoners. That's the way life is in the Middle East. The leaders of Lebanon in recent years have been bloody-handed gangsters who could have stepped right out of the

pages of *The Godfather*. Yitzhak Shamir, the present prime minister of Israel, is a former terrorist leader who planned cold-blooded assassinations and bombings. So was Menachem Begin, the former Israeli prime minister. The Israelis and Arabs both torture prisoners to extract information. They both arrest people arbitrarily and imprison them without trials. If Saddam Hussein were a gentleman or a humanitarian or someone who flinched at the sight of blood, he would be out of place in the Middle East. But is it America's mission to stamp out the world's S.O.B.s? If so, why don't we sever all relationships with the likes of Yitzhak Shamir and wash our hands before going after the Saddam Husseins of the world?

It's only in Mr. Bush's fourth reason for going to war against Iraq that we can see a bit of truth. Saddam Hussein must be killed and Iraq's military capabilities permanently eliminated, otherwise there will be trouble later, say Mr. Bush and the other advocates of war. Iraq has weapons of mass destruction; it soon will have nuclear weapons. So let's wipe out the Iraqis now, before they become really dangerous.

Before we buy that argument we should ask, dangerous to whom? Certainly not to Americans. To Iraq's Arab neighbors and to Iran, perhaps. Should Americans go to war now to head off possible future inter-Arab or Arab-Iranian squabbles? Of course, not.

There is one other country which is worried about Iraq's growing strength, however. That country is Israel. And in that fact lies the hidden motive behind all of Mr. Bush's phony and unconvincing explanations of the necessity of a war against Iraq.

Israel is at this time the only country in the Middle East with nuclear and biological weapons, and the Israelis are determined to keep it that way. Only by maintaining an overwhelming military superiority over her neighbors can Israel hope to hang onto conquered Arab lands and keep the Palestinian people in subjection. This necessity has become more acute than ever in the past, as the Palestinian *interfadeh* has heated up. The Israelis are realizing that all of the methods of terror and brutal repression they have been using to hold the Palestinian people down are not working, and that the situation is likely to evolve into a full-scale uprising within the next year or two. As long as no Arab country can stand up against Israel's nuclear-armed might, the Israelis can hope to deal with the Palestinian uprising through genocide and mass expulsion, but if any Arab country is able to match Israel militarily, then an Israeli attempt at the extermination of the Palestinians will bring on a new war in the Middle-East—a war which Israel conceivably could lose. Israeli leaders, therefore, consider the elimination of Iraq now as absolutely essential to the continued Israeli domination of the Middle East. The only question in their minds is, who will undertake that

dangerous and bloody task? Will Israelis have to sacrifice men and money to do it—or can they manipulate Americans into doing it for them, much as they have manipulated Americans into doing so many other things?

It would be helpful for a public understanding of the situation if Yitzhak Shamir and George Bush had held a joint press conference and announced to the world that Shamir has asked Bush to destroy Iraq for him in order to save Israel the trouble and that Bush had agreed to do so. That would fit right in with the policy of the U.S. government in recent years in bowing to the enormously powerful Jewish lobby and putting Israel's interests ahead of America's. But, of course, in the matter of the Persian Gulf crisis it is essential to both Shamir and Bush that the public *not* understand what is going on, and so there has been no such public announcement. In fact, the Israeli government and Jewish groups in America have carefully kept a low profile since the beginning of the Persian Gulf crisis. They very much want to remain unnoticed by the public, so that the pretense can more easily be maintained that they have nothing to do with the crisis.

Nevertheless, the evidence is abundant. The joy in Israel is unrestrained, and even though Shamir has been rather discreet in his statements, other Israelis have been less so. The byword there is "Iraq must be destroyed." And in America prominent Jewish spokesmen, from Henry Kissinger to former *New York Times* editor Abe Rosenthal, have been beating the war drums and claiming that America must destroy Iraq for the sake of the American way of life, with angry accusations of "anti-Semitism" ready to hurl at anyone who suggests that a war against Iraq can only be for the sake of Israel, not America. On November 17, 1990, in San Francisco 700 delegates to the Council of Jewish Federations, representing every major Jewish group in America, passed a resolution *unanimously* affirming support for Mr. Bush's war policy against Iraq. The Christian churches, by way of contrast, have almost without exception protested the rush to war.

The National Alliance and other truly patriotic American groups also oppose a war against Iraq. War should be resorted to only when it serves a compelling American interest. Neither restoring the Emir of Kuwait to his throne nor preventing Saddam Hussein from having a say in the sale of another one per cent of the oil we use is a compelling American interest. And, most assuredly, having young Americans die in the desert so that Israeli's won't have to is not in America's interest.

George Bush may think that he can fool the American people with his reasons for leading them into a war and a deeper recession, but if enough patriotic Americans speak out now and let him know that they're not being fooled he may be forced to rethink his policies. Every concerned American should express himself forcefully and repeatedly, with letters to newspaper

and magazine editors, with calls to radio talk shows, and with every other means at his disposal (including copying and distribution of this leaflet). The message should be loud and clear:

No war for oil.

No war for monarchy in Kuwait.

AND NO WAR TO DO ISRAEL'S DIRTY WORK!

*From a leaflet distributed by the
National Alliance, Box 2723, Arlington VA 22202*

☆☆☆

Whose
"NEW WORLD ORDER"
Are We Fighting For?

by

Dr. William Pierce

As we continue to carpet-bomb Iraq into rubble—and our Marines continue to die in the desert—we still haven't heard a single valid reason for George Bush's great military adventure in the Persian Gulf. Why is this war necessary? How does it serve American interests?

Mr. Bush says the war is to establish a "new world order." Do our Marines and airmen in Saudi Arabia know that? Are they prepared to put their lives on the line for Mr. Bush's "new world order"?

Mr. Bush started by telling us that we had to attack Iraq in order to protect the "American way of life" and to save the jobs of Americans. When that didn't wash he said that the war was to punish "naked aggression." His reasoning was that if we don't fight Saddam Hussein now in Kuwait, we'll have to fight him later on Main Street, U.S.A. Naked aggression can be nasty stuff if you let it get out of control! As far-fetched as that sounds, we had half a million troops in Saudi Arabia willing to accept it as their excuse for being there.

And now we are told that the real reason for the war is a "new world order"! It may have been dumb of George Bush to have told us that, when he already had managed to get his war started with his phony excuse about saving Americans' jobs and keeping Iraq's "naked aggression" away from our shores. But we should be grateful that finally he's telling us something with at least a grain of truth in it.

The fact is that George Bush and a number of other people with whom he works have been planning a "new world order" for some time. They want to re-draw the map of the world and change the power relationships

48 — *Liberty Bell / March 1991*

between nations. They want to force the peoples of the world into a new mold. Throughout history other men have lusted after a "new world order" of one sort or another. All too often they have been willing to resort to war in order to satisfy their lust. Most Americans, on the other hand, believe that war is justified only when it is necessary to defend vital national interests. If George Bush had not tricked them by telling them that Iraq is a threat to the "American way of life"—if he had told them from the beginning that the purpose of his war is a "new world order"—they would have told him, "Hell no, we won't go!"

The worst of it is that if Americans really understood what George Bush has in mind when he babbles about his "new world order," they would be horrified and disgusted. They would be willing to go to war to prevent such a "new world order" from being born. George Bush's "new world order" clique consists of men who see a central rôle for the state of Israel in the "new order." In their vision of the future Israel will rule a Middle Eastern empire stretching from the Nile to the Euphrates, in accord with the Jewish territorial claims set out in the Old Testament (*Genesis 15:18*). The purpose of the present war in the Persian Gulf is not to protect the "American way of life"; it is to remove a threat to Israel's domination of the Middle East.

This is not to say that George Bush is a religious fanatic who sees any validity in ancient or modern Jewish imperial claims. But the people who do believe in those claims are very powerful; in particular, they control most of the news and entertainment media in America. Through their control of the media they wield a large measure of control over American public opinion—and hence over the political process. And George Bush is, above all else, a politician.

When we understand who is behind George Bush's "new world order" scheme, we can understand why Mr. Bush was so determined to start a war against Iraq, and we can understand many other things as well. We can understand why he puts on a great show of moral indignation about Iraq's annexation of Kuwait (to which it has an arguable historical claim) and remain silent when the Soviet Union massacres patriots demonstrating for freedom in Lithuania. We can understand why he expresses outrage at Iraq's feeble attempts to defend itself, saying that Saddam Hussein has "sickened the world" by firing a few Scud missiles into Israel and Saudi Arabia, and remains silent when Israeli police turn their machine guns on unarmed Palestinian civilians in Jerusalem and massacre more people in five minutes than all of Iraq's Scuds have killed. We can understand why he claimed in his January 29 State of the Union speech that he wanted to "lead the world away from the dark chaos of dictators" while seeking alliances against Iraq with dictatorships like China.

Liberty Bell / March 1991 — 49

When we understand that the essential element in the "new world order" to which Mr. Bush pays lip service is the elimination of every threat to the continued expansion of Israel, we can understand the deceit and hypocrisy surrounding the whole scheme. And we can understand that to order American servicemen to give up their lives for the sake of that scheme is nothing but treason and murder.

No patriot who understands what George Bush means when he says we are fighting for a "new world order" in the Persian Gulf can support this war. Let him know that that's how you feel about his war. Let him know by writing letters to your local newspaper and by telephoning every radio talk show you can. Let him know by reproducing this flyer and posting it wherever people will see it.

From a leaflet distributed by the
National Alliance, Box 2723, Arlington VA 22202

☆☆☆

A SALUTE TO A VALIANT NATION

by
Harold A. Covington

One of the characteristics of the true Aryan is that he admires and respects the martial virtues of courage, endurance, discipline, and loyalty—even when those characteristics are to be observed in people not of our race.

The people and the armed forces of the Republic of Iraq have over the past few weeks withstood the most massive and total aerial bombardment in the history of warfare. The only event in history which compares with the current Zionist air assault on Iraq is the attempted aerial genocide directed against the Third Reich during World War II by the same Zionist puppet regimes who are for the most part involved in the present Gulf war. And yet these Iraqis have endured the loss of their homes, the murder of their families, and the destruction of the holy places of Islam with a stoic bravery and unflinching devotion to their country and their leader which is slowly, irresistibly stirring the admiration of the world. It is now admitted even by the "allies" that Saddam Hussein is simply holding back the bulk of his air force and coolly, deliberately refusing to be drawn into an unequal high-tech battle of super-expensive weaponry, patiently taking everything ZOG dishes out and waiting to lure us in on the ground where his battle-hardened veterans can take on our MTV-raised illiterates, our niggers, and our bitches of war in a genuine battle. Iraq is displaying in this time of crisis an iron discipline and an inflexible will not seen in the world since 1945.

I can only wish that our grand and glorious "movement" could find within itself one fraction of the valor and the dedication that these alleged "racial inferiors" of ours are displaying. I think of these clowns who do-se-do down the streets of Hootertown on a Saturday afternoon wearing Mardi Gras costumes while hundreds of screaming Reds and niggers and hebes and degenerates throw rocks and bottles and bellow filthy words. Would such scum be allowed to go unpunished in Iraq? And yet we, the "big, bad, tough Klan and Nazis," willingly put up with it like little lambs, even seek it out as if we get off on it. (I have long entertained suspicions that certain so-called "White leaders" DO get off on mass abuse, in some bizarre, kinky way.) I think of all these drunken macho men who wave hog-leg .44s and Armalites in the air at cow-pasture rallies, generally after starting in on their second six-pack of the evening, and vow that they will never be taken alive and fight for the White race to the end. Yet at the first hint of heat from ZOG these same big bad dudes blubber like babies for mercy and can't crawl on their bellies fast enough through the office door of the U.S. Attorney or the grand jury room to sell out their friends.

In the name of God, let SOMEBODY come right out and SAY it, for once: our problem is that we are as soft as butter from luxurious living, as weak-willed as water and as cowardly as rabbits.

We have never faced the rubber bullets of the West Bank or the bombers overhead in the night, and we *couldn't*, because we have spines of jelly. On the few occasions when we actually *do* something to inconvenience the enemy our courage generally comes from a beer can or a whiskey bottle and we are utterly appalled when we sober up and realize what we have done. It is no wonder that our enemies hold us in such contempt. It is deserved. They know us too well.

But the *Arabs* they fear—because they know that the *Arabs* know no fear. It is significant that Meir Kahane operated for years in the United States, advocating murder and terrorism against Whites and spreading his filthy poison with impunity. So far as I know Meir never received even so much as a gentle tap on the cheek from any of us big, bad Nazis. Oh, to be sure, back in the old NSWPP and NSPA days we had a good few tangles with the Jewish Defense League and we invariably whipped them down into jelly. We have generally been able to hold our own in brief bar-room-brawl style encounters, fair enough, although these generally entailed months and years and thousands of dollars of legal consequences which we could have done without. Yet the fact remains: when Meir's final coda was writ, it was an Arab who put paid to the obnoxious little

kike. If it had been left up to us, our worst enemy would have lived until his beard was long and white.

What am I trying to say here? Simple. LET US HAVE AN END TO PRETENSE. Let us allow words like "Viking" and "Aryan warrior" and all that pseudo-militant horse manure to disappear from our vocabulary and cease trying to pretend that we are the men our ancestors were. We are not. Let's quit buying guns and stocking up on ammunition and survival gear which we have no intention of ever using. It's a waste of money that would better be spent on written and electronic propaganda material and on creating a genuine separatist philosophy and way of life.

The vast majority of us are not "Vikings" or anything of the sort. We are products of the American consumer system whose main objection to the present system is usually that we have been left out of it and we're not getting our fair share. This is not to say that revolution is impossible for Americans or that we are all totally useless twits who can be of no use to the White race. (Even if some of us *are*...but I digress.) But we have a long, long way to go in moulding and shaping our character, our political and philosophical direction, and our strategy.

Robert Mathews and the Order showed us that it doesn't have to be like that. Aryan Americans CAN find within themselves the necessary courage to act, to place their physical bodies at risk in order to resist ZOG. But let's either fish or cut bait, shall we? Either DO IT—hit hard, act alone, and understand that death is the inevitable result—or DON'T PRETEND. Sell your guns and your survival gear and buy a PC with desk-top publishing software. Hang your Klan robe or your Nazi uniform in the closet and go buy a three-piece suit and drop in on your local Republican committee meeting.

If you are one of those rare Bob Mathews types who is going to fight, then make like the Nike ads and JUST DO IT. Don't mail out a little newsletter for years telling us how you're going to do it. Remember those three provisos—*act alone*, or else you will be betrayed by some chicken-shit White coward; *hit hard* and make ZOG buy your life in Jewish blood; and *accept death* as inevitable. When you are caught, don't surrender—shoot and die and give the rest of us a martyr to name our sons after.

And if you're not going to DO IT, then stop pretending. Stop lying to yourself and stop lying to the rest of us. Pop the top on that six pack, sit your butt down in front of that TV, cheer for the Iraqis as they fight the true fight which we cannot as yet enter. Then tomorrow throw the beer cans in the trash and hit the streets with a car-load of good leaflets or stickers. You'll find that there is a good deal of satisfaction in doing all that you know in your heart you are really capable of doing.

52 — Liberty Bell / March 1991

No one expects White American men to behave with the same fearlessness and the same toughness that the Iraqis are displaying. We have not been through what they have as a nation. And yet *genetically we are Vikings*, or can be once we get our minds right. Some people, like Bob Mathews, can perform that cleansing and tempering and hardening of the soul as an intellectual process, but men like Mathews are rare. For most of us it will come with experience—the experience of joblessness, of grinding poverty, of losing that color TV and that six-pack and of losing that house and that car and having to pound the streets looking for work, competing with niggers and spics and Yuppie Barbie dolls who get jobs on affirmative action quotas. Having to root in garbage cans for food. Having to collect other people's beer cans to sell for recycling in order to buy some Hamburger Helper to feed your family. Sweating in the summer because your air conditioner has been repossessed and you couldn't afford the electric bill to run it anyway. Freezing in the winter, stealing wood from construction sites for the fireplace. Above all, that hardening will come when we realize that there is no hope, and that at long last we have nothing to lose but our lives and life is no longer worth living; we would rather die than see the Zionist system go on for one hour more.

Each nation confronts evil in its own historical context. Iraq is doing so now. We will do so tomorrow. Not that we have any choice. We are all caught up in history's tide and it's coming whether we like it or not.

For now, let's do what we can to hinder ZOG's war effort against a little nation of brave and tough people who have decided they will no longer be pushed around by the Jews and their American bully boy. Non-White or not, they deserve a hand. The time may well come when we need their help, and they will be justified in asking us, "Where were you when our Iraqi brothers were dying under the bombs of Bush?" Let's make sure that when that time comes, we all have an answer to that question.

From Resistance #6, 31 January 1991
Box 1321, Raleigh NC 27602

☆☆☆☆☆

No War For Oil!
No War For A Corrupt Monarchy In Kuwait!
AND NO WAR TO DO
ISRAEL'S DIRTY WORK!

Liberty Bell / March 1991 — 53

THE LEUCHTER-CONGRESS

The great European Leuchter-Congress is now on track to take place on 23 March 1991 in Munich.

The usual initial difficulties in the form of meeting hall rentals, cancellations, possible change of venues, legal moves, etc. that we in our the movement are all too familiar with had to be overcome. However, perseverance has paid off!

A hall with a seating capacity of 2000 has now been rented. The deal is signed, sealed and delivered, as well as pre-paid! Lawyers insist that all is thus secure, and our one-day marathon spectacular is on track—and now we must make up for the delays caused by the legal wrangling. People from all over Europe, guests and speakers from Canada, the U.S.A., France, England, Sweden, Switzerland, Holland, Denmark, Spain, Belgium, Austria, United Germany, Eastern Europe, and hopefully, from Latin America, South Africa and several Arab states will meet for the first time ever to share their research findings with friend and foe as well as the invited media! This is to be a conference like no other and in competition with no one.

This gathering, it is hoped, will be the 'break-out' from the intellectual and ideological ghetto onto the center stage of history now in the making. We will see if the ideological 'left' and the wobbly 'center' have the courage and the ability to defend their convictions or if they wish to hide a little longer in their ivory towers and snipe at us from behind the paper walls of their phony 'foundations', their one-man 'newspapers' and commie fronts.

Those of you who have the money to go should register now! The admission fee is **only DM50 for the entire day**. If you need help in finding accommodation and/or would like to stay in the home of a German family, please contact the organizers at once! **DO NOT DELAY!** Everything is on a first-come, first-served basis. Two thousand seats will be filled quickly.

DATE: 23 March 1991 TIME: Conference begins at 10:00 A.M. & ends at 10:00 P.M. PLACE: MUNICH. ORGANIZER: Ewald Althans, Postfach 2, W-8125 Huglfing/Obb.-Federal Republic of Germany.

The organizer will supply you with further details. Because of tight security requirements, the location of the meeting hall will only be given to you at a certain time and place after your arrival in Munich. There is no other way if we wish to avoid 10,000 demonstrators in front of the place!

✠ ✠ ✠ ✠

A SHORT, IRREVERENT HISTORY OF THE WORLD

by
A.N. Outsider

The Jews really are a remarkable people, but not for any of the reasons they claim. For example, in some mystical pre-existence phase, before the Beginning, they invented their great God Yahweh, created in their own brutish image. Eventually He became bored with the vast void and emptiness of space, and 5994 years ago decided to create a universe with some interesting inhabitants to amuse Him. To make it even more interesting, He created night and day. After looking it all over the following week, he pronounced it good, and He made the Jews his favorite creation—His Chosen People. In fact, they were the only true human beings; all other tribes and animals are *goyim*, created only to serve as slaves, beasts of burden, or sources of food.

God's Chosen People then proceeded to replenish the earth, and except for a few mistakes, migrations, and massacres, things appeared to go reasonably well until some tribes from the North, not being aware of their subservient status, wandered down and foolishly occupied territory which Yahweh had destined for His Chosen. Obviously, this could not be tolerated, so old Yahweh trumpeted His orders from the mountain, came down, and joined His People in slaughtering millions of the sub-human intruders. (Several of these genocidal holocausts, whether real or imaginary, are still celebrated in Jewish holy days.) This kind of bloody warfare continued intermittently for a few centuries without eliminating the insolent *goyim*, so a new tactic had to be found to supplement the sword.

Greek language and culture, as well as several of the older religious legends were studied for ideas, and many possibilities appeared. Quite conveniently, tough old Yahweh, with the help of a nice Jewish girl, now begat a son, an emasculated, feminized semi-god who espoused such semi-appealing traits as meekness, humility, poverty, altruism, chastity, mercy, peace-making, honor, trust, truthfulness, integrity, tolerance, and loving one's enemies. What wonderful traits to find in one's enemies!

It might be a bit difficult to sell this bill of goods to the *goyim*, so several inducements were incorporated, with many more to come later. This new Savior would assume the guilt as well as the punishment for any infractions of the rules, including the Original Sin of not being born Jewish. All converts were assured of endless bliss in an indescribably beautiful Heaven after death, if only they would whole-heartedly believe. Furthermore, rebirth into the new life was

alleged to bring such peace and satisfaction that living in this vale of pain and tears would be not only tolerable, but actually enjoyable. On the other hand, those who never heard the salvation message, along with those who heard it but were unable to believe, were doomed to spend eternity being mercilessly tortured in a fiery pit of burning sulphur. That ought to really get them!

Somewhere in the dim, forgotten past the Jews has formulated and faithfully practiced their Golden Rule that "when you learn to fake sincerity, you've got it made." It was recently quoted on television by a well-known Jewish writer-philosopher, so it is still considered current and useful. This made it easy for the Great Teacher to attract a few missionary-helpers, and before long things were going great. In fact, some of the new converts were so zealous that it was feared the infection might spread to God's Chosen. Some of the female *goyim* appeared attractive and submissive, which also posed a severe temptation to the young hot-bloods of the Tribe.

The Learned Elders were equal to any emergency threatening their People, so they added more ground rules to the convoluted *Mishnah* already at hand. Among them it is stated that female *goyim* are available to the Chosen, and fair game for labor, entertainment, and gratification, but nothing more. If a Jew-boy weakens and marries one, he is to be publicly and officially declared dead by his family and the tribe, with appropriate mourning, funeral ceremonies, and subsequent shunning. If a *goy* aspires to cultivate one of God's Chosen Females, he is to be promptly eliminated. Anyway, killing *goyim* is recommended whenever feasible, since that is not considered murder. The Ten commandments and the Golden Rule are not involved, since they were admittedly never intended to handicap the Jews. This brings to mind old Moses, one of their most Venerated Figures. After a hundred years of archaeological digging and exploration and careful study of the Dead Sea Scrolls, no evidence has ever been found that Moses ever existed, although there are at least three older sects with legends of a baby prophet being found in a basket in the bulrushes. Similarly, there is no trace of evidence for Abraham, Solomon, David, Joshua, Saul, John the Baptist, or Jesus the Christ. Israel has maintained exclusive custody of the scrolls, and other scholars and translators have no access to them. Could it be that this secrecy is due to fear that revelation of the sordid origin of these religions would cause a total collapse of the house of cards, without which Israel probably could not survive?

In order to keep the new religion under control without destroying it, appropriate insults and obscenities were devised and applied from time to time, with occasional massacres to keep the *goyim* in line. But in spite of all of its contradictions and inconsistencies, the religion spread to Europe, with many adherents so zealous that they were willing to suffer and die for their faith. The new doctrines were ambiguous and unclear, so many different interpretations ap-

peared, resulting in the formation of opposing sects. The sects sometimes became so antagonistic that, with some outside agitation, major wars developed between them, with casualties running into the millions. Here these mixed-up fools were slaughtering each other in righteous indignation or wrath, while at the same time treating their real enemies with kindness and consideration! This was even better than the Learned Elders ever had reason to hope for.

Strange as it seems, the new religion survived and spread among the Aryans, but it had to be updated and enhanced to meet the aesthetic, intellectual, and cultural requirements of advancing civilization. And in order to meet the religious needs of more people, the new deity was fragmented into three parts, known collectively to the clergy as the Tri-Une God or Trinity, and the clergy were the only ones presuming really to understand his complex nature. The common people understood only that if they needed a Father-figure to lean on or to answer their ultimate questions, He was there in Heaven, a distant relative of old Yahweh and probably having the same nebulous residence. If they wanted love, wisdom, companionship, forgiveness, or salvation, the Son was also there, always ready to come to their aid. If their needs were more complex, the Holy Spirit could guide them heavenward in the mysterious ways of righteousness and holiness.

Joint committees of rabbis, priest, scholars, and kings were convened to decide which of the many religious legends, fables, and lies would be acceptable to the now more educated masses, and which were so ridiculous or repulsive that they must be discarded. There never was a true consensus, but a compendium of translations, interpretations, truisms, and wishful thinking was finally formulated and transcribed in the most elegant language and poetry of the time. Of course, it had to be re-done periodically, but there was no shortage of volunteers for the job, Men of God with their Divine Revelations.

As sophisticated music was coming into vogue, great poets, composers, musicians, and fine instrument makers appeared, all for the glory of God. The music took many forms and was very effective, majestic, joyful, prayerful, or imploring, depending on which mood the clergy chose to induce at the time. The rituals became very impressive, and the cathedrals with spires reaching almost to Heaven were truly inspiring. Artists and sculptors contributed their finest work and there was competition and rivalry to see which city-state could build the tallest, the most magnificent, or the most intricately carved structure. The poor serfs and artisans were taxed and enslaved for years to build these edifices and to maintain their popes and bishops in the style to which they aspired, all for the Glory of God. If the Great Teacher were to return to earth, as many of the followers claimed to expect, he would be puzzled as he sought in vain for evidence of his simple teachings in the lives of the people.

This inborn knack for faking sincerity has been a tremendous asset in the Jews' campaign to bring about Yahweh's will on earth. It has made them perfect masters in the theater, which they have exploited with great skill to inculcate countless nefarious ideas into the minds and lives of the unsuspecting *goyim*, while making fortunes for themselves. With their duplicity and fanaticism (enthusiasm) the Jews are the greatest salesmen, regardless of the value of their product. If they fail in fulfilling a promise, contract, or vow, they have annually renewed (Kol Nidre) their right to perfidy and perjury renouncement in advance. If they are threatened by unhappy clients (victims), they usually have brethren in high places who will come to their aid, legally or otherwise. With typical audacity they have invaded the various fields of art, music, literature, entertainment, economics, politics, philosophy, ethics, justice, law, and medicine. With the unfailing help of their news media they have attained positions as critics and arbiters in every field, even including etiquette and protocol. They appear to have convinced most of the *goyim* that the ugliness is art, discord is music, vulgarity and obscenity are the root of comedy, and degenerate licentiousness is the ultimate goal of sophisticated playwrights and novelists. Poetry is barely connected words without rhyme or metre. Unlimited indebtedness (to them) is desirable, and bankruptcy or fires are honorable and legitimate means for transferring their debts to innocent parties. All races (except Jews) are equal, and the ultimate crime is "anti-Semitism." As usual, they pervert or invert our language, this time by ignoring the fact that the only true Semites are the Arabs and the Sephardic Jews, while the Ashkenasi Jews who predominate in Israel, Europe, and the United States, have no claim whatever to being anti-Semitic.

The Gentiles have tolerated and/or adopted so many of the Jews' ideas that we should be wondering if we really are as stupid as they claim us to be. At one time or another they have been physically expelled from nearly every civilized country in the world for infiltrating and corrupting its morals, ethics, art, religion, economy, currency, and political system. Here, in the U.S., we allow them to dominate not only our Congress, but our news and entertainment media, our school system, our churches, our central bank system, our legal and medical professions, and our book publishing. We have the incongruous spectacle of a mediocre president (thought to be secretly "anti-Semitic") being subjected to a media-managed trial for relatively trivial offenses and finally submitting his resignation to a Jewish (dual loyalty) Secretary of State in an allegedly Christian nation.

The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (ADL), a tax-free, unregistered foreign agent, lobbying for Israel, publishes Sunday-School lessons, pictures, and other literature for the major Protestant denominations, all fostering the myth of Judaeo-Christian community of interest. It has been very successful in instilling and maintaining the idea, suicidal for us, that the Jews are God's Chosen People and we must support and protect them if we hope to survive and prosper. They also maintain massive files of up-to-date politically useful infor-

mation with which they can, and do, foster, impede, or destroy the careers of rising young professionals as they see fit. Having a budget and staff rivaling that of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the League provides many other services, all for the benefit of Israel.

Almost without exception their ideas bring disaster when we adopt them. Their control of our immigration policies has ignited the fuse for an inevitable explosion in our country, not in theirs. Our schools are another good example, after integration, busing, permissiveness, new socially oriented textbooks, and "progressive" teaching methods. Socialism, which they promoted here and established by revolution in the Soviet Union, is now an obvious failure. Integration was promoted as a noble cause, but actual race relations in the U.S. are probably worse and more dangerous now than they have ever been. Major businesses are required to hire a quota of "minority" employees, but all too often they find it necessary to hire duplicate white personnel in order to get the work done. Integration has made a mockery of the judicial system; we aren't supposed to notice it, but most of our crimes are committed by blacks, so should they be tried by a jury of *their* peers—or *our* peers? There is no way for justice to prevail with such different standards of behavior. We don't want more riots, do we? Who arranged a black U.S. Capital and two black Miss Americas?

Three decades ago the entertainment and news media, literature, and theater were glamorizing the use of certain mood-altering drugs, claiming in some cases that they were not addictive. Some of the same media are now pretending to deplore the widespread use of drugs and the concomitant crime, and advertising a nearly-futile "war on drugs." For years these same media have been glamorizing and encouraging recreational sex without regard to the consequences. Now they are forcing sex education and instruction on many young children who otherwise would not have given it serious thought before reaching adolescence. So we wonder why there is an epidemic of venereal disease, pregnancy in school girls, and AIDS, which latter can't even be reported as a communicable disease. Homosexuality is just another "perfectly normal" lifestyle, and "gays" are just a little bit nobler and nicer than other people.

There are so many other ideas that people ought to add up to get the results that now threaten us. Whose idea was the atomic bomb? Who were the spies who gave it to the Soviets? Who were the lawyers who defended the spies? Who was head of the Communist Party USA? Who founded and supported the NAACP? Who got us into two unnecessary world wars, and who benefited from them, and who is now urging us to start another one? Who are the leaders in most of the demonstrations against some of the policies the country really needs? Who screams loudest for free speech—except when it involves Israel or their beloved money-making Holocaust? Who but Jew lawyers, judges, and like-minded jurors would create the existing chaos about medical malpractice insurance?

It appears that Yahweh's Chosen People have eventually won almost every round, and that David Ben Gurion's peaceable kingdom, ruled from Jerusalem, is almost here, if only we will whip those nasty Arabs for them and hasten the climax of the Greatest Story Ever Told!

This eventuality would probably be the greatest set-back ever to befall humanity, since it would effectively end the era of mankind's greatest achievements. Under the new regime, governed by the all-powerful tribunal sitting in Jerusalem, the former great nations, already impoverished by wars to please Israel, would be permanently enslaved by taxation to support greater Israel, "Eretz Ysrael," extending from the Nile to the Euphrates River as promised by old Yahweh in the Beginning. Their massive police force patrolling most of the world is going to be very expensive, and certainly God's Chosen People are deserving of the finest living that can be provided by wealth stolen from the despised (and envied) *goyim*.

If this scenario appears too stark to be credible, people should become aware of the recorded maps and plans drawn up by the current Learned Elders of Zion, available to anyone interested enough to look for the unpleasant facts. These Elders, while still unidentified, are real people, they are deadly serious, and they wield more power than you would ever want to believe.

If the American people continue to be governed by Jewish ideas, influenced by religion-based love of Israel, constrained by an age-old fear of the Jews, and allow themselves to be led into another insane, unnecessary, Jew-contrived war, we can expect nothing but national disaster of whatever kind. In fact, it appears that the disaster point has already been passed, and unless we have an instant mass awakening and new leadership it is too late. Too bad!

If you question some of the statements reported here, please consult relevant sections of the Talmud, and your Holy Bible. The evolution of religions, music, and culture are adequately reported in various histories of the Middle Ages. More recent history, though frequently biased, is helpful for study, and current events of historic significance are recorded from time to time, often incompletely, by the *Washington Post*, *The New York Times*, and other such accredited sources.

If one only superficially ponders the State of the Union in 1990, two disturbing questions may come to mind. First, why are grown-up, educated, otherwise normal Christians still unable or unwilling to distinguish between fantasy and reality? Second, if the Jews effectively impoverish and destroy the major nations, who will provide sustenance for Israel, since all true parasites require a viable host? Think about it all—if you are still able to think.

KEEP THE *LIBERTY BELL* RINGING!

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

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

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

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

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

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

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