

September 12, 1998 - A Loyal Southern Misfit
September 12, 1998 - Ain't We Got Fun!

A Loyal Southern Misfit

Probably only us Southerners and Southern sympathizers can appreciate the incident I am about to relate. It was 1982, and I was sitting on Capitol Hill in Washington talking to someone at my publisher's office on Manhattan Island. The New Right Papers had just been published, and I had more plans for promoting it.

The New Yorker said unto me words I never expected to hear spoken to a boy from Pontiac, South Carolina straight from the Big Apple,

"Bob, you shouldn't be so PUSHY!"

I started laughing uncontrollably, and the guy at the publisher's asked me what I was suddenly laughing at. I said, "It would take YEARS for me to explain!"

I have always been a fanatically loyal Southerner, but I have always been a serious pusher in the midst of a region noted for its passivity. This is illustrated by the fact that, when I went uptown from Pontiac to Columbia High School in 1955, my best friend at Columbia High was one Lake Erie High, Junior.

There were about a thousand students at Columbia High, and Lake and I never had a single class in common. But Lake was another fanatically loyal Southerner who never, before or since, has been noted for his passivity.

In 1971, when I got back from Rhodesia, I was at a loss as to what to do next. There was no market for the particular talents I had developed there. So I took some courses in premedicine at East Carolina University. The only student I became friends with there was Raymond Moody, who later became a psychiatrist and began the near-death experiences craze with his book Life After Life.

I remember being at Ray's house, with his wife and my new wife there, looking at the first water bed I ever saw, while Ray talked about his own out-of-body experiences.

Raymond Moody is a North Carolinian, but he is a pusher and promoter like Lake and me. His image is that of a passive North Carolina boy with a very calm, Southern "accent"(Southerners don't have accents). But he didn't take the country by storm with his theories by being passive.

It tells you something that I have never been hired by another Southerner. I had several jobs in Washington, staying in each for several years. The only Southerner I ever had EVEN AS A RECOMMENDATION, out of dozens of people I used for recommendations through the years, was Floyd Spence.

The poor man had no choice, since I had driven him all over the state in his 1962 campaign and a large part of my family were his constituents.

The only Southerner who ever interviewed me for a job was Jesse Helms. But here again, the real story is different. His Administrative Assistant - the head of his office directly under Helms - brought me to him, and this AA was from Michigan.

From Michigan, but with excellent Copperhead instincts. He had a 1785 map of Virginia on his wall which showed his part of Michigan inside Virginia. He said that made him a Southerner.

I guess I was in DC for the same reason I was in Rhodesia. I'm the kind of Southerner other loyal Southerners are glad to have on their side - at a distance. Tom Fleming said of me in a speech that Americans could either be reasonable and settle for Southerners like him or choose to fight it out and "deal with Whitaker".

Let me tell you, when you get old and tired, you really LOVE it when somebody says something that makes you sound that macho!

Maybe I ought to get back in touch with Ray. At my age, life is becoming one long near-death experience.

My problem is, what do I do when we achieve independence? Do I live at the northern border of the Confederacy and commute, or will one of you folks in the government find me a nice job at a very, very distant Confederate embassy?

Ain't We Got Fun!

Everybody else has on looks of outrage, sadness, and all the other praiseworthy emotions about the present presidential situation.

True to my absolutely classless tradition, I am having an absolute ball.

I have admitted fearlessly unto you that I have known Lake High for well over forty years. If that does not show a lack of class, I challenge anyone to tell me what does. But a joke Lake told sums up the present Clinton situation beautifully.

There was a professional con man who had taught his son all the tricks. One day, the little fellow asked his father, "Dad, is there ever a time when you should just tell the TRUTH?"

The father looked a bit taken aback, then he looked thoughtful. Finally he said, "Son, in a real pinch, ANY gimmick will do."

Thus spake William Jefferson Clinton.

Another classless remark: I LIKE Clinton. He is very much a Southerner. He is real trash, but he is the kind of trash I am used to. When he flew in the face of all the rules of politics and selected Al Gore for his Vice President, he gained a lot of loyalty from me.

They are both Southerners. They are Southern turncoats, but so is every other Southerner who is now a public figure. Clinton feels comfortable working with another Southerner, and I like that. When Al Gore went to Yale, he was a roommate of Tommy Lee Jones.

In these days, when the so-called conservative Southerners are every bit as anti-white as liberal ones, I fail to see the difference.

In the midst of the present flood of commentary, let me interrupt the chorus of conservative "DUHHs" to make a couple of simple points:

First, no practicing addict to anything, be it alcohol or sex, should be president.

Secondly, the sexual harassment that occurred in the Oval Office had nothing to do with the consensual relationship between Bill and Monica. When any executive provides access in return for sex, it creates a hostile work environment for the OTHER, repeat OTHER, young women in the office. That is the harassment. It has nothing to do with the consensual relationship.

Now back to conservatives trying to contradict liberals who say it was a consensual relationship.

In Washington, I would always make points like that, which utterly destroyed the other side when they were made. But the conservatives always went right back to their "DUHHs." Their attitude toward me was once expressed beautifully, accurately, and I am not kidding here, in MAD Magazine: "Him smart. Me throw rocks."

I like Clinton's Southernness, but I DO hate liberals, and I am deeply and truly enjoying watching the total destruction Clinton's situation is causing liberalism. Even the press is talking about the libs' wild hypocrisy. The most amazing people are noticing that you simply cannot pry the truth out of these people with a corkscrew.

I said one thing to my brother Jon some months ago that is very important today. This Clinton thing has driven the first critical wedge between the American left and the national media

The national media is hard left, but if you understand it, you can do a lot with it. Back in 1982, Paul Weyrich discussed his astonishing success with the press in his article in The New Right Papers. He made the point that the media is made up of people, and the first thing you do in dealing with people is to figure out what they want from you.

Nobody gets along in the media if he is not a good liberal or one of the few thoroughly vetted and acceptable respectable conservatives. It is true that each person in the press is, ideologically, your dedicated enemy. He couldn't get there if he were anything else. But there is a huge mass of people there, and every single one of them is in front of you for a reason. They need news. They need a well-written press release that is highly quotable. If you write it well enough, they'll use your words entirely!

I was a new appointee in the Reagan Administration, for heaven's sake, and I got my picture and favorable coverage in the New York Times because I wrote a major part of the reporter's story for him! Paul Weyrich was born and bred up North, but he gave David Beasley his Orwell Award for demanding the removal of the Confederate flag.

I choose my friends well, gang! My smart remark to Jon came directly from listening carefully to Paul Weyrich's wisdom about the press. When the Administration struck out, it struck at Starr, but it also hit the media.

Everybody blames the press, but I noticed that this time the press took it personally. Maybe I noticed because I have dealt with them a long time. At the Voice of America, I was one of them briefly. It surprised me how badly they took it this time. I think that they were caught in a uniquely bad situation.

It is true that criticism of the press happens a lot, but it is always from only one predictable direction. They criticize the right, and are attacked from the right. They report something bad about a liberal politician, and he attacks them. If they criticize one group, that group says they're awful. This time, when the President jumped them for talking about the scandal, everybody either agreed with him or hid under the bed.

The press had to report the situation because that was what readers wanted to read about. Competition today is fiercer than ever, and they simply could not do the boring stuff and ignore the interesting story.

There was a time when the press could ignore anything it wanted to. Us older folks can remember when the network news ignored the burning down of major parts of cities all over America. People literally watched the news while they saw the smoke going up in their cities, and the press never said a word about it.

All good conservatives have forgotten that, but I haven't. Ask anyone over 55, and they'll remember it. I will never forget when one of the all powerful network anchors felt that the hundreds of thousands of letters of complaint required some kind of response. He complained that he had gotten all these demands, and in a clipped, angry voice, he read off the list of riots and burnings that had occurred **THAT DAY**.

When you hear the media commentators talking about the 1960's today, you can see that they are almost crying. Boy, those were the days! The three network bureaucracies had eliminated **ALL** opposition. They were absolute. They can't do that today. Even if they had wanted to, they couldn't have ignored the Clinton scandal. The fact that liberals refused to understand that hit home. **NOBODY** took the media's side in this.

Public opinion was four or five to one against them, saying that the people wanted to forget about sex and talk about social security, educational testing standards and other fascinating stuff. For once, the junk that people tell the pollsters, the same stuff that the press usually uses for their side, was used against the press.

The same people who would click the remote instantly the second the talk went from Paula Jones to national educational testing were saying they had had enough of scandal. And while they talked about Clinton, none of Clinton's opponents said a word. Good old conservative cowardice usually makes them smile weakly and say the press is fair. Usually conservative cowardice works for the press. Now it made conservatives tacitly back Clinton.

Everybody, on every side, was against the press, and the press could not do a damned thing about it. They can dish out abuse, but they are **FAMOUS** for not being able to take it. This time they had to take it month after month after month. The press got its butt kicked, and liberals are spending the last bit of moral capital they have left.

Ain't we got fun? Let me add, that right now Clinton is having the most exciting illicit relationship of his life. That is how addicts behave, gang.

September 19, 1998 – Observations
September 19, 1998 – George Corley Wallace, RIP

September 19, 1998 – Why I Will Not Denounce Southern Racism or American Imperialism

OBSERVATIONS

1. Clinton doesn't matter.

What does matter is that the so-called "women's movement" is history.

We don't realize how important that is precisely because the liberal women's' groups that were so important last December have disappeared from the media radar without a whisper. We have already forgotten that they used to get attention.

As my brother Jon has pointed out, until last December there was a story in the papers every week about some CEO getting charged with sexual harassment.

Gone.

2. Who the hell CARES whether Russia goes on with its economic reforms?

Socialism had absolutely nothing to do with our concern about the Soviet Union. It was the USSR's threats against us that was the problem.

A stable Communist government run by old ex-Communists right now would be no problem, as long as they took back control over their outdated atomic arsenal. That's our problem. Their economic system is of no concern to us at all.

GEORGE CORLEY WALLACE, RIP

In the wake of the death of George Wallace, I am sick and tired about all the talk of his "apology" for his pro-segregation stand. In his last interview, they asked him if he regretted anything. He started to make the ritual apology, then sat back and smiled, and said "No."

You are not going to see a repeat of that interview often.

The whole point of paying any attention to Wallace, from the media's point of view, was to get to his apologies for having been an Evil Racist.

Otherwise, he didn't exist.

Bill Moyers, PBS' official political historian, showed a Humphrey for President ad from the 1968 election. In its original form, this ad consisted of quotes from Nixon and Wallace, and it then contradicted them, and showed a balloon bursting with each "wrong statement. In the Moyers' version, the Wallace part of the ad was cut out, question by question! According to the Moyers version, Wallace did not exist in 1968.

Moyers put Wallace, quite literally, right down the Orwellian Memory Hole!

In 1968, the Wallace vote, which got as high as 22% in the polls, was the most historically significant for the future of politics. It was the first movement of white Southerners and Northern white ethnics out of the Democratic Party. The Wallace Democrats of 1968 became the Reagan Democrats of 1980.

It is not surprising that Moyers simply cut Wallace out of political history. The Wallace phenomenon did not fit PBS' version of Social Progress in History, so it was removed without a whisper of objection.

I met Governor George Wallace twice, once when he was on his feet and the second time when he was in his wheelchair.

The second time was in 1976. In 1976 I had written a book, *A Plague On Both Your Houses*, which discussed Wallace's importance to political history. Jimmy Carter, the Democratic nominee who had a huge lead in his presidential race against Gerald Ford, was in Montgomery waiting to see Wallace, but the Governor wanted to talk to me. His wife called twice while I was there, and the last time he picked up the phone, said, "I'm COMIN'!" and hung up.

He wanted to talk to me because I took his historical role seriously. He preferred that to playing second fiddle to Carter.

As he wheeled out of the room, he was still talking furiously: "If I had my legs and you were working for me, we'd have gone places!" He also said he wished he had had a chance to hire me earlier.

He did.

In 1968, in the midst of Wallace's historic third party run for the presidency, I went to Montgomery with Maurice Bessinger and Lake High in an attempt to get Wallace to turn his campaign over to us and our Independent Party. The guy he was handing the campaign over to in South Carolina was either a ringer or a fool. We were told that he reported to a Republican Party committee every week. But he had the nicest, most respectable friends! This same guy, to whom Wallace turned over his 1968 campaign, is now South Carolina's leading far leftist. In the end, Wallace ignored our advice and South Carolina became the only state in the Deep South that Wallace lost.

Wallace lost South Carolina in 1968 by succumbing to the "respectability" gambit.

He made a great point of getting "working people" to support him in the North, because only working people WOULD support him there. But in the Deep South, where he had more general support, he chose to reject those of us who dealt with real working people. In South Carolina he wanted to go with the coat-and-tie crowd. The Republicans, of course, owned the support of that coat-and-tie crowd. So Nixon won South Carolina in 1968.

In the end, Wallace renounced his earlier views and pursued respectability. Time after time, year after year, he did the Southern Crawl, begging Yankess to forgive him for ever having been a segregationist. Southern conservatives love to do the ritual Southern Crawl. To be a respectable Southern conservative, you have to love to beg for forgiveness. And Yankees love to watch them do it.

But in his last time in public, George seems to have gotten his pride back.

In the end, George refused to do that one last Crawl. The Moyers' and the conservative respectables will remember George's years of snivelling. But those of us who never have been respectable remember him at the beginning and at the end, when he stood tall.

In the wake of the death of George Wallace, I am sick and tired about all the talk of his "apology" for his pro-segregation stand. Every bad thing we segregationists predicted integration would bring has happened, and it was the integrationists who were, as they always are, dead wrong. Eleven years ago, when I was a Senior Editor of Southern Partisan, they made the ritual apology for Evil Southern Racism. I blew my stack in the following reply. It was written in 1987. I stand by it today.

WHY I WILL NOT DENOUNCE SOUTHERN RACISM OR AMERICAN IMPERIALISM
(originally published in Southern Partisan, 1987, and is reprinted with permission)

There are always self-styled spokesmen for America who use Moscow's language to confess American evil. There are always self-styled Southern spokesmen who use New York language against the South. Both groups turn my stomach.

In Moscow's terms, I am a warmongering imperialist, and proud of it. If in New York terms I am a racist provincial then I am proud of that, too.

America has a huge defense budget. The kind of American Pravda likes apologizes for the arms buildup without ever asking why it was necessary. The kind of Southerner loved by the New York Times regularly offers up ritual denunciations of Southern racism and hate groups, again without ever asking why those groups came to be.

Two New York Times-style denunciations of Southern racism appeared in the last two issues of the Southern Partisan

When I was fifteen, I was arguing that any integration would lead to total integration, and that interracial dating and interracial marriage would become established policy. Those who said I was crazy then now brag about how great it is that the Supreme Court forced Bob Jones University to permit interracial dating.

Back then the Enlightened Bunch argued that no such results were possible. Look around you and see how wrong they were. Now the Enlightened Bunch claim that the melting pot gives them a warm and fuzzy feeling; they worship the Statue of Liberty and gather on Ellis Island to sing hymns of glory before the fiery torch that fuses all races into one that is neither white nor black, red nor yellow.

That torch is not my god. And while it may be blasphemy in our time to say so, I am proud to be white; I like my race and I pray that my children and grandchildren will retain their whiteness.

As several national columnists have had the courage to point out, the existence of the white race is, in sober fact, threatened. Europe, North America and Australia have been opened wide to a flood of third-world immigration.

To the turncoats on the Southern Partisan staff, the white race may be just one of those little sacrifices one has to make to be liked by Yankees. A Southern partisan doesn't think like that.

I am not surprised to see working people, confused by the madness of our time, drawn to groups like the Klan. Such groups merely articulate a prejudice that has gone out of fashion in chic places. But make no mistake about it, those who dwell in chic places are filled with their own bigotry.

Sure, we would like for people who are drawn to the Klan to do something more constructive and to give a more persuasive shape to their arguments. But I do not blame them for feeling betrayed when the Southern Partisan publishes drivel about how hateful and retarded Southerners are. If we cave in, they will find other leaders.

What Vancounver calls "hate" has loyalty behind it. There are lots of writers in other regions to denounce our extremists. Our job is to denounce theirs. And if our people join "hate groups," it is because "respectable" outlets like the Southern Partisan offer no leadership - just the history of yesterday's bravery and cutesy wimpishness today.

In dealing with Moscow, we can prevent war by giving up our country. And we can solve the race problem by giving up our race. I reject these solutions.

My people and their prejudices are better than the Enlightened Bunch and their prejudices. I am a partisan loyal to my race, my nation (which is the South) and to the country which protects my nation's existence. I have respect for other races who feel the same way about themselves because only a clown can be loyal to a melting pot. By definition, a melting pot is nothing specific. Anyone who can be deeply loyal to nothing specific is in urgent need of psychiatric care.

September 26, 1998 – Observations

September 26, 1998 – English Works

September 26, 1998 – Respectable Conservatives Kill Their Wounded

OBSERVATIONS

1. Conservative respectables are wonderful for liberals. One of the leading lawyers supporting Clinton on MSNBC mentioned he had hundreds of sex offenders as clients. In short, he makes his living getting sex offenders back on the streets ASAP. Not one conservative respectable picked up on that - of course. Alan Dershowitz and Arthur Miller are Harvard lawyers who have devoted their lives to getting repeat criminals off.

Respectable conservative debating this say - guess what - not a word! Boy, those conservative respectables are brave denouncing letting criminals back on the streets - until they have to face off with one of the people who do it. What a bunch of prostitutes respectable conservatives are!

2. CODE WORD: "irreverence"

Charles Groden exposed himself as such a fanatical liberal that, despite his expensive contract, MSNBC had to take away his daily show. Nobody wanted to watch him.

The new Charles Groden at MSNBC is named Keith Obermann. Like Groden, they say he is "irreverent". Which means he smiles and says liberal things.

Watch that word irreverent.

ENGLISH WORKS!

When Bob Whitaker and Joe Sobran agree on a point, all decent men agree that it therefore be the truth.

Joe and I were talking recently, and we agreed that old-fashioned liberalism is no longer the problem. Liberalism is discredited. Liberalism is dead meat.

Our real problem today is the one thing that keeps liberalism from being laughed off the national stage completely. What is saving liberalism today is Respectable Conservatism.

For example, Bob Barr just lost any chance he ever had of being declared a Respectable Conservative by the national media.

Congressman Barr was a guest on CNN's Burden of Proof when Greta Sustern quoted Monica Lewinsky as saying that Clinton had never actually offered her a job in return for her testimony.

Good, what a stupid statement! OF COURSE Clinton wasn't stupid enough to make a flat offer of a job in return for testimony!

But no respectable conservative is going to point out how incredibly stupid that remark was.

There are several absolute rules you have to follow if you are going to be an Official Respectable Conservative. One of the biggest is that you must treat every liberal as a Serious Intellectual, no matter how ridiculous he is.

No Respectable Conservative will ever point out that Official Liberal Intellectual Alan Dershowitz is a nasty little bastard who has made a career out of getting repeat criminals back on the street. All Respectable Conservatives defer to Dershowitz' Deep Morality and his Official Brilliance.

Greta Sustern is also an Official Brilliant Liberal Theorist. No matter how silly she gets, you NEVER point out that she is being silly.

But Barr did.

Barr looked at her the way an intelligent man looks at any moron, and he said,

"Look, I was a prosecutor for many years, and I won hundreds of obstruction of justice cases. Never once did anyone say...." And here he slowed down to a mechanical repetition to make fun of Sustern:

"If-you-say-what-I-ask-you-to-say-I-will-give-you-money-and-a-job."

Barr continued, "The person obstructing justice does NOT say, "ATTENTION, this-is-a-quid-pro-quo. REPEAT-this-is-a-quid-pro-quo."

Sustern had said something really stupid and Barr nailed her with it.

He went on:

"The way it works in the real world is that a person like Clinton calls a Betty Curry into his office and says, "Now, you were with me all the time I was with Lewinsky, right? She came onto me but I wouldn't go along, right?"

Unlike Barr, a respectable conservative NEVER calls a leftist down when he is being moronic. If he did, the conversation would be very short and the leftist wouldn't stand a chance.

Only respectable conservatives allow liberalism to continue to dominate our national dialogue.

RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES KILL THEIR WOUNDED

Linda Tripp has had it! Liberals are going after her, which means respectable conservatives are after her. She is helpless now, and libs hate her, so respectable conservatives will earn their "respectable" label by cutting her throat.

This is what respectable conservatism is all about. As M. Stanton Evans pointed out, "Conservatives always leave their wounded."

Actually, if you want to be a really respectable conservative like Kemp or Hatch or Buckley, you have to do more than that. You have to cut the throats of your wounded.

The word "respectable" is absolutely essential if one is to make good money as a right winger. You don't get on national television without it, and you don't get a national column that is generally published without it. Unless liberals declare you to be a "respectable" rightist, you become a fascist, you become "anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews," and nobody will touch you.

This wonderful term "respectable" comes at a price. That price is exacted by the liberals who control our national dialogue.

Even Pat Buchanan, who is as far right as he is allowed to be, always chooses respectability first, no matter how ridiculous he has to be to do it. If he must choose between conservatism and respectability, a respectable conservative never hesitates to choose respectability.

Look at the craziness even Buchanan has indulged in to keep his "respectable" label:

An outright racist appeared on Crossfire way back when Buchanan and Bradley were on it, and Buchanan joined the liberal commentator Bradley absolutely. Buchanan was in danger of being called anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews, so he had to jump through every hoop Bradley wanted him to.

In his desperation to prove to Bradley that he was respectable, Buchanan agreed to the most incredible proposition. Buchanan insisted that American soldiers fought in World War II to allow massive nonwhite immigration into Europe!

Bradley told the racist what all liberals always say about World War II. He said that American soldiers fought and died so that Europe would accept massive third world immigration and integrate.

The racist said, reasonably enough, that had American soldiers thought that was what they were fighting for, they would have refused to fight.

Buchanan had to prove he was not an Evil Racist, so he backed Bradley all the way. He insisted again and again that American soldiers went to Europe to fight and die for massive third world immigration and integration!

I could not believe Buchanan had done that. But he said the same thing again. Then he INSISTED on it again.

The segregated United States Army, said Buchanan, fought to make Europe brown!

He agreed to everything else Bradley said. In this debate, any deviation from the liberal line would have threatened his status as a respectable conservative, so all bets were off.

I don't think I have ever been so disappointed in anybody in politics as I was in Buchanan on that program. He absolutely CRAWLED!

The left NEVER deserts its wounded. When the USSR fell, Phil Donahue immediately teamed up with one of the Communist Party's Russian defenders in a joint program. Nobody attacks Communists without catching it from liberals.

And if you call a liberal a Communist, he'll look you straight in the eye and tell you where to go. He won't let you call any other liberal a Commie, either.

But if you want to scare off a respectable conservative, say "NAZIHOWANTSTOKILLSIXMILLIONJEWS" loudly and he will panic and give you anything you ask.

And if a liberal calls anybody anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews, every respectable conservative demands the right to join the lynch mob.

If liberals give you the label "respectable", you got it made. You become a Jack Kemp or an Orrin Hatch or a William Buckley. A respectable conservative becomes half of the political dialogue. Jesse Jackson allows him to come on "Both Sides."

Remember that it was not Orrin Hatch or William Buckley who was out there defending Paula Jones when she was alone against Clinton. It was the "fever swamp" (AKA, not respectable) right that stood by her.

Linda Tripp has ceased to be of use to Starr, and the liberals want her bad. So she has had it, and only the "fever swamp" right will fail to declare her Evil.

October 3, 1998 – Observations

October 3, 1998 – Defining Respectable Conservatives: They're Just Bureaucrats

OBSERVATIONS

1. *National Review* lead article this time was an endorsement of Inglis. They said he was a New South candidate who wants the Confederate flag down and represents the Future. Respectable conservatism is on the march!

2. Republicans are very upset about Democrats who say, "Yes, Clinton lied. Now let's move on."

Well, gang, right after the 1996 election in December, Beasley said he met with the Lord God until 3 AM, and the Lord God told him to demand the Confederate flag be pulled down. He had promised all through the 1994 campaign to keep that flag up. Then in 1996, Beasley needed pro-flag voters to support Dole if he ever wanted to run for vice president. So God waited until the 1994 and 1996 elections were over.

It happened that changing his position on the Confederate flag was what Beasley felt he had to do to position him to run for vice president.

So in December of 1996, Beasley looked us straight in the eye and said the Lord God Himself had told Beasley get that flag down.

Now South Carolina Republicans are telling us that, yes, he lied to us, but now we need to move on and vote for Beasley anyway. Look carefully at the Republicans who are saying that right now. Listen carefully to the ones who pose as traditionalist Southerners. Remember their names.

Every word they say sounds exactly like the Clinton spin. Let me warn you now: those people will always sell you out when it is convenient.

DEFINING RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES: THEY'RE JUST BUREAUCRATS

I have been asked to define respectable conservatism.

It is very important to understand that a more correct term would be "conservative respectable", because "conservative" is the modifier here. The first real aim of respectable conservatives is respectability inside the present liberal-conservative political system. If he must choose between conservatism and respectability, a respectable conservative never hesitates to choose respectability.

The commentators you see on television and read in the syndicated columns are selected by a bureaucracy. Bureaucracies always choose people who "fit in."

Liberals run the media bureaucracy, and they only want to talk to conservatives they feel comfortable with.

This is the problem with conspiracy theories. Routine bureaucracy ACTS like a conspiracy, but it is nothing of the sort. A conspiracy is run by the head. You can remove the head men of the media bureaucracy and the body will act exactly the same.

Also, do not think of the "bureaucracy" here in the terms one would usually picture it. I am not using it to refer to a single organization of bureaucrats run from top to bottom.

The "media bureaucracy" simply means those who produce our media commentary. They all answer to each other, argue with each other, and select each other, so they constitute what amounts to a single bureaucracy.

For example, William Buckley became a champion media bureaucrat, though he never worked directly under anyone else.

Buckley was selected for his role because he "fit" into the media bureaucracy. He became the perfect respectable conservative who would show just the right combination of criticism and respect for liberals.

The obvious question here is, who is NOT part of the media bureaucracy?

Well, to start with, Matt Drudge is not a media bureaucrat. He selected himself, and the media bureaucracy hates him bitterly for it. As long as he succeeds by going directly to the market the way he does, he will not be declared "respectable". Any right-winger who has not gotten this "respectable" title from liberals is blocked from the mainline media.

If you are not a right-wing Uncle Tom, you are not allowed to open your mouth. Meanwhile, the Uncle Toms themselves are going to make sure those who refuse to be Uncle Toms are kept in their place. As you would expect, nobody is more fanatical in shouting down "right wing extremists" than respectable conservatives themselves. You can count on Jack Kemp or Orrin Hatch or John Inglis to jump right in on the attack on anyone the media call "racist". The Bushes and the Doles are at the head of any liberal lynch mob.

Bless his soul, Jeffrey Hart reviewed my book *A Plague On Both Your Houses* in 1976 in *National Review*, under the title, "Read This One!" In this review, he freely admitted that even people like him had to make truly bad concessions to respectability in order to get their case to the public through the media.

But Jeffrey Hart never became a full-fledged respectable conservative. He is allowed media access, but he will never be "one of the boys" like Bob Novak or Pat Buchanan or William Buckley.

A conservative respectable will not hang onto real world truths that are uncomfortable for liberals, and they can be sidetracked very easily. You can count on Novak to be an economic theologian, and, in the end, you can count on Buchanan to end up as a harmless religious nut.

While rewriting this, I was watching MSNBC. A conservative laughed at a liberal who was giving the same old routine spin. The liberal was terribly upset. I have noticed this many times - when he is going through his routine silliness and a rightist LAUGHS, the liberal commentator gets terribly upset. Watch and you will notice this, too. In the end it will be LAUGHTER that will RID US OF LEFT. The left will only be destroyed when people start calling their nonsense nonsense, and denounce the morons who keep repeating this bilge as the morons they are. As long as there are conservative respectables who will look stern and serious as "progressives" recite their nonsense, the left is safe. As long as conservative respectables say what True Intellectuals and Honest Patriots leftists are, liberals will survive and dominate our national dialogue. Conservative respectables live to oblige this leftist need. What is important to a respectable conservative is to maintain his respectability.

Any point he was making takes a distant fourth. Clinton's recent use of frivolous court privileges is very much like the routine liberal use of frivolous labels to throw conservatives off. When the heat was on, he used what liberals always use, fast footwork to get attention off of the hot problem.

Few people have noticed the fact that it worked -- again. In January almost everybody, from Moynihan to Ginsberg, agreed that if Clinton had had sex with an intern in the White House, he should go. No more!

As always, not one conservative respectable confronted these people with their earlier statement about demanding Clinton's impeachment for using his office to have sex with an intern in the Oval Office.

Novak was busy trying to be trendy and Buchanan went back into his moralist groove. The basic point was utterly forgotten by the respectables.

That is, after all, what they are there for.

If a respectable conservative starts making a point that bothers liberals, the "progressives" simply throw frivolous labels at him like "racist" or anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews. By the time he has saved his respectability, he has completely forgotten the point he was making. It never really mattered to him anyway.

This is not a conspiracy to select kooks and lightweights. It is simply that, if you had someone there who would not let liberals get away with silly stuff, the debate would collapse.

A man who worked with me on the House Education and Labor Committee appeared once, just once, on a national television debate. The debate concerned increasing federal aid to education. My friend would not get off the point that, the more federal aid there is, the more student scores fall. The two liberals were furious. They accused him of saying that giving money could actually HARM education - which was exactly what he WAS saying - and they were shouting that this was impossible.

They said education money HAD to help. My friend was pointing out that Federal money goes with federal regulation, and federal bureaucrats are ruining education.

There was a respectable conservative on the program. He was supposed to be on the same side as my friend. But this conservative respectable knew better than to join in this exposition of liberal silliness. The liberals were furious about it, and he had to satisfy them first.

He did so, and took their side against my buddy.

My buddy was, not surprisingly, never invited for another national debate anywhere. You will see that conservative respectable on national television a lot.

The right will fail as long as it selects its spokesmen this way.

October 10, 1998 – Is Our Only Choice Between Cowardice And Racism?
October 10, 1998 – Letter to the Editor

Is Our Only Choice Between Cowardice And Racism?

In my imagination, I enter a room and sit at a table. At a nearby table, a man is hiding underneath. I can see his trembling backside, and I can hear him murmuring, "Forgive me. Oh, please, please, please forgive me."

Naturally this makes me a bit curious, so I ask someone, "What is that man doing?"

"He's leading a Revolution."

We watched Governor Beasley of South Carolina lead just such a Revolution. He found he could take South Carolina conservatives for granted, so he decided that, if he took down the Confederate Flag from the state capitol dome, there was nothing Southern traditionalists could do about it. After all, where would they go?

Beasley did what conservatives always end up doing: he sold out his base to get some respectability from liberals. He turned the Reagan Revolution in South Carolina into an apology. He may well have destroyed it, and if Republicans in South Carolina don't renounce this tactic immediately, they will have turned the state over to the New Democrats in the long run.

George Wallace, not Ronald Reagan, began the Reagan Revolution. It was the Wallace Democrats who marched out of the Democratic Party in 1968 who became the Reagan Democrats of 1980. If you count the votes, those Reagan Democrat votes made up ALL of the electoral revolution we have seen in our generation.

Not libertarians, though respectable conservative worship them. Not NeoConservatives, though respectable conservatives worship them, and no, Virginia, NOT the Religious Right, either. The Reagan Revolution is built on Wallace Democrats of 1968 and 1972. When he was shot, Wallace had a comfortable lead in the democratic primary in MICHIGAN!

Only after the shooting of Wallace did the left secure control of the Democratic Party.

All of that is forgotten. It is forgotten most of all by conservatives.

When Wallace died, all anybody talked about was how good Wallace did the Southern Crawl for daring to defy integration. I wrote an article here saying he had very good reason to fear integration and the Federal power and antiwhite motivation that was behind it.

After liberals and conservative respectables had talked about nothing but Wallace's Southern Crawl for days after his death, someone in the League was upset that WHITAKER brought up the race issue!

I didn't bring it up, but damn if I'll back down.

We must avoid being racists, but we must also avoid being Beasleys about it. When they attack us, we must hit back. Nobody leads a Revolution from under a table, whimpering.

This is why the lesson of respectable conservatism is so critical to us. Let me give you one vital lesson I have learned from over forty years of fighting the left: if you say, "I will not touch that issue," the left is going to grab that issue and bang you over the head with it until you are under that table.

Everybody agrees that nonwhites have problems. Whites have serious problems, too. Our birth rate is low and all of the lands where we live are being overrun from the third world. To say that is not to be anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

I once defined "New South" as "a term used by Southerners whose attitude toward the South is the same as an Uncle Tom's attitude toward blacks."

Whenever liberals or respectable conservatives tell me to do the Southern crawl, it is exactly like asking a black to be a good Uncle Tom and do a jig. And my response is the same as any self-respecting black man's would be to a like request.

Never avoid an issue. That gives the left something to hit you over the head with. If your world view makes any sense, you can deal with any issue directly and honorably. Our people expect leadership on all issues.

Let us learn the lesson Beasley and Inglis are teaching us. We will not be racists, but we will not be wimps either.

Letter to the Editor

Here is an example of dealing directly with the race question when it is brought up without being either a traitor, a racist or a wimp. Can anybody find any fault with it?

Letter to the Editor
Hartsville Messenger
207 E. Carolina Ave.
Hartsville, SC 29550
September 9, 1998

Dear Sir,

I very much enjoyed Scott Davis' column on the League of the South and our secessionist message. It was an excellent piece.

I am a member of the League but not an official spokesman.

Mr. Davis pointed out that it is League policy to "recruit no racist members" and that "some KKK types are banned from the organization." I would not belong to the League if any "type" were banned from it. These folks are welcome, but they absolutely must leave their hoods outside the door.

The Confederacy will be reactionary, like old-fashioned America. That means there will be room for everybody. If you are a white separatist, nobody is going to use busing or low cost housing to chase you down and impose multiracialism on you.

The same goes for black separatists.

By the same token, if you use violence against anybody, of any color, you will face old fashioned American justice, and the most expensive lawyer in the world won't save you from it.

Mr. Davis points out that some of our leaders like English spelling, because Noah Webster, who started the American spelling, was a Yankee. That is their opinion. I don't share it, but again, there will be room in the Confederacy for oddballs, eccentrics, and downright contrary people.

The day the Confederacy goes into business, Political Correctness closes up shop.

Sincerely,

Robert W. Whitaker
Columbia, SC 29204

October 17, 1998 – Don Kennedy On "Politically Incorrect" With Bill Maher
October 17, 1998 – Now The Pope Calls Us Thieves! This Must End!

Don Kennedy On "Politically Incorrect" With Bill Maher

Members of the League of the South know the Kennedy brothers much better than they do me. Ron and Don Kennedy are founders of the League and authors of our authoritative book.

Don appeared Tuesday night/Wednesday morning from 12:05 AM to 12:35 on "Politically Incorrect With Bill Maher", representing Southern Nationalism. There was a country music man who also represented the Southern point of view.

There was, of course, the standard black who represented the screaming anti-Southern point of view. Roy Innis might have had an interesting and unexpected perspective. So might William Raspberry, the national black columnist from North Carolina.

Which is why Maher didn't invite Innis or Raspberry.

The point of having a routine black person was to have somebody to shout about how Southern independence would violate minority rights. All over the world, there is one consistent rallying cry used to crush every independence movement. That cry is "Minority Rights." If you can't deal with that line face on, you should get out of the independence movement and do something you can handle.

Also on the program was a loud-mouthed retard from Scotland. I never quite got the point of this screaming moron being included. His opinions were standard European, which means they were the same as the Boston Globe. Maher had another Scottish moron on two nights later, for no particular reason. He seems to have some private agreement with the League of Feeble Minded Scots.

Don did one thing right. He shut up that loudmouthed Scot. Don said, "You may be a great comedian, but you don't know a thing you're talking about", or something similar, and the raucous shouts died down some.

Don showed no nervousness at all, but Maher did. I would like to ask Don if he had talked with Maher beforehand. It may be that he and Don had had it out before the show. It may also be that Maher is used

to having respectable conservatives on his show, and is not used to dealing with anything that is really Politically Incorrect.

This latter point was made, of all things, by The New Yorker Magazine!

But Don blew all his advantages, and everything went as expected. The outraged black person said anyone who disagreed with liberal race policy wanted to firebomb little girls. This is a version of the familiar "anyone who disagrees with me is anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews."

Don tacitly agreed by doing the Southern Crawl.

The Southern Crawl did the same good it always does: the black person was still outraged as ever. All it accomplished was what the Southern Crawl always accomplishes: it got the Southerner off message.

The purpose of the "enraged black" tactic is to force one to say everything is "just wunnerful" in the New South. But if everything is just wonderful in the New South, why secede? You'll learn to live with whatever the Yanks do to us, and thank them for it. When someone uses any version of the anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews tactic - including the enraged black version -- you are absolutely lost if you do not immediately go on the attack:

Call them on it: "Are you accusing me, in front of this audience, of wanting to kill little girls?"

"We simply cannot have a rational discussion if you are allowed to accuse me of being a murderer."

"Are you saying that everyone who wants socialism wants to murder millions of people the way Stalin did? If you can't say that about a leftist, why can you accuse a rightist of being a murderer the same way?"

You can attack THEIR solutions: "No, we do not want a Harlem in the South. You say the North has the perfect solution on race. I think you're wrong. I don't think what we have is working well. But we can't discuss it while you are screaming murderer at me."

The point is to force THEM to defend their insane anazihowantsantstokillsixmillionjews crap instead of going into the old bellyflop Southerners are expected to do.

Anything, ANYTHING but the standard old Southern Crawl!!!!

Bill Rusher wrote the introduction of my first book, A Plague On Both Your Houses. In his national column, he said, "What makes Whitaker so interesting is that he manages to put daylight between his position and those of both the liberals and conservatives without wandering off into eccentricity and while remaining quintessentially American."

Until the League can do this, it has no place in real world politics.

When Maher said no one wanted to secede, Don agreed, more or less:

"Not enough do", said Don.

Secession is all over the world, including Quebec and 28% of the vote in Alaska. But you would never know it from what Don said.

Off message again.

Maher started the program with another standard tactic: he read off the only point he agreed with Don on, which was restricting the franchise. In short, he wanted to get off Don's message, and offered Don his approval if Don would go for it.

Don went for it.

Rule One in any form of politics is to stay on message. I am a League member. I have been a Southern Nationalist since my preteens. But I was left mystified by the end of the program as to why Don wanted to secede.

Our spokesman must be better prepared than this next time, or we should get out of separatism and leave room for someone who knows what they are doing to take our place.

For the cause, we must be frank: What Don did was far, far worse than useless, and we need to learn from our mistakes.

Lake High has come up with something that might just work. It boils down to this: we are in a war for our independence, and a war requires training. Unlike National HQ, the SC League TRAINS its people regularly.

They should learn, a) what the tactics of the other side are - nothing could have been more predictable than the ones Maher used, b), what our message is, and c), how to stay on message.

Now The Pope Calls Us Thieves! This Must End!

Does anybody on our side have any sense of outrage at all? Or guts?

The Pope is getting old, senile, and therefore liberal. So as he left Cuba, he said America and Europe are only wealthy because they exploit countries like Cuba. He said our wealth was a result of their poverty!

The Pope says we're all thieves living off of Cuba. Has anybody heard a peep of objection?

Me neither.

American Indians are here because they drove other Indians out. But it is routine today to declare that white Americans are evil and are here because we STOLE America from THEM.

What about all these glorious conservative blacks? Anybody hear anything from them?

Every night a lot of whites are killed by blacks. So whites are always being accused of being a race of murderers. So we apologize, if we want to be respectable.

Or we turn into racist nutcases. Is there anyone who is not a racist nutcase or a wimp?

Another timely issue no one but outright racists dare mention:

Every state that ratified the Bill of Rights had and enforced a law against miscegenation. All but one of the states that ratified the fourteenth amendment had and enforced antimiscegenation laws.

So the Federal courts said the Bill Of Rights and the fourteenth amendment were written to outlaw laws against miscegenation. South Carolinians are supposed to ratify that decision on election day this November.

Which brave defender of states' rights comes forth to attack this absurdity?

None but the screaming racists.

This is an example of South Carolina's version of respectable conservative bravery: at the Redshirts' meeting in September, I saw a person who wanted to pass out objections to the November resolution. But he wanted to do it ANONYMOUSLY.

I have openly objected to this ballot initiative, under my own name. I have written my third letter to the The State newspaper on it, and demanded that this time it be printed.

They have printed all of my other letters but those attacking this court decision. I have called and now I am demanding in writing that this letter be printed before the November vote.

But then I am apparently unique.

Everybody else is either a nutcase racist or a coward.

We are accused of being thieves and murderers, and we apologize to those who accuse us.

And we keep wondering why this country does not seem to have any sense of outrage left.

Bottom line: No country was ever saved by nutcases or by wimps.

October 24, 1998 – Poisoned Fruit

October 24, 1998 – Liberal Spores

Poisoned Fruit

It is established law in this country that, if a man tortures and kills children, he is set free if any of the evidence that convicts him is collected in violation of any rules set up by a judge. So if he is searched incorrectly, or Miranda rights are not read, the policeman who did it wrong suffers no penalty, and the criminal is set free.

All evidence collected as a result of a violation of judicial rules is called "poisoned fruit." So, if an informant's name is found before Miranda rights are read, and that informant leads the police to the children's bodies and other evidence, that evidence is not admissible.

Liberals go all the way for their clients.

A few thousand kids may get molested and a few hundred killed, but that's the price you have to pay if liberal lawyers are to have their form of justice. All liberals agree that it's a bit tough on the kids, but justice is not perfect.

Unless, of course, that injustice comes from a nonliberal source. Liberals oppose the death penalty, so the possibility of one innocent person being executed worries them to death.

So liberals talk endlessly about the possibility that the death penalty may be imposed on an innocent person. They never spend one second worrying about the innocent children their policies kill.

So, when debating the death penalty, no respectable conservative ever brings up the innocent children liberals kill with their policies. By the same token, no Southern Crawler ever brings it up. You become a good respectable conservative and a respectable Southerner - a Southern Crawler - by following liberal rules.

If you are to be a good Southern Crawler, you never question the "poisoned fruit" of integration laws. The Fourteenth Amendment was adopted unconstitutionally, and the Federal court decisions outlawing antiscegenation laws in the 1960's absolutely reject all traces of constitutional intent. The states which adopted the Bill of Rights and the Fourteenth Amendment had and enforced antiscegenation laws. Not even the carpetbagger administrations in the South objected to them.

But the courts decided all that didn't matter. The courts didn't want miscegenation laws, so out they went. Naturally, no respectable conservative and not one Southern Creep objected to this.

Years later, in the 1970's, the Federal courts decided they didn't want states to have restrictions on abortion, either. So they declared the constitution did not allow states to have restrictions on abortion. Every Catholic bishop had cheered the court decision doing away with antiscegenation laws. But when the court did exactly the same thing to antiabortion laws, the bishops started shouting about "original intent." Since bishops had objected, respectable conservatives felt they could object. Since Northern conservatives had objected, Southern Crawlers decided they could object to the abortion decision, too.

But all this fake courage came far too late.

Because respectable conservatives and Southern Creeps only objected when fashionable opinion allowed them to, unborn children got murdered, and other children get murdered and molested every day.

People who only object when fashionable opinion allows them to are going to betray you every single time when it counts. If you select Southern Creeps and respectable conservatives as your leaders, you get precisely what you deserve.

Liberal Spores

We have to get out of the Union, because the only discussion inside the Union is between liberals and their pets, the respectable conservatives. In the present so-called discussion, the right can only delay the inevitable expansion of leftist authority.

As recent incidents are demonstrating once again, leftism will not stop until its power is absolute. Respectable conservatives and Southern Crawlers provide a false and temporary illusion of opposition.

Many infections use spores to preserve themselves. A disease germ infests an area, but then the area dries out, so the disease germs form individual, hard shells, and wait for the rain to come back. In the meantime, it looks like the disease has been beaten.

Leftism uses the same method.

Southern Crawlers insist that, now that the libs have won on all the old civil rights fronts, they will quit. How happy we all are now, with JUST ENOUGH anti-white laws. So, by giving liberals those laws, we have inoculated ourselves against any further outbreaks of this disease. We need no longer worry about limitless Federal expansion in the name of civil rights, right?

Wrong. The disease did not go into remission. Like all liberal programs short of total bureaucratic control of everything, it merely spored.

But the spores are always just waiting for their water. And for Federal power extension in the name of diversity, the "water" is a hate crime. Give them one hate crime, and the disease is back in action.

Now a homosexual got murdered, and, surprise, surprise, liberals want more Federal "Hate" laws. In the name of the melting pot, we need another extension of Federal authority.

Crawly Southerners (I call them Southern Creeps) agree with liberals that they were wrong to object to such extension last time.

But the respectable conservatives and Southern Creeps say, "THIS time, you really are going too far." Quite reasonably, liberals say, "Just let us enforce it a few years and you'll LOVE it, just like you did everything else we enforced."

Experience everywhere shows us that leftists often look like they've been tamed for the moment. But in the long run, they never stop demanding more. And conservatives never stop giving them more.

Back in 1959, when I first went to England, Hyde Park in London was the world center of free speech. It was a point of pride with Britons: in Hyde Park you could say dirty words or defend dope addiction or anything else. It was a tourist draw because it was unique in the world.

Then, in the 1960s, Britain passed laws against any bad remarks about any minority group. This was a Labour Party move, and bothered a lot of people. But then something happened that made the left look like it had been tamed: a person who was convicted under the law proved that every remark he had made was a simple recitation of statistics. The judge acquitted him with a historic remark:

"You cannot imprison an Englishman for telling the truth."

All the world thought freedom of speech was saved in Britain!

It wasn't.

The left was tamed for the moment, but the left always gets what it wants in the long run. It is essential to the left that all dialogue about minorities be subject to law.

In 1986, the British courts gave the leftists all they wanted. Even the blasé British were shocked. In *Crown vs. Joseph Pierce*, 1986, the judge gave Pierce a year for inciting racial hatred, and the judge said:

"The truth is no defense."

By the way, in 1986 the United Kingdom was under respectable conservative rule.

As usual, the left seemed to be under control, but, with the connivance of respectable conservatives, it has resumed its march toward absolute control over free speech in Britain.

We all know there is now a major offensive to expand Federal authority under new "Hate" laws.

Meanwhile the left is opening up this offensive on new fronts. There is a new cable movie starring Beau Bridges. It is called "Defending the First." The movie argues that anyone who publicly disagrees with the liberal line on race is criminally responsible for hate crimes.

But this incitement is only to be blamed on the political right. Leftists can incite all the hate crimes they want to. A year or two ago, a black man got on a subway in New York City and started shooting white people. He said he hated whites.

A couple of years ago, the New York State School Board actually approved a textbook which stated flatly that all white people were racists! It was pulled at the very last minute.

So, who got blamed for the black man's murder of a lot of white people? New Yorkers unanimously blamed the gun for it! A wife of one of the victims got elected to congress saying it was the gun's fault!

Did you hear any respectable conservative blaming any of this on leftists?

Me neither.

How about Southerner Crawlers?

Me neither.

The bottom line is this: in politics, you are either going forward or you are going back. We must either destroy the left and discredit it, or it will consume us. Respectable conservatives and Southern Creeps say that liberalism so far is not just OK, it is great.

We must either discredit liberalism totally, or we must secede.

We must stop trying to get liberals to approve of us and turn to driving them out. If the Union continues, if leftist respectability continues, your future belongs to the left.

October 31, 1998 – JONATHAN POLLARD, ISRAELI PATRIOT
October 31, 1998 – A NATIONALIST ATTITUDE
October 31, 1998 – DEALING WITH THE NAZI LABEL
October 31, 1998 – FIVE WORDS AND EMMA LAZARUS

JONATHAN POLLARD, ISRAELI PATRIOT

Alan Dershowitz is joining the Israeli Government and untold others in trying to get Jonathan Pollard released from his life sentence for spying for Israel. Pollard is an American citizen who was working for the United States Government, but he is Jewish, so who can object to his spying for Israel? Dershowitz has gone to great lengths to demonstrate that Pollard only spied for Israel. That makes it OK, you see.

How many other countries openly demand that their spies be given a break?

But it's OK, because this is Israel. You see, anyone who criticizes Israel is anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews.

Also, anyone who criticizes civil rights laws is anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews.

There are lots of other ways to be anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews. Black New York congressman Major Owens declared anyone who wanted to reform welfare to be anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews. Oh, well, by now, I've already been convicted on at least a dozen counts of being anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews, so I might as well raise Cain about Israel, too.

Actually, if the same logic that applies to Israel were applied to the rest of us, I wouldn't have much objection to the attitude we have toward that country. After all, I am all for a group having its own national state if it wants to. But liberals and respectable conservatives agree that this right is only to be allowed to Jews. What is absolutely outrageous is the fact that so many of the same Jews who insist on their right to Israel demand that everybody else be jammed together in a melting pot. I am sick and tired of American Jews being allowed to have American and Israeli passports, while the same Jews, as liberals, say Southern secessionists are traitors to the United States.

Liberals and respectable conservatives and Southern Crawlers all agree Israel had the right to displace the Arab inhabitants of Palestine and set up their own state. At the same time, they all agree that the South has no such rights. Why? Because our minorities might not like it.

In fact, every objection to Southern patriotism and separatism is not given a split second's consideration when it is applied to Israel.

A NATIONALIST ATTITUDE

My attitude toward any group, be they Jews, Moslems, Orthodox Christian, or whatever, is always: "What's in it for the South?" Today, this attitude is expected of blacks or other minority groups. Any black who fails to respond on any issue "from a black perspective," i.e., in terms of black interests, is

instantly branded unnatural and evil by liberals, and therefore by respectable conservatives and the good old Southern Creeps.

If you ask my attitude toward "Jews," my question will be "Which Jews"?

Are you talking about the first two Jewish senators, Yulee of Florida and Benjamin of Louisiana, both firmly proslavery antebellum Southerners? My attitude toward them is good. Are you talking about Alan Dershowitz, Harvard law scholar and one of the best friends repeat offenders ever had? Do you mean Dershowitz and similar Jews who make their group identity an excuse for attacking everything I care about?

My attitude toward them is not good.

Lake High pointed out that the late Cardinal Bernardine was a product of Columbia, SC. A reporter asked him about his youthful experiences with anti-Catholic bigotry in his youth down here. He said he didn't have any such experiences.

Naturally, the reporter thought the good Cardinal had gone deaf. He pressed Bernardino, telling him, as Yankees will, about the realities of the place he was raised in, and how bigoted it was against Catholics. Bernardine told him a little story: When the future cardinal was a boy in Columbia, he and two other guys had gone to lunch together regularly for years. They found out, when they were about to finish school, that one of them was a Protestant and one of them was a Jew. Over the years, the question had simply not come up.

I am willing to bet that, if one of them had been a Yankee, they would all have known it from the word go.

By contrast to this very Southern concept of accepting different groups, the Southern Crawler feels that the South will only be a true modern society when it replaces the Confederate flag with a sign that says, "Kick Me."

DEALING WITH THE NAZI LABEL

Nobody dares call a liberal a "Communist" anymore. But Southern Nationalists are going to be called Nazis all the time. This is because respectable conservatives and Southern Crawlers are weenies. Whereas no liberal allows himself or any other leftist to be associated with totalitarians or mass murderers like Stalin, Southern Crawlers and respectable conservatives routinely allow leftists to use the label on rightists.

The reason Stalin was evil was not because of his economic ideas. He was a totalitarian and a mass murderer. Likewise, it was not Hitler's racial ideology that made him a Nazi. It was his dictatorship and his mass murder. But whereas liberals do not allow people to accuse leftists of being Communists because of their economic ideas, they know, and insist, that it is the means, not the ends, that make the difference.

Respectable conservatives and Southern Crawlers care about nothing but pleasing leftists. They are happy to agree that all nationalists and all racists are Nazis. Jefferson was a Nazi, sure! The segregated United States Army that invaded Normandy was Nazi, sure!

Do not allow anybody to do this to you.

And do NOT allow them to subject you to any kind of an ideological test to prove you are not a racist. The minute you give them the right to approve of your views on nation and race, you have lost. The entire issue here is not your aims, but the fact that they are accusing you of advocating violent revolution, dictatorship, and mass murder, and you will not stand for it. Point out immediately that they are saying that Jefferson was a Nazi, that all those who wrote the Constitution were Nazis, because all of them opposed racial intermarriage. This is outrageous. Nazism, like Communism, is a matter of means, not of ends. All socialists are not Communists, and all nationalists, nor even most racists, are Nazis. KEEP ON TOPIC! If they accuse you of being a racist, say that is a code word for "Nazi," which it is. Keep them on the defensive. Until we do this, the Nazi Scare will keep us as impotent as respectable conservatives and Southern Creeps.

The Nazi Scare is one of two standard attacks all nationalists have to deal with. The other, which is related, is the argument that no separate countries should be allowed because they might not treat their own minorities right. Respectable conservatives and Southern Crawlers allow the leftists and centralizers to use these tactics without challenge.

Respectable conservatives and Southern Crawlers are the best friends tyranny has.

FIVE WORDS AND EMMA LAZARUS

A little while back, Dr. Rolandi sent out a copy of an email from a leftist who declared neo-Confederates to be traitors, I found one particular line fascinating:

"Our group, by studying the neo-Confederates and realizing their hostility to the Statue of Liberty, the Declaration of Independence, and American democratic values in general have also come to realize one thing. RACISM=TREASON."

What is there about the Declaration of Independence or the Statue of Liberty that we are supposed to be hostile to?

Is this anti-Confederate saying we denounce the thousands of words directed against King George in the Declaration? Clearly not. Is he saying neo-Confederates object to the mention of God in the Declaration? Clearly not.

That is almost the whole Declaration, and we have denounced none of that.

What he means by "the Declaration of Independence" is actually a grand total of five words: "all men are created equal."

What he means by The Statue of Liberty is not the representation of a white woman inviting Europeans to come to America. He is talking about the inscription on that statue written by Emma Lazarus, a dedicated Zionist. Emma was giving away a country inhabited by goyim, while she dreamed of a homeland reserved for her and her fellow Jews.

If one denounces Emma Lazarus for giving America to any of the goyim who wanted it, while dreaming of her own land for Jews only, one is being "unpatriotic."

November 07, 1998 – Introduction

November 07, 1998 – WHY WE ARE RULED BY SOCIOPATHS

November 07, 1998 – THE BEAD BUYERS

Introduction

Winston Churchill said that "Democracy is a system of government where one gets what one deserves."

It is time to stop blaming politicians and political experts for the weakness and ignorance of the American people. In a representative democracy, the job of a politician is to get elected.

He does this by taking good advice on how gullible we are.

WHY WE ARE RULED BY SOCIOPATHS

While a lot of people are for Clinton and a lot are against him, I doubt anyone now doubts that he is a sociopath. A sociopath is a person who is incapable of feeling honest guilt. He is also incapable of feeling any obligation to another person or to society in general.

This is a shockingly common phenomenon. Once we thought it was very rare. We now know that sociopaths probably constitute one to five percent of the population.

To be acceptable today, a politician must be a sociopath. Every move, every smile, every emotion is used to get what he is after. By definition, the more conscience you have, the less perfect a modern politician you will be.

Democracy is a system of government where people get what they deserve. We ASK for sociopaths to rule us. We want someone who will say the right thing. We label anyone who loses his temper or says anything that is purely an individual opinion, as over the edge. So we vote for people who say the right thing.

All the time.

Nobody who is not a sociopath can have acceptable opinions all the time.

In "The Bead Buyers"(below) I explain that we have become a society where sociopaths who learn the formulas for "handling" us, the right "spin", are allowed to rule us.

Dale Carnegie's book, How To Win Friends And Influence People, was a handbook for sociopaths. Not coincidentally, his methods worked like a charm. Nothing could be more inevitable in a country where Carnegie's advice works than that we get presidents like Nixon and Clinton.

The best book I ever read about success with women was written by a woman. It's title was The Inept Seducer. At the end, it had a piece called "How to be Ept," which gave men ten steps by which they could get what they wanted just about every time.

It worked like a charm.

The Inept Seducer worked beautifully, just as Carnegie's stuff worked beautifully. And the one tactic that was never discussed in The Inept Seducer at all was HONESTY. With American women, according to this lady, honesty is absurd. My experience says she was dead right.

We are ruled by sociopaths because we ASK to be ruled by sociopaths.

THE BEAD BUYERS

Hoogetoobee the Elder spoke unto his son, "Young one, a man is only a real man when he has a BLUE glass in his nose."

Hoogetoobee pointed at the blue glass shining in his nose and said, "My son, among our people, blue glass beads are deeply valued. If you wish a wife, take all your pigs to white men and get blue beads for your nose, not red beads."

And Hoogetoobee was right. His son took all his pigs and bought blue beads and put them in his nose, and he had many wives of his tribe, which loved blue beads.

The tribe soon died out.

Wise Hoogetoobee was right. He gave his son excellent advice for getting along in the grown-up life of his tribe.

But it is also true that that was one dumbass crowd of savages.

This year, a very thick but popular book called *The Wealth and Poverty of Nations* was published. It is by a Harvard professor, but it is popular because this Harvard professor is talking sense.

No, I have not been drinking, this Harvard professor actually makes some sense. He says that countries that are poverty-stricken are that way because they are run by what might technically be referred to as a crowd of dumbasses.

His language is more diplomatic, but that is what he is saying.

Historically in Latin countries, for example, real men in every class tended to mean men who did not work. The goal of a really macho man was to be nonproductive.

Real macho men in America tell us that "It's not what you know, it's who you know." That is true.

It is almost fatally true. When we ran head-on into a Japanese economy which was deadly serious about WHAT people knew, we damn near went under. What saved us was that the Japs had some "real man" advice THEY lived by.

The real men who were on top in Japan lived by clique. At the top, they went by WHO you knew. As a result, they made big loans on the basis of other real men asking for them. Their heroes defaulted, and the whole thing seems to have collapsed on them, saving the US for the time being.

But somewhere there is always a bunch of people, some Bill Gates', who take output seriously. Who you go to lunch with in such places is no substitute for creativeness or knowing your business. Whenever that happens, a lot of modern coat-and-tie bead-buyers get ruined.

Whenever someone tells me how to get along in a society, I listen for this bead-buyer crap. I am not so impressed by the wisdom I am hearing as I am by the sheer cowlike dumbness of people who can be "handled" this way.

Dale Carnegie says remember their names, that bowls them over. Other good advice tells us that "this is the way you talk to women," and "that is the way you flatter men's vanity." This is usually good advice. It also tells me that we live in a society where grown men and women give out their money and their votes on that kind of basis.

This is a LOT more sophisticated than a blue bead in your nose.

November 14, 1998 – Observation

November 14, 1998 – IF IT'S RESPECTABLE, IT'S STEALABLE

November 14, 1998 – EUROPEAN OPINION

Observation

The excuse for refusing to submit military action to a declaration of war is that things move too fast these days. Nobody has noticed that that is absolutely untrue. In the old days, fighting could have been going on for days or weeks before a declaration of war could be made. We are all aware that the Battle of New Orleans was fought two weeks after the War of 1812 had already ended.

The real situation is exactly the opposite. The congress can be assembled, fully informed, within the day of any incident. It is easier, not harder, to formally declare congressional support for a military action. People are used to hearing the word "faster" in connection with modern technology, so as soon as someone says this is an excuse for not consulting congress, our mindless political commentators, and our mindless people, accept the word without any thought.

It isn't true, that's all.

IF IT'S RESPECTABLE, IT'S STEALABLE

Poor Gingrich. All his revolutionary ideas either 1) were abandoned, or 2) became Clinton programs. Get used to it. As long as conservatism is respectable, that is going to happen to every conservative leader.

Respectable conservatives are always upset because liberals, they say, steal their ideas. But the only initiatives respectable conservatives will pursue are those which do not offend liberals. If they work, and they do not offend liberals, then liberals adopt them. This seems a rather obvious conclusion.

If a conservative initiative is one liberals cannot adopt, they scare respectable conservatives away from it by declaring it unrespectable.

One of the most obvious things the new congress could have done in 1995 was to abolish the National Endowment for the Arts. The NEA had financed obscenity, and, in any case, what on earth are bureaucrats doing financing what the government decides is art? If the government is allowed to define what "art" is, what can it not define for us?

The NEA is tiny, but the symbolism is important. So conservatives wanted it done away with, pronto. Note that, after two full terms with a Republican majority in congress, I refer to the NEA in the present tense.

Once the Democrats pulled out their big guns on the talk shows, Republicans backed down on the NEA. Cutting funding for the arts would make respectables look unsophisticated.

I once held a joint press conference in Washington for Boston antibusing marchers and Kanawha County anti-textbook protesters. We brought together two grass roots protests against the Washington education establishment, and several congressmen addressed us. Republicans said busing didn't end because Peter Rodino, Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, would not let antibusing bills reach the House floor.

Rodino has been out a long, long time, and the buses still roll.

And when proposals came up to do away with racial quotas in hiring, liberals threatened to call Republicans naziswhowanttokillsixmillionjews, "racists," and "divisive." So Republicans backed down.

So when the English-only initiatives got popular support and were put on the ballot in California, respectable conservatives were threatened with being called "divisive," "racist," and naziswhowanttokillsixmillionjews.

So Republicans backed down on the English only initiatives.

So when proposals reached the California ballot to cut illegal aliens off the public dole, liberals threatened to call conservatives "divisive," "racist," and naziswhowanttokillsixmillionjews.

So conservative respectables backed down on cutting illegal aliens off from US-taxpayer-financed benefits.

All three of these initiatives passed overwhelmingly by popular vote in California. So Republicans just lost the governorship in California. Democrats control both Houses of the legislature in California. When reapportionment takes place in California, where about an eighth of the entire US House will be elected in the next decade, Democrats will control it.

As for federally financed dirty textbooks, if the Republicans don't have the guts to challenge the bureaucrats defining "art," how could they possibly question their definition of education?

Before we condemn conservative respectables as lacking raw guts, let's look at what they had the courage to propose.

In 1992, Ross Perot won 19% of the national vote, the largest third-party vote in this century. Perot's big demand was a balanced budget.

In 1994, Republicans had the courage to formulate a novel objective: a balanced budget.

Republicans got a lot of votes demanding a balanced budget, so Clinton went along with it.

No problem.

Dole screamed bloody murder in 1996, saying Clinton had "stolen" the balanced budget. The point is, if the only thing Dole had guts enough to propose were things respectable liberals could adopt, why shouldn't Democrats adopt them?

Conservative respectability is, by definition, unable to do anything that the left cannot scare them away from or adopt itself.

EUROPEAN OPINION

Once again, during the Clinton crisis, we are being told how Europe is looking down on us. We are told that those Europeans are really sophisticated, and we're not.

Thank God.

There is a particular segment of European opinion leftists love and are always referring to this way. These are the Europeans who see themselves as fashionable and intellectual. They are almost never right about anything.

What is never mentioned is what all that sophisticated European opinion has done to Europe. It hasn't been that long since Europe was still cleaning the blood off its streets from the results of its own wisdom. Twice. European wisdom, in the form of "balance of power," gave us World War I. Then, after that bloodbath and wiping out a generation of its sons, European sophistication handled the peace so well they got World War II. At the end of the second slaughter, European intellectuals had another hero -- Joseph Stalin.

And the only reason all those brilliant European socialist intellectuals aren't standing in Communist bread lines today is because middle Americans weren't stupid enough to trust Stalin.

European "intellectuals," the most sophisticated of the sophisticated Europeans, worshipped Uncle Joe. Almost every single trendy European movie producer or university professor was either an outright Communist or a strong sympathizer. French intellectuals were famous for being Marxists.

As Communism was collapsing of its own silliness, they claimed they had been suddenly turned off on Communism because they read Solzhenitsyn. These geniuses had the Berlin Wall and walls around every Communist state to look at, but they didn't get it. But it is critical to remember that Communism, a theory so beloved of sophisticated European intellectual leaders, did not collapse because it was brutal. This idol of those smart European opinion leaders collapsed because it was SILLY!

These are the intellectual LEADERS of the geniuses we are supposed to listen to!

Those "sophisticated" Europeans are always talking about how "violent" Americans are. Look at THEIR recent history!

What could be funnier than a group of people who just finished slaughtering each other by the tens of millions - twice - whining loudly about "violence" in America! Americans will never match the sheer volume of violence Europe has had. But Europeans are like good dogs: they kill when they are told to.

That makes it all right, you see.

Killing on command even makes killing "sophisticated." Europeans are, indeed, very obedient people. They only commit violence on a horrendous scale when their betters put them in costumes, give them guns, and tell them "Go kill!"

Liberals like European opinion because it is obedient. When their European "intellectuals" told them that the economy would be efficient if the government owned all industry, the Europeans took them seriously. But nobody out in the American hinterland ever took that nonsense seriously.

When European intellectuals told them that the way to handle Communism was to reason with those reasonable people, only the rednecks and chauvinists back in the American heartland said that was nonsense.

If somebody with a college degree says it, Europeans will take anything seriously.

If you want to know what passes for opinion in Europe, just read the Boston Globe. Europeans and Canadians think like New Englanders, no matter which political persuasion they claim to be.

So now that liberal opinion has gotten too silly for Americans to repeat it, they are using Europeans.

Today, anybody who repeated the standard leftist line on American television would be laughed off the air. In the 1960s, all the "with it" people said that the economy would be efficient if the government owned and ran it.

By the 1980s, no commentator with an American accent could survive repeating that nonsense. So they got Christopher Hitchens, with his British accent, to repeat it.

For all our worship of European sophistication, we do not expect them to make sense the way we would expect an adult American to. In their desperate search for a liberal talk radio host, the media finally found an Englishman who works out on the West Coast. If he had an American accent, his listeners would tear him apart. So every time the media have talk radio people on, they include this one pitiful little Englishman.

November 21, 1998 – SUPERTERRORISM
November 21, 1998 – IT DOESN'T WORK!!!

SUPERTERRORISM

There it hangs, the threat of superterrorism.

You can find out how to make a suitcase-size atomic bomb on the Internet. Russia probably has hundreds of times as much plutonium missing as is needed. Disease and poisoning of water supplies are constantly mentioned as cheaper, less complicated means of superterrorism.

There is no reason liberals or moderates or respectable conservatives would look at this threat. The minute superterrorism appears, the entire, narrow world of liberalism collapses.

As you will see below, the first thing that will disappear as soon as superterrorism appears will be the liberal concept of a society planned on rules set down by social experts.

Liberals don't like to think about superterrorism, so moderates and respectable conservatives ignore it.

Someone once said that facing execution concentrates one's attention wonderfully.

Atomic devices will concentrate our attention wonderfully.

As I mentioned at the Redshirt meeting, the first atomic terrorist explosion will cause instant decentralization. Suddenly, when anybody could carry an atomic device into a community, all this multiracial, multicultural nonsense will evaporate.

Today, liberalism forces us to make heroes of anybody who has a grudge against American society or white people or, in the case of fanatical environmentalism, even mankind itself.

To the liberals, all the other terrorists are just right-wing extremists, but the Unibomber was a semihero. Suddenly, it will no longer be fashionable to treat guilt-sellers as colleagues. The Unibomber will be the man of this future, though compared to his nuclear successors, this leftist radical was a piker. The guy who got his arms blasted off by the Unibomber got his attention concentrated abruptly.

He wrote a book about it, and in that book he no longer shows the usual businessman's tolerance for environmental radicals.

If political resentment leads people to use atomic terrorism, and you say you feel America really belongs to the Indians, I do not want you within a mile of me.

Literally.

Every liberal and respectable conservative will declare that superterrorism will be end of civilization. Not long ago, that might have been the case. But today, the same thing that makes secession so efficient will preserve civilization after superterrorism, probably without too much of a bump. Industry is no longer concentrated the way it once was. We no longer need the sort of huge cities that superterrorists can threaten as the center of our civilization. We can easily spread out and defend our production facilities.

How will we unite without the United States Army to force all of us to be part of a single Union?

We will do what we should have done in the first place. Communities will make voluntary agreements for trade and mutual protection, as the Confederacy will make with the United States and other countries. Such agreements could easily be more efficient than our present bureaucratic tangle of interstate regulations.

Can civilization survive without the Federal Courts to regulate every facet of our social life? I believe so.

IT DOESN'T WORK!!!

Will Durant, writing in 1957, said that capitalism was "the economic system that continued in modern Europe until the twentieth century." In praising an economic commentary from the sixteenth century, he describes it as being "as contemporary as a planned economy and the welfare state."

When Durant wrote that, he was simply saying what absolutely everybody in academia took for granted.

I remember it well, when every "with it" professor told us that, if the government owned all the industry, the economy would be EFFICIENT! Socialism was the way of the future. No liberal remembers this nowadays, and no respectable conservative reminds him of it.

Back then, both sides took socialism with perfect seriousness. No respectable conservative ever said, "Do you mean to say that if the whole economy was run like the Post Office, it would be efficient?" Oh, no. Just like today, all opponents of liberalism took the most egregious nonsense seriously.

And the bottom line on socialism is not complicated: It's silly.

The Soviet Union did not collapse because it violated any complicated theories. It collapsed because the idea of government owning all the industry is silly. Now everybody claims that nobody ever believed it made any sense.

Don't believe it. For decades, every person who was recognized as a "sophisticated intellectual" believed that the only way to justice and productivity was government ownership of the means of production.

All of those highly sophisticated "European intellectuals" we are supposed to listen to supported socialism, or at least took it very, very seriously. All of those Harvard intellectuals, all those social science professors who are still considered our national experts believed that socialism was inevitable and would be a good way to run the economy.

Every time someone tells me to pay attention to what foreigners and "with it" intellectuals think of things, and how silly the average American is, I think of this attachment to socialism. Will Durant pronounced the capitalist system dead, and clearly at the time that was considered a given. I remember it well.

I am the only person who seems to remember it at all.

I also remember when every "with it" American professor and every European intellectual insisted that the only true criminal was Society.

All the way through the 1960s, Bella Abzug was a hard core liberal. She was fighting to get every criminal back on the street as fast as possible. Then, one day in the early 1970s, she and some other liberal females announced to the press that they were the "women's movement." On that same day,

Bella began to point to all those repeat rapists who were on the streets and she demanded to know why they were there.

They were there because of people like Bella, but I have yet to hear one single respectable conservative bring that up to any women's libber.

Pretty well everybody now is down on outright socialism, and rehabilitation as the only answer to crime is discredited with everybody, even most liberal blacks.

If we press leftists, we are told that they were never for socialism. They say that the word "socialism" back then really just meant more welfare. It didn't, as you can see from the quote this article begins with. Somehow, someone has forgotten that that is what "socialism" means: common ownership of the means of production is the definition of socialism.

No leftist ever admits flatly that he advocated something that was silly because no respectable conservative will ever force him to.

If you have a memory, you cannot be respectable.

Then there were the insane liberal ideas on education. Forget the basics. Forget phonics. That's was what all the smart experts - the people we are still paying to be experts - said back then.

We in the opposition said that, if that liberal nonsense was enforced, the kids would grow up illiterate. All the sophisticated people laughed at us bumpkins. It has long since been routine for a high school graduate not to be able to read his diploma.

We are calling in those same educational experts today to tell us why our kids are illiterate. They and their disciples are supposed to get out us out of the hole they dug for us. Has anybody heard any respectable conservative point this out?

Me neither.

Where is the liberal who will admit he was wrong for ignoring the basics? And where is the respectable conservative who will bring it up?

Then there's the absolute holy of holys: racial integration. The rate of drug use and illegitimacy that were associated with black people in the 1950s are now the average for the white population today. In fact, every single prediction made by the segregationists came true.

You just aren't allowed to say so.

Integration has been a catastrophe. Public policy is still essentially the old game of chasing down whiteness: a neighborhood gets a certain number of blacks, whites move out, then busing and public housing is used to chase them down, so whites move out. This is on a worldwide scale. Immigration and integration for the third world are demanded only for every white majority country, but only for white majority countries. No one is pushing immigration into Japan (which is less crowded than the Netherlands) or any other country.

As a matter of fact, nothing that has come down the leftist pike has ever WORKED! During the Depression, running a budget deficit for public works worked, a little. Hitler did that, and he did it better. Roosevelt's Depression was still going strong six years after he took over. But the rest of the New Deal, the part that leftists like, was a catastrophe. A ninety-one percent maximum income tax rate, fifty-two percent corporate tax rates and an expanded bureaucracy kept our economy strapped down right through the present day. And the Depression dragged on, worse here than elsewhere, right down to Pearl Harbor Day.

Saving America from the Depression and integration are the two things all respectable conservatives are required to credit liberalism for. They are the only two things which liberalism still claims actually worked.

And they didn't.

November 28, 1998 – YOU NEVER WIN WITH THE BLACK VOTE

November 28, 1998 – WHOSE ETHICS?

YOU NEVER WIN WITH THE BLACK VOTE

Whitaker's Law on the Black Vote:

If a nonliberal gets a heavy black vote, he already has the election won.

No nonliberal EVER gets a heavy black vote unless he already has an overwhelming majority of the white vote. The term "going for the black vote" is always a code for going to the left. The press is always looking for proof that a winning black vote could be gotten if Republicans would "broaden their appeal to minorities," which means if they would move to the left.

This time, both Bush brothers picked up a number of black votes. As always, this was a byproduct of the fact that both of them already had the election won. But the press, as always, pushed it as a reason for Republicans to head left or "broaden their base," as the code term goes.

The breathless press found another Republican who got a large black vote in 1998. Kit Bond of Missouri got about 45% of the black vote for his reelection. As always, they did not mention he had the election won going away.

The Democrat opposing Bond had won his party's primary because, as state attorney general, he had taken a stand against racial "balance" in the public schools. Even with this, and with his opponent trouncing him in every other category, the majority of blacks still voted for the Democrat.

If he hadn't taken his stand, Bond's opponent would have gotten more black votes. But he also wouldn't have gotten the nomination, so that helps a lot.

So which votes do Republicans stand to get in the real world, those of the white Democratic primary voters who supported the former attorney general, or the blacks who joined the rout for Bond?

For some forty years, I have had conservative Republicans sidle up to me and say:

"This time, we're going to get the black vote."

Back in the early 1960's, the argument for this brilliant strategy of getting the black vote always came back to the Eisenhower victories of 1952 and 1956. In those elections, Eisenhower got forty percent of the black vote, even though he was a Republican running against the liberal Democrat, Adlai Stevenson.

The catch was that the black vote came along for the ride. Eisenhower was getting a crushing majority of everybody else's vote, and he would have had a landslide with no black votes.

If a Republican gets a big black vote, it is because he has already gotten an even bigger proportion of everybody else's votes.

No Republican ever WINS with the black vote.

WHOSE ETHICS?

As Richard Boorsteen put it, "The greatest obstacle to progress is not ignorance but the illusion of knowledge."

There is also nothing as dangerous as the idea that you know something that you do not know. This is most true when you are supposed to be protecting against a clear and present danger.

Today, science is moving headlong into new and dangerous areas. The most dangerous thing we can possibly do in this area is to throw up knee-jerk regulations and act as if we know what we are doing.

When a real danger pops up, what liberals want to do is use it to hire some bureaucrats and regulators. Respectable conservatives, naturally, ask for half as many knee-jerk regulations.

It is now possible for a person to begin cloning body parts for himself. That is, they are just beginning to grow, not identical human beings, but just the part of the body from your body that you need. No more heart transplants. You produce your own new, healthy heart. No more people hooked up to costly kidney machines for years waiting for a dead person's donated kidney. You will grow your own healthy kidney. This would save millions of people's lives, and restore millions more to health.

Naturally, somebody has to try to block it.

Who is trying to block it? Is it religious fanatics? Not at all.

While fundamentalist churches have obvious problems with whole-body cloning, they have said little so far about this process. This is not a matter of someone producing other human beings. It is a person producing new organs from his own body to save his life.

But, to repeat, somebody has to get in the way of this. Liberals cannot allow any productive endeavor to go ahead without their having control over it.

Liberalism does nothing productive. All it does is to regulate productive people. By the same token, liberalism cannot allow productive people to go ahead with what they are doing without regulation.

But in the case of scientific advances in dealing with human beings, liberals are in a bad position. This is not a matter of income redistribution or of defining education. This is a matter of ethics.

The political left has rejected every single basis on which our society has based its ethics. They have declared that all ethical values are relative, that there is no true right and true wrong.

So how is the left to suddenly come up with a code of ethics?

We all know what ethics is. It is a derivative of your traditions, like Western Civilization, or your religion. These bedrock beliefs and traditions tell you how you should behave, and that results in a code of ethics.

The problem is, to modernists, both Christianity and Western Civilization are outdated prejudices.

So here you are, you have rejected all your traditions and your religion, and you want to block scientific advances. Where on earth will your "ethics" come from?

Leftists do what they always do. They simply declare that they are now experts on ethics, and all the respectable conservatives agree with them.

We have an established religion in the United States. To be a priest of this religion all you need is a PhD. Professors of a philosophy department get together and declare that somebody is now an "ethicist." He teaches a course in Ethics.

Voila! "Ethics" is born, without any trace of religion, tradition, or anything else.

What do these new "ethics experts" do? They pronounce on morality. They tell us what we should do, something which our parents and our clergy once did.

Not a single respectable conservative has questioned this new profession.

What does this new Official Ethics do? Obviously, like every other liberal institution, it does nothing productive. Its purpose is to regulate -- and retard -- the activities of productive people.

While everybody talks about how fundamentalists and other religious people are supposed to be in the way of scientific advances, it is actually liberals who are fanatically anti-science today. For every active, productive scientist who is trying to make human life longer and better, there are several lawyers, several bureaucrats, and now some Official Ethicists to regulate them.

Right now, we have what is called the "controversial" prospect of human beings being allowed to replace their own organs. It sounds wonderful to me. Why is it "controversial?"

This new process uses the new technology of cloning, but it does not produce new human beings. I get liver cancer. Liver cancer is usually fatal. But with this technology, I give some cells from my own body, and they are put into the center of a cow cell, and the result is that I end up with a new liver.

"Ethicists" have declared this controversial. Why? I am not too sure. Could it be the cow? Nobody objects to saving lives by transplanting animal organs.

Could it be the cloning? I am making a new part of me. What could be Evil about that?

Could it be that the ethicist just wants to say something on a newly fashionable topic and get paid for it? Could it be that liberals simply cannot stand to have any aspect of human life exist which is not subject to their control?

Conservatives have allowed the Food and Drug Administration to provide thousands of bureaucrats with a cushy living by slowing scientific progress as much as they possibly can, all in the name of the public good. Conservatives have allowed a million lawyers to make a cushy living by getting in the way of every productive activity, especially medical and scientific advances. France produces all of its electricity by atomic power. In America, anti-nuclear radicals openly used the law to make nuclear power too expensive to produce.

Liberals are always talking about how backward the right is. Actually, in 1968, the only national political party which had a specific plank in its platform devoted to "Science and Technology" was the American Party of George Corley Wallace.

Modern science is absolutely and entirely the product of Western Civilization. Every other so-called Great Civilization stopped at the slave and rowboat stage of technology.

A true devotee of Western Civilization, a true conservative, is pro-science. Yes, science can get out of hand. But does anybody believe these so-called "ethicists" are going to have anything to do with reigning in the real dangers we face? Quite the opposite.

Instead of worrying about the real problems the new technology presents, we provide new jobs for leftist bureaucrats.

When cloning first occurred, we had silly arguments about whether evil rich people should be allowed to clone endless replicates of themselves. Meanwhile, the real technology continues on, while we hide behind fashionable college professors.

If you are going to seriously discuss any dangers in the advancement of science, you have to get beyond a People Magazine level of discussion.

There is no institutional substitute for intelligence.

By the same token, no matter how many slogans they repeat about being progressive, the political left always slips back into its natural enmity to any kind of productive endeavor. This makes the uniquely science-based culture of Western Civilization a special target of the left.

December 5, 1998 – A MODEST PROPOSAL

December 5, 1998 – BLASPHEMY

December 5, 1998 – ONLY THE RIGHT CAN INCITE

A MODEST PROPOSAL

The United States sends some five billion dollars a year in outright aid to Israel. This does not include unrepaid loans and a few billion a year more we send to Egypt each year, mostly for their friendship with Israel.

The United States sends an absolute minimum of over five billion dollars a year to protect Israel's borders. The Christian Coalition and liberals say that is not enough.

I just noticed that, on "Christian" television, they just started advertising to get Christians to pay for Russian Jews to immigrate to Israel.

Apparently the Jewish community has no money of its own. We all know that, when it comes to supporting liberal causes, the Jewish community has lots and lots of money.

So this Christian evangelist nonsense of raising money from the Christian community to send Russian Jews to Israel is both typical and ridiculous.

Sillyass respectable conservatives really tick me off.

So what could we say that would REALLY make both the liberals and the Christian Coalition go ballistic?

How about this:

What if we proposed that, for every dollar we spend protecting Israel's border, one dollar had to be spent to protect AMERICA'S border? That would mean we would have to spend five billion dollars a year to keep out drugs and illegal aliens!!

The Christian Coalition would certainly loudly oppose such a proposal. It might offend Hispanics. Ralph Reed and his successors want to get cool with minorities. So it turns out, according to Reed, that God wants him to be cool with minorities, too. Therefore, a proposal that Americans spend as much to protect our own borders as we do to protect Israel's would really upset both the present leadership of the Christian Coalition and the liberals.

That means I just HAD to bring it up.

BLASPHEMY

One thing the reader may notice about my opinions is that I never claim that God agrees with me.

I am about the only antiliberal political writer I know who does not claim that his words are dictated directly from On High.

There is nothing new about the religious right. I remember when the left claimed that everything it stood for was straight from the mouth of God. On the right, William Buckley always went straight to theology to explain his opinions whenever he was at a loss for any rational argument.

One thing I noticed about the religion Buckley and the left quoted was that it always kept up with "the times." Buckley's bedrock Eternal Truth never got out of hand. It never said anything that would absolutely alienate fashionable opinion in New York City.

Unlike other commentators, I have a problem when it comes to claiming God's sanction for my opinions. Claiming that one speaks for God is, if you take the Bible seriously, a hideously dangerous undertaking.

I was raised in a literate family in the Bible Belt. I have some familiarity with what the Bible actually says. This is much more of a rarity than it sounds like, because very few people really know much about the Bible.

I have watched well-dressed, literate, Bible-church people state flatly that the Bible says, quote, "All men are created equal." I have heard people use "The poor we have always with us" to show that Jesus' big concern was the poor, and "Render unto Caesar what is Caesar's" to demonstrate Jesus' attitudes on the proper distribution of money.

All this is wrong to the point of lunacy.

But to get right to the present point, I have always had a clear idea of what blasphemy is.

Blasphemy. Now there's a concept you don't ever hear about these days. The first time I ever heard the word "blasphemy" was when I was about twelve. We were talking about suicide being the only unforgivable sin, and, as sometimes happens in the literate Bible Belt, someone showed me a quote in the Bible about another unforgivable sin. It was called blasphemy.

The point was, here was a quote in the Bible that referred to blasphemy as a sin that could be unforgivable. If you claim you are God, or that you speak for God, you are taking on a supernatural responsibility. I, for one, am in no position to take on that responsibility.

It doesn't seem to bother anybody else at all.

I used the word "blasphemy" in a letter to The State newspaper a couple of years ago. I bet it was the only time that word was used in exactly its proper sense in that newspaper in many, many years. I used it in connection with the sudden conversion of Governor David Beasley. It is hard for us to remember today, but when he was first elected, David Beasley had big plans to be a vice presidential possibility on the national Republican ticket. All the respectable conservatives told him that, in order to become a vice presidential prospect, he had to get that Confederate flag down from the state capitol dome.

But before Beasley could take that flag down, he had to get the vote and active support of people who liked that flag being up there. He needed their support in 1994, to get himself elected. He needed their support in 1996, to carry the state for Dole.

In short, he needed the backing of those who wanted the Confederate flag to stay over the state capitol until November of 1996.

So in December of 1996, Beasley did what every conservative does when he decides to turn on his fellow conservatives: he declared that God told him to do it. He said that, the night before the Baptist Convention, he had stayed up until 3 AM asking God's guidance on the subject of the flag. God came through. That flag had to come down.

The clear implication was that God had told him to take the position he needed to take, and right on time.

Yes, Virginia, that is blasphemy.

I said so in my letter to The State. I have yet to hear a single other person, among all those columnists and writers of letters who claim to speak for God, mention blasphemy.

Maybe there is a reason that folks who claim they represent God don't want to talk too much about that particular sin.

ONLY THE RIGHT CAN INCITE

Obedient to respectable opinion, Britain's House of Lords has just decided that General Pinochet must be held responsible for his government's political actions in Chile. Pinochet was the right-wing dictator of Chile.

The important point, of course, is not that he did bad things, but that he was right wing. During the Cold War, Pinochet and his fellow rebels threw out an outright Communist government and killed its leader. The left has never forgiven him for this.

Pinochet went to Britain, and Spain's leftist government demanded that he be extradited to Spain for trial for acts against Spanish nationals committed by his government years ago. So the left has been after Pinochet's scalp for decades. Now, with the help of fashionable Brits, they are likely to get it.

Decades before Pinochet took power in Chile, Communists held control of a third of the world. They massacred tens of millions of people, they shot anyone who tried to escape from any area they controlled.

Below is a list of the Communist murderers and oppressors the British Government is punishing for their crimes:

--

Anyone who committed evil under the Nazi regime over fifty years ago is still being pursued by leftists all over the world -- with the approval of respectable conservatives, of course. Stalin and his henchmen killed a lot more people, IN PEACETIME, than Hitler did.

This went on long after Hitler was dead.

Below is a list of the Communist mass killers who are being sought for their crimes:

--

I have already discussed the fact that when a black man who hated whites started shooting whites in Long Island, and killed a number of them, New Yorkers blamed the guns. They did not blame the constant anti-white drumbeat in the media and in the educational establishment for inciting these murders.

New York is so routinely anti-white that a textbook was actually approved for the entire New York State school system that declared that ALL whites were racists! It was pulled at the very last minute. But naturally this had nothing to do with inciting the nightly crimes blacks commit against whites in New York.

All those crimes, you see, are not the fault of anti-white leftists. They are caused entirely by by the National Rifle Association. A wife of one of the men killed by the black gunman ran on an antigun ticket and won a congressional seat.

Only the right, you see, ever preaches hatred. Only the right incites anyone to violence. This is the standard position of the media and of opinion in areas like New York. The media say so.

Why, we are asked, was the press so fanatically patriotic in World War II, but could not be dedicated to the American cause against the Communists in the Cold War?

The reason, we are told, is because during World War II, it was clear which side represented evil and which represented good. We are told that that line was blurred when the enemy was Communism.

True, Hitler never did anything the Communists didn't do more of and for longer. But Hitler was a right winger. Communists espoused an "idealism" our left and those loyal to it had real trouble opposing wholeheartedly.

There are plenty of Communist criminals living, and living well, today. Nobody is after them. You are free to torture, enslave and kill, but it must be done in the name of the left.

Israel tried Eichmann for "crimes against humanity." Eichmann represented an anti-Semitic regime, so he was antihuman. So they grabbed him out of Argentina and executed him, not in the name of Jews, but in the name of Humanity.

Below is a list of Communists Israel has punished for killing tens of millions of human beings:

--

Crimes Against Humanity sounds, in practice, a lot like "Crimes Against the Left." The House of Lords, like all respectable conservative institutions, is more than willing to enforce this leftist rule.

December 12, 1998 – OBSERVATION

December 12, 1998 – GLOBAL WARMING AND THE CLINTON DEFENSE

December 12, 1998 – HISTORY CHANNEL PRESENTS APPROVED FICTION

OBSERVATION

Heard anything in the media about conditions in South Africa lately? Me neither. Now, if things were spiralling downhill under black majority rule the way us rightists said it would, the media would report it, right? Sure they would.

GLOBAL WARMING AND THE CLINTON DEFENSE

Watching the parade of law professors and other "liberal intellectuals" going before the House Judiciary Committee to defend President Clinton, one liberal commentator asked, "What's the point?"

He said, "They're all trendy, left wing academics, and so they're pro-Clinton. Everybody knows where they're coming from."

Yes, we all know that academics will take absolutely any position the political left tells them to. Can anybody think of any leftist position that 90% of all professors would not instantly support?

Then we call these same professors forth as our "experts."

Our PAID experts!!

Crazy, isn't it?

Weak, isn't it?

Cowardly, isn't it?

The American people do this all the time, so I do not want to hear anybody talk about how the poor American people are mistreated. Americans deserve everything they are getting.

We know that most academics will always take the leftist position on everything. Since the leftist proposal never works, they are always wrong.

In the 1950s, these academics agreed with liberals that socialism would be the EFFICIENT way to run an economy. In the 1960s, the trendy, well-paid academic experts agreed with leftists that "progressive" education and getting rid of phonics would increase education test scores, and they were dead wrong, as usual. In the same period, these academic experts agreed with the left that treating criminals as Victims of Society was the way to reduce crime, and crime skyrocketed.

And the list goes on and on and on.

We are still paying dearly for every one of these horrible mistakes. And we are still paying those who made those mistakes and they are STILL our EXPERTS!

Yet, while we pay them and honor them, we know we can't believe them, and we show it.

Recently, hundreds of professors signed a paper saying that global warming was a serious and growing problem. This paper stated that the world was in grave danger.

The same old crowd was impressed, but nobody new was convinced.

No one at all.

The environmentalists were terribly upset that nobody took that paper seriously. The left is big on global warming, so the fact that a few hundred more PhDs have endorsed yet another liberal position is not worth a yawn. Nobody, but nobody, takes it seriously.

The environmentalists are FURIOUS!

Naturally, they blame everybody but those responsible.

Absolutely nobody is impressed by hundreds of PhDs signing off on something liberals support because thousands of PhDs will sign off on ANYTHING leftists support.

If it turns out the academics are right this time, but nobody believes them, whose fault is that?

They cried wolf, again and again and again and again, and they were always wrong. If our academic bureaucrats are right this time, it is their own fault that no one will listen to them.

But we still pay them. And it would never occur to a respectable conservative to replace them.

Two of my professors in graduate school later won Nobel Prizes. I taught two subjects at the university level.

Later, I was head of a Research and Oversight Unit for the United States House of Representatives' Committee on Education and Labor. I am not bragging when I say that I found and associated with the few remaining members of the vanishing breed of true intellectuals before they were finally squeezed out completely by the academic bureaucracy.

Today, you simply do not make it in academia unless you fit into the bureaucracy. Intellectuals need not apply.

I have dealt with the academic bureaucracy at a professional level for decades. And every year I dealt with these mindless bureaucrats who are called intellectuals, I marvelled at the unlimited gullibility and cowardice of Americans when it comes to the academic bureaucracy.

These are not intellectuals. These are academic bureaucrats who are taking the jobs that were meant to be occupied by real intellectuals.

In fact, in our complex world, nothing is more important than getting real intellectuals into those positions.

But we cannot have real intellectuals until we clean out the academic bureaucrats.

We desperately need to replace our present academic bureaucracy with intellectuals we can trust. A democracy cannot survive without experts it can turn to on serious issues. That vital resource has been destroyed.

I do not know whether global warming is a threat or not. My point is that, because we have been such cowards and allowed the leftist timeservers to own academia, our sources of information on this issue have been destroyed. We pay these "experts" billions and, when the time comes that we need them, they are useless to us.

This situation will get worse. Every day we face new dangers from advancing technology. But the people we pay to give us information on these issues are worthless. We know exactly what position

they will take on every issue: Just look at trendy liberal opinion and you will know where our official "intellectuals" stand.

This is an increasingly serious situation. How do respectable conservatives deal with it?

They call in somebody with a PhD, of course.

Preferably somebody from Harvard.

HISTORY CHANNEL PRESENTS APPROVED FICTION

In its Movies In Time series, the so-called History Channel presented Mississippi Burning. It's a movie that ends with the FBI agent declaring that all us white people are guilty. They are showing it over and over and over and OVER.

Movies In Time is a series of movies about history. It is supposed to present the movie version of real things that really happened. Here is my Video Movie Guide description of Mississippi Burning:

"Proving once again that he's the master of movie propaganda, Alan Parker presents this hair-raising account of what might have happened in Mississippi in 1964." By "might have happened" is meant "what could have happened, but didn't."

This is about the South, so approved fiction is history.

It is easy to think of examples of this sort of thing. I remember a show that probably wasn't on The History Channel -- though there is no reason it won't appear there. It showed whites literally starving a sick black family that wanted to buy food. It was in the days of the Evil Segregated South, and a black man needed a loaf of bread for his sick wife.

Naturally, the only place in town that had the life-giving bread -- no, I am NOT exaggerating here -- was a restaurant that only served whites. The poor black man staggered in and stood at the counter and begged to buy bread. Naturally, what Southerners did to a black man with a dying, starving wife was to insult him and throw him out on the street.

Please remember that this particular bit was NOT the story line. This was just an incident in the general recitation of the pure hideous Evil of Southerners.

You know, it's funny. These same Southerners were big heroes to these same people when we were storming Normandy Beach in a segregated army. But once we did their work for them against Nazi Germany, there was simply no limit to the insults they threw at us.

Churchill ran into this in 1945. He had been praised and cheered and flattered by Roosevelt and the Communists during World War II. After all, he was their boy back then. He was carrying their fight against Nazi Germany.

But by early 1945, it was clear that Germany was defeated. So the Yalta Conference was held for Roosevelt and Stalin to decide how to divide Europe between them.

Suddenly the left didn't need Churchill any more.

Now that Hitler was clearly defeated, neither Roosevelt nor Stalin wanted anything to do with this little man from a wet little island in the North Sea. As far as the ruling liberals in America and their ally Stalin were concerned, Churchill the Imperialist was now the same as a Nazi.

Today Churchill's British Empire, which was the heroic ally of the left in 1941, is looked upon as a bunch of naziswhowantedtokillsixmillionjews.

And the divisions that invaded Normandy? They were segregated. Today, that means they were the same as naziswhowantokillsixmillionjews.

Just like white Southerners.

From the point of view of Stalin and Roosevelt in 1945, this respectable conservative Churchill had done his bit for what leftism needed at the time, as had Southerners.

Suddenly, we and Churchill were The Enemy.

All the loud praise and pretense of respect for Churchill's Britain and for the South ended, and ended instantly, in 1945.

Respectable conservatives know they will be dumped when the liberals don't need them any more, but they are always shocked at how abrupt the dumping is. As soon as Germany was clearly defeated, preparations began for the American President and Stalin to get together at Yalta. What most people do not know is that Churchill was not even supposed to be there. British reps had to force it.

Even after all the snubs, Churchill STILL didn't get the message! He went to the Yalta Conference determined to make a stand with the Americans to hold back the Soviets. He was astounded to discover that HE was treated as the outsider. The Soviets and the US were talking to each other, and he was just there on sufferance.

Like American World War II veterans, Churchill did not understand that his usefulness to the left had ended by 1945. From that moment on, he was just in the way.

It's pathetic how respectable conservatives are always whining about how the left let them down.

Again.

Remember the shock on Senator Thompson's face when, as soon as the Democrats had gotten what they wanted out of him, John Glenn started calling him names?

When the committee Senator Fred Thompson chaired was assigned to look into campaign financing scandals, the press talked about what a fine, fair man Fred Thompson was.

The senior Democrat on his Committee, John Glenn, talked about what a fine, fair man good old Fred Thompson was.

So good old Fred Thompson wanted desperately to live up to all that praise.

He gave Glenn everything he asked for, time limit and all. Right-wing senators warned Thompson that he was being taken. But Thompson put his trust in his new friend, John Glenn, a man who thought Thompson was great.

I will never forget the look on Senator Thompson's face when Glenn and the media, having gotten everything out of him they wanted, started calling him names.

Respectable conservatives never learn. That's what keeps them respectable.

On a computer newsgroup on South Africa, I saw a piece by an Afrikaner who stated that he had fought his fellow Afrikaners and had always supported South African "progressivism." The leftists told him how great he was, and promised they would support the Afrikaans language and culture after they took over.

Now he is VERY upset. He said he had assumed that the "progressives" were sincere when they said that, after their takeover, they would preserve the Afrikaans language and culture.

He said, in horrified tones, that all support for Afrikaans language and culture was being dropped.

Gosh! Really? The rightist did what the left wanted. Then, once the left got what it wanted, absolutely all bets were off.

Instantly.

Abruptly.

What a surprise!

So after the South bore more than its burden in war after war for the United States, we live in a country where lying about us and propaganda against us is standard practice.

We are treated as enemies inside a country that we were told was OUR country. But now it is our country only so long as we are blindly loyal to Five Words and Emma Lazarus (PLEASE read this October 31 article in the Archives. It explains what a Southerner who opposes secession is declaring his loyalty to.

It is our country only so long as we do what they want done. That is the normal reward for blind loyalty to a system ruled by liberals and respectable conservatives.

Let's secede.

December 19, 1998 – OF COURSE THE IRAQ ATTACK'S TIMING IS POLITICAL

December 19, 1998 – LINDSAY GRAHAM DOES GOOD ON CROSSFIRE

December 19, 1998 – A CHRISTMAS REBEL

OF COURSE THE IRAQ ATTACK'S TIMING IS POLITICAL

On a CNN talk program about the bombing of Iraq, a liberal Democratic senator accidentally told a great truth. He was asked by the moderator what he regretted, and he said, "I regret that there are not more Senator McCain's in the Congress."

How true, how profoundly true! Every liberal Democrat regrets that. Senator John McCain, Republican of Arizona, is one of the Democrats' greatest resources. He sponsored the McCain-Feingold Bill, which would limit all Republican campaign spending. At the same time, the McCain-Feingold proposal would leave the unions free to back liberals with their members' dues.

McCain wanted to take care of smoking by taxing hell out of cigarettes. That tax would fall on working people and give the money to Washington bureaucrats. This time, good old reliable McCain was attacking anybody who would dare say that our beloved president would time his attack on Iraq for political purposes. Like all respectable conservatives, McCain was more vicious than any liberal in attacking conservatives who dare to tell the simple truth.

Conservative respectables like McCain say that if the president timed his attack for political purposes, his cabinet members would resist him and tell on him.

Yeah, right! You notice the number of high-level political appointees who blow the whistle on liberals?

Respectable conservatives especially point out that it is a moderate Republican, Bill Cohen, who is Clinton's Secretary of Defense. Surely good old Bill Cohen would tell if Clinton were doing something political with our armed forces.

In the real world, Cohen would sell out FIRST. You are far more likely to find a conscience in a LIBERAL than in a moderate Republican. Selling out is what moderate Republicanism is all about.

Everything about Bill Clinton is political. Of course this attack took place when he needed it. And nobody around him is going to object.

I have been in high-level political counsels. If you tell the public what is going on, you never get back in the circles of power.

Before you get self-righteous about this, please remember the people ELECT rulers who withhold the truth from them this way.

Look at the women who told on President Clinton. Our beloved and heroic "people" tore them to pieces. Democracy is a system of government where people get what they deserve. But, surely, our noble heroes in uniform would tell if the president put their soldiers in harm's way for political purposes, right?

Wrong.

To a respectable conservative, anybody in a soldier suit automatically attains some kind of godhood. But back here in the real world, the guy in uniform is just another human being.

Nobody, but nobody, gets a general's star in this day and age unless he is an excellent bureaucrat. That means he puts politicians' interests first. It is no accident that the one American general who was known as a heroic whistle blower was not actually a general. "General" Billy Mitchell was a colonel.

He was given a temporary eighteen-month promotion to general while he was assigned to command the Army Air Force in the 1920s.

Mitchell was expected to keep his mouth shut, like any other general. Instead, when he found out what was going on, he blew his top and went public.

No general since has ever done that. No general ever will do that again. And if it is silly to say the generals would tell on Clinton, it is madness to say his POLITICAL ADVISORS would. The story is that they would never, never allow Clinton to put our soldiers' lives in danger for political purposes.

Let us forget for a minute just how ruthless this Administration's politics are, and look at one other simple fact:

Almost all of these appointees are LAWYERS!

Have you ever heard a lawyer discuss the repeat criminals he and his colleagues put back on the streets? He will look you in the eye and say that, sure, they will kill people when he helps them hit the streets again.

But, he will tell you, that's just the way things are.

He will not hesitate for a second to do everything he can to get those murderers, rapists, and psychopaths back on the streets ASAP.

These are thugs, gang. Like all thugs, they use the Constitution and all the cliches, but the bottom line is that they will not hesitate to get people killed, and they will get people killed for far less than a presidential appointment.

LINDSEY GRAHAM DOES GOOD ON CROSSFIRE

Being old and crotchety is no fun unless you get to crochet. But now I have to say something good about somebody. Oh, well. Let's get it over with.

Representative Lindsey Graham of South Carolina was on a Crossfire segment December 15, and he did the best job think I have ever seen a conservative do.

First, let us review what the routine Southerner or respectable conservative does on this sort of program. He crawls a lot. He tries desperately to deal respectfully with the frantic accusations of the leftist.

Once Arianna Huffington took a different tack and knocked the liberal for a loop. When one Clinton supporter was loudly restating the Clinton spin, she said he was "getting hysterical." The fellow stopped suddenly. Like all liberals, the LAST thing he expected was to be called down by a respectable conservative! For a liberal on a talk show, having a conservative say something like that is like getting bitten by a bunny rabbit. It's a completely unexpected shock.

Arianna really took the wind out of that lib's sails.

She never did it again.

Needless to say, no other respectable conservative ever did such a thing again either. A good Republican never repeats anything that worked the first time.

Until Lindsey Graham on Crossfire this week.

To start with, Graham very carefully made sure that, when the camera turned to him, he was drinking coffee. Usually when one is introduced, he sits there with a silly grin on his face, trying to look serious. Graham made it clear he would take all this only as seriously as it deserved.

Bill Press, the Crossfire liberal, is in a constant state of hysteria. But of course no respectable conservative would ever mention it. After all, being picked on is what a respectable conservative or a Southerner -- and God knows it is if you're both -- is there for.

But as Graham spoke, he waited for Press to draw his breath to interrupt, and he said, "Now, please let me finish." Press, of course, said he wasn't about to interrupt, so Graham said, "Well, I guess I misread your body language then."

Press treated Graham as he had never treated any conservative before. He actually let Graham talk.

Bill Press had found out that, if he tried to push him, this rabbit would BITE.

And Graham continued to make fun of Press. Liberals and Yankees cannot STAND that. Humor reflects a sense of proportion, and the one thing liberals and Yankees depend on is that respectable conservatives live and die by the words and moods of their liberal masters.

Someone with a sense of proportion puts THEM in proportion, and in reality, they are very, very small.

When dealing with self-important liberals, it is important to remember that:

"Satan, proud spirit, cannot bear to be mocked."

So Graham's humor was devastating.

At the end of the segment, Lindsey described the crazy soap opera story Clinton had concocted about Monica Lewinsky being a stalker. He ended by saying, "When we get back from the break, I'll tell you how this comes out."

Poor Press. Fortunately, he had a nice obedient moderate Republican to deal with after the break.

A CHRISTMAS REBEL

On December 25, I will be celebrating Christmas.

This makes me anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews.

If I were not anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews, I would not use the "The C Word" here. I would be celebrating The Season, as in "Season's Greetings."

I do not appreciate receiving a card, on the holiest day of my faith, which wishes me, "Season's Greetings" or "Happy Holidays." But then again, I'm a white gentile, and white gentiles don't have feelings, right?

Have you ever considered what a rabbi would think if you sent him a card at Passover that said, "Season's Greetings?" I don't think he would appreciate it.

I am told the people who send "Season's Greetings" cards don't want to offend anybody. After all, I might be Jewish.

A name like Robert Walker Whitaker might easily be a Jewish name, right?

I have known a lot of Jews in my long life. I got along with most of them, just as I got along with most gentiles. But I never met any Jews who were particularly desperate to claim me as a long-lost relative. They are happy enough to consider me a goy, so why can't the people who send me greeting cards?

The Jews I get along with best wince if somebody says, "Jewish person." Subtlety has never been my strong point, and subtlety has seldom been characteristic of people I got along with.

One of the people I used to pal around with put it best: "Greenish means a little bit green. Bluish means a little bit blue. I'm not Jewish, I'm a Jew." The Jews I get along with are JEWS.

What I am saying is that I get along with Jews, or anybody else, who depend upon their own pride in their own identity for dignity. By the same token, I do NOT get along with people whose personal dignity requires them to destroy my holidays or my identity.

Now that we have gotten rid of The C Word, what will be next to go? Nowadays, no business would DARE wish its customers a Merry Christmas. They wish everybody Happy Hanukkah and Happy Kwanzaa all the time, but never, never Christmas. That would be Hitlerite, you know.

But, like all Evil Bigots, businesses still have a code symbol for the Hitlerite Holiday

Despite all the Happy Holidays and Season's Greetings and Happy Kwanzaa's and Happy Hanukkahs, the stores manage to slip in a SANTA CLAUS!

Now we all know that Santa Claus is a code term for Saint Nicholas, a CHRISTIAN Saint. Here we have a store brazenly putting forth a code saint on The Day Of The C Word!!

But we are wise to their game.

You and me BOTH know what they are talking about when they show Santa Claus. They are hinting at The C Word. HITLER celebrated Christmas!! How many poor Jewish children see that Santa Claus and feel excluded from the mainstream of American society?

I am sure that there will be a movement to get rid of that Santa Person. Alan Dershowitz will be brought onto national talk shows to explain how so many of his childhood traumas came directly from memories of that Evil Red Man and all that was associated with him.

This may sound absurd -- for the moment. But I remember when people used to laugh when we said integration would lead straight to racial quotas. I remember when no one thought that a Southerner who flew a Confederate flag was doing anything unusual, much less evil and fascistic.

In the real world, something that all liberals and respectable conservatives say is absurd one day is absolutely required by liberals the next day. Respectable conservatives not only forget it was once considered ridiculous, but they beg liberals to forget that they ever questioned it.

We used to say that integration would lead to removing antimiscegenation laws. But all the cool people agreed that integration had nothing to do with intermarriage. Now respectable conservatives BEG liberals to forget they ever questioned this.

Remember, nobody is as fanatical today about getting that Confederate flag down as Jack Kemp or George Bush, Senior and Junior. And when the liberals want Santa Claus out, nobody will demand it more loudly than the Christian Coalition.

Santa Claus is clearly, unambiguously a symbol of The C Word, and we all know it. It is only a matter of time.

Unless, of course, we drop this nonsense and go back to the old way of being an American. In the old days, you knew someone had arrived in the American Mainstream when they turned the old insulting term into their own brag word.

Like "rebel," for instance.

Yankees called it The War of the Rebellion. They called us Rebels. So by the time I was raised, I was proud to be a Rebel. The University of Mississippi proudly called itself the Rebels. In fact, they got so proud of being rebels that black students at Ole Miss now demand they get rid of THAT title!!

Let me give you a little list. It is a very, very partial list. It is a list of the names that some groups now call themselves. Every one of these names was once used as an insult by their enemies. Because of their pride in themselves, each group took the name and have used it as a term of pride for so long it is now official:

Methodists	Lutherans
Cajuns	Rebels
British Tories	Tarheels
Sandlappers	Yankees
British Whigs	Sooners
Mormons	Crackers

In the days before respectable conservatives took over the opposition, what each new group in America did was to meet the insults with its own pride. The Irish did not demand that all Anglo-Saxon symbols in America be torn down. They added their own Saint Patrick's Day. If you hear them use terms like "Mick," it's as a term of pride now.

We Rebs and Irish allowed them to keep their symbols and we gloried in the words they tossed at us. My pride in myself does not depend on making someone else tear down their flag.

I cannot make blacks feel equal. I cannot make liberal Jews feel American. No matter how completely these groups rip down all of my most precious symbols, it will not make them a whit more secure in themselves.

I don't live or die by whatever term some Yankee decides to use to refer to me.

Blacks and liberal Jews must learn this lesson. Until they can learn to live with The C Word, the Fat Red Man, and the Confederate flag, blacks and liberal Jews will remain outsiders, because, in the end, their alienness is not in my mind, but in their own.

December 26, 1998 – DUMB BOB

December 26, 1998 – FORD, BUSH AND DOLE FIGHT DESPERATELY TO SAVE CLINTON

December 26, 1998 – SADDAMITES

December 26, 1998 – IT IS THE OPPOSITION PARTY THAT ACTUALLY RULES

DUMB BOB

Before his resignation, I referred to Bob Livingston as Dumb Bob.

Robert Livingston has been insisting that the impeachment of Clinton was not just a matter of sex. So now his own sexual indiscretions have been discovered. So he says he will resign. He says that, since he is now resigning because of sexual indiscretions, Clinton should do the same.

Which means it WAS all about sex, right?

Livingston is 1) admitting he was lying, and as far as he was concerned, the whole thing WAS about sex, and 2) he is resigning over sex, though, according to him, that is NOT why he or Clinton should resign.

I was told that new information may show that there was more to what Livingston was doing than just sex. That has nothing to do with the point I am making.

The point is that what Livingston SAID was that he had extramarital sexual relations and was resigning, so Clinton should resign for the same reason. Whatever happens later is not relevant to the message Dumb Bob sent.

In short, Dumb Bob has not the foggiest idea what he is doing.

Dumb Bob is a perfect respectable conservative.

FORD, BUSH AND DOLE FIGHT DESPERATELY TO SAVE CLINTON

As Republican after Republican announced he would vote for impeachment in the House, one Democrat whined plaintively, "Why can't they listen to Bush and Dole?"

Bush and Dole are doing what they always do. Dole is joining with former Democratic senator Mitchell in a last desperate effort to save Clinton. Bush demanded that Republicans accept the Democratic

alternative of censuring Clinton instead of impeaching him. Ford has joined Carter -- and of course Bush and Dole -- in a last desperate attempt to stop the Senate trial with a censure.

Everybody but me has forgotten it, and no one mentions it, but every time there was a confrontation between Clinton and conservative Republicans, Gerald Ford and George Bush would hold a joint press conference to support Clinton.

Not a single conservative has ever complained about this. Moderate Republican presidential nominees are SUPPOSED to stab conservatives in the back. That never prevents conservatives from nominating and supporting moderates. These moderates are always asked to speak to conservative meetings, and the conservatives stand up and applaud wildly, the daggers still in their backs.

And these same conservatives just can't wait to nominate George Bush, Junior, for president. Like all moderates, he will lose the election. Then he will begin HIS career of knifing conservatives in the back.

You can't say conservatives don't deserve it.

And there are still people who say these cowardly retards who call themselves conservatives are going to "save America!"

Forget it.

Let's secede.

SADDAMITES

We are being told that this Iraq attack had nothing to do with the impeachment.

We were also being told the impeachment ought to be delayed or canceled because of the attack on Iraq. We were also told that impeachment should have been dropped because Saddam doesn't understand it. We were also being told impeachment should be dropped because our "Allies" -- by this term is meant those who sit there and complain about our military action -- would not understand it.

The respectable conservative response to all this is the same as always: "DUHH!"

When liberals said they only wanted a brief delay, respectable conservatives did not make fun of them. When they demand delays, the obvious thing for conservatives to do is to remind them of last year, when Senator Thompson gave them a delay. As soon as they got it, they called Thompson names and blocked everything until the cutoff date.

Any person with a memory would mention that. But if you have a memory, you don't stay respectable for long.

So when liberals demanded a delay, conservatives sat there with that look of constipated earnestness they always assume when liberals speak. In other words, respectable conservatives did their usual respectful routine.

So let's take a real, hard look at the dumbass things the liberals were saying this time.

First of all -- I kid you not -- they were openly arguing that impeachment should be abandoned because Saddam Hussein might misunderstand it. He might think we were being weak. So we had to think like a thug, too, you see.

We should only do what Saddam Hussein can identify with. I call this new political theory Saddamism, and those who propose it are obviously Saddamites. Saddamism would be quite a change for us. We never paid any attention before about what some dictator thought of our system, even in a state of all-out war.

There was a presidential election in the United States in 1944, at the height of World War II. In that election, President Franklin Roosevelt could have been removed. As a matter of fact, Roosevelt got a lower percentage of the vote in 1944 than he had in any previous election.

I have not the slightest doubt that Adolf Hitler did not understand why the United States was having an ELECTION at the high point of a total war, an election in which the president could have been removed from office.

Us Americans didn't consider it odd at all.

Liberals say we should now consider it odd to go ahead with our domestic processes regardless of the attitudes of foreign dictators. And, of course, if liberals take this seriously, respectable conservatives do, too. So everybody is seriously saying that maybe we shouldn't have had an impeachment if Saddam wouldn't understand it the way we do.

Certainly Europe would agree with the Saddamites. Unlike America, they suspend elections in wartime. Under Britain's parliamentary system, all elections were suspended for the duration of World War II, from 1939 to 1945. This was despite the fact that elections had not been held for years before 1939, and the fact that the British Constitution requires elections within five years of the last election.

Britain and France suspended elections during World War I, too.

In other words, the United States held the 1942 and 1944 elections in the teeth of the disapproval of Hitler, Churchill, the Emperor Hirohito, Joseph Stalin, Mussolini, Charles DeGaulle, the Pope and maybe even popular opinion in Liechtenstein.

So who cares?

You can get whiplash trying to keep up with what opponents of impeachment say. First, they say congress should not remove the president "because we don't have a parliamentary system in America." Under the parliamentary system, as in Britain, the prime minister who heads the executive branch is elected and removed by the legislative branch.

Liberals say we don't do that here. So we don't do it the British way here. OK so far. But now they say there should have been no impeachment because there is a war on.

In other words, we should follow the parliamentary system's precedent of suspending the system because of the fighting, as Britain did between 1939 and 1945.

What is frustrating is that we all know that respectable conservatives will bring none of these contradictions up when liberals throw up their next new and conflicting argument.

A real opposition to liberalism could take this country over. It could rule this country, even as liberals win and hold offices. But we could do all that if only we had a real, determined, intelligent antiliberal leadership in this country.

As I explain in the next article, the only way to save American is to get rid of the conservative respectables and replace them with a serious opposition.

But the liberals are not going to let unrespectable people unseat the respectable conservatives. In the United States, the combination of liberals, respectable conservatives, and shrieks of "anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews!!" is too powerful to allow the formation of serious rightist opposition.

Secession is probably the only hope for both North and South.

IT IS THE OPPOSITION PARTY THAT ACTUALLY RULES

Whitaker's Law on Real Electoral Power:

If you want to see your politicians in good jobs, you win the elections.

If you want to determine your country's political future, you lose elections, but you do it in the right way.

In other words, political experts concentrate on winning the next election while patriots concentrate on moving the country in the right direction, regardless of what that means for the next election.

You can either hold onto political office at any cost or you can have real, long-term political power. If you want to move the country left, you lose elections by being just a little too far to the left. If you want to move the country to the right, you lose elections by being too far to the right. You keep ahead of the curve, and force politics in your direction.

The party in power is mainly interested in holding onto offices for its members. The party that holds the offices will do anything to keep those offices. That means it will adjust to the direction you set if you are willing to sacrifice this election for long-term power.

We have a perfect example in today's congress, where the Republicans won, and are now only interested in holding onto their offices. The Republican majority has abandoned all their principles so they won't rock the boat and lose their offices in congress.

If you let the other side keep the majority, and force them in your direction, you can rule the national direction.

To cite one of many examples:

The British Labour Party ruled Britain for decades after World War II, but it hardly ever won an election. The Conservative Party held office, but it drifted further and further to the left, so that it could stay in office against Labour.

Of course, if you are the only real opposition party, you are going to win sometimes. The Labour Party won once in 1945. So in 1947 the Conservative Party totally changed its platform to adjust to the Labour position in all important aspects.

In its desperation to regain the power it had held so long, the Conservative Party in 1947 dumped every single major principle it had stood for. It agreed to end the British Empire, to adopt ruinous taxation and to perpetuate the welfare state.

Even when it did win, the Labour Party was not that popular. It was simply the only opposition, and it would not back down. So the Conservatives held the offices and the Labour Party's principles ruled Britain.

Sounds like the U.S. congress today, doesn't it? Republicans hold the offices, and Democrats set the direction.

The Labour Party ruled Britain by ignoring opinion polls. Just how popular Labour was when it won can be judged by the fact that they never won twice in a row.

But you don't have to win to rule. Quite the opposite. George Wallace's 1968 American Party run changed the American political landscape permanently. I supported Wallace, then spent many years building the coalition which elected Reagan in 1980. I can attest that the real movement toward that coalition began in 1968. By getting only 13.8% of the national vote once, Wallace demonstrated the enormous potential of the Wallace Democrats who later became the Reagan Democrats.

In 1992, Perot's 19% showing in the general election actually brought something unheard of for decades -- a balanced budget -- back into American governmental policy. You simply cannot find any WINNING election in recent American politics which compares in importance to Wallace's and Perot's defeated efforts.

A patriot should spend almost all his time studying the "losing" efforts of Wallace and Perot. The "experts" will spend all of their time reverently laying out the means by which ruthless psychos like Nixon and Clinton can get to be president.

And please remember, gentle reader, that it is ALWAYS these "experts" we call on to talk when our national political direction is being discussed.

In America, where would the conservative movement have been had the Republican Party not nominated Goldwater and been absolutely crushed in the 1964 election? In terms of setting our national direction, this "losing" 1964 Goldwater run was more important than any other presidential election in that generation.

Politicians judge elections entirely in terms of whether they win the immediate election or not. But in the long run, it makes almost no difference who wins a particular election.

For the people, losing it right is infinitely more important than winning. The problem is that professional political analysts are hired only by politicians. No one looks at elections from the point of view, not of who won, but of what happened to the nation.

The politicians hire the advisors. The fact is that experts only study how to win the next election, not how to influence long-term policy. So when the talking head "experts" show up on TV, all they talk about is who got 51% of the vote this time.

The faces in politics get all the publicity. So all we talk about is who wins, i.e., how the face we know got into office. But the point here is that that is of little or no importance to the fate of the next generation.

January 2, 1999 - CENSORSHIP PAYS

January 2, 1999 - WHAT DOES IT MEANS WHEN YOU SAY YOU HAVE "A LIVING CONSTITUTION?" IT MEANS IT'S DEAD

CENSORSHIP PAYS

Now that syndicates are taking over local newspapers, almost all Southern newspapers are like The State here in Columbia, SC. It used to be a South Carolina newspaper with our own attitudes. Now it is a Northern newspaper.

Every person hired by The State is a minor leaguer in the faceless national news bureaucracy. Each of these stamped-out little bureaucrats dreams of an afterlife. He hopes that, if he is good, he will die and go to The Washington Post.

Like all good Yankees, including galvanized ones, each of these little bureaucrats accepts every Southern stereotype his betters in Washington and New York serve up. If you are in the South or from the South, any expression of doubt about these stereotypes means your media career ends instantly.

It labels you as a Southern provincial. Every media bureaucrat must assume that Southern opinions exist simply because of provincial nastiness. Once again, if you are in or from the South, you are supposed to be even more fanatically attached to these stereotypes. Otherwise you are a Southern Provincial, and you are OUT.

So, especially in the South, media bureaucrats never hesitate to use nastiness to crush Southern opinions. For example, at the very time when The State was waging war to get the Confederate flag taken down from the state capitol dome, pictures of major independence demonstrations in Eastern Europe appeared on front pages all over America.

Prominently featured in pictures of these demonstrations were huge Confederate flags. Almost every newspaper in America carried these stories, but not The State. To include these front-page stories would require The State to show these lead photographs. This would demonstrate that the Confederate flag is a universally recognized symbol of rebellion against tyranny.

To avoid that, The State simply spiked two major international stories! This was the kind of mind control the demonstration was against. But such small-minded media bureaucrats never hesitate to use

this kind of pure viciousness against what they consider Southern Evil, which has no right to be heard in their world.

But The State made a major error in fighting the Confederate flag. They let the other side have SOME right to object. They were absolutely one-sided and bent over backwards to give anti-flag people all the advantages. But they did publish letters on the pro-flag side. So they lost.

On another issue, The State fought desperately against "right to carry" gun permits. This law, adopted by some 42 of 50 states, allows a person to have a gun permit if he qualifies for it by taking a course and passing a rigid, three-month background check. Before "right to carry" laws, a gun permit was entirely a matter of political pull. You gave money to your sheriff's election campaign or you had other connections, and you got a permit. No other qualifications were required.

As Southerners, we were very much in favor of the right to bear arms. New York and Washington are against it. So The State is against it. The State declared that if people without political connections were allowed to get permits, blood would flow in the streets.

"Dodge City"! was what every major member of the news bureaucracy screamed in The Washington Post and The New York Times. So the little media bureaucrats at The State screamed "Dodge City"! Of course, despite the fact that these permits have been issued by the tens of thousands all over America for years, nothing of the sort has happened.

But the media bureaucrats ignored that, as did their big brothers in the big cities. Once again, The State took a media bureaucrat position that made no sense. And once again, because they allowed some opposition to be heard, they lost. Once again, The State favored everyone who was against "right to carry."

Of course The State printed one editorial after another which was a straight copy of editorials in The Washington Post, The New York Times and anything else by the top media bureaucrats they worship. Of course Arail had cartoons picturing "right to carry" advocates as evil, fascistic, and, above all, Provincial.

But The State allowed some opposition to be expressed in its pages. And, once again, The State lost in its battle against Evil Southern Provincialism. The State lost these two battles because it allowed the other side to speak out.

By the time they got to a third issue, they were tired of getting beaten. So they went to straight censorship. And this time, they won. Every state that ratified the Bill of Rights had and enforced an antiscegenation law. Every state but one which ratified the Fourteenth Amendment had and enforced an antiscegenation law. The congress which proposed the Fourteenth Amendment had and enforced an antiscegenation law in the District of Columbia.

So in the 1960s, the federal courts declared that the Bill of Rights and the Fourteenth Amendment outlawed antiscegenation laws. The State wanted South Carolina voters to approve this court decision by taking the antiscegenation law out of the state constitution in the November ballot. The State had editorials demanding this. It printed letters to the editor demanding that South Carolinians get rid of antiscegenation provisions inside thick lines around them to draw special attention to them. This was what The State routinely does when it fights Evil Southern Provincialism.

But it took another step: The State banned all opposition from its pages. Not one word of opposition to ratifying the court's unconstitutional decision was allowed. Every letter I had written to The State previously had been published. I wrote two letters on this subject. The State did not even bother to send my letters back or openly reject them.

I called the guy in charge of the The State editorial page letters. He was forced to answer, and pleaded complete ignorance of the whole process. I sent him another letter, as I had sent the two earlier ones, both by email and regular mail. He admitted he had gotten them, but he refused even to reject them. He sounded like the operatives for Communist governments I dealt with in Eastern Europe. The proposition won, 62% to 38%. No opposition had been allowed anywhere.

And no one but Robert Whitaker has said one single word about this. To this day, absolutely nobody anywhere but me has said a word about this complete and blatant censorship. And I am NOT going to let it go.

So, now that South Carolina has agreed to the 1968 court decision removing all antimiscegenation laws in the teeth of constitutional intent, there are three lessons I want everybody to recognize:

First, South Carolinians have no right to question ANY Federal court decision. We have ratified the proposition that the court can decide anything it wants to without any reference to original intent.

The second lesson is that the media bureaucracy can win if it uses outright censorship.

The third lesson is that, if outright censorship is used on a really Politically Incorrect issue like this, absolutely no one but me will object to it. So censorship works in South Carolina. And South Carolinians don't even have the guts to object to it.

WHAT DOES IT MEANS WHEN YOU SAY YOU HAVE "A LIVING CONSTITUTION?" IT MEANS IT'S DEAD

The Constitution is very specific about what the Senate is to do once the House of Representatives has impeached the president. The House impeaches, or indicts, and the Senate conducts the trial.

Period.

But the usual people, Republican ex-presidents, Democratic liberals, and respectable conservatives, are all saying the Senate doesn't have to conduct a trial. They demand a censure or something. They say that the old, dead words of the Constitution are not binding. That is because those who wrote the old document are dead, and we have a "Living Constitution."

The twentieth century is full of "Living Constitutions."

In 1936, Joseph Stalin promulgated a new Soviet Constitution. In comparison with the words of that Soviet Constitution of 1936, the United States Constitution looks totally undemocratic. The Stalinist Constitution of 1936 contains a ringing endorsement of free speech and a long list of other freedoms. Its guarantees of freedom are absolutely poetic, and perfectly ironclad.

The 1936 Soviet Constitution declares absolute sovereignty for local government, even including the right to secede! Those who have read it are always impressed by the long list of rights that are guaranteed. It also contains repeated assurances of every Soviet citizen's personal safety.

So much for the words. Now for the music.

Before, during, and after 1936, people were snatched from their homes and sent off to die in Siberian work camps, by the TENS OF MILLIONS.

So how did the millions of Stalinists in the United States and Europe justify all that horror and hold up the Stalinist Constitution as an ideal document at the same time?

They pointed out that, while we bourgeois types might think Stalin was doing things his Constitution forbade, that was because we did not understand the Marxist Interpretation of that Constitution.

Yes, that is EXACTLY what they said! Sounds familiar, doesn't it?

You see, the Stalinist Constitution was a "Living Document." That is to say, the government was not bound by the mere verbiage in a document as you or I might understand it. The leaders of the Soviet Union were free to adjust their interpretation of that document to the times and to Marxist Reality.

So after 1936 Stalin continued a slaughter larger than Hitler's. And Stalin's slaughter was no War Crime. It was just as massive IN PEACETIME as it was in wartime!

Speaking of Hitler, one thing most people don't know about him was that his entire Third Reich was perfectly constitutional. The Weimar Constitution of Germany was written right after World War I, and established Germany as a democracy. Until May 8, 1945, the Weimar Constitution was still in force. All of Hitler's actions were conducted under that document.

You see, there was one little provision in the Weimar Constitution which allowed for the indefinite imposition of emergency powers. So Hitler did not nullify the democratic Weimar Constitution when he took power. He merely INTERPRETED it. Using that Constitution, Hitler simply had the Parliament give him absolute emergency powers after the Reichstag Fire.

True, everybody knew that the writers of the Weimar Constitution did not mean for it to justify a permanent dictatorship. But Hitler adjusted the words to his new and modern age.

Sound familiar?

Let us say that you and I have worked hard together to accumulate some assets. We sit down and make up a very, very serious contract between us for the conduct of business in the future. Obviously, since so much is at stake and it was so hard for us to make this agreement, we make any changes in it very hard. It goes without saying that we are very, very specific about how it can be amended, changed, or, if you like, "interpreted" differently. A few years later, you decide you want more. You get very large, paid thugs to back you up, and you make whatever changes you decide are fair.

So you declare that what we really have is not just a bunch of old dead words on a piece of paper. What we have is "A Living Contract."

I would say that what we now have is no contract at all. I would call you a thug. And I would not appreciate it if someone agreed with you that you were doing the right thing.

And I would think it was crazy if the same people who agreed with you and the other thugs today started getting mad at you for being a thug tomorrow.

It is therefore amusing to hear respectable conservatives accusing Clinton of violating his oath "to protect and defend the Constitution."

WHAT Constitution? Every single respectable conservative has long since agreed that the United States Constitution is nothing but the opinion of nine lawyers sitting in Washington wearing black robes. Nobody can take the idea of a United States Constitution seriously if he goes along with the court's decision to strike down all state antiscegenation laws, for example.

In striking down state antiscegenation laws, the Supreme Court declared openly, and once and for all, that any hint of original intent meant nothing whatsoever. To accept that decision is to reject original intent absolutely.

And ALL respectable conservatives not only accept that decision, but try to prove they are more fanatically in favor of it than any liberal who was ever born. Racial intermarriage is critical to liberals, so respectable conservatives do not hesitate to toss the Constitution into the toilet for it.

A "Living Constitution" is sillier than a joke. It is an oxymoron.

And every single respectable conservative demands a "Living Constitution" when it comes to things liberals really want, like racial intermarriage.

It is important to make all these points before one discusses anything to do with this mythical "United States Constitution."

A new wrinkle has developed in the very unfunny joke that calls itself "constitutional law" in the United States. The "dead words" of the old document contain a provision in Article I that makes the Congress the sole judge of the qualifications of its own members. The Congress, for example, may censure its own members.

When the Congress found it couldn't actually impeach Andrew Jackson, as required by the Constitution, it decided to censure him. Jackson pointed out that that was unconstitutional, since it did not give him the right to argue back. More important, it did not carry the enormous gravity of a vote for impeachment.

Censure of its members is part of Congress's job of judging its own members. There is no provision for congress to judge the qualifications of a sitting president, except for impeachment.

Now, congress can DENOUNCE the president. Congress can DENOUNCE the Pope. Congress can denounce Sasquatch if it wants to.

But a censure, in the same sense as censuring a member of congress, is a different matter altogether.

January 9, 1999 – OBSERVATION

January 9, 1999 - ONLY THE LEFT CAN "LEAD"

January 9, 1999 - THE WAY TO RUIN: BEING "THE WORLD'S LAST REMAINING SUPERPOWER"

OBSERVATION

Commenting on Jefferson's reputed mulatto offspring, one editorial writer said that, "in his older years, Jefferson was concerned that liberation of the slaves would lead to racial intermarriage."

Why "in his older years?" Virginia had had an antimiscegenation law since the middle of the seventeenth century. Jefferson always supported it. Like every other influential white American of his age, Jefferson opposed miscegenation all his life.

At first I found this "older years" business surprising. Obviously all the Founding Fathers were concerned about miscegenation and similar problems, because they wanted the blacks moved back to Africa. Jefferson was always against intermarriage. All the Founding Fathers were. So why "the older Jefferson?"

Stupid of me. The answer is obvious.

To a liberal, and therefore to a respectable conservative, the only reasons to be loyal to America are, 1) Five Words and 2) Emma Lazarus.*

A liberal will say he supports America, but ONLY so long as America exists for the Five Words: "All men are created equal" and 2) as long as America exists for immigration, and lives up to the words of Emma Lazarus on the Statue of Liberty.

These are the only reasons a liberal, and therefore a respectable conservative, feels America is worthwhile. So why did the writer have to imply that, in his younger years, Jefferson SUPPORTED racial intermarriage?

Because YOUNG Thomas Jefferson WROTE the Five Words!

No liberal or respectable conservative could allow himself to even THINK that the young Jefferson was against interracial marriage. To be against racial intermarriage is to be anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews!

It has to be only in his "older years" that Jefferson became anazihowantedtokillsixmillionjews, you see.

I wonder if the writer even knows why he put in those words "the older Jefferson?"

I don't think so. I think it was automatic.

* Please see my October 31 article, "Five Words and Emma Lazarus" in the Archives, top of page.

ONLY THE LEFT CAN "LEAD"

Hysterical Bill, which is what I call Bill Press on Crossfire, routinely resorts to high-pitched shouts. I remember early last year when Matt Drudge reported that Monica had a blue dress with Clinton's sperm on it. Hysterical Bill was actually screaming, "If there is a dress, PRODUCE IT!

Produce this dress or shut up about it!" This time, Hysterical Bill is shouting about how Republicans have decided to end democracy in America by trying President Clinton in the Senate. Press and the other liberals are upset about how evil Republicans are ignoring the polls.

The polls say most people don't want the trial of Clinton to go ahead. But many Republicans want to go ahead with trying the president, as the Constitution says they must. You cannot discuss the subject of impeachment for one minute without a liberal bringing up the polls. He will then go into a discussion of how wise the public is, and how dedicated he is to the The People's Will.

This sounds odd to me, because all my life liberals have been openly ignoring public opinion. They called it Leadership. Back in the days when I was doing press conferences for antibusing marches, we heard a lot from liberals about "Leadership."

The public was against busing by margins of eighty to ninety percent, BUT LIBERALS WERE FOR IT. Liberals said that the probusing senators and congressmen who backed busing in the teeth of public opinion were showing "Leadership."

FLASH FORWARD to 1998.

The public is against impeachment, though not nearly by the margins it was against busing. Liberals are furious that congressmen still DARE demand impeachment. "What," they ask, "Has happened to the idea of DEMOCRACY?"

The public backed the balanced budget amendment by a three to one margin. Liberals stopped it. No respectable conservative will ever remind them of this. Respectable conservatives today mostly support racial quotas, so they will never remind liberals of how leftists have defied public opinion on that issue.

Bob Dole has come out against impeachment and he refused to support the 1996 California initiative against racial quotas, which passed overwhelmingly. The George Bushes are trying to find some unconstitutional alternative to impeachment, and they want to "appeal to minorities."

"Appealing to minorities" is, of course, the code term for backing racial quotas.

Anybody heard anything from Kemp lately? I know he is for racial quotas. But has he said anything about impeachment?

In other words, each time liberals have defied public opinion to push their policies, respectable conservatives end up declaring the liberals were right.

So we have the bottom line from liberals and respectable conservatives: if you defy the polls for impeachment, you are being fascistic and antidemocratic. If you ignore four or five to one public opposition to push a leftist cause, everyone will eventually agree that you were just Showing Leadership.

Watch this closely. I assure you, every time a politician defies the polls for the left, it will be "Leadership." If the right does it, it is being "obstructionist." And, in the end, it will be respectable conservatives who will scream "obstructionist" the loudest.**

Only the left can "lead."

**Please see October 3 article, "Defining Respectable Conservatives, They're Just Bureaucrats" in the Archives, top of page.

THE WAY TO RUIN: BEING "THE WORLD'S LAST REMAINING SUPERPOWER"

The Eurodollar began its official existence on January 1, 1999. This new currency will replace the currencies of seventeen European countries three years from now. As one Dutch official said, this is a first step toward Europe "enjoying the power in the world that the size of its economy deserves".

But Europe is going to have to do a lot besides adopt a common currency if it is to take its place in the world. It will have to stop being a military dependent of the United States. If Europe is to take its place in the world, it will have to stop leaving every serious problem in the world to THE LAST REMAINING SUPERPOWER.

In one discussion about Europe's refusal to deal with terrorism or Balkan problems, Pat Buchanan said, "Europe will have to grow up eventually." Among today's media-selected commentators, only Buchanan would see this reality, much less mention it.

What Buchanan is referring to is this: Since 1945, Europeans have been in a state of permanent dependence on the United States. People who are protected from reality never grow up. This is as true of countries as it is of individuals.

Europe has been a military welfare case since 1945.

Don't let NATO fool you Despite its contributions to NATO, Europe has very little responsibility for living - and living very well - in the post-WWII world. NATO was set up by the United States, and the poor little Europeans were never asked to carry anything like their share of the costs in men or money for the defense of Europe.

But Europe's small share of the NATO burden is the LEAST of the situation.

Europe would not have lasted a month if someone didn't protect the rest of the world from a Communist takeover. The United States could survive economically if we were limited to the Western Hemisphere, to the area the Monroe Doctrine already covered before World War II. But Europe has to trade with the third world to survive. And Europe leaves the protection of its lifeline almost entirely to the United States. When I speak of Europe as an American military welfare case, NATO is totally irrelevant. Europe doesn't even do its share in protecting its own, tiny territory. But in the struggle to keep its lifeline open all around the world, Europe does absolutely NOTHING! And nobody notices.

If the United States had not protected the rest of the world, Europe would have been doomed. But Europe never gave a penny or a man to help this enormous job that the United States was doing outside

Europe. In fact, Europe simply sat back and criticized American policy in fighting the Reds all around the globe.

When the United States based nuclear defenses in Europe to protect them against the USSR, Europeans rioted and protested our Evil Imperialism. When we held the Communists out of all the countries outside Europe that Europe could not live without, Europeans talked about how immoral we were.

Europe said, essentially, "Self-righteousness is our most important product."

This is the sixth decade in which Europe has been a military welfare case, dependent on the United States. This welfare mentality, this utter lack of realism, is by now welded into the European mindset.

In the 1950's, this silliness took the form of huge Communist Parties in Western Europe, and in the 1960's, every ridiculous leftist cause, such as a demand for unilateral nuclear disarmament by America, got enormous support in Europe. In every case, Europe could play its absurd little morality games because someone else was taking care of them.

In the 1970's, the United States, sick of carrying the whole weight of defending the world, cut back dangerously on its military commitment. Europe was not about to question this. And Europe did not increase its own military commitment by a single nickel. Post- World War II Europe reminds me of Peggy Bundy on Married With Children. The very idea of Europe having to do anything for itself elicits nothing but an unbelieving horse laugh.

In the 1980's, the Reagan military buildup helped the ongoing Soviet economic breakdown. It was the Strategic Defense Initiative, what Teddy Kennedy and therefore all the media called "Star Wars," that finally broke the Soviet resolve. Gorbachev simply could not afford a new breakthrough program to match the American high-tech advantage.

So the left tried one last, desperate move to save the Soviet Union: Stop SDI. Every American liberal media source and practically all official opinion in Europe pulled out all the stops.

I remember the last gasp. There was a costly television flop called *The Morning After*, a movie demanding an immediate nuclear freeze. A lot of other shows had pushed this last desperate attempt to stop the nuclear race the USSR had lost. But, even for the leftist media, it was simply too late.

With the USSR gone, as Buchanan said, it is time, at long last, for Europe to try to begin to grow up.

But in the post-Cold War age, there is a last, desperate drive to prevent Europe from having to deal with the real world. Both the left and the respectable right in America support it. Since it is utterly divorced from reality, European opinion is trendy left, and the liberals like it that way.

The American right likes European opinion just the way it is, too. The respectable American right wants, above all else, for the United States to spend lots and lots of money on the military. They LIVE for that. If Europe began to grow up and bear its share of the military burden, the United States could cut back. The one thing ALL respectable conservatives demand is this: MORE AMERICANS IN SOLDIER SUITS. What for? Respectable conservatives don't give a reason. They talk vaguely about "obligation." But what they have wanted fifty years for is more American money on defense, and more Americans in soldier suits. So they want it now. This means European military welfarism MUST continue.

Both the left and right in America have found a slogan to keep Americans providing military welfare for Europe. Both the left and the respectable right repeat it all the time.

On the left and on the right, the slogan they use for their crusade against European adulthood is seven words long.

And here it is:

"WE ARE THE WORLD'S LAST REMAINING SUPERPOWER"

The whole world can just sit back and let The Last Remaining Superpower do all the work. If anything happens anywhere in the world to threaten Europe or Europe's lifelines, Europeans can just sit back and relax. Taking care of the whole world is America's job.

There is plenty of oil in the Western Hemisphere for the United States. But Saddam and every other problem in the Middle East, where Europe's oil supply lies, must be taken care of by The Last Remaining Superpower. The United States will attack Saddam. Our "allies" (what a joke!!) just have to sit back and approve or disapprove.

Which is what our "allies" have been doing around the world for over half a century now.

Lake High has pointed out that many people oppose Southern secession because secession would mean we would no longer be part of The Last Remaining Superpower.

As Lake tells them, "I can live with that".

January 16, 1999 - ABOUT DAVID DUKE

January 16, 1999 - WHY WE HAVE AN UNPRECEDENTED ECONOMIC BOOM

ABOUT DAVID DUKE

The State newspaper just had a perfect piece of straight McCarthyism on its editorial page.

Yes, believe it or not, it was even worse than usual.

This editorial said that some members of the Council of Conservative Citizens were at David Duke's announcement of his candidacy. They then stated that every member of this organization is now discredited. They then listed the issues on which the CCC differed from The State, implying that anyone who differed with Political Correctness on these issues was tainted with Duke's earlier Nazism.

Respectable conservative reaction was the same as it always is. They went to pieces, and are crawling on the floor, begging forgiveness. If Duke had been a Communist, nobody would have said a word. The left doesn't crawl. That is one reason it stays in power.

If Duke had been a leftist, and some liberal group had endorsed him, no respectable conservative would DARE declare that they were ALL thereby discredited. Congressman Barr might respectfully suggest

that, on this particular issue, some of the members -- not the majority, who were good, loyal Americans, but a small minority -- had taken an incorrect step.

But if you commit heresy on the right, you're forever discredited. And your little dog, too.

When I worked on Capitol Hill, I loved to tell people why it was so nice to work for Congressman John Ashbrook:

"When I go to a party and say I work for Ashbrook, every one of the right people goes rigid."

All the leftists go rigid when David Duke is mentioned.

They used to go rigid when Pat Buchanan was mentioned, and that gave us a real alternative. But Pat has now devoted himself full time to being the Personal Representative of God Almighty, and does not bother himself with our mere earthly concerns any more.

The left's attitude toward Buchanan is now quite simple: he is a harmless religious nutcase. So they let him rave on.

Now the only real alternative the system offers to the melting pot is David Duke. The only person the system gives us who openly worries about the fate of my race is David Duke.

So if the system offers us no other alternative but Duke, we are supposed to roll over and die, right?

Back when the "peace loving" Nehru was neutral between Communists and the West, liberals said, "That's all right, what choice does he have?"

Likewise, when civil rights leaders had advisors with lots of Communist ties, liberals said, "That's all right, what choice do they have?"

In other words, the left demands that a person be allowed to commit heresy ON THE LEFT until such time as the system gives him a legitimate ALTERNATIVE.

Duke is the ONLY person in public life today who repudiates the melting pot openly. Many of us who are not in public life repudiate the melting pot openly. We want to be represented.

The system is giving me no choice but Duke if I want to repudiate the melting pot.

But if you are not Politically Correct, the system is under no obligation to give you any choice at all. It merely condemns those who accept the only choice it offers them.

So we must either continue to crawl, or demand a choice. We must tell them that, until we are offered a choice, we are perfectly free to choose heresy.

Please notice that Duke scares the hell out of the establishment. If he is so far out of the mainstream, why should his being in the legitimate political arena frighten the establishment so much?

It is not because Duke might win. It is because, if enough people vote for him, the establishment will have to provide us with an alternative to what THEY want.

So where do we go from here?

We can let the liberals and respectable conservatives get away with this McCarthyite push. Or we can exercise our rights as Americans. We can demand that they adopt that "big tent" they are always talking about, and offer some SERIOUS alternatives.

But as long as the Southern Crawlers and respectable conservatives are the only opposition, they will not need to offer us a damned thing.

WHY WE HAVE AN UNPRECEDENTED ECONOMIC BOOM

Dow-Jones is setting new records, and Bill Clinton is getting credit for it. It is time for us to talk about what is really going on.

The stock market has hit another high. Everybody has been watching for it to go into a nosedive for years. As a result, every shock causes the market to go down hundreds of points, as everybody waits for The Big One. The fact is that we have had a boom every since the early 1990s, there is no end in sight, and nobody can understand it.

I propose to explain to you what is going on here.

First, a quick word about why I feel qualified to talk about this.

To put it briefly, I am a trained economist, but DESPITE that fact, I know something about economics.

While I was studying graduate economics at the University of Virginia, I had a total of about eight professors for different subjects. I was really bowled over some years later when one of them, who had been the second reader for my doctoral dissertation, won a NOBEL PRIZE!

A few years after that, ANOTHER of my former professors won the Nobel Prize!

How many graduate students are taught by TWO future Nobel prize winners?!

Why did we have such a mass of talent at the University of Virginia at that time? The reason is simply: we had almost the only CONSERVATIVE economics faculty in the United States!

My father used to say that an economist is a person with a watch chain that has a Phi Beta Kappa key on it, but no watch. In other words, people would be a lot more prepared to say we economists know all about economics if more of us were RICH.

But the fact is that most academic economists are liberals, and they don't really know anything about the real world. As is the case with all liberals, nothing liberal economists advocate has ever WORKED. (PLEASE SEE my November 21 article, "It Doesn't Work.").

Instead of trying to do anything with their own money, liberal economists persuade people to let these leftist economists plan their economies for them.

These economics professors never make any money, but they are always insisting that the economic planning experts they train should be put in charge of planning and running whole countries. This is called socialism.

It should not surprise you to find out that, in the unique Southern school I went to in the 1960s, where the caliber of the professors was so high, that socialist nonsense was laughed at. One of my professors, an expert on Soviet economics, was one of Barry Goldwater's two economic advisors in his presidential campaign. He was an expert recognized world-wide as having changed our whole view of the Soviet economy, and he was NOT one of the two later Nobel Prize Laureates!

This was the main, tiny reserve of conservative economists in America, and you can see that it was brilliant.

To sum up what I am saying here: despite the fact that I was trained in economics, and the fact that I taught it at the college level, I actually know something about it.

One thing I have learned is that you have to ignore the complicated nonsense and try to find out what is really going on.

While everybody is trying to explain the present boom in terms of Optimal Interest Rate Adjustment or in terms of Fiscal Policy, or because of sunspots, let's take a look at the obvious reason for it:

The Cold War is over.

This does not only mean that Communism is gone. It also means that socialism has been overwhelmingly discredited. Even China and Cuba are going towards the market system.

This means economics is no longer the worldwide province of pure nutcases. So things are going very, very well. Now, follow me closely.

You cannot understand politics today unless you understand that liberalism and leftism in general is not just "intellectually incorrect." You have to understand that leftism is SILLY. You have to LAUGH at the bozos with PhDs who told us for decades that an economy would be EFFICIENT if it is owned and run by the government.

Unless you face the pure madness of yesterday, you cannot understand why things are so much better today.

Almost everything in our society is based on the results of our having accepted yesterday's liberal insanity.

To understand our present crime level, you have to face the fact that it was not some slight error in judgment that made PhDs and all those who listened to them demand that criminals be treated as victims. The crime rate skyrocketed because, in obedience to these so-called "intellectuals," we went mad.

Our children cannot read, not because of some highly intellectual error, but because of one dumbass fad after another, each one backed solidly by the education bureaucracy.

In the same way, our present boom is the direct result of the end of an era of insanity. Now the world is in a long, long economic boom because it is rebuilding from the total destruction socialism caused.

For over fifty years, the entire third world, most of mankind, has lived in concentration camp conditions. Most of the world has lived at a level that we would not let a DOG in our country experience!

Yet, even as these people starved and lived in filth, there was plenty of capital in the Western World just waiting to be invested. Japan took advantage of Western investment, and its standard of living soared.

Japan was not only a hungry Oriental country in 1945, it was a BOMBED OUT oriental country in 1945. In forty years, using capitalism, it had the highest per capita income on earth.

In the meantime, the rest of Asia just lay there and starved. In India, democratic socialism ruled. In China, Communism ruled. Throughout Asia, some form of socialism was in control. Western liberal economists were very, very happy because they were very, very influential.

What kept most of the world living in a giant, starving concentration camp?

The answer comes in one word:

Socialism.

We all know that American and European "intellectuals" were admirers of Russia and China, and we all know just how incredibly insane the economic theology of those countries was. Russia is worse off today than it was in 1913.

But the same academic planners ruled in India and Africa and in all of the rest of that giant concentration camp. All their leaders went to Western universities, and went home to plan their economies as they had been taught. They didn't try to attract Evil Western Exploiters who had money to invest. Oh, no, they tried to PLAN their way into prosperity.

So what happened?

Just what any sane person would EXPECT to happen!

Now the insanity has passed, and these countries have been freed from their socialist hypnosis.

So now that enormous concentration camp is trying to attract investment.

As that investment flows into the third world, at least half of the world's economy is being constructed from the ground up. It is a gigantic boom, and it will last for some time, unless the socialists find some way to stop it.

The worldwide boom we have today is exactly like the boom that occurred after World War II in Europe. Europe had to rebuild its entire bombed-out infrastructure. There were a couple of false starts between 1945 and 1949, and then, finally, the reconstruction of Europe got under way and everybody became very busy.

When Europe got around to rebuilding its whole economy, there was an enormous boom around the world.

The insane economic planning of the last fifty years has been far more destructive to far more people than a DOZEN World War II's. We are reconstructing OVER HALF OF THE WORLD from the disaster that insanity caused.

It is a titanic task, and it will keep the world's economy employed for many years to come.

I hope the world enjoys this boom. God knows humanity has paid enough for it.

January 23, 1999 - THE CLINTON SCANDAL AND THE PRACTICALLY PERFECT PRESS
January 23, 1999 - ROE VS. WADE

THE CLINTON SCANDAL AND THE PRACTICALLY PERFECT PRESS

Every person who engages in power politics lives in a glass cage.

With one complete, total, and absolute exception.

From congressmen to lobbyists to big businessmen or anybody else, every aspect of the lives of people with public influence is an open book. Every journalist has the right to know everything about them.

But what does anybody know about the media bureaucracy itself?

What are you allowed to ASK about the personal lives of these people? It is our national myth that politicians are mere humans, but the press is practically perfect. The press alone has no biases, the press alone is incorruptible. The press lives only to inform the public and expose all evil with perfect impartiality.

Because of the incorruptibility of the press, the first amendment protects us all. But no one is allowed to check to see whether those who now own that amendment, the national media bureaucracy, has anything wrong with it.

Not surprisingly, this is just the way the press wants things to stay.

If anyone started looking into the personal lives or the personal political opinions of members of the press, it would be called Pure Intimidation. It would be called McCarthyism.

All the respectable conservatives would agree.

Freedom of the Press in America means 1) the right of the media to know everything about everybody else and, 2) the protection of the press from anybody knowing anything about them.

The press, in case any living person hasn't noticed it, is no longer what it was in 1787. It is one huge bureaucracy, where no member of the press ever reveals anything about another member of the press.

What if Big Oil were taking over every single local service station the way national newspaper syndicates are taking over all the local newspapers?

What if conglomerates the size of Time-Life were in the midst of a national takeover of any other local industries the way the Big Press is gaining control over all local news outlets? Does anyone think the press would assume that every aspect of this titanic nationwide takeover was entirely legitimate and honest and OK? Wouldn't there be at least some suspicion that maybe something somewhere was not being done perfectly?

Wouldn't there be some breath, some small hint, of undue pressure somewhere? There would be a lot more than that. The press would be raising bloody hell. We are having just such a titanic takeover in the national media. Will there be any suspicion about this entire, coast-to-coast, multibillion-dollar process? No way, Jose.

Has anybody heard the slightest hint that the Big Press could possibly be doing anything that wasn't highly ethical?

No way, Jose.

Who is going to question it? Liberals who control the press?

Respectable conservatives who are given that "respectable" title BY the liberal press?

No. No major liberal institution is worried about the tame little cowards known as respectable conservatives.

The national media bureaucracy has nothing to fear from their kept opposition.

But the national media are scared to death right now.

From little Geraldo Rivera, who is on tiny MSNBC trying to become a real journalist, up to Sam Donaldson at the peak, revelations about the personal life of Clinton are causing genuine terror.

Why?

There is more to it than just liberal bias.

The sheer desperation of Rivera to protect Clinton is too intense, too personal. There has got to be more to it.

I think the fear is that, if we lose respect for the president's privacy, we may soon lose respect for the media's special right to privacy.

Under Kennedy, it was understood that the President could commit adultery with a Communist if he wanted to, and his privacy was absolute. At least as long as the president was a liberal.

That absolute cloak of secrecy is being lifted.

The question that immediately occurs to anyone in the media is going to be:

"Just how high is this curtain going to go?"

In other words, "Will I be next?"

After all, there is nothing that is actually sacrosanct about the private actions of the public figure who happens to be President of the United States. Congressmen who got caught doing sleazy things have always routinely lost the next election. The exemption of the President was merely a matter of a custom that was once unquestioned.

But the absolute protection of the press from any publicity is also merely the result of a custom that is presently unquestioned!

One thing no Great Defender of the First Amendment ever mentions is that, when the first amendment was adopted, newspapers were often viciously opposed to each other. The editor of one paper would not hesitate to tell EVERYTHING about the personnel of the other paper. Back then, the public was kept informed on the press, just as it was kept informed on other things. Today's media bureaucracy is totally different from the press that the first amendment talked about. And no one EVER mentions that today.

Members of the press are public figures. Many, many of them have more power and make a hell of a lot more money than anybody in politics. But unlike anybody in politics or anybody in any other business, they do not have to answer to anybody but their bureaucratic superiors.

The press itself faces absolutely no threat of publicity.

For now.

So it is only a completely irrational rule that requires that public opinion about the press NOT be INFORMED public opinion about the press. Discussion of the political opinions of any member of the press bureaucracy is cut short. Their private lives are absolutely private. They protect each other from being questioned the way police officers protect each other from traffic tickets.

The blanket of secrecy that was supposed to protect Clinton is the same one the press hides behind. The media wants things back the way they were. But the modern threat to that security blanket really became obvious with the Clinton scandal.

Matt Drudge came up with the blue dress and would not let the whole thing die. Again and again, the media tried to kill the story. Again and again, the Internet revived the story. With people like that out there, the press could not do its usual job of spiking any exposure about a liberal president. The press is horribly upset about this, and every time media bureaucrats get together on CNN, they bemoan the fact that these people on the Internet will not obey their rules.

It is only a matter of time before even the blanket of protection our practically perfect press hides behind is torn apart by the new information sources.

God bless the Internet!

ROE VS. WADE

January 22, 1999, is the twenty-sixth anniversary of the Roe v. Wade decision, which overturned all state abortion laws in 1973. As always, the professional conservatives who are fighting abortion have the entire situation entirely backward.

Backward, that is, from the point of view of serious opponents of abortion. The professional opponents of abortion are doing very, very well for themselves.

I have been working with antiabortion leaders for a quarter of a century, on and off. I did it professionally for many years. Like the rest of the conservative movement, the antiabortion crusade is dead in the water. The reason for this is the same.

Like all professional antiliberals today, recognized antiabortion leaders do two things: 1) they make statements which give professional liberals something to complain about and, 2) they do not attack anything that would offend or threaten liberalism seriously.

As a result, recognized antiabortion leaders take up a nice, cozy place in our political hierarchy.

Now, according to the approved version, Roe Vs. Wade came as a complete shock to these antiabortion "leaders." The Supreme Court, these official spokesmen tell us, gave them no warning it was going to do something so extreme.

Before 1973, they tell us, the Court had kept to the Constitution. Only once before 1973 had the Court stepped out of line, you see. Antiabortion leaders moan and groan about what they seem to feel was the only bad decision the Supreme Court ever made before 1973: the Dred Scott Decision of 1857.

The wonderful thing about the Dred Scott decision of 1857 is that liberals agree with antiabortion leaders about it. It was a proslavery decision, and all the justices who decided it are safely dead.

This is supposed to show liberals how liberal antiabortion leaders are, at heart.

The liberals just laugh at them, of course.

Antiabortion leaders say they couldn't understand why liberals would laugh at them. So they tried to counter another reason that liberals don't take them seriously: their ideas are based on Christian teachings.

So the antiabortion leaders got some orthodox Jews and Jewish opponents of capital punishment on their side. Surely THIS would make liberals take them seriously.

The liberals are now lying on their backs, wheezing. They can't breathe they're laughing so hard.

Pro-life leaders try so hard to get liberals to respect them, and all they get is more guffaws.

The Roe v. Wade decision struck down all state abortion laws. I have repeatedly explained here that it is utterly ridiculous to challenge the court's right to make this decision after accepting the 1968 Supreme Court decision which struck down all state antiscegenation laws. In striking down all state antiscegenation laws, the federal courts openly declared that they could do absolutely anything they wanted to.*

It appears that prolife leaders would far rather see millions of abortions than criticize the one thing that is most holy to both liberals and respectable conservatives: interracial marriage.

Every state which ratified the Constitution had and enforced and KEPT antiscegenation laws. Every state but one which ratified the fourteenth amendment had and enforced and KEPT antiscegenation laws. The court decided that the original Constitution and the fourteenth amendment made all state antiscegenation laws unconstitutional.

Few, if any, states had antiabortion laws when the Constitution was ratified. If you accept the Supreme Court's 1968 decision, the 1973 Roe Vs. Wade is absolutely and, more important, UNQUESTIONABLY valid.

But the Catholic bishops all cheered on the 1968 decision on antiscegenation laws. Liberals all cheered it on. No respectable conservative, then or now, has even dared to question it.

So, to remain acceptable to the media bureaucracy and other liberals, antiabortion leaders bravely attack the Dred Scott Decision.

Let me tell you a little story about these self-proclaimed Mouths of God who lead the antiabortion movement. They fancy themselves to be Great Theologians.

The Great Theologian of National Review and conservatism in the 1970s wrote a book that showed how the traditional Catholic ethnic groups in the North were morally superior to the Yankees - a proposition I can certainly live with.

But he did not call the Yankees by their real name. He called them "WASPs," which means "White Anglo-Saxon Protestants." To avoid calling Yankees by their real name, he insulted the entire white Protestant population of the South, too. The fact is that Southern white Protestants had exactly the same cultural and moral outlook he was praising in Northern ethnics -- the opposite of the Yankees. When we had lunch together, I pointed this out to this Official Conservative Voice of the Lord Jehovah. He freely admitted what he had said was a lie, and he would stand by it.

I pointed out to him that Southerners were largely White Anglo-Saxon Protestants, but they had the values he was declaring superior, the opposite of Yankee values.

I said to him that it seemed he had not used the accurate word "Yankee" because the media would attack him for it. He would lose his respectability.**

He looked me straight in the eye and said "Yes."

It never occurred to him to change this just because it wasn't true. He was insulting Southerners to get liberal approval, and he knew it. I mentioned this to dozens of other big-time conservatives. Not one of them doubted what I said, and not one was the slightest bit impressed by the fact that someone claiming to speak for God Almighty would stand by such a cheap lie.

That's what Mouth of God conservatives do routinely, you see.

The fact that this guy spoke for God and Conservatism did not obligate him to tell the truth.

I get very, very tired of conservatives acting like Clinton's lies are something special. For liberal approval, conservative respectables lie all the time.

So we have a prolife movement led by people whose first priority is not to offend anybody important.

Just as with the general conservative movement, until the rank and file tosses out the present leadership, which is acceptable to liberals as a barrel of laughs if nothing else -- it is strictly a noisemaking enterprise substituting for a real opposition.

We all know that, as presently constituted, the prolife movement is going nowhere.

In our society, whether abortion is formally legal or not is going to make very little difference. The war against abortion and the war against drugs are different in that abortion is legal and drugs are not. They are alike in a far more important way: both wars are being lost.

January 30, 1999 - ELEANOR ROOSEVELT'S HISTORY-MAKING LIE

January 30, 1999 - DIRTY OLD WHITE MEN

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT'S HISTORY-MAKING LIE

When people complain about Clinton lying, liberals look at them with a bemused expression. When was lying not a legitimate thing to do for any Liberal Cause? Clinton is a piker, an amateur.

We all know that Nixon taped people in the Oval Office. We know that Lyndon Johnson taped people in the Oval Office, and that the god of Modern Politics, John F. Kennedy Himself, taped conversations in the Oval Office.

As for extramarital affairs, Clinton is once again a piker compared to our popular god, John F. Kennedy.

No respectable conservative is going to complain about John F. Kennedy! Every respectable conservative will join in the attack on the Evil Nixon for taping! In a couple of decades, every respectable conservative will be worshipping Clinton, and we all know it.

If a conservative is to be respectable, he has to worship and praise the liberals of yesterday. He must have nothing but praise for Kennedy, Truman, Roosevelt, and all the rest. Liberal programs of the past were good, liberal leaders of the past were good. If your favorite politician of the past was not a liberal, you cannot be a respectable conservative.

By the same token, no respectable Southerner can object to integration. No respectable Southerner can do anything but worship those who imposed it. The result is that both respectable conservatives and Southerners look silly objecting to what liberals are doing to them today. They yell and scream at what liberals are doing, but everybody knows that tomorrow they and their successors will declare they were wrong and the liberals were right. What everyone can see is that they are doing a ritual dance, a dance they get paid to do.

One leading example of this ritual worship of liberal icons is the case of Eleanor Roosevelt. She was pushing racial integration long before other liberals even considered it. So now she is Saint Eleanor, and no one will light more candles to her than a respectable conservative Southerner.

If he doesn't, he won't stay respectable long.

Just a couple of weeks ago I saw a clip of Saint Eleanor on television, presented by the host of Meet The Press. She was criticizing Nixon in the 1950s. Eleanor the Beloved, you see, was being presented by this supposedly neutral host as the judge of True Veracity.

Actually, when it came to brazen lying, Saint Eleanor outdid both Richard Nixon and Bill Clinton! With one big lie, she destroyed the presidential prospects of South Carolina's James F. Byrnes, and made Harry Truman president!

James F. Byrnes of South Carolina gave up a lifetime seat on the United States Supreme Court at Franklin Roosevelt's request in 1942. Roosevelt asked Byrnes to resign so that he could keep Byrnes with him at all times. Roosevelt did not even give Byrnes a cabinet post. He made him "Assistant President."

Nobody, but nobody, gives up his lifetime appointment to the Supreme Court for anything that is not enormous. Everybody knew that Roosevelt was grooming Byrnes to be his successor.

All this, oddly enough, has been ignored by historians.

But in 1944, when he was desperately ill, Roosevelt informed the Democratic Convention, through his wife, that he wanted Harry Truman for his vice presidential nominee. As Truman pointed out later, he had scarcely met Roosevelt.

What happened?

In his autobiography, the former Doorkeeper William "Fishbait" Miller, who knew ALL the secrets, tells us what happened in 1944:

"But what the public doesn't know is that it was Eleanor Roosevelt who changed the course of history..." Miller explains that several liberals had called Eleanor and told her how upset they were by the fact -- WHICH EVERYBODY KNEW -- that Roosevelt wanted Byrnes as his Vice President in 1944.

Eleanor asked who they liked, and they said Truman might do, being not too obviously liberal and being "from an acceptable state," i.e., not South Carolina. "Without waking up the President, the first lady gave the word to the powers that be at the convention that FDR HAD CHANGED HIS MIND and wanted Harry Truman." I capitalized those words to make it clear that everybody knew Byrnes was to be nominated.

"When FDR found out what his wife had done, he almost had a stroke then and there."

Truman was stunned by this nomination out of the blue. He had come to the convention to support Byrnes. There has never been any explanation of how this person, whom Roosevelt had scarcely met, was chosen by him to be vice president. Every other decision of this sort has been discussed in detail,

all the maneuvering over the nomination for president and vice president. Especially when the vice presidential candidate chosen went on to become president. When the choice of the vice presidential nominee determined the next president, you would think a detailed discussion would have taken place, and everybody would know the answer.

But in Truman's case, nobody knew nothin'. Have you ever seen a discussion in the general media about how Truman got the nomination that made him president?

Me neither.

And why did Eleanor's lie work? Why was FDR justified in violating the promise by which he had lured Byrnes from his lifetime appointment on the Supreme Court? Because Roosevelt could not repudiate Truman and declare publicly that his wife was a bald-faced liar.

In other words, his situation was a lot like that of Democrats today in dealing with Clinton. Any liberal today would have done just what Saint Eleanor did. But he will also deny that she did it. He knows better, of course. But, as I said, truth is not what liberalism is all about.

DIRTY OLD WHITE MEN

I was watching a report on the Council of Conservative Citizens on CNN. The representative of the Anti-Defamation League said that the group was "racist and anti-Semitic." I have not heard anyone even imply that they have said anything anti-Semitic.

What the ADL was calling "anti-Semitic" was the fact that the CCC was worried about the disappearance of the white race.

So what the ADL is saying is that anyone who is concerned about the disappearance of the white race is THEREFORE anti-Semitic.

This is a self-fulfilling prophecy. If you use your Jewish identity to fight for the destruction of another group, that group is going to hate you.

Some years back, New York rabbis put a full-page ad in the New York Times which read, "Jews, Be Jewish!" They were worried about the disappearance of Jews.

According to the ADL, Jews have a right to an identity, but whites don't. And they are willing to crush all opposition to that position.

And, as always, respectable conservatives are the very first to want to join the lynch mob.

The day after Don Kennedy appeared on "Politically Incorrect With Bill Maher" for the League of the South, Maher made an interesting comment. That show the next night was about Jews and Jewish identity. Maher began by saying that the discussion about Jews was the continuation of a theme: he was dealing with important identity groups. He said he had had Southerners on the night before, and this one was about Jews. This was a very, very strong boost to Southern identity, since Jewish identity is absolutely holy to liberals and therefore to respectable conservatives. Maher said that Southerners have an identity as important as that of Jews!

You know this is true. I know this is true. But what liberal or respectable conservative would DARE say that? That was a brave thing for Maher to say, because it is a statement liberal Jewish groups would declare to be Evil. After all, it is still traditional for a real Southerner to be proud of it if he is white. Turncoat Southerners deny this, but everybody knows it is true. To the ADL, if you are proud to be white, you are anti-Semitic. The New York-based ADL promotes the idea that Jewish identity is at war with Southern identity, just as it is with white identity.

In the history of the South, exactly the opposite was the case. Bernard Baruch was born and raised in Camden, South Carolina. His father was Deputy Surgeon General of the Confederate States of America. After the War, his father was a member in good standing of the Kershaw County Ku Klux Klan in the 1870s. When they lived in New York as wealthy, highly respectable people, Bernard could never keep his father from jumping up and shrieking the Rebel Yell whenever "Dixie" was played.

Bernard Baruch said the first time he ever even heard of anti-Semitism was his first day in New York City, when someone called him a "dirty Jew." The story of loyal Southern Jews goes on and on. Both of the first Jewish senators in the United States were from the South, and the first Jewish cabinet member in America was Confederate Treasury Secretary Judah P. Benjamin. When I was coming up in the 1950s in South Carolina, the Speaker of the State House of Representatives was Solomon K. Blatt, of Barnwell County.

Down through the years, dealing with hundreds of Northern Jews, I have thought of all this as their militant hatred of the South and white people in general boiled out. The most recent example of this was a comment by feminist leader Betty Friedan, blaming the impeachment of Clinton on "dirty old white men." The hatred of white people, the hatred of the South, all this is routine and accepted rhetoric among leftist Jews. Nobody, but NOBODY objects to it, least of all respectable conservatives. As I say, their only comment is to demand a lead place in the lynch mob when a white gentile gets out of line.

One Jewish man years ago said to me, "Other Jews can't believe it, but I actually LIKE the South." It never occurred to him that this might just lower my opinion of his Jewish friends. I wonder what he would have thought of the South if I had said, "Other Southerners can't believe it, but I actually LIKE Jews!" But then again, white gentiles don't have feelings, do they? So when Maher compared Southern and Jewish identities, he was saying something very important. Historically, Southern Jews have been proud to be white and proud to be Southern.

But for a New York Jewess, it is routine to blame "dirty old white men." I wonder how liberals -- and therefore respectable conservatives -- would have reacted if someone had blamed ANYTHING on "dirty old Jews"? This statement is typical of Friedan, and Friedan is typical of the ADL mentality. Friedan is a member of a group which is referred to by pretty well everybody else -- privately -- as "New York Jews." By this is not meant people like Bernard Baruch and his father who tried to bring civilization to that city from the South. It refers to a group of people which, using its Jewishness as an excuse, are rude and nasty and openly hate and insult other groups. The group that brought over this ugly "New York"-type Jewishness was the millions of Eastern European Jews who came over in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. They brought with them every grudge they ever got in Europe. They brought over their far leftism. They made it fashionable for New Yorkers to glory in their rudeness. Not all of them, of course, but the ones who didn't have that attitude were obviously overwhelmed by those who did.

Today, a major heritage of this wave of immigrants is an attitude of pure hatred for those around them, the hatred demonstrated by the Friedans and the Dershowitzes and a legion of others. They keep alive

the spirit of the pogroms their ancestors suffered, and they are determined to make Americans suffer for nineteenth-century Russian anti-Semitism. Not surprisingly, their gentile neighbors soon got to really hate Jews. Then Hitler came along and gave them a fresh justification for their nastiness and hatred. Anybody who talks back to them now is anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

Friedan continues this horrible tradition of "New York City Jews." Today, due to the New York Jewish tradition -- with a little help from their liberal friends in the North -- the old Czarist idea that Jews don't have feelings still rules. It just rules IN REVERSE: Modern America insists that it is white gentiles who are without feelings. Jews who worry about the survival of Israel are just being patriotic. Whites who worry about the survival of their race are being naziswhowanttokillsixmillionjews. I cannot imagine a policy better guaranteed to promote anti-Semitism. This is why I appreciated Maher's offhand -- and unintended -- comment on Southern identity being comparable to Jewish identity. Maher says we Southerners not only have feelings, we even have a right to an identity. Just like humans do.

February 6, 1999 – OBSERVATIONS

February 6, 1999 - THE LEFT REPEATS, SO THE RIGHT LOSES

OBSERVATIONS

I.

If all men were created equal, an awful lot must have happened since then.

II.

Americans are overweight and out of shape. We desperately need exercise. As an expert on everything, let me explain how we can instantly increase the number of Americans doing regular exercise:

1) Spread the word that exercise is a cheap thrill.

2) Point out that this cheap thrill is sinful, illegal, and fattening.

3) Have reputable scientists announce that regular exercise is a major cause of cancer, AIDS, ringworm, and halitosis,

4) Put on regular public service advertisements about healthful physical activity that say: DON'T DO IT!

5) Increase the price of exercise by ten times, and have bootleggers selling exercise tickets at even higher prices.

6) Make people stand in mile-long lines and camp out overnight in order to get tickets to exercise.

I guarantee that attendance at gyms will quintuple in a matter of months.

III.

LIBERAL THEOLOGY

Loafers get more
And workers less.
I asked the Lord
And He said Yes.

THE LEFT REPEATS, SO THE RIGHT LOSES

The movie The Sound of Music performed a very useful function for the political left. The whole plot revolved around the "fact" that the von Trapp family couldn't get official permission to leave Nazi Austria. The drama was that they had to escape from Nazi Austria over the mountains.

Meanwhile, back in the real world, the von Trapp family just got on a train and rode to Italy.

They never had the slightest problem leaving Nazi Austria.

But in the post-World War II world, when The Sound of Music was produced, every single Communist country had walls and mines at its borders. Anyone who tried to leave a COMMUNIST dictatorship -- and I am talking about CUBA TODAY - was and is shot down in cold blood!

So The Sound of Music said that ALL dictatorships did that. In the real world, not even totalitarian governments like Hitler's had ever done such a thing before in all of history! The absolutely insane idea of constructing a major military defense along all of your OWN borders to keep your people IN was something that began with Communism. Only the left has to kill its people to keep millions of them from running away as soon as they possibly can.

When the left actually puts all its silly cliches into force, the entire population tries to escape. It is critical to the let that this profound historical truth be ignored, because they are still trying to sell those SAME silly cliches today. *

One of the major functions of the respectable right is to help the left keep people from repeating historical truths like this. So when The Sound of Music assigned this completely leftist crime to the Nazis, no one dared say a word.

In fact, as far as I know, I am the only person who has EVER dared to say a word about this. Any rightist who points this out will be called anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

If being called anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews - for the millionth time - doesn't stop the rightist, this will: liberals will just tell him he is being a bore.

He will usually stop immediately.

If that doesn't work, liberals will get another conservative to insist that this one stop repeating himself. Nobody is more desperate to do the liberals' will than a conservative who is trying to prove to liberals that he is being reasonable. Conservatives trying to look good in public are the best friends the left has in the world. ** To be accepted as part of the "cool" crowd, conservatives will cut ANYBODY'S throat. So conservatives never repeat anything that hurts liberals.

What happens if a conservative breaks that rule?

When I worked on Capitol Hill in Washington, Congressman John Ashbrook used to do it. We were up against a huge Democratic majority in both Houses of Congress, and the Democratic Carter Administration in the White House, but we stopped them cold time after time.

In the late 1970's, the BATF under President Carter tried to sneak in complete gun control. They put through a rule which registered, not guns, but ammunition.

When we got BATF representatives in front of the Subcommittee on Crime, of which Ashbrook was ranking Republican member, he asked them, "Is this a first step toward registering all weapons?"

The BATF reps gave the usual long, rambling answer they gave to all conservatives. In every other case, once they finished this ramble, the conservatives would go on to another topic.

But John Ashbrook was different. After they had finished their usual evasion, he asked, "Is this a first step toward registering all weapons?"

They gave another long answer, so John Ashbrook asked, "Is this a first step toward registering all weapons?"

Another long, rambling reply.

Other Republicans on the committee, of course, now began to attack Ashbrook for being such a bore. As I said, the people liberals can always depend on to crush needed repetition are good old conservative coward-morons.

Fortunately, John didn't give a damn what they thought.

So he asked, "Is this a first step toward registering all weapons?"

After six or seven repetitions, he finally got a clear "No" out of them.

Then he put them UNDER OATH!

And, despite the hateful glares of his conservative colleagues, he asked them the following question:

"Is this a first step toward registering all private weapons?"

And they said Yes!

And that particular Carter scheme began to die that day.

The tactic worked. And one thing you can depend on with respectable conservatives: they will never repeat a tactic that works.

Here, in short, we have a major reason why the modern right loses. Here we have the reason that the right will lose EVERYTHING. It boils down to this simple point:

The left repeats whatever hurts the right. The right never repeats anything that hurts the left.

Liberals are always talking about how evil Hitler was. If any rightist says anything even vaguely good about the white race, leftists tear them to pieces by comparing them to Nazis. But when a leftist talks about how "idealistic" the New Left of the 1960s was, no rightist dares say a bad word about it. But, this wonderful, "idealistic" New Left carried around Communist flags all the time!

No rightist ever says a single word.

Now, what if a single rightist group carried a single SWASTIKA anywhere in one of ITS parades?

The left would tear its guts out. And respectable conservatives would demand the right to lead the lynch mob. You see, the left takes hold of something evil the right does, and it hangs on mercilessly.

The left keeps the right in a permanent state of terror.

Just how many times have you heard the phrase, "Hitler killed Six Million Jews?" I have heard the left repeat it about a thousand times, at least.

Now, why do you think the left repeats that phrase so many times?

Stalin killed fifty million people. In peacetime.

Mao killed more. Also in peacetime.

Nobody cares.

But we have all heard Six Million Jews just about six million times. Why? Because it keeps the right in a permanent state of terror. "Six Million Jews" underlies every public political discussion in this country. In every conversation, all a liberal has to do is mention the word "racist," or even hint at it, and every conservative goes into a state of terror and apologizes for absolutely anything the leftist wants him to apologize for.

Why?

Because Hitler was a racist, and Hitler killed Six Million Jews.

Does it work? It's working right now!

We have just watched the Republican Party denounce thousands of its most loyal and active potential supporters, the Council of Conservative Citizens, because of that one phrase: Six Million Jews.

The process went this way:

1) Spokesmen who belonged to The Council of Conservative Citizens announced they believed the book The Bell Curve, which says that there is a large hereditary IQ gap between the average American black and the average American white. As a matter of fact, there is not a single literate person in America, black or white, who does NOT believe The Bell Curve is right about innate IQ differences. It was the fact that the authors of The Bell Curve actually dared SAY what everybody knows that infuriated liberals.

Liberals had said that anyone who published this evidence was anaziwhowantedtokillsixmillionjews. They assumed that they had everybody too terrified to do it again.

Liberals had assumed that ALL conservatives had been terrified out of ever printing the vast array of proof of innate racial IQ differences. So they exploded in fury when The Bell Curve came out.

So, when someone dared to say it again, they concentrated on prohibiting anyone from endorsing it.

2) When the CCC endorsed the book, the ADL screamed that the CCC was a bunch of naziswhowanttokillsixmillionjews. So the Republican Party denounced them. Liberals use the naziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews tactic for a very good reason: It always works!

So the left knows how to use the sins of the far right.

What does the right do with the sins of the far left?

Communists, and ONLY Communists, built a vast defensive work around EVERY ONE of their countries, and they shot anyone down in cold blood who tried to escape from them.

The New Left praised by today's liberals routinely carried Communist flags in its marches. Have you ever heard ANY conservative even MENTION that fact?

Me neither.

Please note I just said MENTION. I didn't say REPEAT that fact, the way the left would repeat and repeat and REPEAT the use of a swastika by any rightist. I just said have you ever heard a conservative MENTION this when a leftist praises the New Left of the 1960s?

Don't hold your breath.

Conservatives are too busy denouncing the Council of Conservative Citizens to mention Communists shooting people down in cold blood for trying to escape them.

You can say what you want to about Hysterical Bill Press on Crossfire, but you can never accuse him of letting any conservative get away with anything the left chooses to call Heresy.

What happens when Pat Buchanan or some other accepted conservative spokesman gets hold of a point? He mentions it once or twice, and then, once it starts to bother the liberal, he moves to something else.

I am not saying Pat won't repeat things. He simply doesn't repeat anything that makes liberals uncomfortable. When it comes to sounding like a religious nutcase, Pat will repeat himself endlessly. It is only when he is making a point that makes liberals uncomfortable that he wants to seem reasonable.

What happens if a conservative does repeat something that bothers liberals?

The other conservative will be the first to tell him he is becoming a bore. If this sounds unrealistic, I challenge you to observe closely when such debates take place.

Stalin killed over FIFTY MILLION PEOPLE.

And Stalin killed most of his people IN PEACETIME!

Of course nobody ever says that. That's my point.

The perfect time to bring up these sins of the left would be when liberals repeat Six Million Jews.

How often do conservatives ever do that?

The bottom line is that the left never misses an opportunity to make its point against the extreme right, and to use it to keep everybody on the right crawling.

Instead of making our even stronger case against the far left at every opportunity, we crawl.

That's why they win, and we lose.

And that is why, if we keep doing what we are doing, we will lose EVERYTHING.

*Please see November 21 article, "It Doesn't Work"

**Please See October 3 article "Respectable Conservatives, they're Just Bureaucrats"

February 13, 1999 – QUOTE

February 13, 1999 - WHEN ARE YOU INTEGRATED?

February 13, 1999 - ISRAEL AGAIN, AND AGAIN AND AGAIN AND AGAIN...

QUOTE

"I would not live within a hundred miles of a damned Yankee."

-- Daniel Boone

WHEN ARE YOU INTEGRATED?

It seems about every week or two Charlotte, North Carolina, is signing a new agreement on how they are going to "desegregate" their schools. This has been going on steadily since they first took care of the whole problem by hurrying to integrate some schools in 1955.

We are constantly asked how the Confederacy would handle "the race question." My response is to ask how the United States handles the race question.

If anybody thinks they know, he has not studied it. I used to think there was such a thing as nonracial public policy, even in a society which contains different races, but I found out different when I got to Capitol Hill. My job there required me to go into desegregation law in extreme detail.

In fact, I wrote some of it.

I was surprised at first at how complicated the whole question was. After all, can't you just ignore race?

Well, not really.

How do you know when a school system is really dedicated to nonracism? Remember that we are after unconscious discrimination, too, so you can't believe a person even when he thinks he is being honest.

There are thousands of school districts in this country, and I can find a good argument in one that another is not doing what it should be doing. There is no objective school to be cited. All cases differ. All school histories differ.

In order to make sure everybody is ignoring race you have to get into his or her mind. Is someone discriminating because of race, or are they discriminating because of what race MEANS?

If you are looking for illegal immigrants on the Mexican border, you will save a lot of money if you ignore blond people with Germanic accents. But the official position of the NAACP and other groups is that you must look just as hard at blond people as at swarthy people, or you are discriminating.

They are perfectly correct. You ARE discriminating.

When a young black man is shadowed by police in a rich white neighborhood, he gets mad at the police, at the establishment, and at absolutely everybody but the people who are responsible for the fact that he is being tailed.

He is being tailed because of all the young black people who commit crimes. The police are reflecting reality. They are not discriminating because of race per se. They are discriminating on the basis of what race obviously MEANS.

But they ARE discriminating.

The police who have so much trouble with blacks are not going to like blacks in general. They are going to have had so many bad experiences with blacks who fool them by acting innocent that they will find it hard to believe that a really innocent black man is really innocent.

Are we discriminating yet?

What about the real problem that a lot of blacks won't try to get jobs with some employers because they assume prejudice? When a black person comes into a job interview, exactly what is a nondiscriminatory attitude?

So you use affirmative action. Affirmative action says, in plain English: you can discriminate in favor of black people, but not against whites.

It is impossible to discriminate FOR someone without discriminating AGAINST someone. But this self-contradictory policy is written into the law, into the United States' "solution to the racial problem."

You think all this is complicated? Wait until you get into trying to figure out whether SCHOOLS are truly desegregated or not!

It is complicated for a very good reason. Race is real, and everybody thinks in terms of race. Nobody thinks more about race and in more purely racial terms than the professional antiracist. Black leaders think of little else BUT race.

The so-called American Solution of ignoring race is completely oxymoronic. You cannot concentrate on eliminating racism without thinking in terms of race. Like all professional antiracists, you soon find it impossible to believe that anyone else does not have a racial motive, too.

Take someone who dedicates himself to nondiscrimination.

The first thing he will do in any group is to count the black and white faces. He is trying to enforce something he cannot do himself.

The so-called American policy on race consists of chasing our tails.

So the North Carolina papers that Charlotte has just signed off on are another desegregation plan that will take care of the problem of white flight.

Again.

And nobody says this is ridiculous.

The nice thing about taking the liberal position is that when it turns out you were being silly, which is always the case, nobody is going to bring it up.

I remember reading the Charlotte Observer in the 1950s, and seeing them announce, again and again, that they had accepted some integration in their schools so their problems were over. They specifically made fun of our South Carolina contention that the integrationists would never, in all history, be satisfied.

They made fun of South Carolina for not following their lead into the final solution to the integration problem. Actually, the only reason they were not having more problems was because of South Carolina and Mississippi and other holdouts.

In 1963, the 101st Airborne Division introduced Social Progress to the University of Mississippi campus.

So, in 1964, with the Deep South finally crushed, racial busing started all over America. Charlotte was all for it.

That was thirty-five years ago. We now have another major program for chasing down whitey in North Carolina.

To me, this program and the Berlin Wall represent the same old leftist phenomenon. Everything the leftist "intellectuals" come up with is a total, absurd failure in the real world, but no one will say that. So they build walls in Marxist countries to force people to keep trying their nonsense, and they keep setting up programs to chase down whitey here.

And the respectable conservative say these are highly intellectual policy failures, not screaming nonsense that should be laughed out of existence.

In the meantime, liberals and the Jack Kemps and George Bush, Juniors, on the respectable right support hiring policies that discriminate against whites.

But these will end as soon as the integrationists are satisfied.

And it goes on, and on and on and on...

Let's secede.

ISRAEL AGAIN, AND AGAIN AND AGAIN AND AGAIN...

Netanyahu has had to call new elections in Israel.

The peace process is in crisis.

The situation is grave.

Gosh.

How surprising.

How unusual.

How fascinating.

Liberals have to be fanatically pro-Israel. A large proportion of their money and their most dedicated support comes from the Jewish community. That means that anybody who is not deeply interested in Israel is anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews.

I watched Robert Kennedy debate the night before he was shot by the Palestinian Sirhan Sirhan. Kennedy and his opponent in the California Democratic primary were both "peace" candidates. This meant that they both demanded an immediate American withdrawal from Vietnam. But what they said in that debate was as far from "peace" as any discussion could conceivably be.

They were not debating about Vietnam. As two far-left Democrats competing for the same votes, they agreed on that.

What the two men were competing for was the large Jewish vote and monetary support for the far left in the California Democratic primary. No one who listened to that discussion would have called either one of them a "peace" candidate. Each one was trying to be harder on the Arabs than the other one.

I had heard many a really vicious attack on the Arabs by political candidates in the past, but I distinctly remember being appalled by the competing diatribes against them by Kennedy and McCarthy on that evening in 1968. I had heard a lot of people condemn the Arabs and demand force be used against them, but this sounded to me like two people bent on something frighteningly close to genocide.

Sirhan Sirhan, a Palestinian residing in the United States, got so angry and frightened by what Kennedy said that he shot him to death..

Having seen the popularity of conspiracy theories about the death of Martin Luther King and John Kennedy, a lot of people are now saying that Sirhan Sirhan may not have killed Kennedy on his own. Before there is any more of this kind of talk, everybody should see a rerun of that debate. Because I saw it, there is no doubt in my mind that Sirhan did it.

Liberals are pro-Israel. Liberals imply that any criticism of Israel is very close to Nazism. So naturally respectable conservatives are fanatically pro-Israel. Except for conservatives who are under a cloud, and are trying desperately to prove to liberals that they are really and truly respectable. They are BLATHERINGLY pro-Israel. The Christian Coalition is more fanatically pro-Israel than American Jews are. No anti-liberal commentator DARES say what so many of us are thinking: I don't give a damn about Israel.

So let me go on record: I don't give a damn about Israel.

There are an awful lot of people that I know who feel exactly the same way.

As soon as "...Middle East peace talks..." is mentioned on television, we all use that wonderful little remote and switch channels. In fact, the better the remotes have gotten, the shorter the pieces on Peace For Israel have gotten. Back when ABC, CBS, NBC and PBS owned all TV news outright, they would have long, long discussions of Israeli affairs, and there was nothing anyone could do about it.

Ah, but I forgot. Everybody but me and the legion of people I know are FASCINATED with Peace For Israel.

How do I know this?

Because I have never seen one single opinion writer on the left, on the right, or in the middle, who dared to say what I just said: "Israel means absolutely nothing to me."

Now, this is a free country, right? If lots of people were bored with Israel, somebody else would have mentioned this somewhere, right?

Maybe, just maybe, we're not as free as we brag we are.

I recently explained that our way to ruin is to continue to be "The World's Last Remaining Superpower." (Please see my January 9 article in the archives, "The Way to Ruin: Being 'The World's Last Remaining Superpower' ")

But we can travel down the road to ruin even faster. The way to do that is not merely to be The Last Remaining Superpower, but to be the STUPID Last Remaining Superpower.

There used to be some rules that everybody knew about foreign policy. To violate them was to invite destruction and, to repeat, everybody knew what those rules were.

One of these rules was that a Western country should avoid getting into "a land war in Asia." As described in the liberal David Halberstam's book, "The Best and the Brightest," the bright young

liberals in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations decided they could violate this rule, and went into Vietnam.

Like every other liberal policy, Vietnam was a total disaster.

Another rule is that you NEVER try to straighten things out in the Balkans.

Europe tried that, and got into World War I. The Balkans have been a disaster for centuries and NOBODY who is sane gets in there.

Then there is the Middle East. Charles Issawi, an Egyptian who teaches in the United States, put it best. In his book, "The Laws of Social Motion," he gave Westerners advice, and I quote:

"ON SOLVING MIDDLE EASTERN PROBLEMS:

God sent Moses, and he couldn't fix it.
God sent Jesus, and He couldn't fix it.
God sent Mohammed, and he couldn't fix it.

Do you think YOU can fix it?"

The United States is still licking its wounds from the Asian land war no Western country should ever get into. And did we learn anything from Vietnam? Apparently not. Now we are in the Balkans AND we are in the Middle East. Once again, the liberals are violating the rules about sane foreign policy that everybody used to know.

We are in the Middle East for Israel.

We also say we are in the Middle East for oil. But the fact is we have ample oil for our needs in this hemisphere. We are in the Middle East for Israel and to preserve EUROPE'S oil supply. We are in the Balkans out of sheer, stumbling, blind stupidity.

Liberals are all for this. Respectable conservatives are BLATHERINGLY in favor of all this.

Let's secede, gang, as soon as we possibly can!

February 20, 1999 - THE FINAL SOLUTION

February 20, 1999 - CLINTON'S ACQUITTED. LET'S GO BACK TO SLEEP

THE FINAL SOLUTION

The United States has a racial policy in force. It is a policy that is aimed at a final solution to what is referred to as "the RACIAL problem."

Everybody knows that the word "race" here actually means "white," though I am the only person who EVER points that out.

This so-called solution to something called a "race" problem involves something called "multiracialism." But this so-called multiracialism is aimed only at WHITE majority countries. It is aimed at Australia, New Zealand, Europe, the United States, and Canada -oh, and Iceland, too.

It is aimed ONLY at white majority countries.

It is aimed at ALL white majority countries.

White majority countries constitute what is called "the race problem." Solving the "race" problem is a euphemism for solving the WHITE problem. As one New Left leader put it in a burst of honesty in the 1960s: "The white race is the cancer of history." For once, the Love Generation spoke plain English.

If all efforts at promoting the immigration of other races and integrating them were ONLY aimed at Africa, white liberals and respectable conservatives would scream bloody murder.

Likewise with Asia.

Any liberal and any Jack Kemp or George Bush, upon hearing about a large white population anywhere, is going to ask what they are doing about becoming multiracial.

Respectable conservatives and liberals agree that the white problem must be solved.

As long as I am the only person pointing this out, I think we can stop pounding our chests and talking about how we brave souls are going to found and maintain a nation.

CLINTON'S ACQUITTED. LET'S GO BACK TO SLEEP.

Virgil Huston is the person who made this column possible. It was his idea for me to do it, and he is the one who puts these pages on the Net. Naturally, I want to use this column to give him some hell.

Each week Virgil sends an email letter to League members. Last week his letter came out the same day as the Clinton acquittal and Virgil was outraged that such blatant lying had not been punished.

Virgil wants us to send outraged letters to Senator Hollings.

I was jealous. I wish I could still get that upset about any extreme of dishonesty in American politics. But I have become accustomed to the fact that there is no honesty in American politics, right or left. In American politics, everybody not only says things that are untrue; everybody always says things BECAUSE they are not true.

"Spin" is everything today, on both the left and the right. Nobody tells the truth. There is no morality at all in our politics, and nobody expects any. There is open amorality on the part of Clinton defenders. But there is blasphemy on the part of our rightist psychopaths who say they speak for God.

For the past year, the American people have said they want a psychopath named Clinton running things for them. The right wants its own psychopaths in charge, the ones who shout "GOD!" a lot.

What is a psychopath? He is a person without a conscience. But he can sure act like he has one. In the course of living his life, the psychopath learns to fake a conscience. A good psychopath is much better at acting as if he feels guilty than anyone who has a real sense of guilt does.

Did you see Jimmy Swaggart's crying guilt act after HE got caught?

Marvelous!

We don't want any honest people in public life. We only want people who say the right thing at the right time. We also want people who do not have any secret prejudices.

A good psychopath tells you just what you want to hear, just when you want to hear it. A psychopath has no secret prejudices. He has NO genuine attachments. A psychopath is the perfect leader for our age, a man with no prejudices whatsoever.

He has none of the underlying beliefs that might be exposed. He has no feeling for his race. He is no provincial, and he will sign any plank you want in your platform without a quiver. The psychopath is exactly what you want him to be.

When dealing with Clinton, I was in exactly the same position I am in when I am dealing with drugs or abortion. Rightists are demanding that I take their position, all the way. They demand I BELIEVE, or at least act like I BELIEVE, that they represent morality.

The right believes it has morality because its leaders keep yelling God. Nobody outside the right thinks we have any morality. We sold out our morality with our prejudices and our personal beliefs. That's the right "spin." Having no prejudices buys you Respectability. We disavowed our prejudices so we could have leaders who claim to represent True Religion.

We have leaders who claim to speak for God, but the problem is that no one outside the right is going to listen to these blasphemous kookoos. They are not only dishonest like Clinton, they are DUMB, which he isn't.

Dumb Bob Livingston was a good example. He kept saying that his demands against Clinton had nothing to do with Clinton's sex life. So when they found some problems with Livingston's sex life, he resigned and said Clinton should resign, which meant that Livingston's demand for Clinton's resignation WAS based on Clinton's sexual doings. These kookoos simply have no idea what they are saying from day to day. Only the right takes them seriously, which is why the right will go under with them.

The psychopaths who rule the right are not only dumb, they have no interest whatever in long term strategy. We need people to go after the left, but the professional rightist's only interest is in keeping his respectability.

The biggest thing that happened in the Clinton debacle was the total discrediting of the so-called "Women's Movement," but no conservative anywhere - but me - is going to mention the hypocrisy of the women's movement in the near future. In a year or two, everybody will have forgotten it and "women's leaders" will be back on the talk shows, so respectable conservatives can go back to respectfully disagreeing with them.

What about some letters to newspapers reminding people of the hypocrisy of the women's movement?

Don't hold your breath.

When liberals get a right-wing group into the position that the "Women's Movement" has put itself into, the left goes ahead and DESTROYS it. And the first group that joins the liberals in damning those groups are the respectable conservatives. (Please see September 26 article, "Respectable Conservatives kill Their Wounded" and October 3, "Respectable Conservatives, They're Just Bureaucrats")

So we can yell about the unrighteousness of it all, or we can try to begin getting serious. We can cry and moan about dishonesty, or we can devote a little effort to BEING a little honest for a change. This is what I am trying to do here.

I disagree with Virgil.** He wants you to spend time protesting to our lame duck junior senator. I think there are about a thousand things that are more important than that to be done. And if we are ever going to get any morality in this country, we'd damned well better get our priorities straight.

I was asked to be specific here. To start with, if I were a betting man, I would bet that: 1) there will be a minimum of three thousand letters sent to Hollings protesting his vote and 2) there has not been and will not be ONE SINGLE letter sent to the State paper protesting their total censorship policy on the antiscegenation provision. (See January 2 article, "Censorship Pays")

The State's email address is stateeditor@thestate.com

The State's postal address is
The State Newspaper
PO Box 1333
Columbia, SC 29202

Another hundred letters to Hollings will mean nothing. A few letters to the State would mean a lot. Both the impeachment and the antiscegenation provisions are done deals, but in the latter case protest would matter in the long run. So, like good right wingers, we join in the protest that doesn't matter.

Why? Because everybody's doing it, that's why.

There is nothing that is more a complete waste of time than trying to save the soul of a lame-duck liberal senator. What it does accomplish is this: It reassures respectable conservatives that we may talk about not supporting them blindly, but when push comes to shove, all our real efforts will go into standard conservative stuff.

I go on and on here about the failures of respectable conservatives. How many of us actually write respectable conservatives about these failures? I would hazard that no such letters are written.

Not surprisingly, my suggestions have to do with backing MY efforts.

Why?

Obviously it is because I take what I do seriously, or I wouldn't do it. I feel that Southern nationalists in general, and I in particular, are fighting a lonely battle here, and it makes me angry when one of us demands that we all get busy backing - ho, hum -- standard conservatism.

****One South Carolinian disagrees with another. How unusual!**

February 27, 1999 - No articles due to technical difficulties

March 6, 1999 – OBSERVATION

March 6, 1999 - HOW TOMORROW'S CONFEDERACY WILL DEAL WITH TOMORROW'S REALITY

OBSERVATION

The United States is nearer a nuclear war today than it has been since the Cuban Crisis of 1962.

Russia today is somewhat like Japan in 1941. Back then, the Japanese Army was actually operating on its own. We tend to think of Imperial Japan as a centralized dictatorship, like Nazi Germany or Fascist Italy. But, in actual fact, the Japanese Army was fighting in China and taking other actions on its own. To a large extent, the Army dragged Japan into its increasing confrontation with the United States.

That piece of history is important to us today. We are dealing with a Russia that still has nuclear power, but it is no longer Soviet Russia, where the central government is in absolute control. Yeltsin is old and sick, and his government is not in real control of its nuclear weapons.

Russia is humiliated and its generals are furious. Our attacks on Serbia, which Russians regard as a fellow Slavic state being humiliated by the United States, has infuriated even Yeltsin. One can only imagine how upset the Russian military men are. Yeltsin has actually threatened the US over Serbia. This is a first for him, one which has been largely ignored here.

This brings up another factor which makes this situation especially serious.

That is the fact that we took the USSR seriously, but we do not take Russia seriously. That could lead us to take steps which would lead into nuclear war, steps we would never have taken in the face of Soviet threats.

Before anyone reassures themselves that Russian nukes are not what they used to be, remember that we have no defense at all against missiles. Russian has numerous missiles for each American target. They may be slow, many may be inaccurate, but there is no defense against them.

The horror and revolutions and slaughter that constitute the history of the twentieth century began at Sarajevo. Sarajevo was in what was then Serbia and later became part of Yugoslavia. In 1914, an Archduke was shot there, and all of Europe got into the act and World War I began. Serbia, and later Yugoslavia, were part of the Balkans, the southeastern part of Europe, east of Italy. The Balkans is an area all sane people know not to get into.

Now the United States is in there.

This century could end in a nuclear massacre springing from the same stupidity, and in the same place.

HOW TOMORROW'S CONFEDERACY WILL DEAL WITH TOMORROW'S REALITY

We are becoming more and more an atomic society, a society in which each person is a separate unit. A person can sit at home with television, he can buy about anything on his computer, or he can talk to almost anybody on his computer or on the phone. Our jobs are becoming more and spread out, and we no longer all go to a single central city for anything.

By the time we attain independence, technology will have moved forward another computer generation or two. If we are to look to our future as an independent South, then, we must think in terms of that world. We may find that our present demand for devolution is outrun by technology.

Instead of having a problem with the basic unit of society being too big, like the Federal Government, we may well find we have problems uniting something as large as the South into a single meaningful unit.

This is a reversal of the historical trend. For thousands of years, we defined civilization in terms of large size. The very word "civilization" means nothing but "city-ization." The history we learned in school ignores the advances made in Northern Europe that did not involve cities. With all the great praise of the Roman Empire and groaning over its collapse, it was the northern "barbarians" who advanced European welfare with a huge leap in the middle of the so-called "Dark Ages."

In the seventh and eighth centuries, these "barbarians" DOUBLED the output per acre of land in the former Roman Empire of the North. Output per acre had stagnated for centuries before then. In fact, there had been precious little advance in this area since the beginning of agriculture millennia before.

These "barbarians" introduced the first real plow. Brilliant Roman civilization had used the same poking stick they had inherited from a thousand years before. The "barbarians" invented the horse collar, which replaced the primitive Roman harness that had been choking horses for centuries. The "barbarians," again in the "Dark Ages," invented the horseshoe and the three-field system.

All that we learn in history courses is that everything collapsed and ignorance ruled when the Roman Empire was driven out of Northern Europe. The fact is that real production and the real standard of living went up for the mass of people.

To us, the development of civilization means the pyramids, the empires of the Middle East, the huge slave-based societies like Imperial China or Rome. Historians go where the records are, and the records are where the masses are forced together and enslaved. All this leaves us completely unprepared to deal with real history.

And being unable to deal with real history makes us unable to deal with the real future. The real future will have little room for city-ization.

Today, the only reason we have cities is because our technology is still primitive. The city is rapidly losing all of its old functions.

I remember very well when you had to go downtown to get almost anything you couldn't buy in a general grocery store. A general grocery store back then had about what you would now find at a convenience store. Any Wal-Mart or K- Mart in a small town today has more than the whole city of Columbia could offer in 1955.

The big cities offered as much as Wal-Mart or a shopping center today has, and they had entertainment as well. But even a big city did not have all that you can get on cable today.

And remember we are talking about a society that is still absolutely primitive in terms of a few decades from now.

There are those of us who will always be dissatisfied if they cannot go to a live play or hear a live orchestra. That is charming and all, but let's discuss reality here. Most people, even the ones who claim all those artistic preferences, will not go to such performances when we get better-than-live performances in our homes.

In the Old South, if you said you needed to talk to someone, it meant you had to wait until the weather was good, get dressed, get out the horses and hitch them to the wagon, and go and see if whoever you wanted to see was at home. Now you call.

Have you seen the New York hit play, CATS? I have. I saw it on PBS, and it is coming out on tape. Actually, I saw the part I wanted to see. I wasn't in the mood, and I wasn't stuck in a New York theater seat, so I'll see the rest if and when I feel like it.

It has been years since I bought anything in the downtown part of Columbia where we used to buy pretty well everything. I simply do not remember the last time I HAD to go downtown to buy anything. In fact, the only time I have to make a trip to buy something is a trip out to Columbia Mall, which is well out of town.

Meanwhile the cities are becoming havens for communities of people who simply don't belong out there in the countryside. "Inner city" has an unpleasant connotation. But the inner city is also being taken over by homosexual communities and other groups who need to cluster. I am all for their clustering, myself:

- 1) I do not want them near me, and
- 2) I do not want them to be miserable, so, in a truly Southern way, I act accordingly.
- 3) I segregate myself and those I identify with.

No longer do we need to live together and tolerate each other for the sake of production or marketing. We will all deal with the whole world from our living room, via computers and virtual reality.

There will be very little you CAN outlaw on the virtual reality Internet. Because one will be a direct part of the world via the virtual reality Internet, enforced "multiculturalism" should be totally abandoned in terms of where one has to live. Since everyone can reach everywhere from where they sit, there is no reason to force people to live in "multicultural" groupings.

In this as in other areas, the Confederacy will first be distinguished by what it does NOT do. The Confederacy will not, for example, begin with the things other countries all did first. Some examples of

the first things we have traditionally expected every new country to do: 1) set up a post office and issue national stamps, a first sign of sovereignty, 2) print its own currency, 3) set up embassies in other countries.

The Confederacy will NOT have a post office. The government-run post office, whether it is run outright by the bureaucrats or is a state-granted monopoly as in the United States, is an expensive, cumbersome dinosaur. Whereas every other form of communication is open practically 24 hours a day, for example, our outdated postal monopoly makes people form lines from 9 to 5 for postal business.

The only reason we still have a Post Office is because we have a law which says that only the Post Office is allowed to deliver first class mail. By simply not passing such a law, the Confederacy will have the world's first private, truly efficient, and TAX-PAYING mail delivery service.

As for money, more and more transactions will be by machine with plastic. But even plastic is soon going to be replaced by handprint or voiceprint identification.

Nor does it look like there will ever be any Confederate embassies. Embassies were developed back in the days when communication was slow, and an ambassador had to reside in a foreign capital to represent his country's interests. Today, Paris can deal directly with Washington.

As Ross Perot has pointed out, traditional embassies are pretty well passe. International relations should be handled by teleconferencing or other means. "Face to face" meetings of leaders are staged affairs, and do exactly the opposite of what they should do.

It would be far, far better if leaders met more regularly by simple teleconferencing.

Our present political setup was developed to deal with the world as it existed before all these changes. Things were organized on a clear, step-by-step continuum. If you lived in the middle of South Carolina, and you wanted something that was available only in Atlanta, you ordered it through a store in Columbia. To express your opinion, you elected delegates from your county, who in turn elected delegates from the state, who in turn went to national conventions.

Now, what we do more and more is simply to email Washington, DC. Under earlier technologies, our work determined where we lived. We had to learn to deal with whoever our job put us into contact with. Now, more and more, we can determine where we want to live according to our preferences.

What I would like to do is to be able to live in a community of people I feel comfortable with, regardless of how that may upset Politically Correct people. In earlier ages, this would have limited a number of my horizons.

In a few years, I can have all the advantages of dealing with any kind of people I choose, and still live in the kind of community I choose.

In my opinion, this will lead many of us evil whites to live in evil, overwhelmingly white communities, just because we want to. Since nonwhites no longer have to live with us in order to obtain the advantages of dealing with us, this takes nothing from them.

Liberals point to poll data and tell us that all whites want desperately to live in mixed communities. If this were the case, Charlotte would not have just signed its umpteenth agreement to force integration

onto its people. If this were true, we would not have this insane national policy of chasing down whites with busing and "low-cost" housing, then white flight, then more busing and "low cost" housing, and so forth. (Please see my February 13 article, "When Are You Integrated?") As I said in an earlier article, I think the rise of super terrorism is going to put all the theories of multiculturalism up against a test they cannot pass. (See November 21 article, "Superterrorism")

Nor is superterrorism the only reason we may have to divide up into widely separate units. We have new diseases like the Ebola virus and the AIDS virus, both of which are mutating. There is also the fact that old infectious diseases are becoming immune to all of our present antibiotics.

The only sane policy is for us to spread out into self-contained communities. I like that idea. In any case, the new reality is that an individual will be a part of the world community by virtue of the new technology.

There will be no natural, step-by- step units between him and the world in general. He will not deal through local cities and local governments and then to higher units. The individual will be part of the world.

That is one end of the new duality technology is producing. The other end is that the individual will be dealing with that world directly and ALONE. He will not go to the state convention as part of his county group.

So we have a person who is part of the world through technology. He can deal directly with government through technology. But he also needs a sense of belonging to a community. His entire sense of community will come from where he lives, so where he lives must be entirely his own choice. The world of the future should be a set of communities, united on a voluntary basis.

The function of such a voluntary unity is one for which our Confederate mindset is admirably prepared. We are, in fact, the only modern political thinkers of our age. This is because we are the only people who are accustomed to thinking in terms of bringing separate units together voluntarily under one umbrella. Every other group today can only think in terms of all the units being brought together into one unit by some kind of force. This includes the libertarians.

Under libertarians or liberals or the Christian Coalition, you must have one society, obeying a single law. Libertarians want open borders and open communities and open markets, and they will do anything they have to make this happen everywhere within their domains.

Confederates are very used to thinking in terms of local areas which only have very limited obligations to the central state and the central market and the central ideas that are supposed to govern everybody in a single area.

In other words, you pays yo money and you takes yo choice. Your community must help provide for the common defense.

And that, boys and girls, is the way everybody is going to have to learn to think. Technology is making us, at the same time, a single society and a fragmented society. With each year that passes, the potential for a single person to kill anybody within miles of him is becoming simpler and simpler and more and more available. With each passing year, it becomes less necessary for voluntary communities of several

thousand people each, the population of a town or apartment complex, to live within miles of each other.

We will have to have compact, voluntary, trustworthy groupings of people. No matter how much libertarians may cry about it, these communities must have strict control of physical access.

None of this will limit our economies or our interaction with the rest of the world in any serious way. We will be able to live among those we choose to live among and deal with anyone we choose to.

As Confederates, we have no universalist ambitions as to how everyone should live. But we do have very, very strong opinions on what should be allowed in our own communities. So the society of the future will come naturally to us.

March 13, 1999 - BUSH, JUNIOR, HAS IT WON!

March 13, 1999 - THE STATE NEWSPAPER BEGINS TO USE PRO-MISCEGENATION VOTE

March 13, 1999 - HIP RELIGION STRIKES OUT

BUSH, JUNIOR, HAS IT WON!

No other nonliberal is going to mention this, so I will:

The press is saying that Bush, Junior, has it WON! In polls, a matchup between Bush, Jr. and Al Gore has Bush, the Republican moderate, winning hands down.

Back in 1992, right up until the Republican Convention, the media were announcing that polls showed that George Bush, Senior, would beat any Democratic candidate hands down. As soon as the nomination was over, Bush's popularity began to collapse.

In 1996, right up until the Republican Convention, the press was announcing poll after poll that showed that the moderate Robert Dole had it won against Clinton.

So here we go again. Once again, the press tells us that each moderate will have the Democrat beat in all the polls.

Until the Convention.

Come November, the moderate will lose like he always does. Same thing will happen in 2004. The same thing will happen in 2008. Respectable conservatives have no memory at all. That's what makes them respectable.

This will keep happening until even Republicans get tired of losing.

THE STATE NEWSPAPER BEGINS TO USE PRO-MISCEGENATION VOTE

Last year, the State Newspaper conducted a campaign to get the old antimiscegenation language removed from the state constitution. The State did not allow a word of opposition to appear in its pages.

When I objected to this, a lot of people busted a gut about it. They told me to just be quiet, it didn't matter.

They told me to just be quiet, because if I didn't liberals would say I was being a RACIST.

They said just be quiet, it didn't matter anyway. Just let it pass, they said, and that would be the end of it.

But many, many years of experience in politics have taught me this: when liberals spend that much effort on something, that is NEVER the end of it.

I keep warning people that our failure to denounce the State's newspapers' censorship of all opposition to removing the antimiscegenation provisions from the state constitution last November would cost us. In its lead editorial for Friday, February 26, The State newspaper began a campaign to cut off all state aid for students attending conservative Bob Jones University. Bob Jones University discourages interracial dating and interracial marriage. The State points out that the voters of South Carolina ENDORSED interracial dating and interracial marriage by voting for the provision to remove the antimiscegenation provision from the state constitution in November of 1998!

I told you so.

Back in November, all our "conservative" leaders were telling me we dare not oppose that antimiscegenation vote, because that would get us declared racists. I said that, if that provision passed, liberals would use it and use it and use it. Please look at my October 24 article, "Liberal Spores," which explains how liberals routinely get what they want by saying they want no more, and then surface and push for more a little later.

Please look at my January 2 article, "Censorship Pays," which describes what ELSE liberals will be demanding because we did not oppose removing that antimiscegenation provision. Those who did NOT openly oppose this provision in terror of the "racist" label, which is pretty well everybody, have no right whatever to complain when the media blank them out. The media blanked out any debate on this provision, and nobody said a word.

As I have explained before, that is why the left always protects the rights of Communists. They know that if they allow the right to terrify anyone by yelling "Communist," they will have to spend the rest of their lives explaining how their opinions are not like Communist views. The right lets the left scare them with the label "racist," and the respectable right always abandons anyone the left chooses to call "racist."

So naturally, the left uses the label "racist" ALL THE TIME. They used it here to justify outright censorship, and no one objected.

So from now on, in order to get any media exposure, you are going to have to explain why no one can call you a racist.

You are going to have to explain this in public despite the fact that you will not be allowed to say anything in the media.

And our silence last November endorsed this.

I explained this in my October 3 article, "Respectable Conservatives - They're Just Bureaucrats" and in my September 26 article, "Respectable Conservatives Kill Their Wounded."

How many readers are willing to state that Bob Jones is the last conservative institution liberals are going to use this pro-miscegenation vote to attack?

Please note I use the term "promiscegenation." But wasn't removing that provision just a little piece of housecleaning, since the federal court had already knocked it down? Isn't that what they assured us last November?

That was last November. Now The State has announced that that vote was PROMiscegeneation. The State has announced that the voters of South Carolina didn't just do a little housecleaning, they approved of miscegenation and interracial dating.

That little myth didn't last long, did it?

As long as we can be terrified into cowardly silence by the word racist, or by shouts of "anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews," or by any other label, you can forget about your right to speak.

What goes around comes around. When you are dealing with people like the liberals, and you do not stand up for others' right to speak, it will soon be your turn.

But what about the old dodge that racists are just leftists, so we should join liberals in suppressing them? As I explained before, this is an old line, and liberals love it. It is so old William Buckley used it all the time. Buckley wanted liberals to approve of him, so he said he would jump in and destroy anybody liberals denounced as racists.

In return, Buckley wanted liberals to denounce Communists and prevent outright Communists from getting lead editorial status in top American newspapers. Liberals laughed at him and went right on with what they were doing. Buckley, as always when liberals insist on something, went along with them.

The result of this effort is that liberals never have to explain why they have the right to be heard, no matter how pro-Communist their views might be. No respectable conservative ever mentions that antiwar protests in the 1960s always had Communist flags in them. We all agreed the left had a right to do that.

Only the right has to jump under the table and gibber its apologies when its masters shout the right words. Only the right has to spend a major portion of its limited media space explaining what it is NOT.

All for lack of guts.

The left is actually terribly, terribly weak. The only thing that keeps it going is our leaders' lack of brains and courage.

A question: how many South Carolina conservatives are willing to bet this is the last time The State newspaper will use that promiseceneration vote to denounce South Carolina conservatives like Bob Jones University?

HIP RELIGION STRIKES OUT

Being divorced, my brother decided to go back to the Methodist church in the small town he was doctoring in. The first thing he ran into was the church campaign to get the Confederate flag down from the state capitol building.

I got a quick look on television at those ministers marching down Main Street to demand that the Confederate flag be taken off of the state capitol building.

I noticed that lots of them had the backward collar. This indicated they were largely mainline ministers, that is, preachers from big churches like the Methodists, Episcopalians, and so forth. They had that serious, constipated look on their faces that big church preachers get when they are really feeling righteous.

You could see that these preachers were feeling really good.

Instead of being embarrassed speaking for a religion they don't really believe in, they are getting to march for a cause they could brag about at a New York City cocktail party.

Ah! The Good Old Days, the '60's! Back then the guys in the backward collars got to be Young Radicals, and they marched in parades with Communist flags and hippies and New Yorkers and even Harvard professors. Those preachers and priests on Main Street had that Sixties Look on their faces as they marched for a Fashionable Cause. That look is a combination of suppressed ecstasy and incipient seasickness.

I used to see it a lot in the 1960s. They marched for any leftist cause back then. But now all they have left is the Confederate flag.

They no longer march for other leftist causes because it cost them too much back then.

In the old days before infomercials, television stations used to do something you young people have probably never heard of.

It was called "signing off."

All the television stations would sign off with "The Star Spangled Banner."

Except the one Jesse Helms worked for. It signed off with "Dixie."

Before signing off, a station would usually have a minister or a rabbi give a five-minute talk. In the 1960s, a fairly normal one went like this:

The cleric got on and announced he was going to talk about prayer. He held up a leftist picket sign and said, "This is a prayer." It was the 1960s, and he was being "with it," "hip," "the times they is a-changing," and so forth.

There is something pathetic about priests and preachers who try to be cool.

Back in the 1960s, all the main line churches decided they would be "with it." They went for all the trendy political progressivism, they had guitars in the churches, man, they were Supercool!

The mainline church leadership was hard leftist. These churches were part of the far-left national Council of Churches, which supported the even farther left World Council of Churches. This latter group did nice things like supporting Communist guerilla movements.

While the mainline Protestant churches pushed to the activist left, their membership started dropping like a rock.

Each of the mainline Protestant churches that went on the Social Progress bandwagon in the 1960s dropped from a quarter to a third of their membership, while the population of the United States increased by a quarter.

Quite a drop.

But even this actually understated the stream of people out of the Social Progress Churches of the 1960s. I noticed this in my own family. My grandfather was a Methodist circuit rider, my sister was a director of religious education in the Methodist Church.

Then the Methodist Church went "politically progressive." It was exactly like the Democratic Party my family had supported for generations. We did not leave the Democratic Party; the Democratic Party left us.

In exactly the same way, the Methodist Church left us. But not all of us OFFICIALLY LEFT the Methodist Church. Those who do the counting only count the ones who go to the trouble of quitting. There were five of us, and two of us left their "church letters" in the Methodist Church. They weren't counted in the outflow, though they were very much a part of it.

Those two remained officially Methodists, and remained part of the millions who -- at least officially -- stayed with that church.

It was the other three of us who OFFICIALLY left Methodism.

For every person who officially left the new Social Progress churches of the 1960s, there was at least one other person who remained a member simply because he never went to church. Since he didn't bother to quit, he stayed on the official rolls.

The heavy drop in membership caused by churches trying to be trendy was TWICE as great as the drop they had thought it was! Slowly, the lesson got through the skull of some of the most pathetic people alive -- liberal clerics.

It only took the libs twenty years or so to catch on.

The problem was that hip and With It Guys who were in holy orders were getting what amounted to middle-age crazies. They were too hip to believe in God, and it embarrassed them that people thought

they were serious about something as old-fashioned as God. So they made a big show of trendy liberal politics, as the anti-Confederate flag marches in Columbia do today.

But now they've at least changed the image. After just a couple of decades, these bright and "with it" hipsters began to actually realize that their membership had been falling fast for twenty years. Education pays!

Now the godless minister is unhip. Nowadays we see mainline churches inviting people to come and hear about GOD! Even the advertisements on television for mainline churches talk about the Bible.

If you didn't live through the sixties, you probably can't imagine what a change that is.

March 20, 1999 – BOOOORING!

March 20, 1999 - RULE WITHOUT CONSCIENCE

BOOOORING!

In 2000, we can look forward to something really exciting. Two of the most thrilling figures of our age may stage a presidential debate. George Bush, Jr. may be the Republican candidate. Gore will be the Democrat. Can anybody imagine anything more exciting than a debate between Bush and Gore?

I can. One thing that would be more exciting than a Gore-Bush debate would be a two-hour special on the night life of pond sludge. One of the losing aspects of moderates is that they are so BORING. If you have a moderate Republican running against a Democrat, you have two people saying the same thing. People switch channels. At election time, they vote for the real Democrat.

I have spent decades in politics, and I am perfectly aware of the dangers of being labeled an extremist. But what those who haven't been in hard core politics are not aware of is how hard it is, in our age of massive competition in communications, to keep the people interested. If you keep your politics moderate and safe, you lose your audience.

RULE WITHOUT CONSCIENCE

It will not surprise the reader to be told that psychopaths dominate America's political system. What he may not realize is why the present setup makes this situation inevitable.

When I first heard about psychopaths, it was a frightening idea. I was already in my early twenties, I had taught at the university level, and I was working with my neurologist brother on research we were invited to Walter Reed to discuss. But the concept of a psychopath was new to me.

Suddenly I discovered there were people who had no real feelings of guilt or obligation WHATSOEVER. This was an extreme concept to me. Naturally, I assumed it was a very, very unusual. In the 1960s, it was generally assumed that it was very, very rare indeed.

Recently, we discovered that psychopaths are not, in fact, rare at all. At least one percent of our entire population is psychopathic. Why didn't we know that earlier?

We didn't realize it because we expect psychopaths to be easily identifiable. Surely, we thought, if a person is so different that he has no conscience at all, it would show.

It turns out that quite the opposite is the case. Intelligent psychopaths are so good at appearing normal that they often make the rest of us seem abnormal.

The case of Ted Bundy is instructive. Absolutely nobody who knew Theodore Robert Bundy believed he was capable of torturing and killing all those young women. In the opinion of those who knew him, he was not just an unlikely suspect, he was the LEAST likely suspect.

Said one close friend: "Ted Bundy is the most caring and compassionate person I have ever known."

Sounds like a lot of TV evangelists, not surprisingly. Sounds like a lot of dedicated liberal activists, not surprisingly.

While you and I are spending our efforts dealing with our regret and our many different forms of guilt, the psychopath carries NONE of that baggage. All he has to do is study how to get along in our society.

Well, what USED to be OUR society. It is his society now.

You must remember that the psychopath is raised in our society. All he is interested in is pushing the right buttons. And never before in history has there been a society that reduced itself so entirely to pushing buttons, and nothing else, than America today.

Parents no longer have any influence in determining their children's partners. Now what we call "love" is entirely a product of how a guy pushes the right buttons in a bar or on a date. A normal young man stumbles. The psychopath knows exactly what he wants and he studies absolutely nothing but how to get it. He is loving, considerate, and, above all, he is "cool."

The psychopath has no prejudices. In Nazi Germany, the psychopath could act like he hated Jews as much as any regular Nazi. But in our society he has the absolute advantage of being able to look you in the eye and say he doesn't care about race, family, or anything else except what you want him to worry about. He is the ideal white gentile.

The psychopath is a great preacher. You and I have genuine feelings of guilt, and they are not trustworthy. You may feel guilty, but you won't show it every minute.

The psychopath will show it every minute. He has been faking emotions all his life, and he's GOOD at it. You may have difficulty persuading yourself that you were called by the Lord to preach the Gospel. For a psychopath, that is no problem. You will feel guilty when you have to interrupt your sermon to raise money. Not the psychopath.

Need some guilt? The psychopath can give it to you right on the spot.

The next time you see a picture of the serial killer Ted Bundy on television, look at his eyes. They are the picture of childlike innocence.

Psychopaths very often have those innocent, honest-looking eyes of a Ted Bundy. The reason for this is that psychopaths ARE innocent. No psychopath can ever do anything against his conscience. He does not have a conscience. This is not guilt. This is the only true innocence.

As Bundy put it shortly before his execution: "I have never felt guilty about anything in my life. I feel sorry for people who feel guilt."

I wonder if a respectable conservative can be anything BUT a psychopath. It seems that those who dominate the media would be able to smell the potential for heresy in a rightist, and would never trust anyone with a conscience that might cause him to feel something and betray his respectability.

Every liberal who deals with Southerners is haunted by the feeling that one of them could have a conscience. In 1964, the Civil Rights Act required that every Southern school district make a "good faith effort" to integrate the schools. What does this mean? It means that every Southern school official must genuinely WISH to have integration. It is a psychological statement which requires that every Southern official not just OBEY the integration law, but that he BELIEVE in integration.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 required that every Southerner have a total internal change in his FEELINGS about integration. No one with deep convictions need apply. Feelings can cost a district all of its Federal funding. To a liberal or a respectable conservative, the highest form of morality is catching a Southerner at having personal beliefs which are not Politically Correct.

Alan Alda played a senator in a TV movie, and one of that senator's moral triumphs was to reveal that an old segregationist Southerner had made a statement to a friend of his that he still didn't believe in integration. If he had revealed that a person with top secret security clearance had told a friend he was a Communist, it would have been McCarthyism. Personal conversations are protected by true morality, if those conversations have to do with Communism. But not segregation. To reveal private conversations that show a white gentile is not a true psychopath on race is heroism of the highest sort.

People who have normal private opinions and guilt and other feelings often react in odd ways. The reaction of some people to hearing awful news is often to say something totally irrelevant and silly. Some laugh wildly. But these people are reacting to their internal feelings. The psychopath has learned to do without such feelings. Psychopaths have no such distractions, and their reactions are right, perfectly right.

The psychopath has spent his entire life learning how to react correctly. He is the perfect citizen of the sound bite age. He is the absolutely perfect lawyer in a society ruled by lawyers. He is the perfect big time preacher. He is the perfect talk show guest. He is the perfect modern political candidate.

For a person to remain Politically Correct is almost impossible unless he is a psychopath. Today, every person who is a public spokesman must be ready, willing and able to change his language and attitudes immediately.

One week, he must be the best friend the repeat criminal ever had. He must recognize that the so-called "criminal" is just a victim of Society.

But the next week, he must be "sensitive" to "women's" concerns." He must be outraged at all the repeat rapists this evil society has released on the streets to prey on women. And he must make these

switches without looking back. To be a respectable conservative, you must agree that what the liberals are now doing is bad, but everything they did in the past was good.

If you go to any political meeting, you will hear people talking, not about what is right, but how to "package" their views. There has always been "packaging," but today the package is everything.

When it comes to packaging, no one can compete with psychopaths. That is all the psychopath has done all his life. A normal person spends his life trying to deal with his emotions, and how to express what he feels. The psychopath has spent his life on what all politics is now about: putting his responses in the right package.

It would seem that the psychopath has all the advantages. In our society, he does. In earlier times, there was a healthy suspicion of anyone who was "too smooth." People had their own loyalties and prejudices, and they tended to expect their leaders to react the way they did. They tended to like it if their leaders were a bit prejudiced and inconsistent. They were expected to have healthy prejudices.

But today, we want the right package, and ONLY the right package. We comb through a person's entire life history to find out if he ever made a single unforgivable statement. A person who can spend his entire life without making a single unforgivable statement has GOT to be a psychopath.

In the early 1970s when Nixon tried to appoint a Southerner to the Supreme Court, he nominated one Southerner, and liberals looked up comments his nominee had made a quarter of a century earlier on race and used them to defeat him.

Nixon named another Southerner, and the liberals did the same thing to him.

Hugo Black was a Southerner who got on the Supreme Court, and he had been a KLANSMAN! But Black did what the two Southerners nominated by Nixon had not done. He made a total, complete, and absolute switch to extreme leftism.

If a Southerner is to get approval by our rulers today, he must make a switch only a psychopath finds it easy to make.

And if a Southerner doesn't make the psychopathic switch, respectable conservatives will be the first to tear him apart.

I remember that in the 1960s there was another Southerner who was a favorite of liberals. He wrote a book called Congressman From Mississippi. In that book he explained that he had risen in Mississippi as a segregationist right winger, and had served in Congress in that guise. But when President Kennedy appointed him to the Board of TVA, he came out of the closet as a lifelong liberal. He was a liberal hero, the perfect Southern white gentile.

It never occurred to liberals that, if the wind changed, this guy would probably announce he had always been a closet Nazi, and would put them in a gas oven without a qualm.

There is no animal on earth more dangerous than a man who is truly without prejudice.

March 27, 1999 – KOSOVO

March 27, 1999 - THE MEDIA GETS WHAT IT ASKED FOR

KOSOVO

Every Democratic Administration since World War II has gone out of office with a foreign policy crisis. Harry Truman was involved in the hopeless, draining Korean War when his Administration ended in January of 1953.

The Truman Administration got us into the Korean War in 1950. Then the Democrats do what they've always done since World War II. After getting us into the war, they refused to fight the war seriously, so the Korean War bogged down into bloody hopelessness. The Democrats were thrown out of office in 1952, losing the White House and BOTH Houses of Congress. It was left to Truman's Republican successor, Dwight Eisenhower, to bring the Korean War to an end.

The Democrats got the White House back in 1961. The Democratic Administrations of Kennedy and Johnson got us into the Vietnam War in the early 1960's. Once again, liberal Democrats got us into a war with the Communists and then refused to fight it seriously. Vietnam, like Korea, became an exercise in bloody hopelessness.

So in 1968, the Republican Richard Nixon won the presidential election and Republicans took over the White House again.

It was not until 1977 that the Democrats took the White House back under Jimmy Carter. Carter promptly got the United States into another foreign policy disaster.

In 1979, Iranians seized the United States Embassy and took its staff hostage. They held on to them until January, 1981, when another Republican, Ronald Reagan, took over the presidency.

Since World War II, we have had three Democratic Administrations, and each of them went out of office in a major foreign policy crisis.

Since I lived through the history I have just recited, I have been waiting for Clinton to get himself into a foreign policy disaster he couldn't get out of. Haiti should have been the catastrophe, but Jimmy Carter pulled that out of the fire for him. If Clinton had actually got into a serious war with Saddam, it would probably have proved a hopeless draw. But Saddam kept backing down.

Clinton keeps getting into ridiculous situations, but he keeps lucking out of them. Being an American watching Clinton's foreign policy is a lot like riding with a wild drunk at the wheel. Like a drunk driver, any time he sees something really dangerous, he swings around and heads for it.

As I have pointed out before, the two places all sane men avoid getting into are the Middle East and the Balkans. Kosovo is right smack dab in the middle of the Balkans, and Clinton wants to get American troops in there so bad he can TASTE it!

Normally, I would freely predict that our present move to get troops on the ground in Kosovo would be a sure disaster in the making. But I am afraid to bet against the Clinton luck. And, frankly, I am praying that he has a LOT of luck this time.

As I said before, the Kosovo situation has brought us closer to a nuclear confrontation than we have been at any time since the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 (Please see "Observation", March 6). What makes this situation particularly dangerous is that, in contrast to our attitude in 1962, we are not taking the Russians seriously today. Russia feels our contempt, and our contempt is a major provocation to them.

The Russians may end up going to war over our treatment of their fellow Slavs in Serbia. They have made it very, very clear that they are totally on the Serbian side, against the US. Add to this fact that many Russians feel they have little to lose today, and the fact that we are making their attitude worse by not taking them seriously.

Further, the Russians don't have the same central control over their missiles that they had under the Soviet Union. Add to this the fact that the man with his hand on the nuclear trigger is a terminally ill alcoholic with little control over his subordinates, even on the rare occasions when he is in good enough condition to exercise it.

So what happens if some Russian does launch a nuclear missile? Aren't their nuclear forces out of date? Wouldn't we just shoot such a missile down?

No, we would not. We have no defenses against any kind of nuclear missile.

If a maverick Russian sends a nuclear missile our way, it will hit its target. All ten megatons of it will explode in the United States.

What would happen next is anybody's guess.

So I am hoping our drunk-driving president has luck once again.

Granted, if there were another Democratic foreign policy disaster it would once again elect a Republican president, as Democratic foreign policy disasters have already done three times since World War II.

But I am not willing to hope for a possible nuclear war to get Dole or Bush elected.

THE MEDIA GETS WHAT IT ASKED FOR

Reporters are getting killed a lot these days. CNN had a special on this rising death rate a short time ago. Even more recently CNN announced that another of their producers had been killed.

This is not completely new. Bill Mauldin, the famous World War II cartoonist, was killed at the front at the end of that war.

A foreign reporter was killed when the United States Army enforced integration at the University of Mississippi on the orders of President Kennedy in 1962.

But recently the death rate among reporters has risen substantially. The Liberated Peoples, the people we right wingers said shouldn't be running countries, are now murdering reporters in record numbers.

Their leaders, the people us reactionaries said were a bunch of mindless thugs, are suppressing reporters all over the world, and jailing them, and killing them.

During all those years we were warning against these "emerging" leaders, the media championed those folks. They were leftists, and the media championed anybody on the left.

Back during World War II, the enemy was right wing, so the press was solidly on the side of the United States. That seemed an obvious side for them to take, since the fascist enemy was against freedom of the press.

But we have been told, over and over, that things got "complicated" after World War II. We are told, again and again, that the enemy was no longer nearly so clear and obvious.

TRANSLATION:

Suddenly, the enemy of the United States was now on the political LEFT.

The media could not come down so hard or so clearly against the Communists as they had upon the fascists.

They tell us that all the time, though they don't use those words. They just say, "After World War II, things were no longer so simple. It was harder to tell the good guys from the bad guys."

Hitler was bad. But Stalin was "complicated."

The post-World War II Communist enemy was just as solidly against freedom of the press as any fascist. All that had changed was that this enemy was on the left. That is the only reason things were suddenly so "complicated."

Exactly the same thing happened with the trendy attitude toward the atomic bomb. When it was to be used against Nazi Germany, everybody from Einstein to Oppenheimer to Fuchs was all for it, no problem. By the time Germany surrendered, the momentum was there, and it was used against Japan.

Then, suddenly, Communism rather than fascism was the enemy. Suddenly, the atomic bomb was Evil.

Once again, the media makes no secret of this.

Recently I was watching a show about Oppenheimer, a scientist who helped develop the atomic bomb during World War II. He switched to opposing the US having the bomb when Communism became the enemy. He was especially friendly to the Communists, and many people suspected that he gave Stalin atomic secrets. There is no doubt that his fellow scientist, Klaus Fuchs, was in fact a Communist and did give Stalin nuclear secrets, so there was nothing impossible about this suspicion. Naturally, this program, like all of them, was dedicated to proving that Oppenheimer did not give secrets to Stalin. To demonstrate how he resisted the temptation to give atomic secrets to the Reds, it showed Oppenheimer at a party in his home, being urged by his Communist friends to give secrets to Stalin.

In order to show how patriotic Oppenheimer was, Oppenheimer was represented as refusing to yield to his Communist friends' open incitements to treason. To the people producing the show, resisting your Communist friends' demands that you commit treason shows you are a true patriot.

I am a fellow from rural South Carolina, so this struck me in an absolutely different way than it did anybody who makes television shows.

My first reaction was to wonder what in the hell a man with a top secret clearance was doing LISTENING TO somebody who was urging him to commit treason?

Well, to the media, this was not so "simple." This was a very "complicated" matter. These were Communist friends, not fascists.

Translation: it's not treason, it's leftism.

I am not joking here. This is how our real national dialogue is determined.

It is just that no one dares put it in plain English. Any respectable conservative who put it this way would quickly cease to be respectable.

And all this is the policy of the American press. They sanction enemies of freedom of the press, provided those enemies are on the left. And, in the world they have created, a lot of media people get killed.

As a South Carolina boy who has no reverence at all, I am not that upset that the media is getting what it gave the rest of us. They have never shown any outrage when Americans were killed or betrayed by their pets on the political left.

When the third world masses and their thugs took over and suppressed freedom and killed people and seized American property, the media said that was just fine. But now that they are killing media people, too, it is suddenly horrible and disastrous.

Or it may be simply a case of what goes around comes around.

April 3, 1999 – OBSERVATIONS

April 3, 1999 - THE FUGITIVE WHITES ACT

ERRATA: Last week I said Bill Mauldin was killed in World War II. It was actually Ernie Pyle, another cartoonist. Thanks for catching that, Richard.

Also, sometime back I referred to the adoption of the "Eurodollar" in Europe. Actually, the unit of currency is the "Euro."

OBSERVATIONS

I. For my peace of mind, it is good that Ronald Reagan began to become senile shortly after he left the White House. I think it may have prevented him from going the way so many old conservative heroes go.

He had already begun the routine process of trading in his conservative credentials for praise in the press. He began by endorsing the Brady Bill.

It would have gotten worse, much worse. Each time there was a confrontation between the Clinton White House and conservatives, Ford and Bush were out there holding a joint press conference to nobly support our beleaguered Chief Executive. I'm afraid Reagan would have been out there with them.

Bush and Ford are little men, and nobody expected them to do anything but stab conservatives in the back. After all, they had been doing that for decades. But with Reagan, it would have hurt.

II. There is lot of discussion about whether the Serbians have committed "war crimes."

As a supporter of the Confederacy, I can comment on that. We had an officer hanged for "war crimes."

Major Henry Wirz, Swiss-born Confederate commander at Andersonville prisoner of war camp, was tried by the Yankees after the War. Many of his witnesses were not allowed to testify. He was hanged.

Available statistics indicate that, despite the fact that the Yankees had PLENTY of food and clothing, and despite all the talk about Andersonville, as many of us died in their prisons as Yankees did in ours. AND they were holding LESS of OUR prisoners than we were of theirs!

There are many complicated aspects to the whole concept of "war crimes." But there is one thing on which all precedents are absolutely agreed. There is actually only ONE thing that every "war criminal" has in common:

Losing.

No one on the WINNING side has ever, in all history, been ACCUSED of a war crime, much less CONVICTED of one. The Serbs will have committed war crimes if they lose the war. If they win the war, what they did will be like Sherman's March, it will be like the starvation and freezing of Confederate prisoners in Yankee prisons, it will be like what Stalin's troops did in World War II, or like the allied bombing raids on Dresden -- just "regrettable necessities of war."

"Just following orders" and "the regrettable necessities of war" only become war crimes if you LOSE.

III. Shades of Vietnam!

Lord, it is just like a news flashback. The State Department spokesman for the Clinton Administration on the Serbian war is a carbon copy of the Harvard intellectuals who were spokesmen for Kennedy as we got into the Vietnam conflict. He has the pencil neck. He has the BOWTIE!

David Halberstam wrote about these people -- whom he knew personally -- in his book "The Best and the Brightest." I used to watch them parade in front of the TV cameras in the early '60s.

This guy is pure déjà vu!

No one remembers that the Harvard types got us into the Vietnam War. No respectable conservative has a memory. That's what makes him respectable.

IV. Speaking of our national habit of forgetting, I remember that it was the Bush Administration that first got us into this Yugoslavian mess. After Tito died, his Serbian successors ruled the country. Then the Communist regime was overthrown. During the Bush Administration, Croatians and others began seceding. The Bush Administration back then had the usual attitudes about secession.

Nobody REMEMBERS this, of course, but just before the USSR began to split up, the whole idea of the USSR splitting up was considered laughable. Cartoon after cartoon back then showed the people talking about national autonomy in places like the Ukraine in CONFEDERATE uniforms, to show how silly the idea was.

Funny, you never see any repeat of those cartoons now. That piece of media wisdom went right down the Memory Hole.

My understanding is that the Bush Administration showed the same sort of wisdom when Croatia and Macedonia began to talk about secession. I understand that State Department reps of Bush and James Baker, being good, solid, old-fashioned carpetbagger Republicans, said that the United States realized that secession had to be dealt with sternly. America had had to take strong measures to preserve ITS union. The Serbians were happy to hear about that attitude. Their secessionists WERE dealt with sternly. But since then, all talk of this Bush Administration wisdom has disappeared down that same Memory Hole.

I seem to have another memory which everyone else does not share. Back when Saddam invaded Kuwait, it was very reliably stated that a representative of the Bush Administration in Iraq had indicated to Saddam that the United States would not look too unkindly on such an invasion. How could such an indication have been given?

Well, I remember something else: right after Iraq took over Kuwait and the US threats began, Saddam was asked whether he planned to leave Kuwait. He answered that he did not plan to withdraw from ANY of the PROVINCES OF IRAQ. Kuwait was historically part of Iraq, he said, and he planned to preserve THE UNION OF HIS COUNTRY.

I wonder if that "unionist" mentality that was conventional wisdom in the press, and especially in the fanatically Lincolnesque Bush Administration, may not be the basis of many of our present-day problems?

According to American history, you can do anything you want to anybody if your aim is to preserve your union. It would not have taken much for a Saddam or a Milosevic to take a message like that from any kind of hint.

One more memory which only I seem to have: when Bush began to react to the brutal Serbian suppression of secession in Yugoslavia, black leaders began to attack him for being an evil racist.

Minority groups began to say that Bush was worried about human rights in WHITE Yugoslavia, but not in BLACK Somalia.

So Bush went into Somalia. That experiment in "nation building" ended up with the corpses of American soldiers being dragged through the streets while the locals CHEERED! The media, of course, have totally forgotten that it was Bush's exercise in total wimpishness in yielding to minority pressure

to get into Somalia that caused that disaster. That might put his version of "appealing to minorities" into perspective! We couldn't have that, could we?

V. While we are reexamining all the fashionable reasons given for the mess we are in right now, we should take a look at the cry of "ethnic cleansing." How does THEIR ethnic policy compare to OUR ethnic policy?

VI. THE SARAJEVO EFFECT:

In 1914, the Austrian Grand Duke was assassinated at Sarajevo. Every European major Power was a part of an alliance, and as one declared war, all the rest were pulled into it. World War I was under way. Today, the respectable conservatives, like George Will and Senator McCain, are saying that this war doesn't make any sense, but we have to fight it all the way because we are part of NATO. Some things never change

THE FUGITIVE WHITES ACT

For the first time since the Fugitive Slave Acts, the United States has given a name to Americans trying to escape, and is actively using force to prevent it.

This form of escape is called "white flight." When a few whites are allowed to escape from communities into which nonwhites are moving, the rest follow. A few whites escape, then other whites follow them. Finally even the whites who hate whites most, good leftists, join the exodus. So the new Fugitive Slave Policy goes into effect. Busing and "low cost" housing are used to enforce multiculturalism.

The community goes downhill. A few whites abandon their investment, and escape. The Fugitive White Policy begins again. This happens over and over.

Every professor who wants to keep his job assures us that multiracialism and multiculturalism are wildly successful and make people happy. All the media assure us that practically everybody is wild about multiculturalism and multiracialism. But, like the Communists, they demand that every single stray white person be chased down and jammed into a multiracial community.

Now, I wonder why that is? Liberals generally insist they are all for "devolution" - local independence - but only if it constitutes no threat to them. They cannot allow there to be a place on earth where whites are able to live in their own communities, because they know very well that most whites will want to go there.

Liberals are always quoting surveys where people tell them what they want to hear --- that multiracialism is wildly wonderful and popular with everybody. But, oddly enough, they will never allow any competition with it. Every last white person must be chased down.

One interesting historical note is that Republicans today take exactly the same position on Fugitive White Laws that they took on Fugitive Slave laws in 1860. The 1860 Republican platform makes interesting reading in this respect. It insists, over and over, that a republican Administration will enforce the Fugitive Slave Acts completely.

Today, Republicans leaders bust a gut insisting they will take the lead in chasing down every last white who tries to escape. If anybody tries to set up a private school because they don't want their kids in a ghetto environment, you can count on Republicans to push liberals out of the way, and lead the lynch mob out to get such parents.

Back in the late 1970's, my little group did free press conferences for antibusing marches, along with other grassroots conservative movements. Republicans said the reason there was busing was because the Democratic Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee tied all antibusing initiatives up in his Committee.

But Republicans took over the House in 1995, and the judges still send any kids they want into a ghetto environment. Every one of those judges, of course, sends his own grandchildren to private schools. But the Republicans are not going to change any of that.

After all, the only person who would change any of that will be called anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews. What mere child could be worth THAT?

So Republicans take the lead in enforcing the Fugitive White Acts. As the Republican chairman just said, there is no room in the Republican Party for anything liberals choose to call "racism."

In other words, nothing basic has changed since 1860.

April 10, 1999 - THE HOSTAGE POLICY

April 10, 1999 - WE'RE NOT MOVING TOWARDS "ANOTHER CIVIL WAR" - THIS IS THE SAME ONE

THE HOSTAGE POLICY

We are now watching a third repeat of the policy that got us into the hopeless bloodbath of Korea.

We are now watching a repeat of the policy that got us into the hopeless bloodbath of Vietnam.

We are now watching why the combination of liberals in command and a group of spineless, mindless respectable conservatives on the other side is going to lead us into one hopeless bloodbath after another.

The formula is simple:

- 1) a liberal president sends in troops.
- 2) Respectable conservatives say, "This may not make any sense, but they've got our troops in there, so we've got to back our soldiers."
- 3) Naturally, some troops get killed.

4) Respectable conservatives now declare that anything the liberal president does from this point on is a matter of principle, since American men have died for whatever it is the president has decided he is doing.

At the time I am writing this, we have reached step 2) in the Kosovo business.

Our leading respectable conservatives have declared that this policy doesn't make any sense, but now that we're in there, we've got to stay the course and escalate the fighting.

In other words, what they are both demanding is step 3) above. They want more troops in there, and that means some of them will get killed.

Then it will become a matter of National Principle.

That happened in Korea. In Korea, General MacArthur was astonished at the first instance of this liberal Democratic phenomenon -- using American troops as hostages. He had assumed that, when Truman sent troops to Korea under his command, they had the full support of their country for the purpose of fighting and winning a war. But then Truman told him that the troops were there to die, not to fight.

Truman told MacArthur that Communist supplies with which to kill Americans were to be permitted to pour into Korea through Manchuria. There was to be no American bombing north of the Yalu River, the border of Manchuria.

Remember, in 1950 this business of killing off a few thousand American troops so the Administration doesn't have to make any hard decisions was brand new idea. MacArthur was an old-fashioned man.

MacArthur went ballistic and denounced Truman. Truman fired MacArthur, which he had every right to do.

But the fact that Truman had the RIGHT to fire MacArthur has obscured what the original dispute was all about.

The dispute was about the fact that a general was protesting the misuse of his men's lives. It is interesting that the same liberals who made fun of Nazi commanders who said they were "just following orders" under Hitler universally denounced MacArthur for DARING TO QUESTION ORDERS he considered to be evil.

By the time of Vietnam, there was no MacArthur. All the generals "just followed orders" without raising any questions about them.

Certainly respectable conservatives did not bring up any embarrassing questions.

At first, Reagan said we should either fight or get out. But once Kennedy and Johnson dipped the flag in blood and then ran it up the pole, all the conservatives saluted and backed the war.

That is happening now, again.

Respectable conservatives have exactly the same contempt for the Constitution that liberals do. Under the Constitution of the United States, there is no way TENS OF THOUSANDS of Americans could be slaughtered without a DECLARATION OF WAR.

Only in Korea and Vietnam -- after the takeover by liberals and respectable conservatives -- have we had tens of thousands of our soldiers killed without putting the REST OF AMERICA, not just the people in uniform, on a WAR FOOTING.

Today, if you want to look tough, you send hundreds of thousands of soldiers abroad, you get them killed, you get them maimed, but you don't inconvenience anybody else. Americans were dying by the thousands in Vietnam, but that didn't mean the country was committed to anything.

Putting hundreds of thousands of Americans on a foreign battlefield without making a decision to make war is the respectable conservative's idea of "supporting the troops." It is also his idea of constitutional government.

The soldiers who were dumped in Korea and Vietnam were the liberals' HOSTAGES. If conservatives objected, the liberals would say they were not "backing the troops."

This is the key to the whole mentality of respectable conservatism. The one thing that respectable conservative fear above all else is that they might be called NAMES.

Respectable conservatives have one, and only one, real concern in life. That is their respectability. You can kill Americans, you can bus children, you can do anything you want to do to anybody, if only you will not give respectable conservatives labels that will make them unrespectable.

They don't mind men dying. They don't mind children being bused.

They DO mind being called "racists." They DO mind being called "isolationists."

Kill American troops all you want to, but don't accuse conservatives of "refusing to support the troops." The troops are just hostages. They are hostages to conservative respectability.

WE'RE NOT MOVING TOWARDS "ANOTHER CIVIL WAR" - THIS IS THE SAME ONE

Lake High had an interesting front-page article in the Edgefield Journal this time. It turns out that my old friend Paul Weyrich, along with others, is beginning to think our way. They are saying that we need to stop trying to take over the present political setup and concentrate on building sovereign communities of our own.

We have to have territory of our own. Lake gives other examples of people coming to this conclusion, including a conservative Jewish commentator, Dr. Laura Schlessinger, and the black conservative theorist, Walter Williams.

But respectable conservatives keep doing their job for the Union and the ruling establishment.

National Review recently had a cover article entitled, "The Emerging Republican Minority." It explained that, due to falling white birthrates in the United States and massive nonwhite immigration from abroad, conservatism in America is doomed.

So what do these brave champions of conservatism plan to do about it?

According to the article, they propose to cry and whine a lot.

Oh, and there is one other thing respectable conservatives are going to do:

We all see this train coming to destroy us. If any of us try get off the rails, respectable conservatives will do ANYTHING to keep us tied to the tracks.

George Will recently did a column about how the League of the South was leading America toward a situation like that in Yugoslavia. And you know what respectable conservatives want to do about bad guys like us in Yugoslavia!

That was Andrew Johnson's attitude in 1860. When Lincoln was elected, and it was clear that all Southern influence in America was to be destroyed, he whined as loudly as anybody. But when push came to shove, he helped kill any Southerners who tried to escape the onrushing train.

In 1864, to keep the war against his fellow Southerners going, the Republicans who wanted to keep killing Southerners needed the support of traitors like Johnson, so they nominated him for vice president. But in 1865, they won the war, and they wanted to get rid of him.

As the Radical Republican congress turned against this fanatical Unionist after the Civil War, one of the common Radical charges against him was that he was a FOREIGNER, a citizen of the ALIEN state of Tennessee! This is the phenomenon I wrote about in my December 12 Whitaker Online article "The History Channel Presents Approved Fiction". My point was that the left always finds patsies like Johnson to use for its purposes. Turncoat patsies like Johnson repeat the Yankee and leftist promises that they only want to be reasonable.

And, as with Johnson then and National Review today, the minute these chumps give the victory to the Radicals, the Radicals dump them like the garbage they are, and laugh at them to boot.

The price of trying to be respectable to the left is humiliation and worse. The left flatters its rightist pawns and honors them and praises them - until the moment it no longer needs them. Then, like Andrew Johnson, you find yourself classed with the other rightists you helped to criminalize.

The second it can safely do so, the left chews these rightist turncoats up and spits them out.

So respectable conservatives are beloved of the ruling establishment -- for the time being.

In the 1830s, many Southerners refused to face facts, and compromised with the growing power of the North. In the 1830s, when the North made colonies of us with The Tariff of Abominations, we could have seceded successfully.

Like their predecessors, respectable conservatives today fight to keep us in the system until things are hopeless.

The strain is showing. During the debate over impeachment, House Minority Leader Gephardt pointed out that "Politics is a substitute for violence," but, he pointed out, the violence on both sides was beginning to show as the impeachment situation got nastier. The partisan split is getting wider and wider.

This widening of the partisan political split in this country is discussed all the time, but nobody wants to face the reason for it. That reason is simple. Once again America is being split over matters that are basic and irreconcilable. The revolution National Review pointed to is under way, and it will lead to a total transformation of America. When the stakes are total, partisanship becomes total as well.

To the vanishingly few of us who remember American history, the present situation is pure *déjà vu*. The same thing happened before the Civil War, as more and more congressmen went to the capitol armed. And the basic situation is exactly the same. On the one side are those who march behind the banner of Five Words and Emma Lazarus (Whitaker OnLine Archives, article for October 31). They see America as the property of All Mankind. They fully intend to take America from its older population and turn it over to All Mankind. This is the same outlook the fanatical Abolitionists had.

Whenever anyone ignored the Constitution and substitutes "all men are created equal" for it, the country is in deep trouble. Both liberals and respectable conservatives today treat "All men are created equal" as a complete substitute for our Constitution.

In its special 1976 bicentennial edition, National Review announced that "All men are created equal" was the basis on which America was built! It has maintained that position ever since. This should cure anyone who thinks respectable conservatism will do us any good at this late date.

As National Review has pointed out, our national problems will only be resolved when enough minority voters have been bred and brought in to overwhelm all opposition. The populations of America, both the whites and the anti-whites, are becoming more and more aware of the titanic climax that is looming. As in the 1850s, the battle is becoming more physical, as Gephardt remarked.

Everyone who is familiar with history knows that, if the South had united behind South Carolina's lead in 1830, when there was still time, the old order and peace might have been saved. But Andrew Jackson, Henry Clay, and other "respectable" Southerners, like National Review today, viewed anybody who wanted off the train tracks as the absolute enemy. So they got to be National Leaders. And, because of their efforts, the South became an outright colony of New England in 1865.

No one is more fanatical about keeping us tied down on the tracks than respectable conservatives. In the present crisis, they are the real enemy, for they are in OUR camp and working for the enemy.

April 17, 1999 – OBSERVATIONS

April 17, 1999 - BALKAN PEACE: THE CASE FOR SEGREGATION

OBSERVATIONS

I. I have pointed out here a couple of times that the United States, because of the Kosovo bombing, is now closer to a nuclear war with Russia than at any time since 1962. Yeltstin just said the same thing. (See March 6 and March 27)

I have pointed out that Arizona Republican Senator John McCain goes out of his way to be the liberal's favorite conservative (See December 19). Since then, he has demanded that we prepare to send troops to fight ON THE GROUND against the Serbians. He is outliberaling Clinton on this war!

II. The United States has recognized that Taiwan is part of China. President Clinton tried to get China to rule out the use of force to reclaim this southern island.

In a joint appearance with Clinton, Prime Minister Zhu Rongji of China refused to rule out the use of force to take Taiwan back into China. He pointed out that he had seen a bust of President Lincoln in the White House. He pointed out that Lincoln had used force, and lots of it, to force his South back into the Union.

Clinton said that was different. I suggest we press people on that point. WHAT is different? Taiwan wants out, and China wants it back in. The South wanted out, and Lincoln wanted it back in. What IS the difference?

I pointed out on April 3 that a representative of the Bush Administration probably caused Saddam's invasion of Kuwait. Apparently she hinted to Saddam that the United States might look benignly on his invasion of Kuwait if he said it was to bring a historic part of Iraq back "into the Union."

I also pointed out on April 3 that the Bush Administration took the same line with the central government in Yugoslavia when Croatia and other regions seceded. They pointed out that the United States had come down on secession hard.

Thank God Bush isn't in power now. As a carpetbagger Republican, he might have given the same hint to the Chinese Prime Minister, and Rongji would have the impression the United States approved of a Taiwan invasion. It would takes a very small hint for a despot to hear what he wants to hear.

BALKAN PEACE: THE CASE FOR SEGREGATION

In Somalia, the American policy was "nation-building." In the Balkans, America insists it wants to help develop "truly multiethnic" states.

That is a natural development from our domestic policy of "multiculturalism."

And it is likely to be as great a success as "nation building" was in Somalia, and as healthy and productive as multiculturalism has been here.

What do you do with two people who have been trying for years to kill each other? What do you do with two people who, the moment they see each other, grab weapons and become violent?

According to NATO, you take those two people, lock them in a room together, and put a large guard in the room to prevent trouble. This, says American social doctrine, is the key to harmony in the Balkans.

The way to keep peace in the Balkans, we are told, is to keep those ethnic groups jammed together - multiculturalism, you know -- with lots of foreign troops to keep them from killing each other. Tito used to do the same thing in Yugoslavia with lots of soldiers and the secret police.

Liberals today are always talking about how WONDERFUL Tito was. Granted, they say, Tito killed people, and he imprisoned thousands of people without trial, and he had an outright, permanent dictatorship which he openly intended to maintain forever.

Sure Tito did all that, the liberals say. After all, nobody's perfect.

But Tito enforced multiculturalism. He killed or imprisoned anybody who objected to the ethnic mix he maintained anywhere he felt like maintaining it. There, say the liberals, was a guy who knew how to keep ethnic hatred under control.

That great guy Tito kept these ethnic groups living cheek-by-jowl, and he kept them peaceful. Just think of Tito as a guy who had a National Hate Law, and was just a little overenthusiastic in enforcing it.

Democrats and Republicans agree that it is now OUR turn to do the same thing to Yugoslavia that Tito did.

Two score and seven years ago, Tito enforced multiculturalism. Now we are now engaged in a Great Civil War, testing whether a Balkans so conceived and so dedicated can long endure.

Actually, there is no question that it CAN endure. You can keep people under the same roof despite the fact that they are bound and determined to do each other bodily harm. That proposition is proved every day in prisons and institutions for the criminally insane throughout the world. If you have enough walls, cages, and armed guards, people who want to kill each other can be kept in the same institution indefinitely, and most of them will survive.

Liberals and therefore respectable conservatives have often confused prisons with their ideal of a normal society. They used to do it all the time when they discussed immigration policy.

I remember that almost all political commentators used to routinely say that the American Border Patrol that kept Mexicans out of the United States was the same thing as the Berlin Wall, which kept East Germans from escaping their country's dictatorship.

The Washington (D.C.) Times used to repeat this line in almost every issue. It demanded that America get rid of all its immigration restrictions. It stated that the Border Patrol on the Rio Grande was exactly the same thing as the Berlin Wall! The Times is certainly not liberal, but it is libertarian, and libertarians are just as nutty on immigration policy as liberals are.

After The Times repeated this libertarian nonsense for the fiftieth time, I wrote them a letter explaining something any sane person should know: there was a difference between the United States border Patrol and the Berlin Wall. I did this by reminding them of a local institution with which they were familiar, the District of Columbia jailhouse.

The guards at the DC jail don't just keep people INSIDE the jail. They also keep people who don't belong there OUT of the DC jail. After all, you can't just walk into that jail, any more than you can just walk out of it. The guards will not let you stay in the DC jail unless a judge orders them to.

Using the DC jail example, I explained that there is a difference between being kept INSIDE a prison like East Germany, and being kept OUTSIDE a wealthy, free country like the United States.

In that letter, I pointed out that the difference between being INSIDE the DC jail and OUTSIDE the DC jail was exactly the difference between being inside East Germany with the guards keeping you IN, and being a Mexican in Mexico with the United States Border Patrol keeping you OUT.

The guards at the DC jail would not let you into the jail unless you have a legal reason to be there. But nobody resents that. Like East Germany, the DC jail was a place nobody really WANTED to get INTO. Those same guards do not let people who are IN the jail get OUT.

The people in the jail, unlike people outside, really resent the fact that they are not let OUT by those guards. People want INTO the United States, and the guards keep them in their OWN countries. It is their own countries that are the prisons, not the United States. The problem with East Germany and the DC jail, I had to explain to these clowns, was not that the world outside the DC jail or the United States was bad. It was the DC jail and East Germany that were bad.

I had to explain that.

To grownups.

It was a very hard letter to write. It is very, very hard to explain reality to liberals and respectable conservatives, because when you start to explain something every sane person should already understand, you begin to sound as crazy as they are.

I will say this for the libertarians at the Washington Times. After I wrote that letter, they no longer made the insane comparison between the United States Border Patrol and the Berlin Wall. They switched to other utterly insane statements about immigration, but they no longer made THAT one.

The liberal intellectual hothouse is not so flexible. They have a host of people to protect them from reality. They have respectable conservatives and thousands of PhDs to tell them that, no matter how crazy liberals get, what they say should be taken very, very seriously.

The problem with leftists is that there is no one to tell them that they are, quite simply, nuts.

When one points out to liberals and respectable conservatives that the Balkans is essentially a madhouse, and the thing to do is to SEPARATE the violent inmates, they keep insisting that they have a duty to keep them locked in together. They have a duty to Eternal Justice.

By Eternal Justice, they mean whatever distribution of the Balkan population was made by the latest despotism, which happens to have been that of Marshall Tito.

With certain exceptions, of course. One particular population movement -- the one that gave Prestina an Albanian ethnic majority -- is holy. Therefore this particular population and border settlement must be

maintained at all costs. This ethnic Albanian majority must be kept in Prestina, no matter what the cost in lives or treasure, theirs or others'.

But there was also a recent major ethnic cleansing of Serbians by Croats. That is a different matter. For some reason, that one did not offend the holy cause of multiculturalism.

NATO says it's just as concerned about that case, where the Croats cleaned out the Serbians, as they are about the Prestina situation.

I'm sure we all believe that, despite the absence of bombers over Croatia, or of any discussion of the matter by NATO.

The fact is that there are not going to be bombers flying in to force those Serbians back into Croatia. It won't be done because, now that Croatia is at peace, nobody wants to put it back into a state of war.

That would be crazy, right?

We are all perfectly aware that the justice of where any population happens to reside in the Balkans at any given time would not survive a moment's serious discussion. There is no justice in the Balkans. There is no record that there has EVER been any justice in Balkans.

The bottom line is this: No one hesitates to move populations by force if it's for integration. If you want to shove people around to enforce multiculturalism, the United States Army is at your disposal.

I have truly radical proposal:

How about moving populations for a SANE reason, for a change? Instead of keeping the bloodbath going forever in the Balkans, why don't we do in the Balkans what a sane policy would do in any other madhouse: separate the inmates.

Present doctrine, agreed upon by liberals, respectable conservatives, moderates, intellectuals and libertarians, requires us to keep NATO in the Balkans forever, so we can keep these violently hostile populations jammed as closely together as possible. All these geniuses agree that it CAN be done.

As I said above, talking about reality to all these liberals, moderates, libertarians, intellectuals, PhDs, and respectable conservatives is always a very, very uncomfortable thing to do. As I also explained above, when you have to explain something that any sane human being should already know, it makes you feel a little crazy yourself.

Nonetheless, let us once again forget respectability and go for sanity.

In a prison, you CAN keep the loonies with the general population. But in most real prisons, the truly, insanely violent inmates are separated from the general prison population. The name of this process is called "segregation." Even in a PRISON, if you have two inmates who are absolutely dedicated to killing each other, you SEGREGATE them.

Even in an institution for the criminally insane, no one, INCLUDING THE INMATES, would suggest that you put those who want to kill each other in the same cell with a guard to keep them apart.

If an inmate in an institution for the criminally insane suggested what is now the official policy in the Balkans, declared by NATO, liberals, respectable conservatives, moderates, intellectuals, libertarians, and the American media, they would never let him out.

I have suggested sanity for the Balkans. I can hear the screams now: "Apartheid!" "Ethnic cleansing!" "Hitler!"

But labels only bother RESPECTABLE conservatives.

I will take sanity over respectability any day.

In the Balkans, sanity means separation.

April 24, 1999 - MADELEINE ALBRIGHT ASKS: WHAT USE ARE AMERICAN LIVES? **April 24, 1999 - CUMULATIVE SECESSION**

MADELEINE ALBRIGHT ASKS: WHAT USE ARE AMERICAN LIVES?

Bruce Herschensohn pointed out that "Republicans want a big military, but they don't want it to go anywhere. Liberals want a small military, but they want it to go everywhere." In other words, liberals always want to cut back the armed forces and spend all the government's money on social programs. At the same time, they want to use American forces to run the affairs of every country in the world. For humanitarian reasons, of course.

That is how "The Best and the Brightest" got us into Vietnam. This was the Harvard crowd around John Kennedy in the early 1960s. Kennedy went through with the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba, but the minute it got serious, he pulled out all American air support for it. The Cubans he had promised to support were slaughtered.

So when things got rough in South Vietnam, Kennedy's advisors wanted a small-scale response. They sent in military advisors, expanding the war a bit. In short, they did what Clinton is doing today. They started small-scale and then expanded, step by step. Under liberal policy, the other side got more serious with each step, so the liberals responded by sending in more troops. And so it went, just as it is going today in Serbia.

This process was described by David Halberstam in his book, "The Best and the Brightest." He was a Kennedy liberal, and he knew those people personally. He watched them get us into Vietnam, step by step. Liberals want American troops everywhere. They don't want them to stay out and they don't want them to win.

Some time back, General Colin Powell was discussing the size and excellent armament of American armed forces. While Powell was proud of the size and strength of American forces, he consistently opposed the State Department's proposals to use those troops for action in the Balkans and other areas. This prompted Secretary of State Albright to ask, "What good are those forces if we can't USE them."

Historically, the reason one wanted large armed forces was so that one would NOT have to use them. Sweden and Switzerland have spent more per capita on their armed forces in this century than any

other countries in Europe. Germany spent a lot on armed forces during the two world wars, but Sweden and Switzerland have maintained huge military establishments during every single year of this century.

The result has been that neither Sweden nor Switzerland has spent a single day at war during this century. That is the ideal use of military expenditures: to keep your military large enough so that no one wants to attack you.

Usually it is the Defense Department that tends to be militant in foreign policy, and the State Department has tended to lean more toward diplomacy. But President Clinton has now stated that the enemy today is not Nazism or Communism, but Hate. America's power is to be used around the world to crush Hate.

Translation: America's forces around the world are to be used to crush what America DEFINES as Hate. This gives a green light to liberals. Liberals do all the defining for America. Liberals propose, conservatives oppose. But conservatives never do the defining.

The State Department has been a stronghold of the political left since Franklin Roosevelt took over, so the State Department is straining at the leash to enforce this new "anti-Hate" policy for which American power is to be used.

This explains why Secretary Albright would ask, "What good are these forces if we can't USE them."

The question Albright asked could only have been asked by a liberal in our own time. In any other time, it would be assumed that no one would ask such a question unless he was a fascist. It is a very, very cold-blooded question, after all: "Why do we have all these people in uniform if we don't put them in harm's way?"

Who would ask that?

Think about it. What would a liberal have said in 1980 if Reagan had asked, "Why do we have all these soldiers if we don't USE them." There would have been a shriek from the media that could be heard in Europe by the naked ear.

But when Albright asked it, it was not even considered odd. And no respectable conservative is going to question it.

That includes the war hero who worries so much about the welfare of American troops, Senator John McCain of Arizona, the liberal's favorite conservative.

CUMULATIVE SECESSION

Southern Nationalism gives us the opportunity to change the world by offering a nation where people want to live. In every country on earth today, leftism and respectable conservatism have united to force people to live the way liberals want them to. If we provide a nation which rejects all the leftists experiments, leftism will collapse forever.

Real secession, the slightest hint of a real choice, will be devastating to leftism in a way that respectable conservatism can never be. The left has an exposed Achilles heel, and that fatal exposure is the simple fact that their entire enforced program is ridiculous, and nobody really WANTS it. Leftism is

gigantic fraud waiting to be exposed. Only respectable conservatism and the lack of any true alternative keeps this titanic fraud going.

One place which is truly independent, where people can live among the people they choose, and give their children the education they choose, and have the kind of justice they choose, would be fatal to the left. One place like this would be the envy of all other people in the Western world.

Nobody WANTS leftism. "Devolution" is a code word for the fact that people want OUT of this system. REAL devolution will be CUMULATIVE: it will grow as the escape becomes a flood.

As soon as people find they can have REAL devolution, everybody will want it. But the emphasis here is on the word REAL.

In Scotland, there is going to be a referendum which, if it gets a majority, will lead to independence in four years. Sean Connery was denied a knighthood in January because he supports Scottish nationalism.

But you can have NOMINAL independence, and it won't mean a thing. After all, when Scotland or the South or Quebec gets "independence," it will do so as the result of a signed agreement. That agreement will include matters like free trade and military agreements with the country they are separating from.

When and if Scotland and Quebec become "independent," the nationalist leaders will be so desperate to get their titles as Prime Ministers and so forth that they might agree to anything. More important, they will want to appear to be Respectable Leaders in the eyes of World Opinion. They don't want to look provincial.

So the Scots and the Quebecois will be pressured to agree to keep their borders open to massive third world immigration. They will agree that Scotland's goal is to be "multicultural," In other words, Scotland is welcome to be a country as long as it doesn't insist on being Scottish. Likewise Quebec.

There is an easy way for Scotland's independence movement to be tamed. Right now the United Kingdom is in the process of giving up its sovereignty to the developing United States of Europe. The pound will be replaced by the Euro and all economic policy will be run from the new central government of Europe. Economic policy will move to the European central government.

Europe began its unification plan in the 1950s with a small and reasonable attempt to reduce tariffs. This was to make trade easier and to "provide for the free movement of goods throughout Europe." Then a little change occurred in the language. One day the centralizers began to say that the idea was to "provide for the free movement of goods AND PEOPLE throughout Europe."

As usual, nobody questioned that apparently small change in language. But it was no small change. It was a gigantic step. It meant that every state in Europe was to give up its control of immigration. The centralizers, who favor enormous amounts of third world immigration into Europe, were to be given authority to impose that on every part of Europe.

So if Scotland signs on to be a part of the United States of Europe, its "independence" will be a fake. I expect that there will be a lot of pressure for this kind of fake "independence." Fake opposition and fake alternatives are all we have today, and the left knows how to keep it that way. Real nationalism,

real independence, would be a threat to the whole leftist program, so that is the first thing nationalist leaders will be required to give up.

Liberals are always quoting surveys where people tell them what the establishment wants to hear --- that multiracialism is wildly popular with everybody. But, oddly enough, they will never allow any alternative to it. Every last white person must be chased down. If it's so great, why can't it stand competition?

To follow on with this example, every professor who wants to keep his job assures us that multiracialism and multiculturalism are wildly successful and make people happy. All the media assure us that practically everybody is wild about multiculturalism and multiracialism. But they demand that every single stray white person be chased down and forced into a multiracial community.

If multiculturalism is so great, why do they have to do that? They cannot allow there to be a place on earth where whites are able to live in their own communities, because they know very well that most whites will want to go there.

There is no area in which liberalism can allow any real competition to develop. In every area, from dealing with criminals to education to economics, liberalism can only survive if it is enforced on everybody.

Liberals cannot allow any white majority country on earth to close itself to third world immigration.

No community can be allowed to treat criminals as criminals. No community can allow parents and taxpayers to use their money for any schools they want to, because that would mean the end of the state educational bureaucracy. No community can be allowed to exist which does not chase down whites and force them to integrate.

If a country were allowed to do ALL that, the left would be doomed, and nobody knows that better than leftists. Nothing would be more fatal to leftism than REAL secession, because real secession means real CHOICE.

When they tell you how their system is beloved by all, your reply should be short and simple: "You want to put your policy up against ours? OK. Let's try it. Make my day."

The trouble with what we want is that it is 1) obviously reasonable, and 2) obviously fatal to the political left. It is obviously reasonable that we would have the right to have our own land and to live to ourselves if we so choose. But it is also obvious that, if we ARE allowed to live to ourselves, absolutely everybody else is going to want to join us.

This is not because WE are so great, but because what THEY impose is so obviously awful, and it only survives because it allows no alternatives.

One instance of TRUE secession will lead to more REAL devolution, and that will lead to yet more. We must settle for nothing less than this real and therefore cumulative form of secession.

May 1, 1999 - No articles posted due to server upgrade

May 8, 1999 – OBSERVATION

May 8, 1999 - ARMED SWITZERLAND AND THE COLORADO SHOOTINGS

May 8, 1999 - WHY POWER HUNGRY ELITES WANT "MULTICULTURALISM"

OBSERVATION

NATO's bombing of Serb television makes it clear this is a liberal war. Normally, a television station is a civilian institution, and Clinton and his stooges declare they are only attacking military targets. But attacking Serb television is legitimate for a fascinating reason.

Serb television can be attacked because it LIES! That is EXACTLY what every liberal says. Naturally, CNN's pet conservative, Kate O'Beirne, immediately agreed.

No one, least of all respectable conservatives, said that Serb television, IN THE OPINION OF LIBERALS, lies. No, if liberals decide it lies, it needs to be bombed.

No respectable conservative would deny that.

This is a major escalation. Anyone liberals accuse of lying in Serbia is now a fair target of violence.

If liberals say you lie, you are a legitimate target of violence. This is a precedent that will come back to haunt us all.

ARMED SWITZERLAND AND THE COLORADO SHOOTINGS

The shootings in the Colorado high school naturally renewed the liberal shout about guns. They say it happened because Americans have guns. As always, respectable conservatives respectfully, very, very respectfully, disagree. They mutter something about Family Values.

Actually, the population of Switzerland is armed to the eyeballs, and nothing like this happens there. Recently there was a mass shooting in a school in BRITAIN, where they have the fanatical gun laws liberals dream about. But nothing like this happens where the guns are, in Switzerland.

So how many respectable conservatives, including Pat Buchanan, mentioned Switzerland?

HINT: Try "Not a single one."

To be a respectable conservative, you never repeat anything that seriously bothers liberals. The Swiss example totally destroys every liberal argument for gun control, so conservatives almost never mention it, and they never REPEAT it the way a liberal repeats his best points.

The argument that KILLS all present gun control demands is Switzerland. In Switzerland, hundreds of thousands of ordinary citizens are required to have either a HANDGUN or an ASSAULT WEAPON at home. The government PAYS for those guns, yet Switzerland has no more gun crimes than any other European country, including those like Britain with absolutely oppressive gun laws.

Good old respectable conservatives! They NEVER mention Switzerland when gun control comes up. Over two decades ago, when I worked on Capitol Hill, my boss was a member of the NRA Board of Directors. We begged them to talk about Switzerland. We put the Swiss example in the Congressional Record.

But still, conservatives would not repeat Switzerland, Switzerland, Switzerland, the way a liberal would repeat a killer point he had. You see, repeating the point about Switzerland would not be polite. It bothers liberals. So to be a respectable conservative, you don't push it.

If there were any serious conservatives in the media debate, they could make some critical points pushing Switzerland. First of all, the Swiss example can make it clear how silly the so-called "assault weapons ban" is. To repeat, the Swiss population has hundreds of thousands of REAL assault weapons at home!

We all know that NONE of the guns outlawed by the assault weapons ban were actual assault weapons. No weapon which cannot be switched to fully automatic is an assault weapon. No modern soldier would make an assault with a weapon which could not be switched to full automatic, the way Swiss weapons can.

Congress has kept guns that can be switched to full automatic out of private hands since the 1920's.

Liberal intellectuals simply cannot understand what an assault weapon really is, because they cannot understand what an automatic weapon is.

So I ask Southern Nationalists to indulge me for a moment while I speak directly to America's "intellectual leaders." I must explain to them the difference between a weapon which is automatic and one which is NOT automatic. If they would stop being respectful, conservatives would use the approach I am about to.

They would say,

"Let us now speak in terms even a liberal professor can understand:

"Gun that is NOT automatic weapon go this way:

"PULL TRIGGER, it go BANG.

"PULL TRIGGER again, it go BANG again.

"On the other hand, we have to explain to these brilliant liberal intellectuals what an automatic weapon is:

"AUTOMATIC weapon go:

"RATATATATATATA TAT!

Now, are even the poor, dumbass liberal intellectuals with me here?"

In Switzerland, every male adult between the ages of eighteen and forty-five IS REQUIRED BY LAW to have a REAL assault weapon or an Evil Handgun at home. These are the two weapons liberals say the people cannot have without a blood bath. These are the two kinds of weapons liberals are banning here. In Switzerland, the GOVERNMENT supplies those weapons!

This is a wonderful example to drive home, and I mean DRIVE home.

It PROVES that simple availability of weapons does not affect the crime rate.

Switzerland proves that gun crime depends on who has the guns. If you push Switzerland, you can make it viciously clear how insane liberals are on the whole subject.

Since I alone have used this point so often, I know that there is a last liberal gambit. When they are driven against the wall with the Swiss example, they will often say that that is completely different, because Switzerland has its guns as part of its military reserve. They will say that that is the only reason it works in Switzerland. Once again, this could give an intelligent and serious conservative -- if there were any in the debate-- a chance to make another point.

A few years back, over thirty states adopted "right to carry" laws.

Before those laws, any citizen who wanted a permit to carry a concealed weapon had to either 1) provide a reason for it the police would accept or 2) have political pull. In the real world, the bottom line was that if you didn't have political pull, you didn't get a permit.

"Right to carry" changed the burden of proof. Under "right to carry" laws, if an honest citizen wanted a permit, police had to provide a reason why they would NOT issue it.

Naturally, when "right to carry" was proposed, ALL the liberals screamed "Bloodbath!" and "Dodge City!!" More than one liberal source stated flatly that the streets would run red with blood if these laws were enacted.

Those laws were enacted. Hundreds of thousands of permits have been issued, and they have been out there for years. Not a single recorded instance of illegal violence has resulted in the years since. If respectable conservatives ever repeated what liberals once screamed about "right to carry" laws, liberals would be humiliated.

Not one single respectable conservative has breathed a word about it.

But, if there were a single intelligent conservative in these debates, he would bring up Switzerland, and drive liberals to the wall. Then liberals would be forced to their last-ditch gambit, saying that the only reason the Swiss don't misuse guns is because they are in the military reserves. That would give the conservative a chance to humiliate liberals again. He would point out that, after all the liberal shrieks about a "Bloodbath!," American "right to carry" permit holders have just as good a gun record as the Swiss reserves do!

No conservative on CNN or in the media will ever say that.

Respectable conservatives are our real enemies.

WHY POWER HUNGRY ELITES WANT "MULTICULTURALISM"

If a country is made up of one people with one culture, that people obviously knows more about its own culture than anybody else.

Social experts and ideologues have very little excuse to claim that they know more about what a homogeneous people wants than the people themselves.

About twenty years ago, I saw an advertisement for a program on a major network that made me sit up and take notice. The network had searched the world for the city where things went most smoothly and people were most content. They found that, back then, that city was Copenhagen. They had found that Copenhagen was a major city with all the advantage of a small town. This was because it was homogeneous. There was little conflict, and little crime.

This is no shock to a rational person. A society which is racially and culturally homogeneous is going to have less conflict than a jumble of races and groups like New York.

But I was amazed that the liberal censors had let that piece of heresy get on the air! Nobody is allowed to SAY that a homogeneous society has less conflict than "multiculturalism."

Well, that program never materialized. The censors DID finally get to it.

As I pointed out in this space on April 17, the only sane policy in the Balkans is to separate the ethnic groups (See *Balkan Peace: The Case for Segregation*).

This point is rather obvious: if two people are trying to kill each other, you separate them. But if you make this obvious point, you are charged with supporting "apartheid," "ethnic cleansing," and, as always, of being anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews. As always, the real leftist objection has nothing to do with any of this.

What leftists, and therefore respectable conservatives, cannot stand about ethnic separation is that it gives them no excuse whatsoever to interfere in the affairs of the ethnically homogeneous countries.

This situation changes in many ways as soon as we get a "multicultural" society. If a society is made up of many different peoples with many different values and many different outlooks, any social expert can claim to know what the people want. He can claim to be the only "objective" expert, and he can point out the fact that none of these different people can claim to speak for each other any more than he can.

That is not the case when a society is homogeneous. If you want to know what a culturally homogeneous people want, you just ask them.

But if a society is nice and diverse, who can say what "they" want? There is no "they." In our diverse America, who can honestly say that he speaks for "us?" There is no "us."

But smaller, more homogeneous countries can laugh at attempts by social experts and ideologues who claim to speak for them. Who needs "social experts" to speak for Liechtenstein or Iceland?

There is another advantage for liberals in making sure a society is as multiracial and as multiethnic and as multicultural as possible.

If you are an ideologue or a social expert, you can tell everybody what to do, and get paid for it, all in the name of "protecting minorities." There is nothing new about this. Modern leftists claim any power they want by saying they are just helping the oppressed smaller groups, but Hitler did exactly the same thing when he claimed he was protecting the German minority in the Sudetenland.

Outsiders always have a standing excuse to interfere in the affairs of a "diverse" country. If you want proof of that, look at the six billion dollar request for funds Mr. Clinton has just made to Congress to take care of the minority problems in tiny Kosovo.

If there is a minority in any country, all liberals have to do is to claim they are supporting the weaker group and move in. A homogeneous society is a country which can remain free from the power of liberals and social experts. As I pointed out before, the first rule of leftism is that there can be no escapees. No one can be allowed to determine his own affairs, away from leftist rule.

This is the reason leftists cannot allow any white majority country to avoid substantial third world immigration.

Despite all the earlier talk about a "melting pot," it was only after the massive third world immigration of the last generation that America became the kind of country that the social expert could control absolutely.

Only a completely unsophisticated person could refer to America until very recently as any kind of a "multicultural" society.

For its first two centuries of existence, the population of the United States came from a very limited and homogeneous part of the world. Its identity, its religion, and its moral values all came from a relatively tiny area in Northern and central Europe, with some southern Europeans added in later. They were all from a part of Europe which, throughout the Middle Ages, recognized Latin as its common scholarly and legal and cultural language.

There was nothing "multi" about this culture.

The one serious minority in America, black people, had been used by the 1960s to overturn major portions of the constitution. The right of free association, all limitations on federal power under the interstate commerce clause, local control of education, all limitations on federal power to select employees, and many other critical limitations on bureaucratic power had been simply crushed in the name of the rights of one minority. In the name of protecting blacks, lawyers, social planners, and bureaucrats took over unheard-of authority and money in America. More minorities to "protect" will make that power unlimited.

The actual cultural difference between a German Catholic and an English Protestant is very small and, in cultural terms, very recent. All the talk about how America was made up of so many really different religious and cultural groups at the turn of the century is, for someone who is familiar with the true differences in the world in general, a reflection of a very limited outlook.

This lack of real racial and cultural diversity in America has been a serious problem for ideologues on both the left and the right.

All through our history, there has been a generally agreed-upon set of outlooks and values that defied and frustrated the "intellectuals" and other people who wanted to revolutionize us.

Now, at last, our homogeneity is REALLY dying out, and a REAL multiculturalism is taking over. The fight for multiculturalism, multiethnicity, and multiracialism is at the very heart of the struggle of social "experts," planners, and ideologues for power. In a truly diverse society, people can vote all they want to, but it cannot be democracy.

How can "the people" rule when there is no "people"?

In a diverse society, there is a great deal of voting, but it is not allowed to influence the really big issues. After all, in such a society, a majority vote means very little. What is important is not just the numbers, but how those numbers represent each group. Above all, the majority must not be allowed to use its majority to "persecute minorities."

So, when California voters overwhelmingly decided not to give taxpayer financed benefits to illegal aliens, the courts simply knocked it down.

So who can protect the minorities? Obviously, it cannot be the people in general. It is the people in general the minorities must be protected AGAINST.

This leaves us no choice: in a diverse society, final authority cannot reside in the people. It must be vested in professionals: judges, bureaucrats, and self-styled "intellectuals" must have the final say where there is multiracialism or multiculturalism.

May 15, 1999 – OBSERVATION

May 15, 1999 – WORDISM

May 15, 1999 - RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES NEVER SAY, "I DON'T BELIEVE YOU" TO A LIBERAL'S FACE

OBSERVATION

On the "Talk Back Live" segment I discuss below, Professor John Lott of the University of Chicago made a point we should tell EVERYBODY about. Arguing against Clinton's knee-jerk demand for more gun control, he explained how a recent "save-the-children" gun control law had worked out.

In Mississippi, a student started shooting people in school. One of the faculty had a gun permit, and he had a gun in his car. But the car was over a thousand feet from the school, as required by the new Federal law. While people died, he had to run all the way to the car and get the gun, bring it back, and subdue the shooter with it.

As Lott pointed out, this man was a genuine hero. And, as always when a private citizen uses a gun to do a heroic deed, the press ignored his act of heroism completely.

The press ignored him, and that means respectable conservatives ignored him, too. Lott mentioned this hero and another in Pennsylvania who used a gun to subdue a school shooter. Have you heard about them from any conservative? Do you ever expect to hear about them from any respectable conservative on any talk show?

Are we all clear now on the function respectable conservatives get paid to perform?

No one who is going to kill people in a school is going to worry about the law against having a gun within a thousand feet of the school. Only this law abiding hero obeyed that law, and it cost lives. This is the only incident where this law has had any known effect.

Lott is the professor who did the University of Chicago study which demonstrated that the passage of a "right to carry" law leads to an IMMEDIATE decrease in the crime rate. As I explained last week, this is the sort of information that embarrasses liberals, so respectable conservatives never bring it up. (See May 8 article, "Armed Switzerland and the Colorado Shootings.")

WORDISM

Michael C. Tuggle's Edgefield Journal article, "True Believers and the South," reminded me about Eric Hoffer. Hoffer was a philosopher many of our so-called "intellectuals" are trying desperately to forget. He had several characteristics the modern academic cannot stand.

To start with, the ideal of the modern academic is Karl Marx.

Karl Marx, the left's Champion of the Working Class, never did a day's labor in his entire life. Academics all insist they are "friends of the working class," but they don't want to hear from anybody who actually does any work.

From the point of view of our so-called "intellectuals," Hoffer's first crime was that he was an actual working man.

Hoffer was a longshoreman who read a lot. He never had any formal education, but he wrote a number of brilliantly intellectual books, starting with "The True Believer." He repeatedly pointed out that intellectuals who claimed to be "friends of the working class" had nothing but contempt for real working people.

This real working man had contempt for other leftist pretensions. President Johnson appointed him to the Civil Rights Commission, and within a few weeks he declared the whole thing a fraud. Later he was given a professorship at Berkeley. Within a few weeks he pointed out that these high-powered university students were great at repeating cliches, but "They simply cannot THINK!"

Hoffer wrote in the 1950s and 1960s, back when almost all professional academics declared that working people needed a socialist economy. Hoffer's statement on how socialism treated real working people was as blunt as the rest of his comments. "Under capitalism," he said, "We are expected to work for money. Under socialism, we are expected to work for words."

For a sane person, reading the Soviet Constitution after their so-called "Worker's Revolution" is hilarious. In 1917, once he became the Soviet dictator, Lenin -- who also had never done a day's work

in his life -- declared that Russia was now "a nation of workers, peasants, soldiers, and INTELLECTUALS."

Now let me ask you something, gang. Which one of these groups -- workers, peasants, soldiers and INTELLECTUALS, is going to sit on its backsides and give orders to the rest?

Lawyers, bureaucrats, and academics, these are the people who rule us. All of these people produce only one thing: Words. For those words they expect lots of money and ALL the power. These people constitute a vast and almost unimaginably powerful lobby dedicated to the importance of words over everything else. The only purpose of government, from their point of view, is to give them money and power.

Lawyers, bureaucrats, and academics insist that the only purpose people are united under one government is for purposes THEY lay down.

Lawyers, bureaucrats, and academics believe that a common race or a common culture means nothing. It is DOCUMENTS that unite men. To them, an American is neither more nor less than a person who has filled out the proper papers. All that matters to our rulers today are the words and documents they produce and control.

Those who want lawyers, bureaucrats and academics to rule are the opposite of nationalists. Nationalists believe that men are united by a common heritage and by blood ties, not by words and documents. Lawyers, bureaucrats and academics believe that the only thing that makes one a citizen of a country is words. A person who believes that men should be united according to their nation -- their common race and culture -- is a nationalist. One who believes that men are only united by words should therefore be called a "wordist."

Every wordist says that his philosophy will unite all mankind into one huge, loving community. But in the real world, different kinds of wordists are every bit as divided as nationalists are, and infinitely more vicious. Communism is a form of wordism. Communism is supposed to unite all mankind into a single, loving unit. The Communist form of wordism has killed over a hundred million people this century.

All wordists claim they love everybody and that their words unite everybody.

Then they proceed to kill real people by the millions, all in the name of their words.

Every wordist claims that his particular words will unite all mankind. The religious wars that slaughtered millions of Europeans in the sixteenth century were fought between fanatics who believed the words of Protestantism united all men and the fanatics who insisted the words of Catholicism united all men.

Each form of socialism is a form of wordism. Each form of socialism claims it makes all mankind one.

There are many different kinds of socialism, and each form of socialism claims to unite all mankind. Actually, each type of socialism unites only the people who are dedicated to the same form of socialism. Willy Brandt, the anti-Communist mayor of West Berlin during the 1950s, was a Democratic Socialist. He was the opponent of his fellow socialists, those of Soviet Communist variety, in East Berlin.

Meanwhile, the Chinese Communists, who claimed their form of socialism united all mankind into a single loving unit, were enemies of Brandt AND East Germany. And, as usual with loving wordists, the Chinese Communists were busy murdering tens of millions of people in the name of their particular form of Love and Brotherhood.

A lot of noise is made about how brutal and vicious war between different nations or different races can be. But the worst wars in history were wordist wars. Those who devote themselves to Catholicism and Protestantism in the sixteenth century were wordists. Like all wordists, they said their philosophy, their books, their doctrines would unite all mankind. But, as usual, the only people they united were the people who agreed with their books and their dogma. But people who subscribed to the OTHER wordist dogma were their deadly enemies.

When the Protestant wordists and the Catholic wordists went to war with each other in the religious wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the slaughter was incredible. In our century, we talk endlessly about Hitler's killings, but he was an amateur compared to Stalin. Hitler was a piker compared to the wordist Communist Mao Tse-Tung.

Today, the media talks about the ethnic cleansing of Milosevic. But compared to the Cambodian Communist Pol Pot, Milosevic is nothing. Pol Pot killed a QUARTER of the entire population of his country, whose population was about equal to that under Milosevic. By comparison, Milosevic is small change.

But Pol Pot is excusable, because he did what he did in the name of wordism.

Milosevic is a fanatical nationalist, so he is like HITLER. Wordism is dear to the hearts of a society ruled by lawyers, bureaucrats, and academics. For the wordists who rule us, it is nationalism, not killing, that is the only crime that matters.

RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES NEVER SAY, "I DON'T BELIEVE YOU" TO A LIBERAL'S FACE

In congress and in the media, the relationship of respectable conservatives to liberals is that of servant to master. If you want to be a respectable conservative, you can disagree with liberals only on the things they allow you. But the moment they declare something unrespectable, like saying integration is a bad idea, you must immediately agree with them on it.

I was reminded of the fact that respectable conservatives are servants of the liberals as I watched the discussion of Clinton's new gun control proposals on CNN's "Talk Back Live."

The hostess of the show said that she wanted everybody to understand that nobody was talking about taking guns away from honest citizens. Then a member of the audience said that the government should take all guns away from everybody, and a major portion of the audience applauded.

Then the congresswoman pushing Clinton's new gun control proposal said that the NRA wanted everybody to go to schools with guns. Then she said she could not understand why anti-gun control people were suspicious of gun control advocates like her.

Obviously what someone should say at this point would be that she had just said that the NRA demanded that everybody go to school armed, and she knew that wasn't true. Why should we trust somebody who says something so obviously ridiculous? But that is one thing no respectable conservative ever says to a liberal, face-to-face, in the media.

Respectable conservatives are the liberals' servants, and the servant never looks his master in the face and says, "I don't believe you."

Liberals are always saying that to conservatives. I remember on "Crossfire" when Pat Buchanan said he believed that blacks should have equal rights and the liberal looked him right in the eye and said he didn't believe Pat. You will never hear Pat say that to the official liberal on the show. Faced with your master, with your job on the line, you never say anything about him personally except that he is a fine, upstanding, idealistic, professional, dedicated, emotionally balanced, friendly, patriotic, all-American guy you are privileged to know and work with. Above all, his intentions are good and he speaks nothing but the truth as he sees it.

Every media conservative says that all the time about all of the liberals he debates with.

No matter how insane hysterical Bill Press got, Pat could not say, "You call anybody who disagrees with you either a racist or an isolationist. You're being ridiculous again."

That is what liberals do to us, and it works. If a rightist says that somebody is being pro-Communist, the liberal simply laughs and says, "Don't be absurd." But any time a conservative doubts we should kill Serbians, he is accused of being an "isolationist." Does the conservative EVER say, "Don't be ridiculous."

Of course not. The servant is never sassy with his master.

Which, of course, keeps them from representing us. Our problem with liberals on gun control is that we know they're lying like dogs, and anything they get is a step toward their goal of disarming every honest citizen in this country. "Hysterical Bill" Press is going to accuse the NRA of not caring if people get killed.

But no conservative, including Pat Buchanan, would ever point out how outrageous it is for Bill Press to use every tragedy to push his agenda on gun control. They have to say how idealistic, if slightly misguided, good old Bill is.

As long as you give any support to respectable conservatives, you are asking for liberals to go ahead with their program without real opposition. You are asking the liberals' paid servants to protect you from the liberals.

I felt sorry for black congressman Major Owens a couple of years ago. For decades, he had done what every liberal does: imply that any conservative disagreement was inspired by Hitler. Any time anybody disagrees with anything any liberal says, especially about poor people or racial quotas, a liberal implies he is thinking like anaziwho wantstokillsixmillionjews.

When a liberal says a conservative who is against busing sounds like Hitler, no one says, "Don't be a damned fool." No. Every conservative always gets flustered and respectfully, very, very, very

respectfully, tries to show that he is not really like Hitler. So when the Republicans came up with their 1995 economic proposals, Major Owens said they sounded like Hitler.

Any other time, this would have been just fine. It had always been fine before, and today no conservative would dare object to it. But Owens said it in 1995, the one year when Republicans had just won both Houses of Congress and were feeling their oats. They raised hell and Owens backed down and apologized.

But, as I say, that was in 1995, during a very brief period when conservatives forgot their proper place and got uppity. Conservatives are back in their proper place now, at the back of our national political bus.

Liberals love conservatives, but only if they know in their place.

And if any conservative gets uppity, all the respectable conservatives in the media will unite against him.

May 22, 1999 - KINKY SEX

May 22, 1999 - JEWS, ISRAELIS, AND ISRAELITES

KINKY SEX

As the Dow Jones Industrial Average broke 11,000, the usual concerns were expressed again - - what is causing this economic boom and how long will it last?

I addressed these concerns before, just after the Dow Jones hit 10,000. I explained where the economic expansion came from on January 16, ("Why We Have An Unprecedented Economic Boom").

What is causing this boom is an old and obvious economic phenomenon: capital expansion. The entire third world, billions of people, is being built up for the first time. This development could have taken place a long time ago, but billions of people have continued to live at a level we would not allow a dog to be raised in because socialist planners wanted to plan for them.

Economic development is not a complicated process. You make something for me, and I give you something for it. To make these things, we need capital. We need money for training, for machinery, for communications equipment and all the rest.

At the end of World War II, Europe and Japan had been bombed out. All their capital was destroyed. They had to rebuild completely. The result was a huge long-term boom, caused by the vast capital flow into Europe and all the tens of millions of jobs that created.

The third world is many times as large as Europe was in 1945. Until very recently, most of the third world was locked into socialist stagnation. Now they are moving toward capitalism. In the past few years, the per capita income of many of these countries has doubled or tripled. For hundreds of millions of people, this requires a great deal of capital.

Five years of simple investment has done more for the people of each of these countries than forty years of planning. And the side benefit has been a continuing boom for us.

You see the results of this phenomenon all around you. Now that socialism is gone, capital is flowing into more and more of the third world. We are producing trillions of dollars worth of capital for billions of people.

The capital expansion of three-quarters of the world will take quite a while. This should be a period of prosperity for decades to come. A person with capital can be very rich in the long run with conservative, growth-oriented investments. My money is in conservative mutual funds, aimed at low dividends and growth.

So the first result of this analysis is that the long-term outlook is excellent. For those with money to invest, this advice: When the long term outlook is like this, one needs to go with the general upward trend. Don't get tricky.

But if this rosy scenario is true, why is it that there have been economic disasters going on all over the developed world? Europe has had massive unemployment for years, and Japan has had a major economic downturn, while Asia in general has had an economic catastrophe.

Europe's economic problems are fairly straightforward. As usual with problems today, they come from policies which are derived from trendy opinion. Trendy opinion says two things: 1) employers must provide lots of benefits for everybody, and 2), all white majority countries must have massive third world immigration. Third world immigration drives down the price of labor. But government policy keeps the price of labor high by requiring a lot of extra benefits for workers. If the price of labor is kept too high for the market, you get lots of unemployment.

So Europe can cut benefits or it can cut immigration.

Europeans want lots of benefits, but they want to keep up with trendy opinion by allowing lots of third world immigration. In the real world, when you do something stupid, you pay for it.

So why, despite the general prosperity, has an economic catastrophe occurred in Asia?

In Asia, the social system which runs the economy is still primitive. Lots of loans and other serious business were handled entirely on the basis of who knows who. Family connections and buddy systems controlled pretty well everything. People concentrated on being liked by the right people.

Business was done on the basis of the buddy system and on the basis of kinship. At the top where the big money was, little attention was paid to real business ability and the ability to pay back loans. The general economic climate was so good that this system went on for quite a while, but eventually it caught up with them.

It's really not much more complex than that.

I wrote about this sort of situation in my article of November 7, 1998, "The Bead Buyers." All this business of loaning money only to your buddies may be referred to as Oriental Wisdom. But it's really silly and primitive, and, as I said before, when you do something stupid, you pay for it.

You hear a lot of wisdom about how to deal in Asia and Latin America. You are told that they don't do business on the basis of your record for making money. We are told, correctly, that they are less interested in serious business questions than they are in getting to know you personally.

This advice is correct. It also tells you something about why those economies are in such trouble. Until grown men get beyond who loves who and start paying attention to business, they are in no position to run a serious and competitive economy.

Oh, by the way, I do remember that the title of this piece was "Kinky Sex." I used to be a college professor, so I know that you have to use a dirty trick like that to get someone to read an article about economics.

JEW, ISRAELI, AND ISRAELITE

As long as Confederate Jew's first loyalty is to the Confederacy, I can understand their wanting to maintain a place of their own to go to. I desperately wish Southerners and whites had a place of their own to go to. But the official doctrine of liberals, and therefore of respectable conservatives, is that only Jews have a right to protect their group's existence.

My position is that of most decent people. I am very much against dual loyalties, but I can have some sympathy with Jews who want to maintain a separate homeland.

What I am absolutely against is self-styled "CHRISTIANS" who claim the BIBLE demands they use American lives and treasure to maintain Israel. These people imply that Christ requires that their main political loyalty be to Israel!

When Israel was negotiating with the Palestinians recently, many American "Christians" were more fanatically anti-Palestinian than Netanyahu's most extreme advisors. As one preacher said on cable, "You've heard people say, 'Don't mess with Texas?' Well, I say, 'Don't mess with Israel.'"

This blasphemous excuse for a Christian wants to fight against the Palestinians down to the last American. He is, in short, a traitor. What is worse, he excuses his treason in the name of God. Blasphemy is the nastiest form of treason.

The God-owners' loyalty to Israel is based on what has got to be the silliest set of fables anyone ever fell for. They simply have not read their history or their Bible. It would be funny if it were not both treason and blasphemy.

Just stating this nonsense shows how silly it is. The story is that in the first century all the Jews in the world lived in Israel, and every one of those Jews was a direct descendant of the Children of Israel in the Bible. Then the Romans destroyed the Temple and all the Jews left. A bunch of complete aliens, ancestors of today's Palestinians, came and took the place of the Children of Israel.

Today, the "Christian" conservatives tell us, every Jew on earth is a direct descendant of the Biblical Israelites. Now (sob!), the Children of Israel are coming home.

None of this is true. In the time Jesus was on earth, the overwhelming majority of the members of the Jewish religion were not in Israel. Not only that, but most Jews at the time were Hellenized. The Bible of most Jews then was in Greek, not Hebrew.

Some Jews had moved out of Israel, but Judaism was a fanatically missionary faith then. It is likely that almost all of the Jews outside Israel were the result of hundreds of years of conversions.

When the Apostles dealt with the Jews, many if not most of the people they dealt with were specifically converts. Many, if not most, of those who were already Jews were converts. Most of the people who had converted THEM were converts. This had gone on for several hundred years. Very, very few adherents of the Jewish religion outside Israel were descended from Israelites.

Since then, most of the new Jews have been converts. Just a few hundred years ago the whole Khazar people, hundreds of thousands, if not millions of them, converted to Judaism. Many, if not most, of today's American Jews are descendants of the Khazars.

So where did the myth that all Jews are Israelites come from? It came from historical necessity. What happened was this: when Christianity took over, any Jew who tried to convert anybody to Judaism would have been burned at the stake.

Later, after Islam took over Palestine from the Christians, it was also illegal for people to try to convert others to Judaism.

To survive, Judaism had to become a religion that did NOT convert people. This was quite a switch. In the time of Jesus, Judaism was a religion fanatically devoted to going out and getting converts.

But to survive under the Christians and Moslems, Judaism began a new myth. To keep the Christians and Moslems from banning Judaism, the Jews said they were all direct descendants of the Children of Israel. They said they had never converted people, and you had always had to be BORN a Jew. They only ALLOWED conversions. Now that they were not allowed to actively convert people, they said they had NEVER tried to convert people. It was the only way Judaism could survive.

There is another problem that is fatal to the whole insane theory the God-owners push about Israel. If it is true that the entire population of Israel marched out in the first century, it would have been the greatest population movement inside the Roman Empire in the entire history of that Empire. We have plenty of Roman history. If this titanic population movement had occurred, we would know about it in detail.

But in the real world, there is no record of it.

It didn't happen.

So what happened to the ACTUAL Children of Israel? According to REAL history, they stayed in Palestine. They are no longer Jews. Most of the population there, as in the rest of the Middle East, became Christian when the Christians took over in the fourth century. Later, when the Moslems took over, most of them became Moslem. In other words, the blood of the Children of Israel is in the Palestinians of today.

The "Christians" are driving the Children of Israel out of Israel in the name of the Bible!

Lately, one person commenting on the Serbian situation on television pointed out that Israel had conducted the most thorough act of ethnic cleansing since World War II. After all, the original

Palestinian population made up almost 100% of the population before Zionism started in the nineteenth century. Now, the original Palestinian population is down to 18% of Israel. That is one hell of a job of ethnic cleansing. What really astonished me was that not one of the other people on the show objected to calling it "ethnic cleansing!" According to World Opinion and "Christian" conservatives, the Zionists had a right to drive the Palestinians out of their homeland.

The God-owners say the Jews are "coming home." According to these so-called "Christian" conservatives, any person a bunch of foreign rabbis have decided to call a Jew has a right to come in and drive out the Palestinians. The story is that the Palestinians, who have been in Palestine for thousands of years, don't belong there.

In the name of God, so-called "Christian" conservatives are helping drive the actual descendants of the Children of Israel out of Palestine!

That is how blasphemy always works.

When we get our independence and some clown who calls himself a "Christian" declares that his first loyalty is to Israel, let's give him a ticket to his real homeland and take away his Confederate passport. Israel won't take him, of course. Who needs other peoples' traitors?

May 29, 1999 - TELL THE TRUTH BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE!

May 29, 1999 - MODERATION AND OTHER DISHONESTY

May 29, 1999 - GETTING EXACTLY WHAT YOU ASK FOR

TELL THE TRUTH BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE!

As Vice President Gore announced his tie-breaking vote for new gun-control legislation, there were two senators standing with him. One of these was the liberal Democratic from New York, Senator Charles Schumer. In New York State a woman who uses a can of mace to protect her from an attacker gets a mandatory one year in prison. The attacker usually gets probation. New York liberals like Schumer have always been famous for, 1) freeing repeat felons, and 2) prosecuting anybody who defends himself.

The point is that Schumer supports laws that are the nightmare of every legitimate gun owner. He is a nut. That is why we must oppose all gun legislation. This has nothing to do with the merits of the specific legislation. This has to do with the fact that we cannot discuss compromises on gun availability with people who have no intention of sticking by their compromise.

So Schumer (Democrat-New York) is ON RECORD as demanding that all honest people in New York who have guns for self-defense be sent to prison. You will never hear a word about this from Orrin Hatch (Respectable-Utah) or John McCain (Respectable-Arizona). You will never hear a word of this from pet conservative commentators on CNN. You will never hear Pat Buchanan tell a liberal that to his face.

Conservative spokesmen -- ALL conservative spokesmen -- simply refuse to make and REPEAT arguments that could wreck the liberals. I discussed this in the February 6 Whitaker Online article, "The Left repeats, So the Right Loses." Conservative spokesmen -- ALL conservative spokesmen -- are

so desperate to gain liberal approval that they simply will not repeat anything that makes liberals really uncomfortable.

It wouldn't be respectable, you see.

On May 8, in "Armed Switzerland and the Colorado Shootings," I pointed out how conservatives in the media -- ALL conservatives in the media -- refuse to use and repeat effective arguments against liberals on gun control. This includes the Pat Buchanans every bit as much as it does standard respectable conservatives.

On May 15, in "Respectable Conservatives never Say 'I Don't Believe You' To A Liberal's Face," I explained that ALL conservative spokesmen refuse to point out what nut-cases liberals are when it comes to gun control. This includes the NRA and people like Buchanan just as much as anybody else.

As the pressure builds up for gun legislation over the Colorado shootings, anti-gun control spokesmen simply refuse to get serious. For them, for ALL of them, personal respectability is far, far more important than principle. Unless their spokesmen finally get serious, all gun-owners will lose. Unless gun-owners start demanding that their spokesmen get serious, they will DESERVE to lose.

With every incident, public demands for gun control increase. Each time our absolute refusal to discuss any rules on gun distribution looks more irrational. But respectable conservatives will never say what must be said about the liberal nutcases with whom we cannot compromise.

Unless we start telling the truth about our opponents, we will lose.

And we will deserve to lose.

Please write the commentators, please write your congressmen, and TELL THEM TO TELL THE TRUTH!

MODERATION AND OTHER DISHONESTY

My boss on Capitol Hill was John Ashbrook, who was proud to be labeled an extremist. Once he was in a committee meeting with Melvin Laird, who was then a Republican congressman. Laird was, as usual, conceding things to Democrats. John said to the microphone, in a stage whisper, "What a prostitute!"

Please note that Mr. Laird would someday lead the department which conservatives worship, the Department of Defense. Goldwater and all the others voted to confirm him to the holy post of Secretary of Defense. Those conservatives would always insist that he was a "true patriot." This "true patriot" spent his entire career giving things away to liberals.

For some reason, conservatives are always being betrayed.

Odd, isn't it?

After Hubert Humphrey died, someone in Congress proposed setting up a Humphrey Scholarship. To make it bipartisan, someone else proposed it be a Humphrey-Dirksen Memorial Fellowship. On the House floor, John Ashbrook said, "The people are not fooled. We are politicians who want to spend the

public's money to honor other politicians....Everett Dirksen HAS a memorial. It is called the national debt!"

Everett Dirksen was not only a respectable conservative icon, he had also been the father of the Senate Republican Leader, Howard Baker. But he had sold out too many times, and John Ashbrook had to tell the truth about him even after he was dead.

John and his people -- including me -- were not popular with respectable conservatives. We were not nice. We were not "reasonable." But by being unreasonable extremists, we were able to accomplish minor miracles.

There are 435 congressmen. The only way that mass of people can move business through is by unanimous consent. Everything in the House requires unanimous consent. Most of the time, unanimous consent is easy to get. Everybody hates somebody who holds things up by refusing unanimous consent. It isn't nice.

But when it comes to the national welfare, a good extremist is not nice.

In 1977, the situation was desperate. Carter had taken over the White House in the 1976 election, and the Democrats had control of both Houses of Congress. A flood of liberal legislation was on the way, and every bill had extra spending and other liberal amendments tacked on.

So John and his handful of extremist buddies would deny unanimous consent until they got rid of the liberal add-ons. A lot of the stuff that had been sneaked in during the flood of business got knocked out. Republican staff hated us. They gave us endless lectures about how, if we would just be "reasonable," no one would notice the bad stuff that went through. If Ashbrook's fanatics would be reasonable, they moaned, we could all go home. Ashbrook refused.

We were wildly unpopular, scorned, insulted, and very, very happy.

This is extremism in action.

Such men as John Ashbrook do not get elected to leadership positions. Such men do not get cabinet seats.

We all know that. The conservative leadership gets along by going along with moderates, and moderates get along by going along with liberals.

Then we are all upset and mystified when we get sold out.

When conservatives do the same thing at the National Republican Convention, the whole country gets sold out.

Richard Nixon was to his party EXACTLY what William Jefferson Clinton is to his party: the Great Trimmer. He was the middle-of-the-road Republican between Rockefeller on the left and the Goldwater-Reagan group on the right. But in 1968 and 1972, all the leading respectable conservatives said, "Nixon is conservative ENOUGH."

So conservatives said they could spare a few principles to win the election, and they nominated Nixon. That is exactly the same reason liberals nominated Clinton in 1992 and 1996. Why did Nixon and Clinton both turn out to be crooks? It is because they both went in as professional moderates. Political moderation is the practice of someone who openly puts his political goals above principles.

Nixon and Clinton were both elected to be crooked.

Someone goes in on a crooked platform. He tells you he puts pragmatism over principle. When he gets into office, he has no principles. And Americans are shocked.

The only incredible sentence above is the last one.

GETTING EXACTLY WHAT YOU ASK FOR

Some time ago I was watching a Discovery Channel program about a community that had been terrorized for months by a nut who lived there. He was always harassing and following women and children. He nearly ran people down. The police would do nothing. He threatened people with death. Finally, he was just about to follow through with his threat to kill a man's family. He came after the man, and the man finally snapped and shot him, again and again.

A jury gave the man who shot this dangerous nut life in prison. His whole community was terribly upset at the sentence. They all said the psychological pressure the kook he shot had been putting on everybody was bound to make this happen.

I do not believe anybody should be allowed to terrify a community this way, so, at first, my sympathies were with the guy who did the shooting. I said AT FIRST. Then it occurred to me that the shooter got the treatment he had advocated all his life.

What occurred to me was this: what if this same man, an upper-middle class by-the-rules California guy who did the shooting, had been on that jury? I'll bet that, if the same facts were presented to him, he would have said, "Well, we can't have people taking the law into their own hands." He, like every one of the twelve upstanding citizens on the jury, would have voted the way the System told him to.

This guy's neighbors considered him a hero. They had all lived through the terror the guy he shot had wreaked on the whole community for months.

Every one of them was furious at the jury verdict.

But every one of them, if he had not experienced that terror and had been on that jury, would have voted the way the lawyers told them to. All their lives, they have championed the System. They have always voted against anyone "taking the law into his own hands." These upper-income Californians are the type of people who went "OOH!" when they were in the audience and some right winger offended Phil Donahue."

In other words, the guy who was stupid enough to stand up for them got what he had always been devoted to promoting. He got what he asked for. His community got the terror they had voted for all their lives. They were like other Americans: The System is Truth for them. Their Only True Faith is that one fatal phrase: "We cannot have people taking the law into their own hands."

Keeping the people from taking the law into their own hands was the cause thousands of British soldiers and American Loyalists died for from 1776 to 1783. You can sum up the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States in these words: "WE, the People of the United States of America, Are Hereby Taking the Law Into Our Own Hands." In South Carolina in the 1950s, if someone had been distributing drugs to schoolchildren, a parent would have gone and shot him dead. No jury would have convicted a parent for it. More important, the process would not have gotten that far: Any District Attorney who would have tried to indict that parent could kiss his political career good-bye.

Today, the DA would get an indictment and the jury would convict. Then the DA would be reelected. The California DA who got the conviction we talked about will get reelected. He will be reelected by exactly the sort of person who shot the nut and got a life sentence for it. If it had been someone else who got indicted, the guy now spending life in prison would have supported that DA for reelection.

In other words, the guy spending his life in prison spent his whole political life asking for it. In the political world, you get what you ask for.

The crime rate in South Africa is out of sight and getting worse.

Surprise, surprise.

The late Alan Paton was the guy who wrote "Cry, the Beloved Country." He made a career out of being an anti-white South African. He got lots of awards and royalties for helping make South Africa what it is today.

Now Alan Paton's sister is leaving South Africa. She says crime has gotten out of control there. Oddly enough, just when things got to be exactly what she and her brother advocated, she has to get the hell out.

But what of South Africans who can't leave? Do I feel sorry for them?

Sorry, but no. They could have dumped the National Party when it started to sell them out, but, like Southern Democrats of the 1960s, they said that it was the "Party Of Their Fathers." When the National Party adopted respectable conservatism and told them to vote for black rule, they voted for black rule.

So they got what they asked for.

Democracy is a system of government where people get what they deserve.

Politics is a deadly serious business, where our entire destiny is at stake. If one treats politics as just another way to be fashionable and sound respectable, he loses everything.

And he deserves to.

June 5, 1999 - BENJAMIN FRANKLIN WAS

ANAZIWHOWANTEDTOKILLSIXMILLIONJEWS!!

June 5, 1999 - MEMORIAL DAY: DIDN'T AMERICA EVER FIGHT COMMUNISTS?

June 5, 1999 - HOW THE PURITANS CAME FROM MOHAMMED

June 5, 1999 - BLIND LOYALTY IS THE REAL TREASON

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN WAS AN AZI WHO WANTED TO KILL SIX MILLION JEWS!!

"The number of purely white people in the world is proportionately very small.... I would wish their numbers were increased.... but perhaps I am partial to the complexion of my country, for such partiality is natural to mankind."

---Benjamin Franklin

MEMORIAL DAY: DIDN'T AMERICA EVER FIGHT COMMUNISTS?

I watched the television coverage of Memorial Day. For over half a century, American soldiers died in Korea and Vietnam and elsewhere holding back the Communists. The Communists killed tens of millions of people, both before and after World War II, and mostly in peacetime. But all I ever see about Communists on television is how bad the anti-Communists were in the McCarthy era.

So what do we see on Memorial Day? Channel after channel presented hours on the Holocaust. Not a word about Communist massacres. The Holocaust is useful to the political left, so the evil of the Nazis is all we hear about.

Honest leftists refer to World War II as "the last good war." Americans who died in that war thought they were fighting against dictatorship. But it turns out they were fighting to open Europe to third world immigration. The official doctrine now is that Americans were in World War II to do away with the white race. They were fighting to open ALL white majority countries, and ONLY white majority countries to immigration and integration.

So that is now what Memorial Day is all about.

Anyone who opposes any of this is "ignoring the Holocaust." Anyone who questions the race policy of liberals and respectable conservative policy is anazi who want to kill six million jews.

Leftists never hesitate to use other people's tragedies for their own purposes. The moment the shooting stopped in Littleton, Colorado, Clinton was using it to push his gun control agenda. No respectable conservative said a word about this incredible callousness. The Jews who died in Nazi Germany are useful to the left, so the left exploits them.

If you are waiting for respectable conservatives to protest even the most extreme use of human tragedy by the left, don't hold your breath.

HOW THE PURITANS CAME FROM MOHAMMED

In the eighth century, the swelling tide of Islam had conquered all of North Africa and spilled over into Europe. The legions of Mohammed came across Spain and surged into the very heart of Europe. They went all the way across France and were only stopped at the battle of Tours, in what is now Belgium.

After the Battle of Tours, the forces of Islam were driven out of what is now France. But they held onto Iberia, the Peninsula which now contains Spain and Portugal. While the rest of Europe was free of the

Mohammedan threat, Spain began a long, agonizing war to free itself of Mohammedan rule. This war lasted for over SEVEN CENTURIES, from the eighth century until 1492.

The slow, horrible process of taking Spain back from Islam was called the "reconquista," the Reconquest. Like later religious wars, it was fought without mercy. As always, the war between two forces that claimed to bring Love and Brotherhood to All Mankind was brutal beyond imagination (See May 15 article, "Wordism"). No one is more totally merciless than Communists and self-styled "Christians" who think they are battling for The Only True Faith.

Finally, after three-quarters of a thousand years of torture and mass killing, the last Mohammedan outpost in Spain was conquered. By this time, the Spaniards were religious extremists to an extent other Europeans found hard to imagine. Naturally, all those generations of war had caused Spain to become unbendingly devoted to its religion.

In 1492, the reconquista ended, and the Spaniards were fanatical Catholics. Then, only twenty-five years later, the Protestant Reformation began. To fight the Reformation, each Catholic country set up an Inquisition. But the Spanish Inquisition was far more ruthless and brutal than any other.

Spain was by far the most powerful Catholic country. It had just taken over the New World, and gold was pouring into Spain. As a result, the extremism of Spain became the standard for battling Protestantism.

While Catholic powers like Austria tried to some extent to reason with Protestants, Spain demanded they be burned alive as quickly as possible. Because of the long, long war Spain had fought to free herself from the grip of Islam, Protestantism was met with pure repression in Catholic lands.

The result of Catholic fanaticism was the rise of an equally fanatical form of Protestantism. In countries where Catholic princes ruled and a Protestant revolt developed, that Protestant revolt was always Calvinist. John Calvin was an absolutely unbending religious extremist who wrote his own theology and ruled Geneva as a religious dictator. He regarded every other form of Protestantism as too soft, and he preached that practically everybody but the few who belonged to his church were damned to Hell. In fact, he even preached that most of the people IN his church were also damned!

In most countries, only the Calvinist kind of Protestant viciousness could fight against Spanish-led Catholic extremism. In France, in Scotland, in the Netherlands (which was rebelling against Spain at the time), the grassroots Protestant revolt was Calvinist.

Mohammed had conquered Spain, and the Spanish Inquisition was a direct result of Spain's long and merciless struggle against its Moslem conquerors. The power of Calvinism was, in turn, the direct result of the Spanish Inquisition.

In England, the Puritans were Calvinists. They were extremists who wanted to clean out every trace of what they called "Papism" from the English Church. These were the Puritans who came to New England.

Let us get one thing straight. The Puritans were entirely different from the Pilgrims. The Pilgrims who landed at Plymouth Rock were NOT theocratic Puritans. Our post-Civil War history likes to confuse the small band of Pilgrims who came here for religious freedom with the Puritans, who came here to stamp out every trace of religious freedom within their territory.

Puritans banned every other church from their territory until 1690, when the British Government forced them to allow other forms of worship. Dissenters like Roger Williams and Hutchinson were thrown out. The spirit of Europe's religious wars had come to America. It would be the basis of the later New England outlook that led to fanatical abolitionism, the Civil War, and the totalitarian tendencies of today's American left.

We see this pattern repeated throughout history. Fanaticism leads to fanaticism. The later fanatics always claim that what they are doing is all right, because of what the earlier fanatics did. Lenin and Stalin claimed that what they did was all right because the Czar had been so evil. The Nazis claimed that what they did was all right because they were fighting the Communists. Today, the antiracists claim that their suppression of all opposition is all right because they are fighting Nazism.

England spent centuries developing freedom of speech. Now they are going back the other way, all in the name of fighting racism (See "Poisoned Fruit," October 24). In America, anti-white fanaticism is justified in the name of fighting Nazism and bigotry (See January 30, "Dirty Old White Men,").

Just as the spirit of the Spanish Inquisition lived on in the Puritans who claimed to be its worst enemies, the spirit of Adolph Hitler lives on today in those who claim to represent Love, Brotherhood, and Racial Tolerance.

BLIND LOYALTY IS THE REAL TREASON

There are lots of pictures on television about refugees crying in the Balkans. It reminds me of the 1970s when I was doing press conferences for the antibusing movement.

In Louisville, thousands of AMERICAN children were forced to wait in the dark and cold at dawn so they could spend HOURS on the bus so they could end up in dangerous ghetto schools as an outnumbered white minority.

There were LOTS of tears there. Lots of children were crying. But, despite everything we could do, not a single newsman was there to report it, much less to PHOTOGRAPH it. It wasn't their issue, you understand. When a single black man is brutally murdered by a racist in Texas, the entire national press is there with the FBI. Every night, black criminals brutalize hundreds of whites, but no one even mentions that.

It isn't THEIR issue.

As I said before, the Communist Pol Pot ruled a country about the size of the one Milosevic rules. He murdered over a million people in that country during the 1970s, but the anti-Vietnam Love Generation didn't say a word. Why was that? Well, Pol Pot was a Communist, and mass murder in the name of Communism is NEVER the stuff of which War Crimes are made. Communists have killed far, far more people in this century than everybody else put together, but no one has ever suggested that any Communist be tried for War Crimes.

After all, the media says, that's not THEIR issue.

But the Serbian War IS their issue.

So I would like an answer to a very simple question: Why am I supposed to blindly support a war that is being fought because it IS their issue?

The answer is that if the United States does it, conservatives will back it, no matter what it is.

This is the history of the American right, and how it has ruined America. Conservatives are always blindly loyal to the institutions liberals have taken over.

Leftists took over the Methodist Church and the Episcopal Church and all the mainline churches, and conservatives kept giving their money to those churches. Conservatives kept leaving money in their wills to those churches. Leftist professors rule on campus, and conservatives give more money to them. For every dollar donated to any conservative cause, conservatives give a hundred dollars to institutions liberals rule. In the case of blind loyalty to institutions, liberals have the superior MORALITY!

The minute any institution stops serving their principles, liberals dump it.

When the Boy Scouts opposed homosexuality, liberals stopped giving them money. If a church starts performing homosexual marriages, it might lose one percent of conservative donations, and that will be TEMPORARY.

My first experience with this immoral conservative loyalty was when I got into politics in the middle 1950s. I immediately saw why conservative voters had lost all influence over presidential policy. Conservative Midwesterners blindly voted for anything that had the Republican label on it.

In the Solid South, conservative Southerners always voted for anything that had the Democratic label on it, no matter what they did to us.

Conservative Democrats and conservative Republicans did not have the slightest loyalty to their principles. The institution, the political party, was everything to them.

Not liberals. Liberals voted for the party that did the most for liberalism. They backed liberal Democrats, but they also voted for Republican liberals like Jacob Javits in New York and Earl Warren in California. It paid off, big time.

Meanwhile, conservatives voted for anything with the right party label on it, including Warren and Javits and all the Republican liberals like them.

Because of this blind and immoral loyalty to their parties, conservatives lost all power over party policy. Each party ignored conservatives when they nominated a presidential candidate and wrote a platform. The Democrats nominated liberals and wrote a hard civil rights platform. All but a handful of TEMPORARY Dixiecrats remained blindly loyal.

Republicans repeatedly nominated Dewey over the conservative Taft. It was clear to everybody that a majority of Republicans wanted the conservative Midwesterner Robert Taft. But the Party nominated Dewey. Party leaders said that conservatives would vote for the Party candidate no matter what. They needed to nominate the more liberal Dewey, who was from New York, in order to get more liberal votes.

In other words, everybody knew liberals were not blindly loyal to anybody, so the parties had to be loyal to them.

In 1960, conservatives wrote Nixon's Republican platform.

But Governor Rockefeller of New York was a liberal, and he wouldn't stand for it. He was for his principles, so he had no blind loyalty to the Republican Party.

So Governor Rockefeller of New York called Nixon and said he wouldn't support Nixon unless Nixon rewrote that platform to suit the liberals. They spent hours on the phone, and Nixon presented the Republican Convention with the platform Rockefeller wanted for his support. According to Theodore White's, "Making of the President, 1960," that cost Nixon the election. He lost by only a few electoral votes, and he got 49% of the vote in South Carolina and Texas, and he got 49.9% in Missouri. Just a few more conservative Democrats would have won for him.

In 1964, all the liberal Republicans refused to support Goldwater when he won the nomination. As soon as Goldwater was defeated, he turned the party back over to the moderates.

And what if Rockefeller won the nomination in 1964? Every conservative Republican would have CRAWLED to him, begging for the privilege of supporting him.

Droolingly loyal people get exactly what they deserve. They get ignored. Their cause gets ignored. But all liberals have to do to get conservatives to do what they want is to wave the right flag. Liberals want a war in Serbia? They just have to point to the uniforms Americans soldiers are wearing, and most conservatives will drop to their knees and BEG for the privilege of supporting the liberals.

When did conservatives finally begin to get some control over national policy? It was when they stopped being blindly loyal. In 1964, conservative Democrats in the South started leaving the Democratic Party -- At last! -- and the Republican Southern Strategy was born!

In 1968, George Wallace ran on a ticket that pulled a major portion of the Democratic base out of the party. Wallace said, "There's not a dime's worth of difference between the two parties." The road to Reagan began, because there was a real hope of Republicans getting conservative votes by going conservative.

Meanwhile, Republican conservatives remained loyal to Nixon, and we all know the result of that.

When Nixon took over in 1969, he went out of his way to kick conservatives in the teeth, as they deserved. He appointed a pro-busing Commissioner of Education. He demanded a national welfare program with a minimum guaranteed income, and took other steps even the DEMOCRATS were afraid to propose. When Nixon got kicked out of office, he appointed Ford as his successor. Ford appointed ROCKEFELLER as his vice president!

And year after weary year, throughout the '50s, the '60s, and the '70s, I kept asking, "Is anybody tired of this yet?" Conservatives would say they were tired of it, and then they would go back and support anything with a Republican label on it. Lake High quoted a line from Kipling which might have been the conservatives' motto:

"And the burnt fool's bandaged finger goes wabbling back to the fire."

Or, as another friend of mine put it, "Every four years, conservatives go to the Republican Convention, get kicked in the teeth, and come up smiling." So when someone tells me I am not being "loyal" to the United States because I am a Southern Nationalist, or I am not being "loyal" because I am not supporting the Republican Party or some other institution, I tell them this:

Blind loyalty to any institution is treason to one's principles.

June 12, 1999 - BUSING BY BOMBER

June 12, 1999 - THE CONFEDERATE ENTRY FEE

BUSING BY BOMBER

Liberals are backing the Balkan war unanimously. In case you are wondering why, let me enlighten you. President Clinton has stated the purpose of this war:

"We must remember the principle we and our allies have been fighting for in the Balkans is the principle of multi-ethnic, tolerant, inclusive democracy. We have been fighting against the idea that statehood must be based entirely on ethnicity."

General Wesley Clark stated this more specifically: "Let's not forget what the origin of the problem is. There is no place in modern Europe for ethnically pure states. That's a 19th century idea and we are trying to transition into the 21st century, and WE are going to do it with MULTI-ETHNIC STATES."

America is now committed to WAR to force multiculturalism on all of Europe! Why? Please see May 8 article, "Why Power Hungry Elites Want "Multiculturalism".

In other words, our official policy is that this is a war to impose Wordism on Europe (See May 15 article, "Wordism"). Every liberal, and therefore every respectable conservative, is a Wordist.

Wordism is absolutely essential to liberalism. It is therefore absolutely essential to respectable conservatism.

THE CONFEDERATE ENTRY FEE

The Confederacy will probably be the only non-Wordist outpost among all the countries on earth that have a white majority. If you want an ethnically pure community inside the Confederacy, you will be welcome to have one.

As I discussed earlier, the Confederacy should allow people to form their own communities, all-white, theocratic, gay, mixed, computer fanatics, blood relations only, whatever you wish (See March 6 article, "How Tomorrow's Confederacy Will Deal With Tomorrow's Reality"). But there is a reality that we all must face: in order to hold ground, a nation must pay for it. This is the reality that limits freedom, and this is the reality that so many ideologues try to ignore.

Benjamin Franklin lived in Philadelphia, the home colony of the Quakers. Quakers wanted freedom of worship and they wanted to keep a very large colony under their rule. These are things men have to

fight and die for. But Quakers also wanted to be pacifists. Obviously, if everybody in Pennsylvania had been pacifists, the Indians and/or the French would have driven them into the Atlantic Ocean. So other people had to do the Quaker's fighting for them. So the Quakers were the original American leftists. They never hesitated to be pure hypocrites.

In his autobiography, Franklin gives many examples of Quaker hypocrisy. He discusses one incident where William Penn himself was on a ship, which sighted another ship. Penn and the rest thought the other ship was manned by pirates. Faced with this threat of death, a young Quaker on board ran up to help fight off the threat, and all the other Quakers, including Penn, cheered him on.

Then it turned out the other ship was friendly. Immediately the other Quakers, including Penn, turned on the boy, shouting that he had violated his Quakerism by wanting to fight. The boy pointed out that, when they thought they were in danger, Penn and the rest had been all for his fighting.

More generally, Franklin points out that the Quakers used their pacifism to save money at the cost of other peoples lives. When Pennsylvania frontiersmen were massacred by Indians and asked for help, the Quakers piously refused to help, citing their pacifism. So they saved the cost of munitions they might have sent. But when the threat got past the frontier, and the rich Quakers themselves were threatened, Franklin got through an appropriation.

Today, the national Quaker organizations are the most left wing church groups, even among all the other left wing churches today. Solzhenitsyn discusses American Quakers who went to the Gulag Archipelago and who, being leftists, were good friends to the Stalinists and reported only what the left wanted them to say.

By the way, Richard Nixon was the descendant of Quakers. But Nixon's forebears went to North Carolina. In North Carolina, there was nobody to protect those Quakers, so they either had to do their own fighting or die. So, surprise, surprise, the North Carolina Quakers were known as "the fighting Quakers."

When I was a boy, I remember reading how William Penn had made an agreement with an Indian chief. The story, given as real history, said that, since that time, no Quaker had ever been killed by an Indian. Nixon's ancestors would have found that grimly amusing. Actually, the Quakers avoided Indian attacks by staying safely away from the frontier and letting frontiersmen fight the Indians. The frontiersmen would take land from the Indians. The Quakers would then nonviolently get the land from the frontiersmen by using the law.

Speaking of famous pacifists, one of the funniest things I have ever heard was said by the person whom liberals, and therefore respectable conservatives, look upon as a sort of human god. This worshipped being was Mahatma Ghandi. After World War II, someone asked Ghandi what he would have done if the Japanese had taken India. Ghandi replied that, if the Japanese had taken India, he would have used the same tactics against them that he used against the British!

I can just see it now. The Japanese invaders have finally conquered India. They have heard of this great Resistance Leader, Mahatma Ghandi. A Japanese officer is asking about this Ghandi when a dirty little man walks up and starts babbling about how he will starve himself if the Japanese don't leave.

The officer chops off the dirty little man's head. He then continues looking for this Mahatma Ghandi who is leading a Resistance to Japan.

Nonviolence only works if you have somebody to protect you. Quakers are big on nonviolence when it means THEY don't have to fight, but they have no hesitation in using others to do their fighting for them. If anybody threatens a Quaker, he immediately calls a policeman, a man with a gun at his side, to protect him.

In the Confederacy, there should be no room for people who piously refuse to carry their own weight. You pay our taxes, you help to fight our battles, or you leave. There can be room for a LIMITED number of genuine pacifists in the Confederacy, but only if they are willing to carry their weight some other way. When I was very small, our landlady was a descendant of a family that produced Confederate generals. Her son was a genuine pacifist, so he had done his duty in World War II as a medic. As a medic, he had won a Silver Star, which she showed to me. Seeing that medal, I realized that heroism and blood shows. Even as a pacifist, he could not help being a hero! He was the opposite of William Penn and the general run of Quakers.

But in the real world, if you want to have ground to live on, somebody has to hold that ground with a gun. Help us do it, or go elsewhere. We will have religious freedom, but religion will be no excuse to avoid your obligations.

Don't get me wrong. I think a pacifist should be free to avoid doing his part. I just do not think he should be able to do it at my expense. If someone wants to be a free rider, I think we should pay for his ticket to a country which will accept him and let him be a free rider at THEIR expense.

June 19, 1999 - SURPRISE, SURPRISE, ANOTHER LIBERAL PROGRAM DOESN'T WORK IN YET ANOTHER PLACE

June 19, 1999 - WHY IS THE AIR FORCE IN UNIFORM?

SURPRISE, SURPRISE, ANOTHER LIBERAL PROGRAM DOESN'T WORK IN YET ANOTHER PLACE

One-year results of the confiscation of 640,381 personal firearms in Australia:

OBSERVABLE FACTS AFTER 12 MONTHS OF DATA:

Australia-wide, homicides are up 3.2%.

Australia-wide, assaults are up 8.6%.

Australia-wide, armed-robberies are up 44%. (yes, FORTY-FOUR PERCENT)

In the state of Victoria, homicides-with-firearms are up 300%!

There has been a dramatic increase in break-ins and assaults on the elderly

At the time of the ban, the Prime Minister said, "self-defense is not a reason for owning a firearm." Like all leftists, he insisted that the police would take of that.

Check with any social science faculty at any college or university, and you will find at least 90% of them will insist that the Prime Minister is right.

We pay them to be our experts, you know.

In 1996, the head of the Australian gun registration bureau had testified that gun control "has not prevented or solved a single crime," and called for the abolition of his agency and his job.

They ignored him and listened to the "intellectuals." As always, what the "intellectuals" recommended was a disaster. (Please see November 21, 1998 article, "It Doesn't Work!!!.")

WHY IS THE AIR FORCE IN UNIFORM?

One of the most profitable results of secession is going to be the fact that we will be able to reexamine all of the mistakes the United States takes for granted. In our new political system, we will be free to improve on all of them. I discussed some of these improvements earlier (See March 6 article, "How Tomorrow's Confederacy Will Deal With Tomorrow's Problems.")

At least one such major improvement occurred when we seceded last time. The Confederate Constitution contained great advances over that of the United States. Improvements happen when you get a fresh start. This is an excellent answer to use when people talk about the DANGERS of a new nation. One should reply by talking about the IMPROVEMENTS a new start can provide.

The United States has great difficulty finding enough volunteers for its armed services. But a new country might be able to avoid this difficulty by being free of the POLITICAL restrictions that our present armed services have inherited over the years.

Under the Reagan Administration, I was a Special Assistant to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management. Under the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, the OPM Director replaced the entire Civil Service Commission.

He is responsible to the president for the Federal civil service.

In Reagan's time, the civil service included about 1.4 million white-collar personnel and about 800,000 blue-collar personnel. Very roughly half of these civilian employees worked for the Department of Defense. I discovered that civilian workers could do many jobs better than uniformed personnel. Unfortunately for our national defense, the division between civilian and uniformed personnel is determined by politics, rather than by our real defense needs.

Under the present set-up, it is the lobbies, not military needs, that determine the number of uniformed personnel in each service. The former members of each armed service constitute a powerful lobby. Military advisors, who are drawn equally from each force, also have enormous influence on decisions. The result of this is that each of the major armed forces must, because of all that lobbying, be given about the same amount of funding. By the same token, each force must have about the same number of people in uniform.

But in the real world, is this rational? In a changing world, does it make sense for each armed service to be about the same size, with very much the same number of uniformed personnel? It is for

POLITICAL reasons that the number of uniformed personnel in the Air Force must be about the same as the number of uniformed personnel in the Army and in the Navy.

But if you think about it, this makes no sense. The basic function of the Army is to put enlisted men into combat, as well as officers. In the Air Force, almost none of the enlisted personnel go into combat. Their jobs are technical. They keep the planes flying, and it is only the flying portion of the officer corps that goes into combat.

In other words, everyone in the Army should be young and physically fit for combat. No one should be allowed to enlist in the Army unless he is young and fit. But the job of most people in the Air Force is entirely different.

Think of it this way: If you were a combat pilot, who would you prefer to have taking care of your plane? Would you like to have your plane serviced by a twenty-year-old who got a quick crash course in airplanes and is physically fit for combat? Or would you rather that the person taking care of your aircraft be a forty-year-old man who is very experienced? The young man in uniform is a LOT more expensive than the forty-year-old mechanic. There are lifelong benefits provided to everyone who has served in uniform. There is the cost of recruiting and training a new fit young man every time the last one's four-year enlistment runs out.

And there is another difficulty involved in putting so many Air Force personnel in uniform. Every person who enlists in the Air Force is a person who would have been able to enlist in the Army or the Navy or the Marines. A young person usually decides to join the service and then picks the branch he will serve in. If we cut back on the number of Air Force personnel in uniform, almost all of the Air Force recruits would be available for service in the other branches. The shortage of volunteers would be reduced, and it may even disappear.

Exactly how many Air Force uniformed personnel should be replaced by non-uniformed personnel? Granted that I am supposed to be an expert in everything, but even I would need a little time to study that question. But the general point I am making is obvious when it is stated without the lobbyists watching. The simple fact is that the mission of each armed force is different, so it doesn't make sense for each of them to have almost the same number of personnel in uniform.

Already, each of America's armed forces has hundreds of thousands of uniformed personnel and hundreds of thousands of civilian employees. All I am saying is that the proportion of each should change according to each service's particular mission.

June 26, 1999 - TRUTH HURTS

June 26, 1999 - STOKELY CARMICHAEL, RIP

TRUTH HURTS

When I first got a top secret clearance, I had been appointed to be on a task force which was determining rules of security clearances for the entire civil service. I was to be directly responsible to the head of the entire civil service for, among other things, security clearances.

So this was a fairly important clearance, and it was supposed to be a cinch. For some reason, I always seem to be disappointing people who expect things to be easy.

My adjudicator, looking over the voluminous files that described my wild past in America and abroad, just shook his head. There were lots of files, including some adverse information from both the FBI and the CIA. I wondered how he would make a decision.

He used common sense.

He said, "You are DEFINITELY not a Communist."

When it came to security, our problem was Communists.

Today, our major problem is psychopaths, people who say what we want to hear (See March 20 article, "Rule Without Conscience"). I am often a lousy diplomat and I am definitely a troublemaker. But I am not going to tell anybody what they want to hear.

The last thing the government had to worry about with someone with my history was that I was a Communist. By the same token, you do not have to worry that I will be too nice.

In these columns, I have offended everybody. Pat Buchanan, the closest friend we have in Washington, caught a lot of criticism here from the very beginning of "Whitaker Online." (Please see "Respectable Conservatives Kill Their Wounded", Sept. 26 and October 3 article, "Defining Respectable Conservatives - They're Just Bureaucrats".) Looking back over my Washington career, I have always been amazed that anybody ever hired me.

Shortly after I started working for Congressman John Ashbrook, National Review had an article blasting me and everybody who sympathized with my point of view. On the very first page, who would they quote against my side but -- Congressman John Ashbrook! Standing in his office and looking at it together, we both laughed out loud.

What John Ashbrook needed as a senior staffer was not someone who agreed with him on everything, but an advisor who was brave enough or stupid enough to tell him the truth.

When I was appointed to a job in the Reagan Administration, it turned out that one of my buddies was charged with providing the materials for my political clearance. The big thing that might disqualify me was harsh criticism of Reagan himself. So the first thing he had to do was to tear a couple of pages out of my first book.

It is hard for me to think of anybody I haven't criticized. It is hard for me to imagine anyone I WOULDN'T criticize, including myself.

Especially myself.

In the real world, everybody praises honesty to the skies but very, very few of them actually want to be exposed to it. The person who is successful today is the person who never really offends people. At the same time, he convinces them that he tells the brutal, unvarnished truth and they, because they are tough and realistic, are able to take it.

In short, his "truth" doesn't cause any pain.

That little balancing act requires a psychopath.

Real truth hurts.

STOKELEY CARMICHAEL, RIP

Stokeley Carmichael did me a big favor. All through my youth, one thing I really hated was the word "Neeegrow" (Negro). It is an unnatural word for the English language. Nowhere else in the English tongue was one required to pronounce two long, hard consonants that close together. It is especially unnatural for a Southerner to say that word. That is exactly why liberals loved to force Southerners to say it.

So for many years, every Southerner who spoke in public was required to pronounce the word Neeegrow, which was like forcing him to bow down in public. Southern traitors and Southern Crawlers loved to say "Negro." They loved to bow down to Yankees. But real Southerners like me HATED that word.

To repeat, that is exactly what Yankees loved about it.

It was also a fact that, since black speech and Southern speech have similarities, Neeegrow was unnatural for black people to say as well. But that was important to nobody. It is a simple fact that blacks had no place in the leadership of the "Negro" rights movement. There was no black president of the NAACP, for example, for the first sixty years of its existence. Then as now, mainline black "leaders" did exactly what their white liberal masters told them to.

Until well into the 1960s, the civil rights movement was just Northern whites against Southern whites. The main purpose of the movement was for Northern whites to triumph over Southern whites. Forcing Southern whites to use the word "Neeegrow" was a major triumph for the Northern whites. Whether or not blacks found the word natural was of no importance whatsoever.

Stokeley Carmichael was the first nationally prominent militant black leader. He was also the first to criticize the word "Neeegrow." It was Stokeley Carmichael who got rid of "Negro," which was unnatural for black people to pronounce. He was the one who replaced "Negro" with "black." This was a shock to white liberals, and it was one of the things they never forgave Carmichael for.

Another thing they never forgave him for was a piece of pure heresy only a black man could have gotten away with. Carmichael told a liberal audience, "If I hear 'six million Jews' one more time, I am going to puke. We have our own dead to bury."

I spent the whole decade of the 1960s hearing "six million Jews" at least a dozen times a week. Liberals used the death of European Jews to justify every single leftist position. I was not the only person who was sick of hearing that phrase, but anyone who objected was called anazihowantedtokillsixmillionjews. To me, Carmichael's daring heresy was like spring rain on a wilted field.

Eldridge Cleaver won the love of liberals by demanding that white women be raped "to bring them down off that pedestal." But all Carmichael ever wanted from "whitey" was power. I cannot understand

someone who wants to make war on women. I can understand someone who wants power, or I wouldn't be a specialist in politics.

A few years back, a Southern Nationalist buddy of mine had dinner with Carmichael in an Ethiopian restaurant in DC. They talked about power. American black "leaders" talk about being "African-Americans," but they stay in opulent America and enjoy the money liberals give them for their services.

Carmichael went back to Africa and died at his home in Guinea. Once again, he offended liberals by criticizing blacks who refuse to go back and actually HELP what they call "their people" in Africa itself. Liberals like black "leaders" who stay on the dole, and who stay right here under their liberal masters' lily-white thumbs.

I ask the pardon of those who cannot stand any mention of Carmichael because of his politics. But for those of us who have spent a lifetime in the political wars, there sometimes remains a certain respect across the battle lines.

July 3, 1999 - CNN DISCLAIMER

July 3, 1999 - WHY WORDISTS LOVE TO SAY, "THAT'S WHAT AMERICA IS ALL ABOUT."

CNN DISCLAIMER

You can tell Bosnia was a liberal war from the solid support it got in the press. Reporters would always begin a report from Serbia by saying Serbia limited their freedom to report. They would have a standard announcement that Serbian authorities limited where reporters could go and what they could say.

You know, it's funny, but they never said a word about any limitations when they were reporting from a COMMUNIST country. There were a lot of restrictions on reporting from Communist countries, but no reporter ever mentioned them.

Aleksander Solzhenitsyn spent many years in Siberia facing Communist guards, guns, barbed wire and guard dogs. He laughed at the fake courage of the American press. He said that the American press acted very brave when it was dealing with American authorities. He said they didn't act so brave in Communist countries. He pointed out that these brave American reporters hopped to attention and obeyed when some nasty little Red Guard in China told them to.

Now that's odd. I never heard any reporter talk about problems in Red China, from the the Red Guard or anybody else. They never complained about the ever-present travel restrictions in any Communist country. The press didn't want to make the Communists look bad. Liberals did want to make Serbia look bad.

American media are only interested in freedom of the press when it serves the liberal cause.

WHY WORDISTS LOVE TO SAY, "THAT'S WHAT AMERICA IS ALL ABOUT."

This is a follow up to my May 15 article called "Wordism." The opposite of nationalism is Wordism. Wordists say that we should forget our race, our culture, and everything about our natural identity. Wordists say that the only important thing is their Final And Absolute truth. Communism is a form of Wordism. All the thousands of other philosophies that claim to Unite All Men in Universal Peace are forms of Wordism.

Nationalism, at its worst, cannot do as much harm as Wordism has done. Protestant and Catholic Wordists fought the religious wars that wiped out a major portion of the population of Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

In our century, Communism has killed at least a hundred million people directly and even more indirectly. Wordism routinely kills so many people and causes so much suffering that it makes Hitler look like a piker. In America today, all the talk is about racism and divisiveness. But here again, what is actually destroying America is Wordism.

To a Wordist, an American is not someone who was born in America. To a Wordist, a True American is someone who BELIEVES in the right WORDS.

To a liberal, a True American is anybody who believes in the Melting Pot and integration. Liberals would love to replace us with hundreds of millions of third world leftists who BELIEVE in leftism. To a liberal, THAT would be a True America made up of True Americans.

Many "Christian" conservatives would LOVE to replace any native born American with a fundamentalist Brazilian convert.

Libertarians want America to open up its borders completely to unlimited immigration.

Yes, Virginia, each of these groups BELIEVES this. I am NOT making this up. And these loons are not extreme examples. Wordist nutcases RUN this country.

According to Wordists, America did not become great because we are a special people. America is great, according to Wordists, only because of the WORDS. It is only the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence that make America a free country. The people who happen to be here are incidental.

According to Wordists, as long as we keep the right words, any people on earth would do just as well with this country as Americans do.

All any population needs to be America is THE RIGHT PIECES OF PAPER. A Wordist conservative will say that America is just the words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence and the Gettysburg Address.

For a Wordist liberal or a respectable conservative, America is even less than that. To liberals and respectable conservatives, as I explained on October 31, 1998, America is just "Five Words and Emma Lazarus."

Any liberal will look you straight in the eye and say that a True American is anyone on earth who believes in what he believes in. A Wordist conservative will tell you exactly the same thing.

This is the official doctrine of those people who are always telling us "What America Is All About." To the liberals and respectable conservatives, America is all about WORDS. As long as we have the words, the PEOPLE are interchangeable.

To Wordists, anyone who says America is in any way a special PEOPLE is Evil. If you say Americans are a special PEOPLE, you are a Nativist. If you say Americans are a special PEOPLE, you are a Racist.

You are a Nativist and a Racist unless you agree that Americans are simply interchangeable with any other people on earth.

I say that is nonsense.

I believe that the words of our nation's Founding Documents were a product of the PEOPLE who wrote them. I believe in a combination of heredity as well as environment, of genetics as well as culture. Our people are not interchangeable with any other on earth.

Most white Americans today are the descendants of people who came here before 1800. In *The Wealth of Nations* (1776), Adam Smith points out that the population of the American colonies was doubling NATURALLY about every twenty to twenty-five years. That means that for each couple that arrived in 1700, there would be an extra TWENTY people in America in 1775!

The earlier you got here, the more offspring you had. It is a simple geometric progression.

America had more German immigrants than British immigrants. But we have more British blood in our veins, because the British immigrants got here earlier, and multiplied more.

By the time Ellis Island opened up, the NATURAL INCREASE of Americans had slowed down enormously. Those who settled in the cities through Ellis Island did little more than replace their own numbers.

Even our big cities contain more descendants of earlier Americans than of recent immigrants! Even at the height of immigration in the late nineteenth century, more Americans came into the cities from the rapidly increasing population of the country and small towns of America than came in from Europe.

In other words, America keeps what freedom it has and its enterprising climate largely because we still have the genes that founded the whole thing. The genes that founded America, that opened the frontiers, also produced huge numbers of offspring in those frontier areas.

The Wordist has to claim that his words are everything, and genes are nothing. Unlike the Wordist, I don't have to claim that either genetics or environment is everything. I think America is the result of a combination of genes and culture. But the genes are indispensable.

Americans are not interchangeable.

July 10, 1999 - THE MONKEY GRIP

July 10, 1999 - BILL PRESS JUMPS ON STEVE FORBES

July 10, 1999 - NO, IT'S NOT DR. WHITAKER

THE MONKEY GRIP

You have probably noticed that television and movies now show people holding pistols sideways. They hold the gun in the same way a monkey would grab one.

Look at all the tapes of live action shooting that have ever been taken. You will never see one single person using this monkey grip on a real gun in a real fighting situation.

In the movies, everybody who has a pistol is an expert. According to television, anyone can hit his target if it's close. Anyone can therefore afford to hold his gun sideways in a fighting situation. Actually, no matter how often you have done it, you can miss anything in a fighting situation.

That is why, in the real world, a professional will use a two-handed grip on his pistol.

That is why, in the real world, nobody uses the monkey grip.

BILL PRESS JUMPS ON STEVE FORBES

Steve Forbes was on CNN's Crossfire. As soon as he mentioned his flat tax idea, Bill Press pointed out that his staff had studied it. He said that they had found out that Forbes would save tens of millions of dollars under the flat tax. Press said that was why Forbes wanted the flat tax.

Like all liberals, Press plays for blood. He knows how serious political power is. He gets personal any time he feels that will help his cause. For a liberal his principles come first, and respectability be damned. Press made one conservative walk off the show by accusing him of being a hypocrite. Press plays hardball.

All this is fair. The show is called "Crossfire." But what I want everybody to notice is that no conservative will ever use such hardball tactics against Press.

Bill Press is always against mandatory sentencing for rapists or killers. And Bill Press always says that he is in favor of gun control, but not against legitimate self-defense. But every place people like Press are in power, they pass laws which give MANDATORY one year sentences to anyone who carries a gun or a can of mace for his own defense.

This is true in New York. This is true in Washington, DC. This is true wherever people like Press gain power.

Has any conservative, including Pat Buchanan, ever mentioned this? Of course not. It would offend Press.

No professional conservative would ever play actual hardball with his liberal master. Principles are not that important to ANY professional conservative.

NO, IT'S NOT DR. WHITAKER

In a radio interview a couple of weeks ago, I was referred to as a Ph.D. Southern Events referred to me as "Dr. Whitaker." For the record, it isn't true.

I am one of the legions of people who went through all the course work for the Ph.D., passed the comprehensive examinations for the doctorate, went off to teach in college, and never finished the degree. It is probably the best thing that ever happened to me.

It was not the best thing that ever happened to the University of Virginia, where I took all that graduate work. The reason it was bad for the University was not because I didn't get MY degree. It was because of the REASON I didn't get it.

Like about forty percent of the other people who do all the course work and go off to teach in college, I never finished my doctoral dissertation, or "thesis," as it is it often miscalled (a thesis is for a master's degree). The dissertation is a piece of original research or theory, usually a hundred pages or so long. All my graduate courses had been taken and my comprehensive exams had been passed with some to spare.

Even the hard part of my dissertation was over. I had presented my topic to the graduate seminar, where all the professors and graduate students heard my topic and cross-examined me on it. I had written a major part of it.

The last obstacle had been breached: I had gotten my first and second readers. These are the two graduate professors who are your sponsors. They accept your topic and sign off on the dissertation after it is finished. Both my readers were part of an independently funded section of the economics department called The Center for Public Choice.

While I was away teaching, a political science professor became Dean of Arts and Sciences. His first action as the new dean was to kick The Center for Public Choice out of the University of Virginia! So my dissertation was kaput. A better man might have gone back and started again. I was too lazy.

I was, in fact, notoriously lazy. In graduate school, we had almost no regular textbooks. Instead, each class was given a thick list of the latest academic articles to read for discussion in class. The year after I left the University of Virginia, one of the graduate professors was handing out his list of articles to read for the course, and some students complained about how long it was.

The professor said he knew of one student -- meaning me -- who had made it all the way through all the course work and comprehensive examinations without reading one single article in any of his courses. He told the class they were welcome to try not reading any articles, if they thought they could get away with it. As I say, I was not only lazy, I was famous for it. There was no way I was going to go back and start my dissertation over again.

But in the end, I cannot blame others for my failure to finish my degree. The simple fact is that I did not want it badly enough.

In any case, this situation cost the University of Virginia far more than it cost me. My second reader later won a Nobel Prize in Economics! If he had been at the University of Virginia at the time he won that Nobel Prize, it would have been one of those huge boosts for the school that universities dream about.

And, since The Center for Public Choice had its own grant money, the University would have had a Nobel Laureate without even having to pay his salary!

Public Choice finally won acceptance, but not because academia ever grew up enough to accept it. Public Choice became legitimate because those who DID get their PhDs in the field were enormous successes. One of them, James Miller, succeeded David Stockman as Director of OMB. Another was for many years editor of the editorial page of the Wall Street Journal. Several Nobel Prizes were awarded in Public Choice, two of them to former professors of mine. One was kicked out of the University, as I said. Another had left earlier on his own. If he lived to see it, the dean who booted The Center for Public Choice out of the University of Virginia was humiliated.

I could say that this experience soured me on academia. Unfortunately, the record shows that I had never been sweet on it in the first place. The professors who got me my fellowship and brought me to the University of Virginia were openly contemptuous of regular academic opinion.

They probably felt that my main qualification for graduate work with them was the fact that I had always been down on the academic bureaucracy. I gave academia hell while I was in college.

Academia likes to think of itself as a collection of true intellectuals. But our society has allowed social science professors to create a completely inbred bureaucracy. In the real world, it would be astonishing if social scientists had turned out to be anything BUT an inbred bureaucracy.

If a physics professor has a theory that doesn't work, experiments will soon show him up. If engineering professors are allowed to push idiotic ideas, bridges fall down or planes crash. In the real sciences, there are practical limitations on silliness.

But in the social sciences, Political Correctness rules. Nothing a social scientist says has to work. His only job is to please other social scientists. In the social sciences, experts choose other experts, and the only thing anyone has to satisfy is fashionable opinion. The result is an inbred bureaucracy. How could it be anything else?

Social science professors are the only people who decide who will become a social science professor. There is no outside control, because nothing they propose ever has to WORK.

Every group of humans which is given money and power, and is subject to no outside control whatsoever, has always turned into a self-serving bureaucracy. Those who insist that social scientists are "intellectuals" have never explained why this same degeneration should not have occurred among them.

The big problem here is that the study of bureaucracy is part of the social sciences. A student of bureaucracy who was also an intellectual would ask, first of all, whether he himself had become a bureaucrat. But, precisely because it IS an inbred bureaucracy, the social science establishment will never ask that question.

July 17, 1999 - RACIAL PROFILING IS THE FAULT OF BLACK CRIMINALS
July 17, 1999 - PROFILING THE RIGHT

RACIAL PROFILING IS THE FAULT OF BLACK CRIMINALS

The trendy new liberal cause is "profiling." The evil "profiling" approach involves policemen using this kind of logic: "I see a young black man driving slowly around an affluent neighborhood at 2 am. I think I should stop him and check him out to protect the public."

This is unfair to an innocent young black who just HAPPENS to be driving slowly at 2 in the morning. What liberals ignore is the REASON the unfortunate young black man looks suspicious. The REASON this black man is being stopped is not because there is a plot against him. Police consider him a possible danger to the public because there are OTHER young black men who are killing, robbing, raping, and maiming people.

Liberals blame everybody -- police, Society, whites -- for this young black man's problem. Everybody, that is, except those who are responsible. That young black man is being stopped because of his fellow blacks who are committing all those crimes.

It doesn't bother liberals, of course, but the killing, raping, and maiming of honest people is something we want stopped. As long as black criminals are doing most of the killing and maiming and raping, honest blacks are going to be harassed.

Let's blame the criminals for a change.

PROFILING THE RIGHT

All the authorities urge us, "DO NOT pick up hitchhikers."

Does this mean ALL hitchhikers are evil? Not at all. The same authorities who urge us not to pick up hitchhikers would agree that most of them are harmless people who simply don't have the money to pay for another form of transportation.

So the slogan, "Don't pick up hitchhikers," is an exercise in PROFILING. Because a few hitchhikers are dangerous criminals, we are urged not to pick up ANY hitchhikers.

Liberals agree to profiling hitchhikers this way. That's OK because hitchhikers are not one of the liberals' pet minority groups.

You are welcome to say that anyone with his thumb out on a public road is a potential criminal. But you are NOT free to say that it is more likely that an illegal alien at the Mexican border will be a brown person who speaks Spanish.

The NAACP and the ACLU are going to court to prevent the INS from checking brown, Latin people on the Mexican border. They admit that it is more likely that a brown person with a Spanish accent is an illegal alien. But they argue that the INS should be required to check blond people with eastern accents just as often.

These nuts are serious.

As with all liberal programs, this one is not supposed to WORK. Liberals admit this would be a waste of resources. But it would benefit one of their pet groups.

The liberal media are saying it is awful that the police check out young blacks more often because they are young and black. They admit that more young blacks commit crimes. They admit that checking out middle-aged whites as often as young blacks would be a waste of police resources. They agree that crime would go up.

But that's OK. No liberal program is ever supposed to WORK.

Please note that all this worry about profiling is limited strictly to groups the left likes: blacks and Hispanics and similar groups.

But when it comes to groups liberals don't like, they profile all the time.

When two insane kids murdered their classmates in Colorado, liberals demanded action against every gun owner in America. Every person in America who owns a weapon is lumped together with these two nutcases, instantly and without question. What if, every time a black criminal raped or murdered a white person, there was instant coast-to-coast discussion about whether black people needed to be controlled more carefully?

In my May 8 article, "Armed Switzerland and the Colorado Killings," I pointed out that hundreds of thousands of Swiss men have real, fully automatic assault weapons at home which are paid for by the government. They have no more gun crimes than England does, and England has absolutely vicious, total gun control.

In that May 8 article, I also pointed out that concealed weapon permit holders in the United States have every bit as good a record for their gun ownership as the Swiss do. But liberals profile permit holders together with those two young psychos in Colorado.

So let's get this straight: "profiling" is only bad if it is used in ways which liberals do not approve.

A couple of years ago, a black man got an automatic weapon, boarded a New York subway, and killed every white person he could. He declared that he did it because he hated whites.

A couple of weeks ago, a white supremacist rode around Chicago killing non-whites.

Now let us take a look at what was blamed in each case.

In the case of the black killing whites because he hated them, his gun was blamed. A wife of one of his victims is now in Congress, leading the attack against every legitimate gun owner in this country. The murderer's hatred of whites is never mentioned.

In the case of the white supremacist, CNN's Talk Back Live immediately did a piece on white supremacists. CNN did special after special on "Hate groups," which includes anyone who disagrees with the liberal racial program.

Nothing liberals do ever WORKS (See November 21, 1998 article, "It Doesn't WORK!"). This profiling issue is a good example to explain WHY nothing liberal ever WORKS. It is very simple: 1) Every example of profiling that liberals OBJECT TO is based on reality, and 2) Every kind of profiling liberals DO is based on a myth.

It is not fair for an innocent young black man who is driving around slowly in an affluent neighborhood to be stopped and questioned by police. But if the police do NOT question young blacks who do that, a lot of people will pay a HUGE price for this wonderful, Politically Correct behavior.

Likewise, it would be nice if millions of Mexicans were to suddenly stop flooding across our southern border in violation of American law. But until that happens, any serious surveillance at the Rio Grande will have to concentrate on people who are dark and speak Spanish. Liberals want to ignore reality and have the public pay the price of Political Correctness.

Meanwhile, the knee-jerk liberal reaction of lumping permit holders together with people who shoot up schools has no basis in reality whatsoever.

You can pass laws prohibiting guns within a mile of a school, and it will not stop a single school homicide. Murderers don't worry about gun laws. Actually, the one case where such laws had an effect was in the case of a person shooting up a school who was finally stopped by a teacher who had a gun. Because of the federal law prohibiting guns within a thousand feet of a school, the teacher had to run four blocks to get his gun while the shooter was still shooting.

Gun laws affect only law-abiding people, and law-abiding people are not the problem.

The bottom line is that the same liberals who complain about profiling do their own profiling all the time. The only difference is that liberal profiling never makes any sense.

July 24, 1999 - **HOW RIGHT WINGERS GO NUTS**

July 24, 1999 - **WHY SO MANY RIGHT WINGERS GO NUTS**

****HOW** RIGHT WINGERS GO NUTS**

We live in a world where people with titles like "Professor" and "Reverend" and "Father" routinely show less intelligence than a ten-year-old child. In our society, a person who does not support silliness as national policy cannot obtain those titles. No reasonably intelligent or moral person could support leftism or respectable conservatism. But to get a title in our society, you must.

The result is that we are ruled by total silliness.

Rightists cannot accept this simple reality. Instead of seeing stupidity and callousness for what it is, no matter how impressive a title supports it, they invent vastly complicated explanations for what is going on. They invent conspiracy theories. They declare that it is all the result of a diabolical falling away from their version of God.

In other words, right wingers take leftists seriously, so they get as silly as the leftists are.

Why do right wingers all seem to go nuts eventually? The explanation goes back to a joke I heard when I was very small. A woman was walking along when she saw three men. One was plucking at the air. Another was leaning down, plucking at the empty ground. The third man was standing there pumping his arms furiously.

So the woman asked each what he was doing. The first said, "I am plucking stars out of the sky." The second said, "I am picking up the stars he is plucking out of the sky."

Then she walked up to the third man, the one who was pumping his arms furiously, and asked what he was doing. He answered, "I'm running away. These guys are NUTS!"

There are an awfully lot of right wingers who end up standing there, pumping their arms furiously.

They honestly believe they look sane.

All this is the salvation of the political left. Dumb as they are, they can always point to a right that is even dumber. They can point to wild theories of conspiracies, when it is obvious to everybody that they cannot organize a single working theory, much less a conspiracy.

They can point at rightists who declare they represent The Only True Religion, which is a laugh to everybody.

Nobody believes some clown on the right who declares he is some kind of Political Pope. Nobody believes in vast conspiracies. People CAN see how stupid and callous our leaders are. But as long as those who denounce them are even more stupid and even sillier, they will maintain their power.

****WHY** SO MANY RIGHT WINGERS GO NUTS**

One of the continuing themes of Whitaker Online is that leftism is SILLY. I keep pointing out that leftism never WORKS. I keep saying that we must never, never allow leftists to scare us with labels like "racist" and "anaziwhowantstokillsixmillion Jews." Unless a right winger learns these facts, he is going to go nuts, as so many right wingers do.

The reason right wingers all seem to go nuts is because they enter into the liberals' world of delusion.

It is generally recognized that psychiatrists tend to be a bit nutty. One of the reasons for this is that people with mental problems tend to study mental problems. But there is another reason so many mental health workers tend to be a bit batty themselves. It is a problem they are continually warned against in training: Do not enter into your patients' delusions with them.

But this advice is hard to act on. After all, you are talking to mental patients all the time. You are trying to communicate with them and understand them all the time, so it is very, very hard not to absorb some of their thinking. You have to tell yourself, day after day, that these people are not making sense, though they can often be very convincing.

Which brings us right back to dealing with the political left. You MUST remind yourself over and over and over, daily, that these people are SILLY. You must remind yourself over and over and over that what they say really never WORKS in the real world. If you don't, you are going to enter into their delusions with them.

You can tell when a right winger is about to go over the edge when he gets that goofy look in his eye that says, "I am going to be SHREWD today." I remember running into it some years back at the office of the Southern Partisan magazine.

I remember seeing that goofy look come across the face of an official at the Southern Partisan magazine. "We Have Decided," He announced in capital letters, "What To Do About The Flag Issue."

"Oh, God, "I thought, "This is really going to be hopeless."

It was.

Liberals were objecting to the flag over the state capitol. Liberals pointed out that the Klan used that flag a lot. So the Southern Partisan was going to completely take them by surprise with a SHREWD move: The Southern Partisan was going to switch its support from the DIAGONAL flag over the state capitol to a SQUARE flag.

This time the Shrewd Bit was to switch to asking for a SQUARE Confederate flag on the dome. The Klan used the DIAGONAL flag.

Let me tell you why this was supposed to be SHREWD.

During the Civil War, the battle flags were almost all square.

Like every other flag living people fly in this century, OUR Confederate flag is rectangular. It is the flag of living Southerners. But the Partisan wanted to apologize for the fact that the Klan used that flag. They would do that by really surprising the liberals -- the leftists were going to be so SHOCKED and so IMPRESSED! - - by using the SQUARE flag!

Like all right wing ideas that are supposed to be SHREWD, this was so silly it was hard to know where to start pointing out how ridiculous it was.

In the first place, absolutely nobody was going to notice that the flag the Partisan was pushing was square except those of us who knew it was an apology. In the second place, absolutely nobody who is against the Confederate flag cares whether that flag is square or diagonal or round or shaped like a puppy dog.

Real national flags today are ALL diagonal. If you want a flag for living people, it must be diagonal.

I would also point out that the flag over the state capitol is also made of materials that did not exist in 1865. You could really astonish, terrify, and destroy the liberals by demanding that we only support a flag that is square AND one hundred percent cotton!

Boy, that would really make the anti-flag forces collapse into confusion, wouldn't it?

Why should people take somebody who pushes this kind of nonsense seriously?

But in the end, the point here has nothing to do with the flag. The point is that this was another case of right wingers going over the edge. They were taking liberals seriously. They were acting like the objection to the flag had something to do with reality.

They entered into the leftist delusion.

Another common characteristic of rightists going over the edge is the constant tendency of all right wing movements to turn into God R Us Stores.

Leftists keep claiming they represent Truth and Mercy and Goodness. So the rightist says, "Aha! I am going to be Shrewd. He claims to represent Truth and Brotherhood, so I'll say I represent God Himself!"

Meanwhile, back here on Planet Earth, everybody knows that liberals do not represent Love and Brotherhood, and that you do not represent God. So you look as silly as they do.

What a sane person does is stick a pin in that nonsense and point out that all Wordists claim the same thing liberals do. Point out that what they call Love is thinly veneered hatred for America, for Western Civilization, and for white people.

That's the truth, and people will believe it simply because they already know it's true. But rightists simply will not stick to what everybody already knows is true!

Leftists are always screaming "Racist!" I have never ONCE seen a SINGLE conservative have the simple guts and intelligence to ask the liberal, "What do you mean by that word?" Not ONCE! As soon as the liberal says it, all conservative spokesmen hit the floor groveling.

In other words, they take the liberal label seriously.

Another group of rightists responds to being called "racist" and Nazi" by putting on swastikas. They are saying, "I'll show THEM!" Again, they take the liberals seriously.

When rightists kept calling leftists Communists, it got to be a joke. Leftists call anybody who disagrees with them on race "anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews." And ALL rightists ALWAYS take it SERIOUSLY! If we don't question it and put it into perspective, I guarantee you no one else will.

Once again, leftists are being SILLY, and we act as if they were making a serious point.

People know leftists are ridiculous. People know leftists use labels wildly. They know that leftism never WORKS.

If we make those points, we can win!

But if we keep insisting that the left represents a highly intelligent conspiracy, we cannot win. If rightists keep claiming that they represent a Political Papacy, they will continue to get the horselaugh they deserve.

The truth is the only thing that will work.

Once again, the choice is clear: you can either tell the TRUTH or you can GO NUTS.

Sticking to the truth requires INTELLIGENCE, MENTAL DISCIPLINE, and GUTS. This is a titanic battle we are waging. If you don't have the INTELLIGENCE, MENTAL DISCIPLINE, AND GUTS to wage it, you will drift out into the never-never land of right wing crazies.

July 31, 1999 - WHAT IF THE HUNLEY HAD BEEN AN ISRAELI SHIP?

July 31, 1999 - SOUTHERN HISTORIAN STRIKES A BLOW AGAINST SOUTHERN IDENTITY

WHAT IF THE HUNLEY HAD BEEN AN ISRAELI SHIP?

Watching the television movie on the Hunley, it kept occurring to me what a bad deal heroes get from history when they are on the losing side. Those who volunteered for this mission knew very well that the odds were that they would die a cold, horrifying death under the sea. They represented the kind of pure heroism that modern historians try to insist never actually existed.

But few Americans had ever heard of these men. If they had been on any winning side, they would not have been so forgotten. It is a very encouraging sign that this movie was made, and I applaud and thank those who made it and those who presented it on television.

If you are on the winning side, you can even be from the South and get your share of fame. Try as they might, trendy people have not been allowed to forget the Alamo. The Alamo is constantly denounced as a symbol of Anglo-Saxon oppression. Modern historians try hard to prove that the men of the Alamo were really not as heroic as they obviously were.

But all to no avail. Texas won.

I cannot help but imagine the fame those heroes on the Hunley would have had had they died on a winning side. Even more, what if they had been part of an approved minority?

SOUTHERN HISTORIAN STRIKES A BLOW AGAINST SOUTHERN IDENTITY

Editorial Department
NATIONAL REVIEW
215 Lexington Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10016
July 27, 1999

Dear Sir:

In his recent article, Forrest McDonald refers to a group of Americans he calls "southerners." Who are these people? Hawaiians are southerners. So are Puerto Ricans. All the vast population of southern California is made up of southerners. That is, each of these groups comes from what is geographically the southern part of the United States. But McDonald does not seem to be referring to any of them. He is talking about the losing side in the Civil War, which does not include any of these people.

Before McDonald, National Review had many, many articles dealing with Southerners, a regional group which has the identity McDonald seems to be referring to. But it is simply wrong, not to mention insulting to some of us, to refer to our region as "the south," or to us as "southerners." I realize that Russell Kirk invented a schizophrenic system of capitalizing "the South" and writing "southern" in the lower case. This is absolutely unique and idiosyncratic, and amounts to nothing more than bad spelling.

I would appreciate National Review continuing to refer to my people as Southerners. We have a history and a culture which is worthy of that much respect.

Sincerely,

Robert W. Whitaker

Forrest McDonald is one of those people who has gotten a great reputation for defending dead Southerners in history. He therefore has a lot of valuable capital that can be used by liberals and respectable conservatives in their present battle against living Southerners. His latest article in National Review shows how that sort of capital can be used.

In real world politics, words are the main weapon. One of the first victories of the civil rights movement was when blacks got publications to stop writing "negro" and got the word capitalized. This looks tiny, but actually it was very important. It showed that, by the 1940s, there was a black reading public, and publications recognized that.

Exactly the same thing happened in the case of the Jews. There was a time when "jew" was freely used as a verb. There was a time when writers freely used the uncapitalized terms "jews" and "jewish." Once again, it was a major victory when the ADL and other groups managed to end this disrespectful lack of capitalization of the title of a legitimate identity group.

I hate this campaign to put "Southern" in the lower case, because I feel so absolutely alone in being against it. If you look, you will see that it is spreading steadily. There was a time when even our enemies would capitalize "the South" and "Southerners." But more and more, especially with the help of people like McDonald, the campaign to take away this recognition of our identity is gaining ground.

If we allow this trivialization of Southern identity to advance, we cannot win the bigger battle. If it weren't worth doing, our enemies wouldn't be doing it.

An otherwise sincerely pro-Southern Yankee, Russell Kirk, gave a big boost to this "southern" business. He used a really weird system of capitalization in his 1951 book "John Randolph of Roanoke." He capitalized "South" but not "Southerners."

This nonsense of putting "southern" and "southerners" in the lower case was a complete invention by Kirk. It is simply absurd, and it is simply bad spelling. Absolutely nobody capitalizes the name of a group, like Jews, and then uses the small letter in the adjective: You NEVER say "Jews are jewish." Such things are only invented by people who want to make a semi-apology for the South.

Kirk's schizophrenic nonsense was one of those totally weird attempts to appease those who hate the South. It was like the insane business of abandoning the flag on the South Carolina dome for a square Confederate flag (Please see July 24 article, "Why So Many Right Wingers Go Nuts").

And our enemies know how to capitalize fully on such apologies. Every enemy of the Confederate flag now uses the term "navy jack," which was coined by OUR apologizers*, to put down the flag on the South Carolina capitol. Actually there was at least one diagonal Confederate battle flag like the one on the state house dome, while the navy jack was one-third farther across than the one on the state house dome. So the modern, diagonal Confederate flag is NOT a navy jack. But, in their desperation to

apologize, the people on our side have given our enemies this club to beat us with, and there is no way we will ever correct this.

Those who want to put all references to our identity in small letters -- and all references to other, "real," groups in capitals -- know how to use Southern apologizers. Just as flag opponents all use "navy jack" to put down the Confederate flag, these people find the Kirk-McDonald apology for "southerners" highly useful.

Before Forrest McDonald's article, National Review always correctly referred to those of us who are part of the South as Southerners. For no reason whatsoever, McDonald has now changed that, and has made a major contribution to the campaign to refer to a group called "southerners," which puts us in the same category as Hawaiians, Angelenos, and Puerto Ricans. Since conservatives constitute the only group which might actually show some respect for our Southern identity, this was a major blow for those of us who are still Southerners.

*An "apologist" is "one who speaks or writes in defense of a faith, a cause, or an institution." An apologist is the exact opposite of an apologist.

August 7, 1999 - BE FRUITFUL AND MULTIPLY

August 7, 1999 - GUILT EDGED SECURITIES

BE FRUITFUL AND MULTIPLY

There is an interesting advertisement on page C-11 of the July 13, 1999 "New York Times." It shows a happy, nice looking young white couple. The header says, "WE WANT YOU TO MEET THE RIGHT WOMAN AS MUCH AS YOU DO."

Below this, the lead sentence is, "Our goal is Jewish continuity."

At the end the article announces that this is part of , "A Not-For-Profit Program of the Jewish Board of Family and Children's Services. A Recipient Agency of UJA-Federation."

The UJA, the United Jewish Appeal, is a tax-deductible organization.

In a sane world, there would be nothing strange about this advertisement. In a sane world, it is routine for people to be concerned about the survival of their own kind. After all, as Benjamin Franklin pointed out, there is nothing more natural than for a person to want to see people who look like he does survive and multiply.(See "Benjamin Franklin Was Anaziwhowantedtokillsixmillionjews!!", June 5)

But one wonders what would happen to a tax-deductible group that sponsored "white continuity."

GUILT EDGED SECURITIES

It is true that no white man ever made an African a slave. Every single black man sold to whites in Africa was already a slave. Whites bought them from blacks. It is true that no one cares about the blacks who sold blacks. There is no guilt there, and for an excellent reason.

It is true that for every Jew killed by Hitler during World War II, Stalin killed several Russian peasants IN PEACETIME. But the Russians who helped slaughter Russian workers by the tens of millions live on pensions today, while Nazis are hunted down. There is no guilt whatsoever connected with Communist oppression, and for a very good reason.

It is true that the ancestors of today's American Indians drove earlier American Indians off their land. Indians moving into America across the land bridge from Asia came down and drove earlier settlers of North America before them. Later waves drove these immigrants south in turn, and they pushed the earlier inhabitants steadily southward. Wave after wave of Indians were driven into the Central American jungles, into the high Andes, into the frozen hell of Tierra del Fuego.

But only when the white man came and drove the latest wave of Indians off of THEIR land did it become a Great Crime. Only whites have ever been found guilty of driving anybody off their land. Driving others off of land you need is part of history. So whites alone are held to be GUILTY of it, and for a very good reason.

We all know what The Very Good Reason is. Blacks in Africa, descendants of those who sold slaves to whites, have no money. There is no money in holding African blacks responsible for their ancestors' enslavement of today's American blacks. But there is plenty of money in WHITE guilt.

Russia is absolutely, stony broke. There is not a dime to be made out of Russian Communist guilt over killing tens of millions of peasants and workers. There is no money in dead Russian peasants.

Germany is very, very rich. There are many billions of dollars to be made from German guilt.

And Western white gentiles in general hunger for guilt the way a baby hungers for its mother's milk. The charge of being naziswhowanttokillsixmillionjews has opened the pocketbooks of American taxpayers for any scheme liberals can dream up. Guilt has provided an ocean of wealth that still streams into Israel.

Russian peasants were more numerous, but they are not considered human, because there's no money in them.

The Indians who drove earlier Indians out of America are collecting endless tributes from whites. Hundreds of sobbing movies have been made about how the Evil White Man drove the Noble and Loving Native American off of the land which, we insist, was always his. The unique right to have casinos on Indian land is but the latest installment of this unending guilt payment.

Why doesn't anyone mention the descendants of the Indians OUR Indians drove south? Down in Tierra del Fuego are the descendants of Indians who were driven out of America millennia before the white man got here. They are cold, they are hungry, and they are forgotten. Why does no one ask today's American Indians about them?

Because if you brought that up to today's Indian, he would laugh in your face. Why should he feel guilty for taking land from people who were already here? It is what all men have always done, and to feel guilty about it would be ridiculous. White Christians, with their perversion of Christianity, love guilt. They absolutely wallow in it. So, say the Indians, the blacks, and all the rest, let them wallow. Let them pay and pay and pay and pay.

Another American perversion of Christianity says this: our ancestors came to America, so we must let anybody from anywhere settle here. You see, "America is a nation of immigrants." There's money in that phrase. Immigrants mean 1) cheaper labor for big business and 2) votes for liberals. So liberals back it all the way, and "Christian" conservatives squeeze every dime out of it they can.*

All in the name of Universal Love, of course. What's a little blasphemy if the price is right?

Anyone who actually knows any history knows that every country on earth is a nation of immigrants. All nations were created by immigration, and all nations are eventually destroyed by immigration.

Working together, liberals and "Christian" conservatives have turned our Christian tradition into nothing more than a giant, growing cancer of pure guilt. It pays for every non-white group to push some guilt for their purposes. It is destroying us.

Blacks glory in their blackness, at least publicly. Jews have nothing but good things to say about the Jewish people and the Jewish tradition. For white gentiles, the one great virtue is self-hatred. "Christian" conservatives consider it evil to be concerned about the fact that the white race is being crowded out of existence. Both immigration and integration are DEMANDED in ALL white majority countries. Further, immigration and integration are demanded ONLY in white majority countries.

Jamaica or Japan can take in immigrants if they want to, but if they cut off immigration tomorrow, no one would object. But if Australia or France cut off immigration, "Christian" conservatives will join with liberals in screaming bloody murder. "Christian" conservatives are now taking the lead in pushing international interracial adoptions in areas where immigration is not doing the job fast enough.

In the long run, I believe the "Christian" conservatives will be proud to say that they did more to do away with the white race than liberals did. After all, they start with the advantage of being trusted by conservative whites, which liberals do not have. For "Christian" conservatives, this trust is money in the bank.

Meanwhile, black churches and synagogues are openly and uncompromisingly in favor of the well being and continuity their own people.

After all, what kind of sicko wouldn't be?

*The payoff is not always in money. When Ralph Reed stabbed Pat Buchanan in the back for George Bush, he was after power, not money. Another payoff might be the one many a "Christian" conservative would sell his mother for: liberals won't call him a "racist" or "anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews."

August 14, 1999 - ORRIN LOVES TEDDY
August 14, 1999 - IN UNION THERE IS DANGER

ORRIN LOVES TEDDY

When the Democrats control the United States Senate, Teddy Kennedy (Democrat -- Massachusetts) is Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. When Republicans control the Senate, Kennedy is the Ranking Democrat on the Judiciary Committee and the Chairman is Orrin Hatch (Respectable -- Utah).

In 1994, Republicans won the Senate and Orrin Hatch became Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Last year, there was an important bill pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee. Chairman Hatch asked Strom Thurmond what amendments he planned to offer in Committee. Strom replied, "Hell, Orrin, I might as well tell Teddy Kennedy directly as tell you." Orrin gives Teddy anything he wants. National Review had a lead article last year about Hatch's infatuation with Teddy. In a later issue, National Review quoted a POEM Hatch had written to Kennedy. It used language that no heterosexual male should address to another.

What happened was this: When Republicans won control of the Senate in 1994, Teddy Kennedy lost the chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee to Hatch. Kennedy decided he had better get in good with Hatch, so he said some nice things to Hatch about how smart and reasonable he was.

Poor little Orrin couldn't believe that a KENNEDY suddenly admired him! He went absolutely nuts.

Poor little pencil-neck Orrin Hatch is a Mormon with an inferiority complex the size of Texas. He is from a poor working class family in Pennsylvania and represents a small Western state. To little Orrin, a KENNEDY, an Easterner and a liberal icon, is very nearly a god.

Little Orrin is an extreme example, but the phenomenon is familiar. We see pathetic little Southern Crawlers who live for some sign of approval from an eastern liberal. In my club, there is a Southern Crawler who tries desperately to get everybody to notice that he reads the New York Times. Every one of us knows a dozen people like him.

Liberalism has totally discredited itself. Liberals have never advocated anything that actually WORKS. The fact that liberalism is still taken seriously is entirely the result of the pathetic servility of little people like Orrin Hatch.

Lake High had his usual penetrating explanation of why there is so much liberalism among newly affluent people in Columbia, South Carolina. As Lake points out, if you scratch a monied liberal in Columbia, you will find a person who is about one generation removed from white trash. His only concern is to prove that he is not a right wing redneck.

By now, with leftism so totally discredited, the only people who feel it necessary to take leftism seriously do so to deal with their own psychological problems. I suggest that we tell them so. The more often we tell them that, the better (See February 6 article, "The Left Repeats, So We Lose").

IN UNION THERE IS DANGER

I recently came across a year old article by George Will. In it, Will discusses the growing secessionist movements around the world. Will is a Lincoln worshipper, so he demands that the Union be enforced, no matter what anybody wants. He concludes, "In the light of the worldwide waxing of centrifugal forces, America's unique combination of vast size and equitably distributed prosperity makes American pre-eminence seem even more likely to be prolonged."

Sounds good. But does it mean anything?

How will America be "pre-eminent?" Does Will think Americans will be richer because we are under the rigid regulatory controls of Washington from coast to coast? That is what our present "vast size" means. Does Will think we will be better off because Federal judges in Washington dictate all our important social policy decisions from coast to coast? That is what his glorious Union means.

In terms of ECONOMICS, an America broken down into smaller POLITICAL units would be at least as big as the United States is now. We would have free trade agreements with countries outside the present United States, which would give us an even larger trade area. We could have free trade with practically the entire world. Our free trade area would be much bigger than the United States.

What we would NOT have would be the choking micromanagement congress and regulatory agencies impose in the name of "interstate commerce."

So would an America broken down into smaller POLITICAL parts be less productive than one run by Washington bureaucrats? Will says so, and he says so flatly and absolutely. Every liberal, and therefore every respectable conservative, assumes this. Their thinking is totally out of date, as always.

Must a political unit be big to be part of a big free trade area? Is it true that Belgium and Luxembourg can't have free trade because they don't have the same government?

The fact is that, in the real world, Belgium and Luxembourg DO have free trade with each other. But George Will just ignores that. No Lincoln worshipper can let reality intrude on his politics.

So Will's idea that the Union is still good for economics is not only incorrect, it's silly. But Will is a respectable conservative, and respectable conservatives are always silly.

Will is always desperate to say something, no matter how absurd, that will get liberals to think he is too sophisticated to stick with reality. In the 1980s, when Reagan was fighting for tax cuts, Will said that, "America is the most undertaxed country on earth."

But is economics all that Will had in mind? Remember that we are dealing here with a real Lincoln fanatic. When Lincoln used words like "pre-eminence," he didn't have economic well being in mind. When Lincoln used words like "pre-eminence," he didn't have anybody's well being in mind.

He meant power. And power is all that respectable conservatives like Will have left of a conservative philosophy.

Respectable conservatives spend their entire political lives selling out in a desperate, hopeless attempt to get liberal approval. To gain liberal approval, they have abandoned every conservative principle.

During the Cold War, conservatives wanted a big military. We thought that was to fight the Cold War. But the Cold War is over, and professional conservatives still want more troops. During the Cold War, we paid most of the cost of Europe's defense. Today, conservatives want to keep on paying the cost of Europe's defense.

Against WHAT? What is the PURPOSE of this giant military conservatives are always demanding? No conservative asks that question. Conservatives want a big military because they want a big military.

Professional conservatives want a big military because the military lobbies give them big bucks. Professional conservatives don't care what the troops or military money is used for, all they care about is serving their lobbies.

Yes, Virginia, the military-industrial complex is real. And yes, the American political right serves it blindly.

So all that is left of the old conservative philosophy is two words:

MORE TROOPS!

But there is also a psychological reason respectable conservatives love to make loud demands for a big military.

Respectable conservatives know they are wimps. They call it "being reasonable," but some part of their brain registers what they are really doing. I think the constant demands for MORE TROOPS helps a little by making them feel macho. They may be wimps by profession, but they are war heroes by proxy.

In Kosovo, George Will is right there with Senator McCain (Respectable-Arizona). The liberals want war, so he wants it even more. Like McCain, Will has no idea why we got into that war, but he knows what liberals want. So Will's policy on Kosovo was:

MORE TROOPS!

When Will talks about "pre-eminence", he means what his idol Lincoln would have meant. He means more troops! He means enforced Union. He means a big, powerful America that can kick anybody around that liberals want kicked.

I want none of this. I said what I thought of this kind of imperial thinking in my January 9 article, "The Way To Ruin: Being 'The World's Last Remaining Superpower.'"

August 21, 1999 - THE TOPEKA DECISION ON EVOLUTION

THE TOPEKA DECISION ON EVOLUTION

The school board of Topeka, Kansas, recently voted to stop requiring that students be taught evolution. I have always believed that parents should have the final say over what their children are taught, and to the extent that this is a victory for that principle, I am all for it

When I say "I am all for it," I am not merely saying that I give my MORAL support to parental rights. I mean I have been out on the streets, risking my neck and reputation, fighting for parental rights. I mean I have stayed up nights and done free press conferences and been denounced and risked my job for parental rights in education.

My tiny group -- three of us -- arranged the first united march of anti-busing and textbook protestors in Washington, DC, in 1974. At that time, there were national protests against dirty textbooks, the biggest one of which was in Kanawha County, West Virginia. There were separate protests going on against busing, the largest of which was in Boston, Massachusetts. We joined these groups together in a joint march in Washington, a show of solidarity by parents against the educational establishment.

We did it, as always, free of charge -- even our costs were at our own expense, out of our own pockets. It cost little money and lots of work.

At the hotel the night before the march, the Boston anti-busing group was having some trouble deciding who would speak for them at the press conference. One of the Kanawha County parents joked, "Well, we don't have any trouble deciding. Whitaker speaks for us, and he's not even a hick!"*

West Virginia mountaineers very seldom let ANYBODY speak for them, so I was very flattered by this trust.

And when I mentioned to some West Virginia fundamentalists and Boston Catholics that my theology might not be same as theirs, someone said something like, "Listen, you stuck your neck out for us and you work your backside off for us. You can believe what you want to and keep our respect."

I am all for all for parental authority over what their children are taught. Given my history, that is a major understatement. Teaching children their particular version of creationism should be their parents' choice. But for grown men to HIDE behind a religious view of creationism is a wholly different matter.

Let me explain what I am talking about here.

In the seventeenth century, Newtonian physics challenged the Biblical view of the universe. Before Newton, it was held that the universe was kept moving by the direct, daily intervention of the Hand of God. Newton's theory said that gravity rather than the direct intervention of God took over the day to day movements of celestial bodies. Church after church beat its credibility to pieces against the Newtonian rock.

But now we find out that Newtonian physics ITSELF is fundamentally flawed. It has gaping holes in it. But the fact that Newtonian physics is wrong on some basic points does NOT mean that the seventeenth century churches were right in THEIR theories of the universe.

What would happen to somebody who said that, since the Newtonian theory is flawed, we have to go back to the direct intervention of God to explain every motion in the heavens? He would be horse laughed off the stage, of course.

There are gaping holes in the Newtonian theory. But no one would say this means that the planets can only move by the direct, daily movement of the Hand of God.

There are huge, gaping holes in the Darwinian theory that are as fatal as those in Newtonian physics. The book "Darwin's Black Box" exposes a lot of these failures of the Darwinian theory. The fact is that Darwinian theory does not explain many of the real jumps from animal to animal. For example, the eye is far too complicated to have been developed by tiny, marginal evolutionary changes, as Darwin would posit.

But you can't use the holes in Darwinian theory to get back to the six-day creation, any more than the holes in Newton's theory can get gravity out of the motion of the planets. You can BELIEVE in creationism, and you can BELIEVE that, as Genesis says, that the sun is just a light hung up in the sky. What you CANNOT do is act like you are being ****scientific**** in saying that. Many conservative spokesmen are using "Darwin's Black Box" to sound like they are making the six-day creation sound science.

Why does this bother me? It bothers me because many spokesmen for the right are using the holes in Darwinism as an excuse not to take leftists on where it is risky. They posture and try to look look brave by attacking evolution. Well, that's cheap and easy. To see why, let's take a quick look at the leftist reaction to this posturing.

If you say leftism is stupid, and none of its programs ever works, you are threatening the very lifeblood of leftism. You are laughing at it. And mark my words: **LEFTISM WILL BE DESTROYED WHEN WE UNITE IN LAUGHING AT ITS ABSURDITY:**

"The Devil, proud spirit, cannot bear to be mocked."

Everybody knows that leftism is silly, but it is also very, very powerful. **PROFESSIONAL CONSERVATIVES WOULD RATHER DO ANYTHING BUT TAKE ON LIBERALS THIS WAY.** They will use any excuse to make liberalism look like something deep and intellectual rather than to expose it as simply ridiculous. Exposing leftism as just plain silly scares liberals, and that makes them nasty.

When you want to avoid hitting leftism where it hurts, religious posturing is a wonderful thing to hide behind.

By attacking evolution, you get to say, "I am really taking on these leftists. The leftists are a giant, highly intelligent conspiracy arrayed behind the Theory of Evolution. I am out there bravely attacking the archenemy, the Devil's Evolution."

That's fine with the liberals, because it is every bit as silly as they are. The public that would join you in laughing leftism out of existence is now quietly laughing at the professional conservatives who are hiding behind religion.

But nobody laughs in church. Nobody **OPENLY** laughs at some political columnist who is making a fool of himself as a religious nut in his columns. Everybody acts like he is saying something profound, out of respect for his religious views.

Except, as usual, me.

The bottom line is that you can be a professional conservative, take the religious nut line, and keep getting paid without taking any serious risk.

Liberals **LAUGH** at you for being a religious nut, but they will not **DESTROY** you for it. They will do their very best to destroy you if you expose the reality that **THEY** are the nutcases. They will do their best to destroy you if you expose the fact that **THEY** are the laughing stock.

But if you clown around as a Political Pope, they'll encourage you.

To repeat: PROFESSIONAL CONSERVATIVES WOULD RATHER DO ANYTHING BUT EXPOSE LEFTISM AS LAUGHABLE NONSENSE. Religious posturing, as in the case of evolution, gives professional conservatives an excuse not to attack liberals where it hurts.

Let me give you an example of this sort of religious posturing to please leftists. One of the biggest threats to leftism is the research psychologists like Arthur Jensen are doing. A lot of psychologists like Jensen have discovered that the differences between races and individuals shown on IQ tests cannot be explained away by evil white oppression. This is devastating to the fundamental bedrock on which leftism is based.

When The Bell Curve was published, discussing this kind of research, liberals went ballistic.

So unless you denounce The Bell Curve and Jensen, the liberals might destroy you.

So one rightist leader, whom I otherwise respect, used evolution as what he thinks is a Shrewd way to attack Jensen. When Jensen first published his findings, a liberal magazine, The New Republic, denounced him in a cover article that labeled his test results "Scientific Racism."

So this conservative leader says he opposes "scientific racism." "Scientific racism," he says, is based on the Devil's Evolution.

As always happens when a conservative gets Shrewd, he is totally, laughably wrong. We are talking about psychological tests here. Long before evolution was ever imagined, it was assumed that different races had different average intellectual abilities. Nobody ever actually believed that God created all men equal. Jensen has nothing to do with evolution, one way or another.

The reason this professional conservative is using the liberal label, "scientific racism," is so that he can attack Jensen as representing The Devil's Evolution. Needless to say, Jensen's findings have nothing to do with evolution.

But by pounding a Bible and shouting "Evolution!!!," yet another conservative who should be providing us with leadership is using religion TO ATTACK THE LIBERALS' ENEMIES.

As always, the resort to blasphemy ends up not only being evil, but also by being stupid.

Another problem: Using religion to avoid taking on the liberals frontally is very, very destructive. For one thing, it turns politics into a religious test. It insults and isolates people who are our natural allies against leftism. If parents want their children to be taught evolution, I get the feeling that our Political Popes would prohibit it.

Sorry, but I believe evolutionists have parental rights, too.

So, in that case, as William Rusher once wrote about me, "You will see Whitaker on the barricades."

* This guy never saw Pontiac, South Carolina in the 1950s. I AM a hick and I'm proud of it!

August 28, 1999 - IT DIDN'T WORK IN BOSNIA, SO LET'S IMPOSE IT ON KOSOVO
August 28, 1999 - NO ACCOUNT

IT DIDN'T WORK IN BOSNIA, SO LET'S IMPOSE IT ON KOSOVO

According to Neely Tucker of Knight Ridder Newspapers, "Resolving Bosnia's dilemma is critical, for the leaders who will sign the pact are basing their hopes for peace in the ravaged Yugoslav province of Kosovo on a Bosnian success story."

The only catch is that Bosnia is a complete disaster. Spanish diplomat Carlos Westendorp has been dictator of Bosnia ever since this multicultural state was formed by brute military force four years ago. The music for a national anthem was picked by Westendorp, because no one in this multicultural state could agree on one. That national anthem has no words, because the multicultural state cannot agree on any. Economic reforms which would change the old Communist system have not occurred, because the multicultural state can't agree on any changes. It is stagnant.

"Westendorp also created Bosnia's new passports, currency, flag, coat of arms and license plates because nobody could agree on any of it."

And the troops have to stay in Bosnia because if they go, everybody agrees that the citizens of this wonderful multicultural state will kill each other.

Like all liberal programs, multicultural Bosnia doesn't WORK (Please see April 17 article, "Balkan Peace: The Case for Segregation").

So everybody agrees it needs to be forced on somebody else (May 8, "Why Power Hungry Elites Want 'Multiculturalism'").

Those who want permanent domination through multiculturalism do not worry about ever having to leave places like multicultural Kosovo or multicultural Bosnia. The wonderful thing about a multicultural state is that it doesn't WORK. That means that the international elite, the International Corps of Experts, will stay and rule forever.

As one resident put it, "As long as Bosnia exists, NATO must stay. The minute NATO leaves, Bosnia will be destroyed." So for millions of people, every decision will be made by Westendorp or one of his fellow bureaucrats.

In the end, multiculturalism only exists when it is enforced. For those who rule by enforcing it, this is just fine.

NO ACCOUNT

After the Chinese Embassy in Serbia was bombed, the United States said that the reason for this disaster was that "Experts" at the Central Intelligence Agency got the buildings mixed up. This was a huge, murderous, and inexcusable error. But when the bombing became a scandal, the CIA said that no one would be punished for it. No one was fired. No one was even transferred.

Some people were surprised and outraged. Pardon me, but where have those people been for the past fifty years? The way the CIA dealt with this issue is the way our society deals with all of its ruling

"Experts." No expert is ever punished for causing a disaster. In fact, it never makes the slightest difference whether an expert's advice leads to success or failure.

Robert McNamara freely admitted that he went along with continuing and EXPANDING the Vietnam War long after he knew it was hopeless.

As Secretary of Defense, he helped get tens of thousands of Americans killed. McNamara has never lost a day's pay or a night's sleep because of this.

In fact, the exact opposite is the case. After Vietnam his opinion is sought after, because he has all that EXPERIENCE. Before Vietnam, he was an automobile executive, and his failure there cost his company hundreds of millions of dollars. But that made him EXPERIENCED, so he was appointed Secretary of Defense. So he helped cause the Vietnam disaster. That made him more experienced, so his advice became even more precious.

Examples of this rule are everywhere. The other day I was watching police chases on a national television program. One of these desperate chases occurred right here in South Carolina. The tape showed a nineteen-year-old running from police at well over a hundred miles an hour. Eventually he crashed. Several of his young passengers were killed. This nineteen-year-old is now in prison for life for first-degree murder.

The commentator mentioned in passing that this teenager had been convicted of reckless driving TWELVE TIMES before! Legal experts, psychologists, lawyers and judges, let this man go TWELVE TIMES before he earned a life sentence for murder, and he is only NINETEEN YEARS OLD!

So what happened to the judges, lawyers, psychiatrists and other experts who let all this happen? Do you think any of them lost a day's pay or a night's sleep over this?

Of course not.

Any time our society has a social or educational problem, we pay Experts to deal with it. Now, what is an "Expert?" An Expert is a person with "experience." When did they get that experience? They got it while the problem we are trying to deal with developed. Look at the people we hire to be experts on education. They went to school and got their experience when all their professors were pushing all the latest educational fads. They got their experience making schools get rid of phonics and developing sensitivity training programs and implementing all the other fads.

As every kind of test score dropped, today's "education experts" were part of the hallelujah chorus putting their professional reputations on the line in favor of all the nonsense being pushed. They praised this nonsense to the skies, or they lost their "Expert" title.

So when the school crisis reached the point where even respectable conservatives had to mention it, who did we call in to SOLVE the problem? The educational experts, of course. You will see them at the front of the room every time this problem is discussed.

When was the last time you ever heard of any social policy expert losing anything by causing a disaster? I discussed the fact that, purely for their own power, economic planning nuts have caused far more misery and death and poverty than ten Hitlers, or even ten Stalins, combined (See January 16

article, "Why We Have An Unprecedented Economic Boom"). So who are our economic experts today? Those same people and the people they trained, of course.

One of the leading economic planning advocates was John Galbraith. It made him rich and famous. Economic planning has been discredited, but Galbraith is still considered a great expert.

Once again, the fact that the Galbraiths have caused endless suffering means nothing. The point is that they have been in the public eye. If one of them recommends a policy, they will get the attention of the public, including all respectable conservatives. A person whose recommendations have always WORKED will get none.

We never ask any expert whether any of his policies have ever worked.

When our social policy leads to another disaster, and we are looking for someone to show his qualifications for solving the new problem, how do we select someone to deal with that problem? We demand that that person prove one thing. We demand that he prove that he is an Expert with Experience. In other words, we demand that he be one of the people who CAUSED the disaster.

Which means we get another disaster.

Once again, as I explained, when you follow these rules, you are "Getting Exactly What You Ask For"(May 29).

September 4, 1999 - LIBERAL MESSAGE TO AMERICA: "BELIEVE THE RIGHT THINGS OR GET OUT!"

September 4, 1999 - ONLY NATIONALISM CAN ALLOW FREEDOM OF THOUGHT

LIBERAL MESSAGE TO AMERICA: "BELIEVE THE RIGHT THINGS OR GET OUT!"

Though its real function is to promote leftist causes, the ACLU takes a rightist's case from time to time, so it can appear to be objective.

The ACLU is supporting white supremacist Matthew Hale's suit to be allowed to practice law. There is no question about Hale's qualifications to practice law, but he has repeatedly been denied the right to practice because of his BELIEFS.

The excuse for denying Hale the right to practice is that his beliefs might make him discriminate against nonwhite clients. But no one even suggests that a Communist be denied the right to practice law. There is no doubt that a Communist would not give property owners the same treatment he would give others.

As we all know, the real reason for denying Hale the right to practice law is the oft-repeated statement that "there is no room for racism in American society." Liberals, of course, define what "racism" means and respectable conservatives follow their orders. This means that a person has to BELIEVE the right things in order to be allowed to function in this country.

Can a society where one is required to BELIEVE the right things be a free society?

ONLY NATIONALISM CAN ALLOW FREEDOM OF THOUGHT

John McCain was on CNN, continuing his campaign to be the liberals' favorite conservative. McCain has begun to abandon his Western conservative, pro-gun position.

But McCain went further. He said that the solution to gun violence wasn't ONLY the suppression of gun ownership. McCain said that gun restrictions were not enough. He wants to push another, deadlier liberal initiative.

Another thing that is to blame for gun violence, says McCain, is the fact that "Hate" sites are allowed on the Internet. What liberal could possibly disagree with that? Liberals say they favor freedom of speech, but not if it promotes "HATE."

Liberals want to ban "Hate" sites, but they would not ban pornography sites. Why? Liberals say we cannot ban pornographic sites because my definition of pornography is different from yours. So, they say, who's to judge what is pornographic?

So if this is true, then who is to judge what "Hate" is?

Liberals, of course.

Liberals routinely refer to Rush Limbaugh and Gordon Liddy as Hate Radio. By using the same word as liberals, McCain infers that he will join them in banning these "Hate" sites, too. How exactly are we to limit what liberals can ban?

Do you think any respectable conservative is going to have brains or guts enough to demand that a liberal DEFINE what Hate is?

No way, Jose.

Respectable conservatives are always agreeing with liberals that "racism" must be stamped out totally, no matter what the cost. As I have repeatedly pointed out, NO CONSERVATIVE HAS EVER HAD THE COURAGE TO DEMAND THAT A LIBERAL DEFINE EXACTLY WHAT HE MEANS BY "RACISM"!

All liberals have to do is use a word and respectable conservatives will give them anything they want. Leftists just declare they are stamping out anything they choose to call Hate, and that they are for Love and Brotherhood, and no respectable conservative dares to question them.

After all, if you ask for definitions or any other reality check, you are labeled anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews. Labels are more important than anything else to respectable conservatives.

Respectable conservatives are desperate to be accepted by liberals. They want to believe whatever will make them acceptable to liberals. Here we have the essence of Wordism.

Wordism is the opposite of nationalism. A Wordist believes that people can be united only if they believe the right thing, if they accept the right words as the Only True Faith. A Communist is a Wordist.

A fanatical Catholic or a fanatical Protestant is a Wordist. A Politically Correct person is a Wordist. A Wordist is a person who believes he has The Only True Belief, and that you must believe in his words to belong to his nation (See May 15 article, "Wordism").

There are tens of THOUSANDS of forms of Wordism. There are thousands of religions, and each religion has its Wordists, people whose only serious loyalty is to that religion. They are the opposite of nationalists. There are thousands of secular philosophies. Every philosophy has its Wordists. There are thousands of political philosophies. Every political philosophy has its Wordists. And every one of those Wordists believes that he has The Only True, Universal Faith.

Nationalism is not a matter of faith, it is a matter of birth. Wordism is a matter of OPINION. If you say that America is nothing but some words in the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution, you are saying America is just a matter of opinion (Please see October 31, 1998, "Five Words and Emma Lazarus").

If America is a matter of opinion, then it must insist on Political Correctness. A country that is based on nothing but opinion cannot allow a diversity of opinions.

Nationalism is just the opposite. A nation does not require everybody to have a common opinion. People are part of a nation because of their birth -- the word "nation" is based on the Latin word for "birth." There may be immigrants, some adoptions into the family, but there is no such thing as "a nation of immigrants" (Please see July 3 article, "Why Wordists Love to Say 'That's What America Is All About'").

Because nationalism does not depend on opinion for its unity, a real nation can allow diversity of opinion. Unlike its exact opposite, Wordism, nationalism allows diversity of opinion within and variety without.

It never occurs to the people of a real nation that they are The Only True Nation. The fact that one is a nationalist presupposes that there are OTHER nations. My nationalism presupposes that mine is one of a number of legitimate nations into which the world is naturally divided.

People who recognize each other as fellow citizens of the same nation can accept enormous differences in religion. They can tolerate huge differences in every kind of belief and still work together as parts of the same nation. In the Confederate Army, the strongly Catholic French population of New Orleans fought side-by-side with the strongly Calvinist descendants of the Huguenots. We were all loyal to the Confederate States of America, and that was enough.

The bottom line is that a Wordist cannot allow serious dissent. If your unity is only based on a form of Wordism, no REAL disagreement can be allowed. Wordism means that everyone has to AGREE, or Wordist "unity" collapses. As leftism takes over America, you cannot be an American unless you are Politically Correct. Liberals keep saying that some form of Political Correctness is "what America is all about." As leftist Wordism takes over, they are perfectly correct. As people like McCain insist, America is no longer about freedom. It is all about Fighting Hate.

You cannot have Wordism or Universalism unless you are willing to use words like Hate and Racism to crush all serious disagreement.

To the Wordist, Love and Brotherhood means, "You agree with me." To liberals and to Senator John McCain, Hate means you disagree with Political Correctness. Liberals and respectable conservatives talk endlessly about "diversity." But the fact is that any real diversity, any diversity of THOUGHT, will eventually be labeled Hate, as in "Hate Radio."

The fact that nations can tolerate diverse opinions and the existence of other nations has been the basis of Western society. The slaughter and oppression of the religious wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries only ended when the nation-state took over. In the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, Europe was almost destroyed. Wordist Catholics and Wordist Protestants tried to force The Only True Faith on each other, and TENS OF MILLIONS of people were slaughtered!

It is estimated that a quarter of the population of Germany died in the Thirty Years War, 1618-1648, alone! If you represent the Only True Faith, you cannot tolerate the very existence of other opinions. Until the True Faiths lost power, and the nation-state took over, there could be no tolerance of other opinions.

Finally, the nation-states took over Europe, and the slaughter ended.

In the Middle East, the only form of identity is still religious identity. In the Middle East, the massacre of Sunni by Shiite, of Moslem by Christian, the life and death struggle of Jew and Islam, all continue. Nowhere on earth is there a more desperate need to get rid of the Wordist evil than in the Middle East. They need nations, and they need them desperately.

Whenever nationalism goes wrong, it is because nationalism has been perverted into Wordism. Hitler's "nationalism" was actually a Wordist philosophy. Like all forms of Universalism, like all forms of Wordism, it eventually had to rest on brute force. Hitler's National Socialism was The Only True Faith, so it could not tolerate other opinions.

In the Middle East, all the self-styled "nationalist" rulers claim to represent The Only True Faith, whatever form of Islam the dictator happens to favor. Whenever you find an evil form of nationalism, you will find it is actually some kind of Wordism.

The first thing any decent form of nationalism must do is to DUMP THE POLITICAL POPES. God be praised, Western nationalism outgrew this Political Papacy insanity over three centuries ago. It should be permanently banished to the Middle East where it belongs. Every decent person will pray that the Middle East, too, will grow out of it.

September 11, 1999 - RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES READ THE SCRIPT EXACTLY THE WAY THE LIBERALS WRITE IT

September 11, 1999 - WACO: CONSERVATIVE COWARDICE AND STUPIDITY HELPED IT HAPPEN

RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES READ THE SCRIPT EXACTLY THE WAY THE LIBERALS WRITE IT

It turns out that the FBI did indeed use "pyrotechnic devices" at Waco.

The Attorney General, she don't know nuthin.'

That term is a mouthful -- "pyrotechnic devices." But everybody is very, very careful to use it. Nobody says "incendiary devices."

An incendiary device is a weapon. It is used for the specific purpose of starting fires. A pyrotechnic device is something which CAN cause a fire, though that is not its primary purpose. Now that it has finally been discovered that pyrotechnic devices were used at Waco, the press has bent over backwards to make this distinction clear.

No respectable conservative has failed to use the term "pyrotechnic devices" instead of "incendiary device." Nobody has any trouble making these distinctions when the liberals want them made.

But liberals and respectable conservatives freely use the term "assault weapons" in reference to semiautomatic rifles being banned by liberals. There has not been a semiautomatic assault weapon in decades. The guns being outlawed by liberals are not assault weapons, because they are not automatics. There is, in fact, no real difference between the guns liberals are outlawing and any other routine civilian weapon. But that is too complicated a point for respectable conservatives to make.

"Assault weapon" is not a complicated term. The difference between an automatic weapon and a semiautomatic weapon is not complicated. But the distinction is NEVER made.

But the far more complicated term, "pyrotechnic devices," is ALWAYS carefully used.

If liberals want a distinction made, it gets made. Respectable conservatives only care about what liberals want. If I were in on the public debates over Waco, I would have refused to make any distinction between incendiary device and pyrotechnic devices until the liberals learn words like "automatic" and "semiautomatic." But as long as respectable conservatives pretend to be the opposition, don't hold your breath.

WACO: CONSERVATIVE COWARDICE AND STUPIDITY HELPED IT HAPPEN

Anything the left gets away with using against anybody will eventually be used against us.

I don't care about Koresh. But I do care about what HAPPENED to Koresh, because it can happen to us.

I believe that the fire was started by the Davidians, on orders from Koresh. The point is that it would not have been started if the FBI had done the sane thing, which was to blockade them.

Yes, I DID say that at the time. In fact, I was mystified at the whole idea of an attack when a blockade would do the job. But the rule at the time was, if the militant isn't a leftist, blast him to pieces.

The chief negotiator for the FBI at Waco was being interviewed on CNN. He said he had recommended that, instead of attacking the compound, the FBI should have just surrounded the place, cut it off, and waited for the Branch Davidians to come out. Van Susteren said that sounded very good to her, and asked why the FBI didn't do it.

Well, said the negotiator, an FBI man had been killed. So they had to attack. He gave a couple more lame excuses.

Commentators seem to have very conveniently forgotten the situation at the time. Before Waco, liberals AND CONSERVATIVES had given the BATF and FBI a license to massacre anyone who resisted them, as long as the resisters were not left wing. I even remember seeing the situation depicted in a major movie of the time.

The hero of the movie was working with the FBI, and he and dozens of other officers had a guy in a nazi uniform trapped. The man knew he was surrounded and dead, so he took out a pistol and fired random shots in the general direction of all the heavily armed and hidden agents. They fired hundreds of rounds, enjoying every minute of it, cutting him to pieces. The hero looked a little disgusted at the butchery.

Back then, not so long ago, Federal agents were under tight scrutiny if they trapped black militants or leftist militants or career criminals. But liberals gave them a license to kill any armed rightist, and conservative leaders cheered them on.

So the BATF had attacked the Branch Davidians, but they got shot to pieces doing it. So the FBI was called in to prepare for another attack.

Now, one might imagine that right wing leaders would long since have realized that this sort of government violence would eventually threaten them. But this ignores the fact that we are dealing here with a bunch of cowardly nitwits.

As soon as liberals declared that some group of rightists were evil, all the other rightists immediately shouted "Kill 'em! I'm with you, liberals, I ain't no Evil Nazi!!!"

This right wing routine of praising liberals for using violence or slurs against their enemies has been standard practice for years (See September 26, 1998 article, "Respectable Conservatives Kill Their Wounded").

It is a vicious circle. In their desperation to avoid being labeled whatever liberals are calling their latest enemies, conservatives denounce the latest liberal target wildly. This makes the liberals denounce more people. In their desperation to avoid being associated with this wider circle of people being denounced, conservatives wildly denounce them too, and demand even stronger action to crush the "evil racists" or "gun nuts" or whatever. And the process continues.

Inevitably, we will eventually find OURSELVES in the group being denounced by the liberals. When that happens, the group screaming loudest for our blood will be our former allies on the right.

You know, the guys we were shouting with last week for the last group's blood. (Please see October 3, 1998 article, "Defining Respectable Conservatives: They're just Bureaucrats".)

But finally, when the Davidians got attacked, even the cowardly nitwits on the right got scared. You see, when this attack took place, a comforting illusion was blown away.

Before Waco, right wing leaders had thought they had a foolproof way to keep the liberals off of them. They thought they could hide their political heresy behind religion. They thought all they had to do was

say, "Well, I would be a good leftist, but I am a right winger just because of religion." Liberals wouldn't DARE attack them then! (Please see article for August 21, 1999, "The Topeka Decision on Evolution").

"But the Davidians were a group of RELIGIOUS nutcases. They even had a Star of David on the flag outside their compound! With the attack on them, the illusion that claiming religion would save you collapsed. When the FBI and the BATF threw their full force against a bunch of armed RELIGIOUS extremists, it scared the right half to death.

"DUHHHH!" said the right, "That could happen to ME!!!"

In the same period, the right even got perturbed about violence against a white separatist -- an Evil Racist, no less. When a sniper shot down Randy Weaver's wife with a baby in her arms, even rightist leaders said "DUHH! (the one-word motto of the Shrewd Right), "That could happen to ME!!!!"

Let us say it again: Anything the left gets away with using against anybody will eventually be used against us.

Today, many a member of the League of the South goes into a fainting fit when our enemies call Lee and Jackson Nazis. When the liberals called Professor Arthur Jensen a Nazi, most of the right laid low. They didn't want to be mixed in with anything "controversial," and the minute anybody gets called a racist by leftists, they become "controversial." Time after time, a group or a person becomes "controversial" because liberals label him anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews. As soon as they are declared "controversial," rightists refuse to defend their rights.

So now the liberals have declared that Jackson and Lee - and anyone who admires them -- were naziswhwanttokillsixmillionjews.

Could any reasonably intelligent person have imagined that this would not eventually happen?

And many League members are astonished that there is no outcry against this label being applied to us.

But, you see, everybody ELSE is just trying to stay out of this "controversy."

Just like so many of us did.

I think Koresh and his Davidians set the fire that killed them and the children they were holding. I also think this would not have happened if the FBI had not resorted to an unnecessary assault. The FBI should have cut off the Branch Davidians and forced them to come out by blockade. But they went in after them, guns blazing, because that was the way things were done then, with the full approval of the left and therefore of the respectable right. It never occurred to the FBI that the right would actually go "DUHH!," wake up and finally realize they, too, were threatened.

For those who have not learned this lesson yet, they'd better learn it. As I pointed out on October 24, 1998, in "Liberal Spores," if the liberals haven't made your nightmares come true yet, they WILL get around to it.

For the third and last time, we must learn this rule: Anything the left gets away with using against anybody will eventually be used against us.

Maybe, just maybe, we can finally learn that, if you wait for them to come get YOU before you say anything, you are doomed.

September 18, 1999 – WHITAKER ONLINE'S FIRST ANNIVERSARY

September 18, 1999 – SELECTIVELY RIGHTEOUS ANGER

September 18, 1999 – EVERYBODY LOVES DANFORTH

September 18, 1999 – THE LINCOLN SOLUTION

WHITAKER ONLINE'S FIRST ANNIVERSARY

The first Whitaker Online was published a year ago, on September 12, 1998. We are waging a life and death political struggle. Virgil Huston, the South Carolina League's webmaster, decided one year ago that what I have to say after many years as a political expert might be useful to all of us waging this struggle.

We talk about the Celtic heritage of the South, but we are not learning the real lesson the Celtic tragedy can teach. Two thousand years ago, the Celtic languages and culture dominated all of Western Europe. Then the Romans came. Against the Romans, the Celts had one fatal flaw. The legions were disciplined and marched in close order. But Celts attacked bravely, wildly, and pointlessly. No matter how many Celtic warriors there were, the disciplined legions would conquer them. And eighteen centuries later, the Irish Celts had the same fatal flaw against the British. Disciplined redcoats could defeat any number of wild Celts. So now the Celtic language is dying out even in the tiny areas where it is still spoken. Because of the fatal flaw in Celtic warfare, their culture is dead and all that is left is the Celtic bloodline, much of it in the American South.

Now immigration, integration, and multiculturalism are pushing out Southern culture and what is left of the Celtic bloodline here and in Europe. Today's war is political, and today's Celts have the same weakness they did before. I have been in political warfare for over four decades. I know what gets to our enemies, but I can't beat them by myself. We cannot beat them in the old wild Celt way, charging and shouting while all the rest of us, separately, run around the disciplined leftist legions and toss words at them.

The left has its legions. They coordinate their arguments. This is a war of words, so the left chooses its words very carefully. When they find cliches or arguments that work, they use them again and again and again. We often complain about how they repeat the same arguments in unison. But doing that WORKS.

The leftist always gets his point in. The conservative doesn't. When the Romans found that the combination of javelin, short sword and shield worked, they used it to conquer the world. In the present struggle for our very existence, words are our only weapon. But we throw them around the way the Celtic hordes threw their spears. For each effective liberal weapon, I have recommended a counter-weapon, which I have developed over years in the political struggle. But they have to be USED, and they have to be used again and again and again. When a leftist even mentions guns, we must cram the New York example right down their throats. We must cross-examine them about the Sullivan Law, which requires a woman to go to prison for a minimum sentence of one year for defending herself with a can of mace.

They are always saying "racism". We must talk about Wordism, which is the real problem. But we must not just MENTION Wordism. We have to make sure our point gets made. A concept is a WEAPON. Words and concepts are our ONLY weapons.

Just as they countered the "Communist" label by ridicule, we must learn to "anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews" until they get as sick to death of hearing it as we are.

As Virgil says at the beginning of each Whitaker Online, I have "been there and done that." My tactics WORK. But the weapons I hand you can do nothing unless you make your spokesmen use them. And they have to be used and tried until they work. When you've honed them to perfection, you have to use them again and again and again. This is not necessarily the way to have the most fun. The wild Celts had the fun. Those who made up the Celtic armies had individual weapons and lots of variety. The dull old Roman soldiers each had a javelin, a shield, and a short sword. The Romans found the arms that worked best, and KEPT them. The Celts enjoyed variety. As a result, the lands that were once Gaelic are now speaking varieties of Latin.

As I pointed out before, you get what you ask for. Words are our only weapons. Unless we develop some discipline in using them, and unless we learn to find the ones that WORK, we will repeat the Celtic Tragedy. I keep complaining about respectable conservatives. The problem is that respectable conservatives are the only ones liberals want on discussion shows. But the secret is that this CAN be overcome. If one percent of the readers of Whitaker Online were to send an email letter condemning a respectable conservative to the show he is on, it would make a BIG difference.

But someone else will find it much easier to do this if YOU do it. And vice-versa. That is why moving as a group makes such a huge difference. If you are in public, debating, input from your potential fans makes a big difference. If you jump on the wimps, it impresses them. Believe me, I've been there.

Our problem is NOT that we're helpless. Our problem is that we are INERT.

Whitaker Online is dedicated to handing out the weapons, and to the hope that they will be used.

SELECTIVELY RIGHTEOUS ANGER

On CNN's Crossfire, the attorney for Ken McVeigh said that if the government had come clean in the first place, there would have been no Oklahoma bombing. Senator Frank Lautenberg, a liberal Democrat, was deeply incensed. He said that McVeigh's lawyer was trying to excuse McVeigh's actions.

The lawyer's argument certainly sounded a bit thin to me, but I don't think Lautenberg had any reason to get upset. After all, Democrats have been saying exactly this kind of thing for forty years. Back in the early sixties liberals were excusing black rioting and killing with just such language.

And not just black killing. Back then, the line on every college faculty was that "so-called criminals" were actually victims of an unjust society.

Liberals like to say that was then, and this is now. They say they no longer excuse crime the way they did in the sixties. But when a black man got on a New York subway a year or so ago and committed mass slaughter with an automatic weapon, nobody blamed him. It was the GUNS that were to blame.

When a white supremacist went around killing nonwhites, it was all racist. But the black guy killing whites was all the fault of the guns. Nothing has changed.

Then McVeigh's lawyer used the same old line liberals have always used. Lautenberg went ballistic. When someone starts murdering people for a LEFTIST reason, everybody agrees that HE should be given the benefit of the doubt. But for a non-leftist to USE the same justification is BLASPHEMY!

I saw a cartoon some time back that portrayed this situation beautifully. It showed a bunch of people lined up on one side. Some were in Klan robes, some were in swastikas. Each one had "right wing extremist" written on him. On the other side, out by himself, was the Unibomber. He was labeled, "Unibomber". There is no such thing as a "left wing extremist." The Unibomber did his bombing for the cause of environmental extremism, but no one connected him with Al Gore or anyone else on that side.

In other words, there is such a thing as "right wing violence." But there is no such thing as "left wing violence." You may be sure the respectable conservative commentator on Crossfire pointed none of this out. When will a respectable conservative force a liberal like Lautenberg to explain these contradictions? Don't hold your breath.

EVERYBODY LOVES DANFORTH

Janet Reno has appointed Senator John Danforth to look into the Waco mess. Both liberals and respectable conservatives say this is a great choice. Why I am not reassured by this?

In a decades-long political career, Danforth has never once outraged liberals. He is therefore eminently respectable and has Janet Reno's full endorsement.

John Danforth has invested all this time in never offending the establishment. Now who really believes he is going to risk all that by exposing a cover up or doing any thing else really serious? I wish they would give me one percent of the millions Danforth is going to spend, and let me write his report for him. I was a professional senior staffer for years, and I have written many speeches and many, many statements and many, many reports for the big dogs. I could write Danforth's report now.

This is the report: Waco was a screwup, but everyone was honest and above-board. Nobody is really to blame. It was tragic and inexcusable, though everybody will be excused. I could have the report ready for you in less than a week, and save us all a lot of time and trouble.

THE LINCOLN SOLUTION

When the Chinese head of state visited Clinton in the White House some time back, the question of Taiwan came up. He said that during his visit he was surrounded on all sides by momentos of and memorials to Abraham Lincoln. He pointed out that Lincoln had dealt with a problem identical to that of Taiwan. If someone is part of the Union and tries to act otherwise, he said, Lincoln had a solution. A Final Solution.

Clinton said the situations were absolutely different, but he failed to name a single difference. Now East Timor is seceding from Indonesia, and the Indonesian forces are in there killing them. Once again, the Lincoln Solution. Clinton says East Timor should be independent because they VOTED for independence.

They had referenda on secession in Virginia and Tennessee in 1861. The vote was better than two to one for secession. Lincoln never claimed the Southern States didn't WANT independence. He said specifically that he was not fighting the war about slavery or anything else. He was invading the South in order to force them, against their will, to be part of the Union. Every respectable conservative, North and South, would be happy to kill anybody to preserve the Union. But they condemn China's threat to use force to reunite Taiwan to China. Respectable conservatives are also upset that Indonesia is using the Lincoln Solution against East Timor. To be a respectable conservative, each of these opinions is required. If you have a logical mind, being respectable is terribly complicated.

Let's see if I can list the respectable conservative positions without a scorecard in my hand:

Independence for the South was the Ultimate Evil. But East Timor deserves full United States and world backing. Independence in Europe is OK if we make sure that every independent state is ethnically balanced (See June 12 article, "Busing By Bomber"). As I make clear in "Busing By Bomber," the United States is willing to use force to integrate all European countries.

On the other hand, the United States supports the reunification of China, which is a racially homogeneous country. All Chinese should be united, just as no European country must be allowed such racial homogeneity.

"Asia for the Asians, Africa for the Africans, and Europe for everybody."

And for each of these goals, all respectable conservatives are ready to fight. As for me, I can't even keep all this straight, much less fight for it.

Maybe I'm just not clever enough to be respectable.

The problem is, of course, that I think in a straight line.

By contrast, one who wants to be respectable must have his eyes exclusively on what liberals consider acceptable. Since what passes for liberal thought is snakelike, you cannot stay within the limits they lay down for respectability at any given moment unless you are able to curve and switch around behind them. Respectability allows no room for a straight line.

September 25, 1999 – WASN'T THE NEUTRON BOMB SUPPOSED TO BE A JOKE?
September 25, 1999 – WHIGS 2000

WASN'T THE NEUTRON BOMB SUPPOSED TO BE A JOKE?

Communist China says it is going to take the South back by force. The South, in this case, is Formosa. The United States agrees that Formosa is an integral part of China, but objects to their doing exactly what the United States is so proud of doing in 1865.

Lately, China has made enormous leaps in military technology at the expense of the United States. By spying and by taking advantage of our loose security, China has stolen generations of high tech weapons from America. One of these advances has been the capacity to build a neutron bomb.

In one of its threats, China stated that "China's neutron bombs are more than enough to handle aircraft carriers." Once again, I am plagued by the fact that I have a memory.

Back when the neutron bomb was about to be deployed in Western Europe, the Soviets were bothered by it. It was a technologically advanced, cheap, effective weapon which they could not match. Immediately, the trendy left in America began a campaign against it.

Back then, the neutron bomb was made into a joke, and all the trendy comedians made fun of it. They made fun of the neutron bomb as a weapon which killed people but did not destroy property.

The campaign was very effective. It was worth billions to the Soviets.

Later, the Soviet Union was terrified by Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative. Once again, it represented a technological program the USSR could not match. So the trendy left called it Star Wars and the comedians began a campaign against it.

If Americans had a memory, they would feel betrayed. The neutron bomb, which the trendy crowd taught them was a joke, turns out to be a deadly serious matter. On top of this, it is clear that Americans gave China the neutron bomb.

There is no doubt that it was Americans who gave the Chinese all this technology. The only question is whether it was stupidity or treason.

Mainline conservatives insist these friends of the Communists are just stupid and gullible.

Conspiracy theorists insist the trendy left is not just stupid, and that all these people knew what they were doing against us.

I have the ingrained cynicism that results from decades of working among these people. I just don't think the trendy left CARES what it does to this country. Like respectable conservatives, they just do whatever seems hip at the moment.

WHIGS 2000

Pat Buchanan is considering running for the Reform Party nomination, and polls give him about 16% in a three-way race. In third party terms, that's huge, and third parties have been bellwethers in American politics. In Minnesota, Jesse Ventura started his gubernatorial campaign with a lower poll percentage than that and took out two big-name major party candidates.

Can the Reform Party become a major party? The last time a new major party was founded was in 1854, and that was the Republican Party. The very next year, in 1855, the Republicans dominated the House, electing William Tecumseh Sherman's brother Speaker of the House. The Republican Party immediately replaced the Whigs, which had been the official opposition to the Democrats until then.

The Whig Party was formed in the late 1820s to oppose Andrew Jackson's new Democratic Party, which took power in 1829. The Whigs were America's second national party from about 1828 to 1854. They won only two presidential elections during that entire time. Whigs really didn't stand for anything much. They were simply a light opposition party for the ruling Democrats.

If Whigs cared about anything, it was the interests of rich people. Whigs wanted high tariffs, a national bank, and the other things that would help the rich get richer. Above all, Whigs did not want to rock the boat.

One thing that was clear about the Whigs was that, when a serious national issue arose to split the country along lines of principle, the Whigs would not be able to deal with it. As soon as the split between the North and South took precedence, the Whigs simply melted away. In other words, the Whigs were exactly like professional Republicans today.

Exactly like today's respectable conservatives, the Whigs made complete fools of themselves when they tried to be Shrewd. Like professional conservatives today, the Whiggish attempts to be Shrewd always ended up producing a bad joke.

By 1840, the Whigs had compiled a record today's Republicans would be proud of: they had run three times and lost three times. Then, in 1840, they decided they would be Shrewd. Though the actual Democratic candidate was President Martin Van Buren, they were running against the party of Andrew Jackson. So the Whigs nominated a former general, William Henry Harrison, to balance off Andrew Jackson's image. Then came the Shrewd Bit. They decided to get opposition votes by nominating an anti-Jackson Democrat for the unimportant office of VICE president.

So in 1840 the Whig ticket consisted of Harrison for president and Tyler for vice president. They were not sure what Tyler stood for, but since he was to be only the Vice President, that made no difference. He was just a Shrewd addition.

For the first time, the Whigs actually won. Then the results of their Shrewd Move began to kick in. William Henry Harrison was inaugurated in March of 1841. One month later, he was dead. After twelve years of Democratic rule, the Whigs had had a Whig President for exactly thirty days. In April, 1841, another Democrat, John Tyler, moved into the White House.

Tyler was no Jackson Democrat, but he was just as certainly no Whig. Actually, he was a John C. Calhoun Democrat. Very soon, the entire Whig Cabinet was gone and Southern Democrats took over. All this was courtesy of the Whigs' Shrewd Move.

The Whigs won one more election, in 1852. Once again they elected a general. Once again the Whig luck kicked in and he died in office. He was succeeded by the world renowned Millard Fillmore. The Whigs held the White House until March of 1853. By 1856, they had ceased to exist.

So from 1828 to 1852, in a quarter of a century as the official opposition party, the Whigs held the White House for a total of one month!

The Whigs ended up being a bad joke. To me, the similarities between them and the modern Republican Party are absolutely eerie.

In historical terms, the Whigs were just pointless time-fillers. They were tolerated as a fake opposition until the inevitable time came when national politics got too serious for them. They merely got in the way of serious discussion until the split between North and South became too serious to be settled in the realm of politics.

Republican moderates, professional conservatives, and "Christian" conservatives own a Republican Party that is exactly like the 1840s Whigs.

Any serious issue would break the modern Republican Party.

America needs a post-Cold War political party. Democrats want American armed forces all over the world enforcing their agenda. Republicans are happy with that. All they want is a bigger military. What it is used for is of no importance. They just want more troops and more dollars for the Defense Department. They are still a Cold War party.

Democratic trade policy is aimed at pushing a liberal agenda. Republican trade policy ignores any special concern for domestic interests. The fact is that the Republican Party is owned by the Pentagon and by big money, and everybody knows it.

Democrats want massive third world immigration for long-term votes and power. Republicans want open borders for short-term cheap labor and profits.

There is plenty of room for a Reform Party which would be for cutting immigration and for keeping defense expenditures and military adventurism down.

More generally, it is time for an American party with the slogan America First. I think they would probably screw up economic policy, but I am talking politics here, not economics.

I think that Pat Buchanan could be useful to this movement. He will lose, but the Republicans had to lose with John Fremont in 1856 before they won in 1860. The first time Jackson ran for president in 1824, his budding Democratic Party lost. I think Pat would lose, but he could establish the Whig Party as a serious contender.

I think Pat would lose because he does not have what I would call a "clean ticket." The Republican ticket in 1860 was severely limited. It only contained items such as building the transatlantic railroad by the northern route and, above all, opposing the extension of slavery to any new territory. There were a lot of issues that New Englanders would have liked to include, but they were avoided. The Republican platform in 1860 even went out of its way to insist that Lincoln would enforce the Fugitive Slave Act.

New England did not take control of America by insisting on everything at once. New England took over America through the Republican Party only AFTER it used the "clean ticket" to win a national election. The "clean ticket" party first had to break the Southern-Western coalition that controlled American politics.

To have a chance of WINNING, Pat would need a clean ticket. But Pat has a fatal misconception. In 1976, I wrote "A Plague On Both Your Houses," which described anti-liberal populism. As Pat says, anti-liberal populism will be the force that forms the next major political party in America. But Pat has fatally confused anti-liberal populism with the Religious Right. They are NOT the same thing.

Today's fake Republican opposition is not going to fight for any social issue. In order to win on any social issues in the long run, Pat would have to show the patience New England did in 1860. If his issues are to get anywhere, he will first have to clean out the fake Republican opposition. That requires more of a "clean ticket" strategy than Pat is likely to settle for.

So Pat cannot win, but he would certainly help the Reform Party to advance.

If the Reform Party is ever to actually win a national election, it must EVENTUALLY find a nationally credible candidate who will go the "clean ticket" route and concentrate on immigration restrictions and America First. To attract such a candidate, it will first have to make an impressive run against the other two parties in a national election WITHOUT Ross Perot at the top of the ticket.

As the Republicans did in 1856, the post-Perot Reform Party must lose an election while proving that they are a credible national party. Pat Buchanan could be the John Fremont of the Reform Party.

October 2, 1999 – LAND OF OPPORTUNITY

October 2, 1999 – THE WORLD'S CHAMPION PESSIMIST

October 2, 1999 – BLACK AND WHITE SOUTH CAROLINIANS SHOULD UNITE ON FLAG ISSUE

LAND OF OPPORTUNITY

In Europe you have to be born a bastard. In America, people EARN that title.

THE WORLD'S CHAMPION PESSIMIST

There was once a man who was a very good man. But he was always depressed, and he always looked on the dark side of everything.

The angels in Heaven looked down on him, and they loved his goodness, but they got very, very tired of his pessimism.

Finally this good depressed man died. He was coming to The Pearly Gates!

The angels were joyful, "At long last," they said, "He cannot be pessimistic about anything!"

So he came to the Pearly Gates, and he faced Saint Peter.

And Saint Peter flung wide the Gates, and said, "Now you will spend the rest of eternity here in Heaven!"

The depressed man frowned and replied, "The REST of eternity? You mean I MISSED THE FIRST HALF!?"

I'll bet every one of us knows somebody like that.

BLACK AND WHITE SOUTH CAROLINIANS SHOULD UNITE ON FLAG ISSUE

When President Clinton gives a speech, look to his right. There is a flag there. It is the flag of the President of the United States. In the District of Columbia, it is not just the president who has his own flag.

Each AGENCY has its own flag. When I worked for the Office of Personnel Management, the flag of OPM flew right below the United States flag.

In South Carolina, we are told that only SOVEREIGN flags are allowed on flagpoles. But in the very city which represents True Righteousness to Confederate flag opponents, mere AGENCIES have their own standards right out there on the flagpole.

There is only the US flag and the agency flag on the OPM flagpole. Though OPM is in Washington, DC, there is no DC flag. Why? For the same reason there are no state flags on the flagpoles of Federal buildings in South Carolina. The buildings don't belong to the STATE. They are FEDERAL buildings. So why should they have state flags flying over them?

In Washington, DC, you have a Federal flag and an OPM flag. The flagpole says, "This building belongs to the United States Government, Office of Personnel Management." The South Carolina capitol building has a Federal flag and a state flag. The message is, "This building belongs to the United States Government, Division of South Carolina."

For those who support such a statement, there is obviously no room for any flags which express any special state identity. South Carolina is a division of the government in Washington. Period.

Recently the United States Supreme Court shocked everybody by announcing that the states actually have an existence separate from that of the Federal Government. The Columbia, SC, State newspaper, which is fanatically against the Confederate flag flying from the State House dome, had a cartoon showing a Confederate flag flying from the flagpole over the United States Supreme Court!

Why would a newspaper which says that a Confederate flag flying from the State House flagpole has no meaning turn right around and show one on the Supreme Court flagpole?

Obviously, because the Confederate flag HAS a meaning. It means STATE sovereignty. It means the opposite of "United States Government, Department of South Carolina."

For those who believe that the only purpose of a flag over the State House is to say, "United States Government, Department of South Carolina," there is room there for only one real flag, the FEDERAL flag. You only have a state flag below it to show which department of the Federal Government this building happens to belong to.

For the rest of us, the banners over the State House should show who WE are. And by "we," I do not mean the Federal Government. I mean that the purpose of flags on the dome of the South Carolina capitol building is to say who SOUTH CAROLINIANS are.

What heresy!

The latest South Carolina Patriot quoted state representative Robert Ford's statement that he no longer opposes the Confederate flag. Mr. Ford is a black man and an old-time liberal who worked with Martin Luther King. He now accepts the Confederate flag because WHITES see it as representing OUR white tradition in this state. He asks that the Black Liberation Flag be added, to represent the BLACK experience in our state. If we are going to quote statements of Mr. Ford of which we approve, we owe it to him to take a position on the issue that is so important to him.

I am a proud white man and a right winger, but I wrote a tribute to Stokeley Carmichael in these pages some time back (See June 26, "Stokeley Carmichael, RIP"). His politics were repugnant to me, but I was eulogizing the man, not his politics. For those of us who support the Confederate flag as a statement of our identity, the question is whether the black experience should also be represented. That is the only question we must answer.

What the symbol is is not our problem. What symbol black South Carolinians choose is their business, not mine. If we are asking black people to forget some of the uglier things that the Confederate flag flew over, then we should show the same flexibility. All we should demand is that the symbol chosen be picked by black South Carolinians.

There have been some attacks specifically on the Black Liberation Flag for what it is supposed to symbolize. That makes no difference to me. As a nationalist, I believe that black people should choose the symbol of the black experience. What they choose is none of my business. The sponsor of the Liberation Flag is Robert Ford, a black South Carolinian who was elected to represent black South Carolinians. That is what I am looking for.

Robert Ford is a representative elected by black South Carolinians. He shows the kind of courage I would be proud to be aligned with. As a black representative in South Carolina, Mr. Ford is in an excellent position to suck up to the fat cats. The big money group loves to have endorsements from genuine black leaders, and they are willing to pay for it. Ford gave all that up for the cause he supports. Mr. Ford is now one of the people whose contributor list the NAACP is looking into. There are already strong rumors of attempts by liberals to unseat Ford in the next election.

Contrast Ford's courage to the absolute wimpishness of South Carolina's so-called leaders on the right. When national Republicans and the Chamber of Commerce wanted the Confederate flag down, Governor Beasley switched sides. Every single statewide Republican leader lined up with him. I'll take Ford as my ally, thank you.

Lastly, what Mr. Ford wants represents something politics often ignores: the simple TRUTH.

In sober fact, the unique history of South Carolina would be represented by the Confederate flag and a flag to represent the black experience. That is who we are. That is the basis of South Carolina history. That is where we came from. The real history of the South is tied up in two landmark books, "Gone With the Wind" and "Roots."

Carol Rowan, a columnist who is black and very liberal, pointed out that, next to American blacks, the group that has gotten the rawest deal in the last century of this country were the Southern whites.

There are two titanic, almost unbearably bitter experiences that are at the basis of our Southern history. They are absolutely Southern. They are absolutely and exclusively American.

It is true that both these historical backgrounds are tragic. But it is also true that real history tends toward the tragic. These experiences made us what we are.

It would be my pleasure to be allied with blacks who are also proud of their heritage. I am proud of my own tradition, and I would like to be an ally of others who are. I believe in this kind of pride, and I am willing to put my money where my mouth is and support the Black Liberation Flag.

It is time to tell the world what the real history and tragedy of the Southern experience has been, all of it, black and white. We can do that if we stand together with black South Carolinians whom we respect. And if we stand together, both of our groups, nobody can ever tear our flags down.

October 9, 1999 – "HOW STRONG DO YOU HAVE TO BE TO PULL A TRIGGER?"
October 9, 1999 – IF MCCAIN BECOMES PRESIDENT, LOOK FOR MORE WACOS

"HOW STRONG DO YOU HAVE TO BE TO PULL A TRIGGER?"

In the movie GI Jane, this was a brilliant liberal statement. A woman senator was complaining publicly about all the combat jobs closed to women. In response, a lady reporter said women might not be as physically fit as men to fight. So the genius lady liberal said, "How strong do you have to be to pull a trigger?"

So how do national conservative spokesmen deal with a pathetically stupid statement like this? The conservative reply to brilliant liberal arguments like this is to repeat the motto and mantra of conservatism:

"DUHHHHHH!"

The conservative then respectfully disagrees with the liberal point, but only in the exact way that the liberal made it (please see September 11 article -- "Respectable Conservatives Read The Script Exactly The Way The Liberals Write It").

If the liberal limits the statement to women, then the conservative talks about women. As a result, the basic point, the fact that liberals are always saying things like this that are simply nutty, gets missed completely. Nothing liberals say makes any sense and nothing they do WORKS, but conservative spokesmen save them from the public exposure and humiliation they deserve.

Now, let's pretend there is a conservative spokesmen with an IQ above room temperature. Let us further assume he has not degenerated into a hopeless theologian or nutcase (please see July 24 articles, "How Right Wingers Go Nuts" and "Why So Many Right Wingers Go Nuts").

An intelligent conservative spokesman - - yes, I KNOW that's an oxymoron, but this is an exercise in fantasy -- would look beyond what the liberal said. He would not just try to prove he knows how to respectfully disagree with his liberal master. Instead, such a spokesman would make up some policy himself rather than following the liberal along like a puppy dog.

So what is the GENERAL POLICY IMPLICATION of, "How strong do you have to be to pull a trigger?"

The general policy statement is that there are NO PHYSICAL REQUIREMENTS FOR COMBAT DUTY!

This, in fact, is the policy implication of ALL liberal statements on women in combat.

To demonstrate this, our nonexistent intelligent conservative could demand that a liberal follow his own logic. He could make a constructive proposal on the basis of liberal statements about women in combat. To be specific, he could say that the same argument be used to allow OLDER MEN to be accepted for the military.

Women are allowed to participate in the military despite the fact that women in general have less strength and endurance than men do. Using the same logic, OLDER MEN should be allowed to join the service. Older men are only kept out because they have less physical strength and endurance, ON AVERAGE, than younger men do.

If we can change these requirements for women, why not for older men? If this allowance is made for women, then why is it not also made for older men?

The liberal will insist that, if older men are included, then older women should be included, too. The conservative would counter that, since a special consideration has to be made for these older women's average lack of stamina and strength, then yet OLDER men will have to be included. And so on.

The problem here is that ALL age requirements are based on the AVERAGE for that age group. If one insists that the average be forgotten in the case of women, then one must insist that all averages be forgotten for age. So if women are included despite their lower physical averages, then all age requirements must go.

In other words, the liberal must either admit the sexes are different, or he must drop all age limitations on enlistment!

Naturally, no one brings this up. No one brings it up because conservative spokesmen are not bright enough. They are also not brave enough. Even if they thought of this proposal, they couldn't use it because it puts liberals in an impossible position.

Liberals need to keep the older men out, because their goal is to make no distinction between women and men. But if conservatives were to insist that the same break be given to older men as to women in the younger age brackets, that would be a recognition of the reality of innate sex differences.

Recognizing the differing nature and roles of men and women is supposed to be a conservative goal. But nothing is a conservative goal if it requires either brains or guts.

As the next article shows, the idea of "courage" for so-called "leaders of the right" is for a conservative to repeat liberal cliches.

IF MCCAIN BECOMES PRESIDENT, LOOK FOR MORE WACOS

As I pointed out on September 11 in "Waco: Conservative Cowardice And Stupidity Helped It Happen," the cross-examination of the BATF and the FBI over Waco is unfair. Both organizations had been given a license to kill, and they were only doing what both the left and the right had encouraged them to do. When the Branch Davidians discovered the BATF's impending raid, the BATF simply pushed it ahead a half-hour. This was in violation of all the normal confrontational rules. But it fulfilled the mandate they had been given in dealing with any armed non-leftist group.

When it came to attacking non-leftists who had weapons, the rules had been set aside. Armed leftists were protected by liberal opinion.

But when it came to armed rightists, the right demanded that they be massacred even more loudly than the left did. Rightists, and not just respectable conservatives, are desperate to convince liberals that they have nothing to do with condemned rightist groups. If leftists condemn these groups, rightists demand that they be crushed without consideration or mercy.

This reminds one of Senator John McCain's attitude about Kosovo.

Liberals wanted to attack the Serbs. McCain wanted to hit them harder, faster, more brutally, and preferably with American troops on the ground. The left wants to ban anything it chooses to call "hate" sites on the web. McCain wants to ban them even more.

Now, consider this: how would a President McCain deal with any group the left considers outside the pale? And when President McCain produces more Wacos, how will the right react? The entire right would follow its President faithfully. Can you imagine what would have happened after Waco if McCain had been president?

Nothing.

In fact, the only reason conservatives investigated Waco was because Clinton was a Democrat. The attack at Waco was the direct result of attitudes that developed under a series of Republican presidents. If the president under whom Waco had taken place had been a Republican, the two parties would have united behind the actions taken. No one would be more ferociously in favor of a Republican president slaughtering those condemned by liberals than conservative Republicans.

Professional conservatives are already beginning to cover for McCain. Southern Partisan editors split three to three over whether to support McCain for president. In their article on McCain, they praise him for his "honesty." They say he is like Barry Goldwater, in that his "honesty" often offends conservatives.

No way, Jose.

Barry Goldwater often outraged conservatives with his honesty, but Barry Goldwater also upset LIBERALS just as badly by his bald assertions. MCCAIN'S SO-CALLED "HONESTY" NEVER, NEVER, NEVER DOES ANYTHING BUT PLEASE LIBERALS. Naturally, the Partisan conveniently forgot that little difference.

To repeat, to a so-called "leader" of the respectable right, "courage" is taking the liberal side against conservatives.

The Partisan also "forgot" another problem with McCain. It praised his enormous bravery in pushing the McCain-Finegold campaign finance reform.

The real problem with that proposal, of course, delights liberals. The real problem is that that bill would cut off business funding of Republicans, but would not touch union funding of liberals.

Surprise, surprise! Exactly like the liberal media, the Southern Partisan just happened not to mention that little problem. Like all conservatives who are trying to be respectable, the minute the Partisan decided to back the liberal stand, it began to use the liberals' tactics.

This brings us back to the original point: when the right wants liberal approval, it is at least as ruthless as the left, and uses their tactics shamelessly. It is no surprise that, when dealing with the Branch Davidians after a set of Republican presidents, the BATF felt it had a license to kill any armed group that had been condemned by the left.

McCain's only real interest is in being the liberals' favorite conservative. In every case where the Southern Partisan praises his great courage in outraging the right, it has been in cases where he was taking the side of the left on something crucial.

There are very few conservatives in whom I am still capable of being disappointed. I expect them to be to be gutless nitwits. But the editors of the Southern partisan do not have that excuse. When they indulge in this kind of dishonesty, it cuts far too close to home.

Cut it out, guys.

October 16, 1999 – OCCIDENTAL WISDOM

October 16, 1999 – ALAN DERSHOWITZ, HATEMONGER

OCCIDENTAL WISDOM

I may be a late bloomer, but I didn't know that "occidental" meant "western" until I was in college.

I had known that "Oriental" meant "Eastern" since I was in grammar school. This was because we always heard about Oriental Wisdom. For most of our history, Western scholars accepted the slogan "Ex Oriente Lux," which means, "Enlightenment Comes From the East."

From this base, we got the verb which describes what you must do if you are to discover where you are. In order to find out where you are, your true location, you must "orient" yourself.

Whatever truth there may have been in the past to "Ex Oriente Lux," it has been outdated for centuries. I think we need to get over this idea that true wisdom comes from the Orient. For most of history, the mentality of the Orient has produced stagnation and tyranny.

To me, real wisdom today is almost entirely a product of Western Civilization.

To see wisdom in most of what the Orient has produced in recent times is to fall for the most absurd kind of fraud. Westerners who fall for this sort of thing are usually robbed by some kind of silly guru.

Actually, Japan and other countries have made progress only by learning what the West has to teach. The first thing a country in the Middle East or in Asia must do to get freedom and to feed its children is to "occident" itself.

In a couple of thousand years, the Far East has produced a few really excellent comments. We have all heard, "The longest journey begins with a single step." My favorite, especially as I get older, is, "The palest ink is better than the best memory."

But in the real world, you will find that it is only ignorant, inexperienced people who think that a few quotes and an image makes someone Wise. Actually, the few wise sayings we can get from Eastern Philosophy are tiny gold nuggets pulled out of a vast river of pure, unmitigated crap.

What an ignorant person does not know is how many sayings there are in the Far East, and how incredibly unusual it is to find anything intelligent in these sayings. The Far East is an ocean of double-talk.

One of the major myths of Oriental Wisdom comes from stories of how travelers spent years in Tibetan monasteries, and gained deep and valuable knowledge there. Nothing could be sillier.

In those monasteries in Tibet, where there is supposed to be all that arcane wisdom, the usual discussion goes like this:

A young monk walks up and loudly, formally addresses The Old One, who is seated and looking Terribly Wise. The young monk asks, "Master, what is the nature of man?"

And the Wise One answers something like,

"A frog may jump twice, but not three times."

And the young monk answers, "Thank you for your Valuable Answer!"

These crazy exchanges goes on and on. This is the kind of thing these ADULTS actually spend their lives on!

For endless ages, Oriental Wise Men have sat around saying things like, "Meditate upon The Clapping of a Single Hand."

I would answer this with a bit of Occidental Wisdom: "By definition, a single hand doesn't clap."

What if I were to try to sound profound by saying, "Let's all think about the firing of an empty gun." You would think I was being pretty damned silly, and you would be right.

Most Oriental Wisdom can be described this way: "It sounds obscure, but it is actually meaningless."

These guys are sort of like Western bureaucrats. They need to get a real job.

ALAN DERSHOWITZ, HATEMONGER

Alan Dershowitz is a famous defense lawyer and a professor of law at Harvard Law School. He is also one of the favorite commentators on legal matters on national television.

Dershowitz told CNN that, in his youth, he had been raised not to complain about the gentiles who dominated his country. His family taught him that Jews had to be quiet in the face of the persecutors

who ruled over them. But, Dershowitz told CNN, he spoke out anyway. He said that scared the rest of his oppressed, silenced family, except for his heroic mother. Dershowitz said that his mother, though she went along with the policy of silence, was proud of his bravely daring to speak out.

Now, where was this brave Jewish child being threatened this way? Was this Nazi Germany? Was it in Russia, with the Czarist Okhrana waiting at his ghetto door?

I went to the library and looked up the location where little Alan Dershowitz was born and raised and silenced and oppressed. It turns out that he was born in BROOKLYN!!

While the Dershowitz family cowered in terror in their ghetto in New York City, what was happening to their fellow American Jews elsewhere? Were they too being oppressed into fearful silence?

Not really. Judah P. Benjamin, Secretary of the Confederate Treasury and Senator from Louisiana, was accused of many things. He was called hero by some and traitor by others. But nobody called him SILENT!

In my youth in the South Carolina in the 1950's, the Speaker of the State House of Representatives was one Solomon K. Blatt. He, too, was seldom accused of living in terrified silence.

So why would a grown man describe a youth spent in abject terror of the gentiles in New York City? How could anyone, even CNN, take him seriously?

Let me ask another, more serious, question. There are about as many Jews in Brooklyn as there are white gentiles. Let us say that a white gentile lawyer who was born in Brooklyn was on CNN saying something similar. This white gentile lawyer would say that, as a youth, he had been raised not to speak out in the face of JEWISH oppression.

How would CNN react to THAT?

In the first place, he would be rejected on the spot. The interviewer would have shouted him down. Secondly, he would never be invited to appear on a nationally televised interview again. Thirdly, he would be labeled a Hater.

So why does Dershowitz get a free pass on this kind of open, lying bigotry?

Liberals, and therefore respectable conservatives, all agree that only white gentiles are capable of Hate. Anyone who accuses any Jew of being capable of hatred is automatically labeled anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

The fact is that Jews can hate just like anybody else can hate. Anyone who devotes himself completely to resentments and self-pity is going to end up hating. The Dershowitzes of the world - and there are a lot of them --have long since crossed the line from righteous resentment to plain, old-fashioned hatred for white gentiles. Liberals and respectable conservatives have given liberal Jews a license to hate without criticism. It is time to take that license away.

When Elliot Gould announced in a 1960s Playboy interview that, "My enemy was always the tall, blond Nordic," it was not considered Hate. This is OK, you see, because of the Nazis. But Gould was

not talking about Nazis. Gould did NOT say, "tall, blond NAZIS." He simply said that all blond Nordics constituted a group of people he had spent his life regarding as enemies.

Everybody agrees that a very large proportion of Communists have always been Jews. So is it just fine for a gentile to blame all Jews for the ones who were Communists?

No way. That's HATE. But, since he is Jewish, for Elliot Gould to regard all white gentiles as Nazis is just fine.

In the 1960s, Susan Sonntag, another product of the same background Dershowitz and Gould come from, announced that, "The white race is the cancer of history." So what is the difference between the attitude of Dershowitz, Gould, and Sonntag towards white gentiles, and the attitude of a real Nazi toward Jews? Why is what they say not just as much Hate as what Goebbels said?

Not only is what Dershowitz says not considered hate, but Dershowitz is one of the official media spokesmen on Hate laws.

Dershowitz's hate is just like the hate of any other human being. Everything this man has done professionally can be explained as a result of this simple hatred.

To Dershowitz, white gentiles are his enemies and have been since they supposedly crushed his right to speak when he was a child. His entire career has been dedicated to the defense of those who are considered enemies by that evil, white-gentile-dominated society. The enemy of his enemy is his friend. He is a fanatical defender of those accused of committing crimes in this society.

In his book describing his life in the concentration camps run by Stalin, Aleksander Solzhenitsyn explains that Stalin's regime had an attitude toward criminals which was very much like Dershowitz's. Stalin and his ideological henchmen saw the thieves and their like as friends of the Communist ideology. The thieves were the enemies of property, and so were the Communists. The title of this particular chapter is the term the Communists used to describe the thieves. The Soviet Government's term for those who preyed on Soviet citizens by robbing and beating them was -- "The Socially Friendly!"

These "socially friendly" thieves were given special privileges in the Stalinist camps. They made life for Solzhenitsyn and his comrades even more of a hell.

This attitude is not limited to Communists. The attitude of liberals -- those who see the white race as "the cancer of history" and who look on all white gentiles as enemies -- is very, very friendly towards criminals. This is why they want criminals to have more rights than honest people do. If you understand the fact that their attitude is based on simple hatred, this becomes understandable.

But no respectable conservative ever dares label leftist attitudes as "Hate". They tacitly agree that "Hate" is something only white gentiles do.

I, for one, am sick of giving liberals a free pass on hate, even when those liberals are Jewish.

October 23, 1999 – MCCAIN WAVES THE BLOODY SHIRT AT BUCHANAN
October 23, 1999 – WORSHIPPING THE MILITARY MACHINE

MCCAIN WAVES THE BLOODY SHIRT AT BUCHANAN

The South suffered from the "Bloody Shirt" policy of Northern Republicans for many years. After the Civil War, New England steadily proceeded with their program of making the South a colony of New England. Higher and higher tariffs were imposed, forcing the South to buy industrial goods from New England rather than in cheaper foreign markets.

Industry was kept in New England by the simple device of charging several times as much to ship industrial goods north as for shipping them south. This was an internal tariff, preventing industry from moving south. Two sets of tariffs, one internal and one external, kept the East rich and the South poor.

All these policies favored New England and impoverished the south. It was not until AFTER WORLD WAR II that the last discriminatory rail rate ended. The South remained a New England colony until after 1945!

New England ruined the South economically all this time by controlling the Republican Party. The rest of the country did not benefit from these policies. So how did Republicans push policies favorable to only one section of the country and still get a consistent majority?

They did it by waving the "Bloody Shirt." Every four years, the Republican candidate would go to the Midwest and remind everyone about how the Republicans were the Party of Lincoln, and how the South deserved anything that happened to it for slavery and secession. The Bloody Shirt kept us economically enslaved for three generations.

McCain has pulled out the Bloody Shirt again.

Pat Buchanan was worried about the United States trying to guarantee union and freedom and so forth around the world. Liberals, as always, justified intervention around the world in the name of - what else? - Hitler. Anybody who opposed intervention in Kosovo was anaziwhoantedtokillsixmillionjews. So Buchanan did some research into how the world dealt with the real Hitler, and came up with a piece of heresy: He said England did it wrong!

Buchanan said that the guarantee Neville Chamberlain gave Poland in March 1939 was a bad idea. He said that, had Chamberlain not agreed to go to war with Germany if Hitler attacked Poland, Germany would have attacked the Soviet Union next. Instead, Hitler fought England and France and conquered Europe. The result was a catastrophe for Europe.

In any case, Buchanan points out, the guarantee did Poland no good at all. Hitler and Stalin divided Poland up between them. Buchanan points out that the European invasion and the European Holocaust were a direct result of Chamberlain's policy.

Harry Truman said much the same thing before World War II that Buchanan is saying today. He wanted Hitler and Stalin to fight each other, and wanted to find some way to arrange that, rather than a war in Europe. Would things be better or worse had Chamberlain not made that guarantee at that time? No one actually knows.

But that is not the point. The point is that Buchanan is criticizing the Clinton-McCain foreign policy. So they do what they always do when someone hits them with criticism they can't answer. They scream HITLER!

And how do they justify screaming at Buchanan? They wave the good old reliable Bloody Shirt. If you criticize Neville Chamberlain's policy and all it led to, you are insulting and attacking all of the American troops who died in World War II. That is what McCain is actually shouting. He has read Pat Buchanan out of the Republican Party for daring to criticize Neville Chamberlain, because Neville Chamberlain's policy represents all American veterans!

New England's Bloody Shirt Policy said that Union soldiers all died for policies that would benefit New England. McCain says that all those Americans died for the foreign policy advocated by him and Clinton.

Oddly enough, McCain never says that the critics of the Vietnam War should be excluded from the political process the way Buchanan should. He would never say that Vietnam War critics are desecrating the memory of tens of thousands of Americans who died over there. That would insult liberals, and that is the last thing John McCain will ever do.

WORSHIPPING THE MILITARY MACHINE

As I pointed out on June 12, in "Busing By Bomber," General Wesley Clark pointed out that it was the US main military objective in Europe to make sure that there were no ethnically pure European states! Ethnic balance, like racial balance, is the purpose of our armed forces there.

Not one single conservative objected.

This guy is a general, and conservatives worship generals. Listen to any professional conservative, and you will hear that the main item in his political wish list is that there be more generals, more soldiers. It doesn't matter to him what they are used for.

One thing that the Founding Fathers had no use for was a huge standing army. Nothing could be more alien to the mentality of the Founders than the endless, mindless demands of conservatives for a bigger army, navy and air force. But every time you hear a professional conservative set out his policy goals, one of the first things he mentions is a bigger, more expensive military.

No conservative ever says WHY he wants this military expansion. If anybody ever asks him for a reason, his eyes go glassy and he begins to talk vaguely about "America's place in the world."

A vague comment about "America's place in the world" was NOT what the Founding Fathers considered a reason for expanding the military. As a matter of fact, that was EXACTLY the kind of cant the Founders intended to leave in Europe. It was fine for Prussians to talk about "Germany's rightful place in the world" or for Russians to say they were following Russia's World Mission. But that was for Europeans, not for free born Americans.

How is it that we now have twenty-first century American conservatives talking like eighteenth century Czarists?

The only reason for a big military, according to those who wrote the Constitution, was for a very specific, very short-term need. Unlike any professional conservative, a real American would say, "World War II is over."

The Cold War is over. What are all those troops FOR?"

No conservative ever asks.

This reveals something very basic about today's conservative. Nobody could be further from the Founding Fathers than the modern so-called conservative. The Founding Fathers were, first and foremost, makers of policy. They demanded a reason for anything the government did. Respectable conservatives are not guided by reasons. Modern conservative policy is purely a matter of blind worship.

Today's so-called conservative worships liberals. Liberals make policy, define the question, and then conservatives debate the question strictly within the guidelines set by liberals. They want respectability, and for them respectability is defined by liberals. Above all, they need to avoid liberal labels like "racist" or anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

Conservatives also worship institutions. In fact, a blind worship of the military is, to today's "conservatives," the basis of their claim to the title.

Blind loyalty to institutions like the military is EUROPEAN conservatism. As stated above, mouthing phrases about wanting a big military to ensure "America's place in the world" is good PRUSSIAN conservatism. It doesn't belong HERE.

The only proper, historical American attitude toward the armed forces is that they are a necessary evil. Americans have always kept the standing military as small as possible. We have just had a period of national emergency lasting from 1939 to the present day, when World War II and the Cold War required our expanding the military and our worldwide commitments to previously unimaginable levels.

One could say that, after two generations in which the military has been expanded and bloated beyond previous imaginings, it is natural that we have forgotten the traditional place of the military in our society.

The problem with that logic is that it ignores what conservatism is all about. How can someone who forgets our basic tradition be called a conservative? Who is going to remind us of what our proper traditions are if not the conservatives in our society?

Conservatives talk about paying for more soldiers for foreign adventures, but our own borders are completely unprotected. Illegal immigrants pour in. According to the Constitution, the purpose of the United States is to provide for "OURSELVES and OUR Posterity." The first purpose of our armed forces is to protect OUR borders.

We spend a lot more to defend Israel's borders than we do to protect our own. And conservatives want more troops to protect other people's borders. Until OUR borders are defended, no more troops should be provided for our politicians to play with abroad.

Until the Vietnam War, it was truly said that, "The United States has never lost a war or won a peace." After Vietnam, the first rule was broken, but the second rule holds firm. The Gulf War demonstrates, once again, that the United States never wins a peace.

Since the Gulf War, American troops have been used for Wesley Clark's ethnic balancing and for disasters like Somalia. Since the Cold War, our military has never been used for anything a conservative could defend. Yet conservatives keep up their knee jerk demands for more troops.

What has the United States done with its military since the end of the Cold War? The only thing that was semi-defensible that we have done was the Gulf War. That, at least, was fought to save oil rather than for some liberal objective. But it was fought to save EUROPE'S oil supply. There is plenty of oil for America's needs in the Western Hemisphere.

If we keep doing that, Europe will never grow up and provide for its own defense. Like every other kind of unnecessary welfare, military welfare is destructive.

It is time to cut the umbilical cord and let Europe grow up.

It is also time to stop giving our politicians American lives to play with.

If we give our politicians troops, they use them horribly. Politicians will only be careful with using American troops if their numbers are very, very limited. It is time to put them on a starvation diet. Cut the military, and cut it hard.

We will give them back their soldiers if and when they give us a good reason why they are needed. That is the way the Founding Fathers set it up.

October 30, 1999 – SOMETHING ELSE RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES NEVER, NEVER SAY

October 30, 1999 – WHAT THE FLAG BOYCOTT REALLY MEANS

SOMETHING ELSE RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES NEVER, NEVER SAY

One secret that liberals are desperate to keep is just how tiny the actual membership of liberal organizations is. The national press refers to the National Organization for Women as "the women's movement," but its membership is tiny compared to that of conservative women's' groups.

If it were not for respectable conservatives, this secret would be out. Keeping this sort of thing secret is one of the major services professional conservatives do for the liberal cause (See May 8 article, "Armed Switzerland and the Colorado Shootings").

One of the best-kept secrets that respectable conservatives help liberals keep is the sheer size of the National Rifle Association. When liberals talk about the power of the "leadership of the National Rifle Association," respectables sit there trying to find some way to apologize. When liberals say that the only thing blocking gun control is the big money of the NRA, respectable conservatives try to think of something irrelevant to say.

Recently, on CNN, I heard a respectable conservative supporting Bush say, "You don't run against the NRA for the Republican presidential nomination." He embraced the liberal characterization of all opposition to gun control as emanating from a small, well-financed conspiracy called "the NRA."

The fight against gun confiscation is the most solidly grassroots movement in this country. It is supported by the millions in the NRA, and by tens of millions who aren't.

It is typical of the Bush camp to dismiss all opposition to gun control in this inside-the-beltway manner.

In the real world, what makes the NRA so powerful is that it is huge. I have been in politics for many years, and there is simply no other organization with the titanic grassroots membership, the paying and active membership, that the NRA has. This fact would be murder if any conservative, including Pat Buchanan, ever mentioned it.

Back when I last looked, the NRA had three million paying members, and membership is expensive. There is simply no other organization to compare to that, and certainly none on the LEFT. If any of the people we pay to represent us ever did the math, they would realize that that means that there is an average of almost SEVEN HUNDRED NRA members in EACH congressional district!

How much difference can seven hundred active people make in a congressional campaign?

The "pressure" that congressmen are bowing to is grassroots pressure. That is exactly the sort of "pressure" an organization called the House of REPRESENTATIVES is supposed to yield to.

And you only read that here.

Respectable conservatives are our real enemies.

WHAT THE FLAG BOYCOTT REALLY MEANS

Recently a black South Carolina legislator was organizing a campaign against the deadliest scourge presently threatening the black community, drug addiction. Bob Jones University offered to help. With its enthusiasm and funds, Bob Jones would have been a great help.

But Bob Jones prohibits interracial dating. So the legislator decided its help would not be accepted, since interracial dating is more important to black leaders than drug addiction is. This is a typical example of the black leadership's priorities.

The estimates vary, but as many as half of this entire generation of young black men are somewhere in the legal justice system. They are in prison, on parole, or on probation. So naturally the first priority of the black leadership is interracial dating.

AIDS is cutting a murderous swath into the black population. Blacks have that always-fatal disease several times as often as do whites. So national leaders of the black community, represented by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, have launched a boycott against South Carolina to get the Confederate flag down off the state capitol dome.

The American public school system is a disaster, and getting worse. In white communities, the parents usually have enough education to protest or send their children to private schools. Since black "leaders"

take liberal orders absolutely, their response to this situation is to back every policy that has created this collapse.

The priorities of the "leaders" of the black community are insanely out of sync with the priorities of the real black community. Interracial dating and the Confederate flag have nothing to do with the desperate needs of the mass of black people. If your son is a crack addict and your daughter has two children out of wedlock, the Confederate flag on the South Carolina dome is not a big deal with you. These are issues for the comfortable and well fed who are living safely inside a well-protected, upper middle class community.

Interracial dating is a huge priority for liberals, respectable conservatives, and suburban blacks. It is therefore the only priority that really matters for the so-called "black" leadership. There is no one who speaks for the needs of the mass of blacks. This is because blacks in leadership positions live in a completely different world from the rest of the people of their race. This is a direct result of integration. This situation was predicted by segregationists a generation ago.

In the late 1960s, heretical sociologist Ernst Van Den Haag was the last person allowed to criticize integration in the pages of National Review. He stated the obvious fact that blacks have a far lower average IQ than do whites. Van Den Haag said that, since the average IQ of blacks was so much lower than that of whites, integration would cause the upper IQ blacks to go into the white community. The rest of the blacks, he predicted, would be ghettoized. Not only would they be ghettoized, but they would be HOPELESSLY ghettoized, because their natural leaders would be integrated into the white community.

That is exactly what has happened.

The only priority of black "leaders" is to get themselves accepted into white society. The white liberals who finance them dictate their priorities.

A good example of the kind of white liberal thinking that dictates to black leaders may be picked up in a little debate I had with a graduate student in political science some years back. There were a few other students listening, and the subject of South Africa came up. I brought up the little known fact that, under apartheid, one of the more serious problems South Africa had was illegal BLACK immigration. While the black countries were talking about how great they were and how awful South Africa was, hundreds of thousands of Africans were voting with their feet each year to live under that Evil Oppression.

Her answer was, "Yes, but they only leave their own countries because they were starving there."

I responded, "You know, starvation can be pretty important to the person doing the starving." Everybody laughed, and she looked like the ass she was.

But this is standard liberal thinking. Interracial dating is important. Starvation or AIDS is irrelevant.

The black legislator who feels that interracial dating has a higher priority than drug addiction is reflecting the same outlook.

The fact that blacks have a lower mean intelligence level than whites is something nobody really doubts. But like all facts, it has implications, and these implications are intolerable to liberal doctrine.

So liberals toss a label at it and all respectable conservatives back down and grovel.

Black Africa cannot feed its people. All over black Africa, the standard of living has plummeted. Starvation is everywhere. There is oppression at a level no colonial country would have tolerated.

What is happening is the result of the liberal need for blacks to integrate Europe. Blacks with ambition are pouring into Europe and America.

Educated blacks remain in white majority countries, where liberals need them for their racial program.

So who is left to govern the black countries? Most African rulers and their functionaries are exploiters with black faces. They are in Africa only because they could not make it in the white world.

Precisely because of their relative disabilities, the mass of blacks need leaders even more than other people do. This is a fact. Liberals simply denounce this fact as "paternalism." Liberals throw a label at it, so all respectable conservatives immediately grovel and denounce any mention of this reality.

But the fact is that blacks do need their leaders desperately. Those leaders are now pursuing liberal aims, not black interests. They only talk about real black problems when it is useful for pushing an item in the liberal agenda.

The serious concerns of the mass of blacks are simply out of the picture, just as Van Den Haag said they would be.

**November 6, 1999 – LEFTIST "CHAMPIONS OF THE WORKING CLASS" NEVER SEE
November 6, 1999 – JUST DON'T BORE ME!**

LEFTIST "CHAMPIONS OF THE WORKING CLASS" NEVER SEE

In the 1960s, about the time she was being photographed behind a North Vietnamese anti-aircraft gun, Jane Fonda discussed Communism. "If you knew what Communism really was," said Hanoi Jane, "you would get down on your knees and pray for it." The idea of praying to a God Communism claims does not exist to bring you Communism is a bit ironic, but Fonda would never notice it.

Fonda's beloved Communism is supposed to produce a Workers' Paradise. Like other fashionable leftists, Fonda loves the working class, but only if they don't get too close.

This attitude toward working people is illustrated by Hanoi Jane's opposition to nuclear power.

Hanoi Jane's attacks on atomic power plants is based on her and her ideological buddies' claim that atomic energy is dangerous. If she had ever met any coal miners or oil rig workers, Jane Fonda would know that EVERY form of energy production has killed thousands of people.

Except nuclear power. Outside of Communist countries, no one has ever died from the production of nuclear power.

In other words, all the deaths the Friends of the Working Class talk about from nuclear power are purely theoretical. Death from other forms of power production is very real. But Hanoi Jane would never know this, because those deaths occur in the working class, a group of people who, to her, is largely mythical.

Unlike the trendy leftist Friends of the Working Class, I know and have worked with an awful lot of actual working people, both on the job and in politics. When I was staying with coal mining people in West Virginia, I heard a very long list of people who had died in the mines. Likewise, if you talk with oil rig workers, dead people pepper the conversation.

I hazard a guess that Hanoi Jane has never sat down and had a drink with a single coal miner or rig worker. The fact that death in energy production is real is something she would never think of.

And no one is likely to bring it up.

JUST DON'T BORE ME!

In my short piece for March 20, called "BOOOORING!," I pointed out an important secret of American politics. In the media age, you have to FIGHT for attention. If you spend all your time trying to look respectable and middle of the road, you are going to lose. You are going to lose because you are BORING.

Moderates look good in the polls and lose elections because they are BORING. Every four years, the moderate Republican looks good in the polls at first, but by election time, his prospects have collapsed. Four years ago, in late 1995, the polls had Robert Dole crushing President Bill Clinton in a one-on-one race. Eight years ago, in late 1991, the polls had President Bush crushing candidate Bill Clinton in the general election.

At this point in the election cycle -- a year before the election -- some moderate Republican candidate is far out in front of the Democrat in the polls, just as Bush is ahead of Gore right now. The Republicans believe the polls, and nominate him. Then, come election day, he barely gets forty percent. This happened with Bush in 1992. This happened with Dole in 1996. This will happen with Bush Junior in 2000. It will happen again in 2004.

The main reason for this is that Republicans simply cannot understand the killing power of BOREDOM.

There was a time in the last century when everybody looked forward to the day when the political campaign came to town. You would hitch up the horses and take the kids to town to see the candidates. In the 1800s, you would listen for HOURS while the candidates talked. But those days are over. Only the Republican moderates do not realize that those days are over.

At this point in the electoral cycle, people take a very low-key approach to an election that is, after all, still a year away. At this point, if a pollster asks people who they would be willing to vote for, they will generally choose somebody whose general position may be accurately described as "harmless." So they generally pick someone whose entire aim is to appear harmless and vaguely neutral on most hot issues. That is the definition of moderate Republicanism. But in the heat of the final lap of the presidential race, when the competition is intense and emotions high, this preference changes radically.

Even when there is no election on the horizon, every voter has an endless number of people trying to get his attention. There's cable, there's the Internet, and competing with those are all the older forms of time-users -- newspapers, books, clubs. The modern voter is deluged long before any political campaign starts.

And when the campaign starts, it's everywhere. On top of the fact that the competition for everybody's attention is already fierce, dozens of different campaigns start fighting for the public eye and ear.

Into the middle of this storm marches the moderate, with his thundering cry of "Well, sort of."

The competition for attention in our day is the ultimate competition. It determines who gets power and who gets rich. The stakes are enormous. It is bloody and hard. Very few people in Republican politics seem to have noticed this. Your first problem is not to be respectable. Your first problem is not to be ignored.

In this environment, the Reform Party has an opportunity similar to the one it blew when Perot dropped out in 1992. I do NOT mean that they have a good chance to WIN this election. But they have a chance to become THE major third party.

The Reform Party has this chance because, in the Communications Age, they are the only party which is not BORING. What a SHOW! Pat Buchanan, who always causes sparks, against a media showcase billionaire! The Reform Party is the only game in town!

In this three cornered match, just look who is in the other two corners. You have the Republicans, with Bush and McCain battling to be the liberals' favorite conservative. Both are using the liberal mantra about "getting the minority vote." Neither ever says anything but the old knee-jerk stuff about more troops and less government. And it is understood that, if one of them does get elected, he will cave in on these issues like all the other Republicans do.

As for the really important issues that may raise some sparks, like immigration, Republicans will simply ignore them from the get-go.

So what kind of excitement do the Democrats and Republicans together have to offer the public for Election 2000?

The one thing that might make the millennium worth while is waiting for the Ultimate Political Thrill. The Ultimate Political Thrill, of course, will be listening to the Bush-Gore Presidential Debates. Now, there are two of the truly dynamic personalities in the national arena. The Democrats have finally managed to get a candidate who is as boring as the me-too Republican!

As with the Republicans, there is no serious policy debate on the Democratic side. Just as McCain and Bush are both trying to act like conservatives while pleasing liberals, both Bradley and Gore are both liberals trying to look like moderates.

By a contrast so total as to be described as "wild," the Reform Party offers an exciting but politically vague and amateurish Donald Trump against Pat Buchanan. In terms of excitement, the Reform Party has it all. It will get the attention. In politics, attention is critical.

If the Reform Party does not self-destruct in this confrontation of extremes, it can become the center of national attention. The result would be a surprisingly large vote in November and a permanent position among the major players in American politics. Their job then will be to stay in there while one of our two superfluous political parties self-destructs and leaves room for them.

November 13, 1999 – ON YOUR MARK, GET SET, GROVEL!!

November 13, 1999 – ANOTHER EUROPEAN GOVERNMENT KIDNAPS A FOREIGN RIGHTIST

ON YOUR MARK, GET SET, GROVEL!!

Since I started discussing how respectable conservatives are professional grovelers, it is amazing how many people have begun coming up with examples. Once you become aware of this phenomenon, you begin to see examples of it every day.

Actually, the situation is even worse. It is not just conservatives crawling and apologizing to liberals. It is also conservatives doing the old tummy-up before their moderate masters in the Republican Party.

Many years ago, a friend of mine observed that "Every four years, conservatives go to the Republican Convention. Every four years they get kicked in the teeth and come up smiling."

In his very first speech as president in 1989, Bush Senior denounced Reagan. Bush Senior promised a "kinder, gentler America" than that evil old tyrant had produced.

At the very beginning of the Bush Administration in 1989, the Bush people fired all the Reagan appointees in every agency of government. I remember that in February of 1989, one Bush agency head bragged that he had been the first to clear out all the Reagan people. At the 1992 Convention, after Reagan and Buchanan spoke, one Bush leader said, "That's a relief. We've finished with the damned conservatives!"

Now Bush Junior has blasted conservatives. He denounced social conservatives and he denounced congressional conservatism. Only the truly retarded were surprised.

Of course Bush Junior denounced conservatives. That is what Republican moderates always do. The next day, he sort of backpedaled and explained his remarks. But even as he did so, one of his staffers explained why Bush was following his denunciation of conservatives with a little sweet talk. "After you hit a dog," said the Bush spokesman, "You pet it." Once again, this is what Republican moderates always do.

The dog has been whipped, and now the master has petted him. As far as the eye can see, conservative tails are wagging. Of course, they fussed a little. Conservatives always fuss a little when they get kicked in the teeth again. Nobody cares, and for good reason. They're already telling each other that it's not really that bad and Bush is OK.

Bush, Dole, Ford -- Republican moderates were all losers in the general elections. Moderates are losers, and they are an infinitesimal part of the Republican Party. But they always get the nomination, and conservatives always take their kicks and come up smiling.

So there is a kicking order, exactly like the pecking order among chickens. The liberals are at the top. Conservatives are at the bottom. Moderates are in the middle. The whole point of being a moderate is that you give liberals half of what they want. For a moderate, liberals are always the ones who set the agenda. Moderates then compromise with each new liberal proposal, giving them part of anything they demand. When liberals say jump, moderates reply, "Yes, master, but does it have to be so high?"

Moderates are the liberals' crawlers and obeyers. Conservatives are THEIR crawlers and obeyers.

What a despicable, pathetic crowd respectable conservatives are!

ANOTHER EUROPEAN GOVERNMENT KIDNAPS A FOREIGN RIGHTIST

An 87-year-old British woman who spied for Stalin says she would do it again. She will never be prosecuted. She is a media heroine in Britain.

General Pinochet was the Chilean ruler who overthrew Communist rule in his country. He is now being extradited from Britain to Spain. A British court has ruled that the 83-year-old Pinochet must be sent to Spain for trial. He is to be tried there for actions that occurred under his rule IN CHILE.

Unlike Stalin, Pinochet ended his rule by turning Chile over to an elected government. Unlike Stalin, Pinochet had no agents trying to subvert the governments of other countries around the world. None of that matters. All that matters is that Pinochet was a rightist, and the old lady who spied for Stalin in Britain was a leftist. No former Communist has ever been tried for what happened under their regime. No Leftist will ever be tried for this sort of thing (See December 5, 1998, article, "Only the Right Can Incite").

Margaret Thatcher denounced Pinochet's extradition as a "judicial kidnapping... which would do credit to a police state."

Some years ago, an American who put Nazi propaganda on the Internet FROM HIS HOME IN THE UNITED STATES was seized in Denmark and sent to Germany for trial. German law prohibits Americans from putting pro-Nazi propaganda on the Internet in America, since it can be read in Germany. So this American is in prison there for four years.

American publications, of course, backed this kidnapping of an American. You see, they said, this guy was "hiding behind the first amendment" in the United States. Those were the words they all used.

Interesting. None of these publications ever says that repeat felons are "hiding behind the Bill of Rights" when they are let off. In those cases, the criminals are just "exercising their civil rights."

In the 1950s, witness after witness went before the House Committee on UnAmerican activities and refused to answer the question, "Are you, or have you ever been, a member of the Communist Party?" They claimed their right to refuse to testify against themselves under the Fifth Amendment. No one in the liberal media said they were "hiding behind" the Fifth Amendment.

Documents found in KGB files now make it clear that Soviet penetration into the highest levels of the United States Government existed at a level liberals denied hotly until very, very recently. But they

would be the first to insist that this did not justify taking constitutional protection away from American citizens.

Liberals insist that the protections of the United States Constitution should not be denied to Americans even to protect real United States security interests. But they are all for allowing foreign countries to kidnap an American to protect Germany. It is necessary to protect Germany from a revival of the Third Reich, a revival which will be caused by the propaganda of one American.

And that is the least of it. Would we praise an action that takes a leftist American away from the protection of the United States Constitution and kidnaps them into countries where those protections do not exist?

What do you think liberals would have said if one of those Americans suspected of being Communists had been extradited to Spain or South Africa, where they could not claim the protection of the Fifth Amendment? Would liberals have approved of that?

Liberals would have gone ballistic. So would respectable conservatives.

Every respectable conservative publication in America either backed this kidnapping of an American or stayed silent.

Conservatives were too cowardly to say anything when the American Nazi was kidnapped. But even some of these cowardly morons are beginning to see a pattern developing with the seizure of Pinochet.

Obviously, what happened to Pinochet is entirely a result of the fact that he was an anti-Communist, while those who helped Stalin are heroic. Many conservatives are upset about Pinochet. Now they are feeling a little bit threatened. The threat is beginning to dawn even on these cowardly numbskulls.

I keep sounding this warning: anything that can be done to anyone by the left not only CAN be done to you, it WILL be done to you (See September 11, 1999 article, "Waco: Conservative Cowardice and Stupidity Helped It Happen").

November 20, 1999 – REVEREND JACKSON GETS LIBERALS BACK TO BASICS
November 20, 1999 – TYPES OF COURAGE

REVEREND JACKSON GETS LIBERALS BACK TO BASICS

The Reverend Jesse Jackson objected to students being kicked out of school for two years for fighting during a football game. They were expelled under the school's "zero tolerance" policy on student violence. Jackson pointed out that these students did not have guns, so they should not be expelled. As a response to violence in schools, schools have adopted a "zero tolerance" policy. A student who comes to school with a gun is expelled. He gets no break. But when this zero tolerance policy was extended to include other violence, it went too far. The purpose of the "zero tolerance" policy is not to prevent student violence. The purpose is to condemn guns. In a pretended response to school killings, legislators started introducing legislation to jail people for having guns within SEVERAL MILES of schools. It did not matter that the people do not know whether a school is within the required number of miles. No one has ever argued that these or other gun laws would have prevented any school violence.

Everyone knows that the response to school violence has nothing to do with preventing future school violence. The aim is to promote liberal policy, in this case the liberal policy on guns. Every liberal Democrat in New York State condemns minimum sentencing. But every liberal Democrat in New York State also supports the Sullivan Law, which provides a one-year minimum sentence for anybody caught carrying a gun for self-defense. And not just guns. A woman who uses a can of mace to defend herself against an attacker gets a minimum one-year sentence. There is no minimum sentence for the attacker. So the Reverend Jackson is just reminding school administrations of the real purpose of "zero tolerance." Like all crises, the outbreaks of school violence are to be used to promote liberal causes. When they cease to do that, they have gotten off track.

TYPES OF COURAGE

November 11 is the date on which we honor the courage and sacrifice of American soldiers. It is also a time to remember that we usually win the war, but we always lost the peace. In World War II, for example, American soldiers won the war by their physical courage, but the same generation lost a third of the world to Communism by a lack of moral courage at Yalta and in the years that followed it. I have been in a lot of situations, and some of them were such that people HAD to tell each other the truth. One such case is very relevant to November 11. The man talking to me had served for two years in the Pacific in World War II. He had been pulled back from the front and had wanted to go back in with his buddies. But if he had gone back, the doctors said his feet would rot off, and they would not let him go back. There was no questioning his physical courage. He was assigned to a base in the Pacific that had more than its share of war heroes. At that base, the commander would go to the officers' club, get drunk, and beat up one of the officers under him. They didn't dare fight back, and no one dared to complain. In other words, this particular noble hero was a drunken bully. Finally, one officer got sick of it, and knocked the bully out. Said bully then court-martialed him for striking a senior officer. He was convicted. None of the noble heroes, INCLUDING MY FRIEND, had the courage to testify on his behalf. All of the dozens of officers there had PHYSICAL courage in abundance. But they had no MORAL courage at all. You see it all the time. The same man who is a real hero in combat cannot summon the different kind of courage needed to fight drugs or alcohol. In this Pacific case, you see that people who can face machine guns cannot summon the courage to risk damaging their careers in a moral cause for a buddy. In America, you have to have lots of physical courage and no moral courage to become a general. I discussed this on December 19, 1998, in "Of Course The Iraq Attack's Timing Is Political." In that article I pointed out that nobody, but nobody gets a general's star if he would ever put his duty to his country over his duty to his superiors. People who would rat on their superiors in the national interest are weeded out ruthlessly. If you get a star, you are a bureaucrat first and a patriot second. Period. Does this lack of MORAL courage mean they lack PHYSICAL courage? Not at all. It is simply that there is no proven relationship between the two. As one combat professional said to me, "I enjoy driving fast. I enjoy shooting and getting shot at." But this does not make him a paragon of morality. There is no reason why it should. When I was in Africa, I was with a lot of mercenaries. Every one of the older mercenaries had seen more actual combat than ANY person who serves in uniform for thirty years. And they were damned good at it. I can assure you they were not all moral paragons. During World War II, liberals insisted that every American be dedicated to total war against totalitarianism. After all, the totalitarians we were fighting were rightists. But the moment the enemy of freedom was Communism instead of Fascism, leftists shook off this militant stand for freedom like a dog shakes off water. By the 1960s, Jane Fonda was openly supporting those who were killing Americans. Naturally, respectable conservatives go along with these liberal dictates. John McCain openly pals around with those who were on the Communist side in the Vietnam War. Meanwhile he condemns Buchanan as a Hitler lover. McCain has physical courage, but he is a second generation military bureaucrat. He is the legitimate offspring of his Admiral father. He has physical courage but

lacks the moral courage we need today. He is absolutely obedient to the liberal authorities who decide who is respectable and who is not. No one who does not understand the distinction between physical and moral courage can have the slightest inkling of what history is about. People who blindly worship uniforms, as America's political right does, are not fit to govern any nation. One of the things Buchanan is attacked for saying in his book was that Hitler was a brave man. Hitler won two iron crosses in World War I. He was a physically brave man. But Buchanan is attacked wildly for saying that. Let me explain why stating this simple fact is so devastating to leftist propaganda. As I pointed on October 23, 1999 in "McCain Waves the Bloody Shirt at Buchanan," one of the major leftist stratagems is to wave the Bloody Shirt of World War II. It goes like this: 1) anybody who is not Politically Correct is anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews, 2) Americans died in World War II to fight Hitler, and therefore they fought for Politically Correct ideas, the melting pot, and so forth. From a sane point of view Americans died for their country in World War II. They did not fight for the liberal cause. In other words, the blood of American soldiers does not endorse the melting pot, as liberals insist that it does. If liberals are to wave the bloody shirt, they must insist that all those Americans died for a leftist cause. They must further insist that the only men who were brave, rather than just evil, were the people on their side. As is the case with all liberal propositions, when you state this in plain English, it is just plain crazy. But it is also exactly what the left is saying with its bloody shirt strategy. If you say that Germans, including even Hitler himself, could also be brave men fighting for their own country, it undercuts the bloody shirt justification. It gets us back down to the simple truth that men who die nobly can still be dying in a bloody, messy, pointless waste brought on by insane reasoning at the top. Buchanan says that American bloodshed in the Second World War might have been prevented had Neville Chamberlain followed a more rational strategy. That is NOT the way leftists want us to view World War II. They want the war against Hitler to have been the Last Necessary War. It was fought because Americans were champing at the bit to fight Racism. Meanwhile, back in the real world, Americans declared war on Japan because Japan attacked US at Pearl Harbor. They did NOT declare war against Germany and Italy. In one of the most insane acts in history, Hitler and Mussolini declared war on US! But this real history has been totally forgotten by liberals. They dictate history as they wish it had been, and respectable conservatives go along. One who does not understand history cannot be a conservative. A proper understanding of history is what conservatism is all about. That which calls itself conservatism today has nothing to do with conserving anything. It is all about respectability. To leftists, the only useless bloodbaths were the ones fought against Communists after World War II. To leftists, World War II was The Last Good War, when everybody on the other side was evil, and we were side by side with the Progressive Peace Loving People's Republics our Great Ally Joseph Stalin. The reason leftists honestly believe that Buchanan is secretly a lover of Adolph Hitler is because they themselves have an awfully lot of sympathy with Communists. They made this very, very clear in the 1960s. And respectable conservatives accept every word of the leftist view on the Second World War. McCain pals around with those who supported the Communists openly during the Vietnam War, but he denounces Buchanan as a traitor. And every word McCain says is holy to the respectable right, because McCain wore a uniform. And so long as they blindly worship uniforms, respectable conservatives will maintain this warped view of the world (Please see October 23, 1999 article, "Worshipping the Military Machine").

November 27, 1999 – REAL FREEDOM NEEDS NO JUSTIFICATION

November 27, 1999 – YOU CAN FOOL ANYBODY WITH STATISTICS - - PROVIDED HE'S A FOOL TO START WITH

REAL FREEDOM NEEDS NO JUSTIFICATION

The Texas A&M bonfire disaster was the subject of discussion on "Burden of Proof." Before an important football game, the Texas Aggies have been lighting a bonfire for some ninety years. This year there was an accident, and some students were killed.

One of the two lawyers who run the show asked a spokesman for the school to justify the bonfire. The lawyer said that despite the fact it was a long-standing tradition, there was some potential danger in any bonfire. He wanted to know what benefit to students would justify that risk, however slight it may be.

This is a good example of how we have accepted the erosion of liberty. You are allowed to do something only if you can justify it to the legal system. If you want to do something, you had better be able to prove to a lawyer that, IN THE LAWYER'S ESTIMATION, the benefit of your doing it outweighs the risks HE sees in it. "Lawyer" includes judges, because a judge is just a lawyer with a black dress on.

When we begin to justify freedom to a third party, we have already lost it. Freedom does NOT mean the right to do anything you can justify to somebody else. Any police state will let you do anything you can justify to the police in charge. Freedom means doing something JUST BECAUSE YOU WANT TO DO IT.

As a matter of fact, the right to do something other people feel you should not be allowed to do is exactly what freedom is all about. The instant you begin to justify freedom is the moment your freedom has ceased to exist.

YOU CAN FOOL ANYBODY WITH STATISTICS - - PROVIDED HE'S A FOOL TO START WITH

I was watching the lawyer for the 11-year-old who is being tried as an adult for cold-blooded and repeated murder. The lawyer said that rehabilitation funds had been cut back. He said that it would cost a lot less to rehabilitate than to punish. What he is missing is the fact that rehabilitation, like every other liberal program, doesn't WORK. You might as well pour money down any other rathole.

Naturally, nobody brought up this fact, the fact that rehabilitation doesn't WORK. If anybody demanded that any leftist program WORK, liberalism would be dead within the year.

The reason our social policies are so screwed up is because we accept liberal assumptions, and since none of their conclusions ever WORK, we end up with a real mess. Respectable conservatives help out by never mentioning any of this.

We are constantly hearing that the world just needs more social workers, because all our problems come from bad habits. We are told that those bad habits make children bad, and that would end if we made one generation of children good.

For instance, children who are abused grow up to be child abusers. This is called "the cycle of abuse." The logic goes like this: children who become child abusers have parents who are violent and irresponsible. Since both the parents of most child abusers were violent and irresponsible, one must conclude that their children get in the HABIT of being mean. So, we are told, it cannot be hereditary. All we need to cure this "cycle" is more social workers.

But social workers would only help if this pattern of bad behavior is not HEREDITARY. Liberals say it can't be hereditary because the child "Never had a chance." After all, both of the poor guy's parents were violent and irresponsible.

Therefore, liberals say, we can only say that child abuse is hereditary if we can prove that the child "had a chance." In other words, you could only prove child abuse was the result of heredity if both of the abuser's parents were NOT abusers. This is the kind of logic our society proceeds on. Oddly enough, our society is a mess.

Some years ago, I was watching a program on how to avoid crime. Most of it was common sense. For example, they said that you should walk in well-lighted areas wherever possible. When walking alone to your car in a dark area, you should have your key ready, so you don't spend time in a vulnerable position fumbling for it.

Let me mention something that it would seem that no person with an IQ over 30 would need to be reminded of. What the program did NOT say was that anyone who did not have his key ready would ALWAYS get mugged. It did not say that anybody who walked in a dark area would ALWAYS be attacked. The point was that your STATISTICAL chances of getting mugged were higher in such cases.

Then the announcer asked what one should do if he had a choice of getting on an elevator with "members of a minority group." Should one avoid that? The answer, of course, was NO, NO, NO! You see, said the announcer, crimes are committed by whites and by non-whites, so there was no difference.

Some time back, Jesse Jackson admitted that when he was walking a dark street at night, he was relieved to find out that the person walking behind him was white. According to our official instructions on avoiding crime that makes Jesse Jackson a nazi who wants to kill six million Jews.

As a matter of fact, there is a reason one should avoid getting in an enclosed space with strangers who are not white. It is true that you will not ALWAYS get assaulted if you get into an enclosed space with nonwhites. But it is true, as Jackson's testimony indicates, that your STATISTICAL chances of getting mugged are higher in such cases.

Which is what the program was about.

In big cities, sane people of all races avoid areas with a preponderance of dark skin if they can. The program on avoiding crime said this is nonsense. But, like all liberal statements, this one does not WORK in the real world.

But the program writer assumed, correctly, that most watchers would not understand the difference between ALWAYS and statistical probability (See July 17, 1999 article - "Racial Profiling Is the Fault of Black Criminals").

Which, of course, brings us to New York cabbies who do not pick up black folks. I was looking at the black guys who held the press conference complaining about how taxis would not pick them up. Every one of them was dressed in "gangstah" style. They looked like thugs. They looked like thugs on purpose. If you pick up someone who looks like a thug, your chances of getting robbed and killed are very good. If you pick up people like that, you are asking for trouble. In this world, as I keep saying, you have a habit of "Getting Exactly What You Ask For" (May 29, 1999).

If you decide to walk in a lighted street rather than a dark one, you are not being indiscriminate. You are discriminating. If you drive a cab, you had better learn to discriminate if you want to stay alive.

I was riding in a New York cab some years ago, and I asked the driver if he had been robbed. He laughed out loud and said, "Man, I'm a CABBIE!" Obviously only a hick didn't know that, in the home of Social Progress and Gun Control, all cabbies were being robbed.

Another New York cabbie told me that the one time robberies had gone down was when some policemen moonlighted for a while as cab drivers. Robbers got scared because the cops were allowed to have guns and if the crook picked the wrong cab he could wind up dead.

Now, let me make this clear: it is not true that EVERY robber was ALWAYS killed when he robbed a cab while cops were moonlighting. But, unlike voters, crooks understand this much statistics: the fact that they COULD get killed discouraged them.

The mayor, sickened by these violent incidents, ordered the cops to stop moonlighting as cabbies, so the robbery rate went on back up. He said that such violence just encourages more violence. That is the kind of reasoning that makes sense to the American electorate today.

If you built an airplane with the sloppy statistical reasoning we use in our social policy, you would die on the first flight. That is the way we have built our society, and we deserve exactly what we are getting.

December 4, 1999 – CLINTON MAKES THE CASE FOR RACISM!!!

December 4, 1999 – RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES ALLOW LIBERALS TO GET AWAY WITH MAKING UP "OFFICIAL LIBERAL FACTS"

CLINTON MAKES THE CASE FOR RACISM!!!

Clinton has just come up with an Official Liberal Fact. He says that "ninety-nine point nine percent" (99.9%) of the genes of all human beings are exactly the same. Clinton could not have just said "ninety-nine percent." He had to say "ninety-nine POINT NINE" percent. The reason he has to say "ninety-nine point nine" is because human genes are ninety-nine point two percent (99.2%) the same as a CHIMPANZEE'S!

It HAD to be 99.9%. So, by gum, that's what it is.

The fact that a human and a chimpanzee share 99.2% of the same genes does not mean that the real difference between an animal and a human is very small. It simply means that a mere eight-tenths of one percent (0.8%) difference in genes means a tremendous lot. Since the difference between a human and a chimpanzee is just one gene out of one hundred and twenty-five, that one gene in one hundred and twenty-five is very important indeed.

Because it is so convenient, Clinton's "ninety-nine point nine" figure was probably just made up in his speechwriter's head. As I explain in the next article, making up convenient "facts" like this is standard procedure for liberals. But if it is true, what does it REALLY mean? It means that one gene in a thousand makes the difference between a genius and an idiot. That one gene in one thousand makes the

difference between a seven-foot giant and a man who was born to be four feet tall. The fact that one gene in a thousand makes all this difference does not make these inherited differences any less important. It merely makes a slight genetic difference far more important.

And, as so often happens, what this actually turns out to mean is exactly the opposite of what Clinton intended it to mean. If only one in a thousand genes produces all the gigantic differences in human beings, then race is probably more important, not less. After all, we know that races have some very VISIBLE differences. We know that those differences that we can see are genetic. We know that each race has a few genes which are very different, because we can SEE them. And, according to Clinton, it takes almost no genes to make ALL the difference!

In other words, Clinton says that 1) only a minuscule, a tiny, a handful of genes makes ALL the difference in the gigantic range of human inheritance. You then note that 2) all the members of a particular race share a difference in genetic makeup that is VISIBLE to the naked eye. If you put these together, Clinton has as much as said that 3) racial differences are enormously important.

Clinton's new Official Liberal Fact has made a very strong case for racism!

RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES ALLOW LIBERALS TO GET AWAY WITH MAKING UP "OFFICIAL LIBERAL FACTS"

Bob Novak made a remark on "Crossfire" that seemed to contradict one of the liberal historical myths. Instantly Bill Press and the liberal guest went into a Greek chorus in which they recited -- and I do mean RECITED -- the required liberal myths. America fought World War II, one recited, because of Hitler's Hate. The other liberal took up the tale instantly, reciting how the Civil War was fought against slavery.

Novak could have mentioned that the US fought Hitler because Hitler declared war on the United States. He could have mentioned that Stalin represented Hate, too, and he was our Great Ally and Hero. He could have mentioned that Lincoln made it very clear that the war was NOT about slavery.

But we all know Novak could not do any of that, because these are Official Liberal Facts. All conservatives are required to accept them or be convicted as naziswhowanttokillsixmillionjews.

It is true that Bob Novak is himself Jewish. But being a Jew provides not the slightest protection against being condemned by liberals as anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews. Richard Herrnstein, who co-wrote "The Bell Curve," was a Jew, but he is permanently condemned as anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

When I was on Capitol Hill, I was talking to a black school official in Ohio who opposed busing. He sounded very tired. He told me that white liberals had condemned him as a Klan sympathizer. I sort of chuckled, and he said, "It was funny to me too. At first. But I found out that these nuts MEAN it!"

He knew he would never get another promotion for the rest of his career in education. He would be lucky to keep his job.

Just a little while back, anyone who questioned the Official Liberal Fact that ten percent of all men were homosexuals was in DEEP trouble. That figure was arrived at by Dr. Kinsey, himself a bisexual, in a study which said that any man who had ever had a homosexual experience was homosexual. He

also included PRISONERS in his study! So a teenager who had been raped in prison was classed in the Kinsey Study as a homosexual!

At that time, everybody had to repeat Kinsey's ten-percent-of-all-men-are-homosexual "fact" as biblical truth. By now I doubt that one in twenty of the readers of this column even remembers this. No respectable conservative disputed this "fact" at the time. No respectable conservative has ever reminded anyone of this "fact" since it disappeared, and no respectable conservative ever will.

A study finally killed that liberal "fact." It found that about 1.4% of men were classed as "homosexual."

So liberals keep on making up "facts" as they go along. I've killed a few liberal "facts" myself. In their day, those "facts" were recited in the media thousands of times daily, and every reader of this column saw them. But I am willing to bet no one remembers them.

The best known liberal "fact" that I killed was during the Carter Administration, when the first major effort was under way to declare homosexual households to be "family units." New types of families had to be accepted, it was said, because ONLY SEVEN PERCENT OF AMERICANS WERE PART OF A "TRADITIONAL FAMILY!"

I got the Congressional Research Service to chase down the origin of this strange assertion. They traced it to a Labor Department finding that the stereotype of a traditional family was of 1) a husband working, 2) a wife not working, and 3) the family had exactly one son and one daughter. This became the "traditional family" that had now declined to a mere seven percent of the American population.

It was like magic. I put that finding in a speech for my boss, Congressman John Ashbrook, and it appeared in the Congressional Record. Like magic, that "seven percent traditional family" statement simply DISAPPEARED from the media! No one ever mentioned it again! Certainly no respectable conservative will ever mention it again, to remind us of how liberals make up their "facts."

But if I had not chased that down and challenged it, liberals would still be saying that only seven percent of American belong to "a traditional family," and respectable conservatives would still be agreeing with it.

December 11, 1999 – THE DISMAL SCIENCE LOOKS AT CHILD LABOR

December 11, 1999 – WHITAKER'S LAW ON HISTORY

THE DISMAL SCIENCE LOOKS AT CHILD LABOR

Liberals tell us that women used to be looked at as mere child producers. What stopped this, we are told, was liberal policy.

In the real world, the reason women once had to devote most of their lives to nothing but child producing was because they had to have so many children just to keep the population from dying out. Queen Anne of England in the early eighteenth century had eighteen children, and not one of them lived to adulthood. It was not merely poverty-level women whose infants died. The Queen was not a poverty-level person. And it was not liberal sympathy for the poor which reversed this enormous infant mortality.

We are given the impression today that the only reason wages went up in the last century was because of the labor movement and the New Deal. Like most media commentary, this puts cause and effect backwards. Labor unions were only able to get wages higher because productivity went up. More important, wages had been rising steadily for centuries before the New Deal or the rise of unions to national power.

Economics has been called the Dismal Science. One of the things that makes it so dismal is the fact that serious economic analysis destroys the happy story that all you need to be rich and happy is idealistic politicians.

An international protocol has just been signed by the Clinton Administration to abolish child labor throughout the world. Sounds great. Only a student of the Dismal Science would destroy the wonderful atmosphere by asking, "So what happens to the kids?"

If you believe the standard theory that everybody is better off only because "idealists" signed idealistic papers, the banning of child labor in third world countries is just another great advance.

The assumption is that, once child labor is abolished, the children will live happily ever after. The problem is that, in the countries where child labor is being abolished, none of the TECHNICAL and ECONOMIC advances that REALLY allowed us to abolish child labor have taken place. In the countries where there is child labor, people are routinely allowed to starve to death.

This reminds me of an exchange in the old "Pogo" comic strip. One character says, "The Constitution guarantees I can say whatever I want to say." The other character replies, "Yeah, but it don't say nothin' about what happens to you AFTER you says it."

Child labor in many places will now be abolished. But what happens AFTER to the children thus freed from it? The experts and "idealists" who pushed this through feel they have done their jobs. Since they signed a paper, all the kids' problems are over.

I am certainly not saying child labor shouldn't go as soon as possible. I am just saying that when upper-income "idealists" and "experts" have their way, they tend to hurt those they think they are helping.

If we believe that all that is needed to make the world better is for idealists to sign papers, there is no problem. But that view of the world is bad history. And when bad history becomes policy, it kills people.

WHITAKER'S LAW ON HISTORY

Timothy McVeigh's mother just announced that people who were in the buildings that were bombed in Oklahoma City should "get over it." Naturally, everybody was appalled, and her history of mental illness was used as an excuse.

But McVeigh's mother is simply expressing the same view about her son that the media always takes toward LEFTISTS who commit violence. Has anybody every heard anyone even bother to criticize the Unibomber? That gentleman was 1) a Harvard graduate and 2) an environmentalist fanatic. He did his mail bombings in the name of environmentalism. Not only have I never heard any expression of outrage in the media, I have never heard the man CRITICIZED in the media. I have heard some

laudatory remarks on some talk shows about how he lived with nature in the raw, but otherwise nothing.

One businessman got his hands blown off by the Unibomber. He admitted he had been a trendy type himself until that happened. He was appalled by the indifference of the media to this murderer and maimer. He wrote a book about the situation.

While McVeigh and the nuts who do school shootings are regularly tied in with "rightist hate groups," the Unibomber has never been mentioned in connection with leftist "environmentalists."

By the same token, no one has linked the rioting thugs destroying things in Seattle with other "environmentalists." When people begin destroying things in the name of this popular leftist cause, there is never any conjecture that the radical environmentalist rhetoric may be responsible. But if a kid shoots up a school, it is entirely the fault of right wingers and of gun owners.

Out in Seattle, they are rioting in the name, among other things, of saving the environment. How did people find an excuse to riot and destroy things in the name of preserving nature? To find out why they are so violent, you need only read the words of our Vice President. In his book, he says evil industrialists and other exploiters must be stopped at all costs. He says they are destroying the world. If he were a right winger, he would be accused of inciting violence.

Let me add something that will really surprise you:

Respectable conservatives don't object to all this. They are too busy apologizing.

According to the media, all violence on the right is caused by the inherent and historical evil of right wing ideas. On the left, there is no such cause and effect.

I have formulated this as Whitaker's Law on History:

"Any historical incident will be remembered to the exact extent that it serves to promote a leftist cause."

Many businessmen and church officials collaborated with Hitler fifty years ago, when he had their lives in his hands. No leftist will ever let us forget that. But I remember when most Western European "intellectuals" were outright Stalinists or had openly Communist sympathies.

Communists who stated flatly that they were Communists dominated the Italian movie industry. French and Italian universities were dominated by this kind of thinking and openly so.

With the appearance of *The Gulag Archipelago*, many French intellectuals were repelled by the violence of the Stalinist regime. But their remarks saying this made it clear that, for decades, they had been admirers of Stalin.

But no one ever blames these collaborationist professors who backed the Communists a little over two decades ago. Condemning leftist "intellectuals" would harm leftism. Blaming Nazi collaborators who are long since dead serves a leftist purpose in discrediting religion and capitalism.

So the word "collaborator" is never used to describe Communist collaborators during the Cold War.

Media history does not include the word "collaborator" unless it means someone who worked with the extreme right over half a century ago.

I am sure the reader can come up with a dozen examples like this.

We hear a lot about the campaign to abolish slavery, but we never hear about the factories that financed that campaign. Women and children worked fourteen hours a day in the New England factories that produced the money that was used by financiers to support John Brown. If a woman or a child was crippled in one of those factories, as often happened, there was no workers' comp.

When abolitionism triumphed abruptly in 1865, the death rate among blacks just as abruptly doubled. The black population, which had doubled regularly every twenty-five years under slavery, immediately stagnated. Blacks were subjected to the same rules abolitionists maintained for their own workers, and they died like flies.

But this history serves no leftist purpose, so it is quietly forgotten.

Until World War I, about ninety percent of the blacks in America were in the South. The South was kept subject and poverty-stricken by the combination of discriminatory rail rates and high tariffs I discussed on October 23, 1999 in "McCain Waves the Bloody Shirt At Buchanan." Ninety percent of blacks were included in that subjection and poverty. But don't look for this to be discussed in any history class, least of all Black History.

As a result of Whitaker's Law on History, what little education media people are subjected to discusses cause and effect only to the extent it serves the cause of the left. It is no surprise that they apply the same rule in reporting.

December 18, 1999 – WHY INSTITUTIONS ALWAYS BETRAY CONSERVATIVES

REVEREND JACKSON GETS LIBERALS BACK TO BASICS

The Citadel Board has now joined the State newspaper in its campaign to take the Confederate flag off the State House dome. A short time ago Bob Jones joined the State in its campaign.

When Beasley turned on the Confederate flag, every single statewide Republican official backed Beasley. Seventy-five percent of Republicans had voted in a recent primary to keep the Confederate flag atop the State House. One politician, without consulting with anybody, had reversed that stand all by himself.

Given a choice between the politician and the conservative grassroots, the Republicans had, as always, backed the politico. They say they love us dearly, but when push comes to shove, the first thing any Republican does is spit in the grassroots conservatives' faces.

Obviously, they fear no conservative backlash. It never even occurs to them to fear such a thing.

The Afrikaners' Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa stood for apartheid as long as it was profitable. Then, when the pressure was getting really strong, and the Boers needed its support as never before, their church turned and snapped at them like a snake. I remember the same thing happened to us Methodists as the integration movement grew. Our church turned on us like a snake.

When the present Bob Jones turned on us on the flag issue, he, like every conservative when he turns on us, thought he was being Shrewd. He is probably bragging about how he has proved to liberals that he is not unreasonable. Actually, the State is happy to use him. After the flag issue, it will continue its war against Bob Jones University (See March 13, "The State Newspaper Begin to Use Pro-Miscegenation Vote")

But, for the moment, Bob Jones thinks he is being smart. After all, he can count on blind conservative support, no matter what he does. So he is using this cheap trick to get liberal approval.

Conservatives invest everything in institutions they trust. In the meantime, leftists work at taking over or subverting those institutions.

Somewhere in his public statement, every conservative spokesman always includes a knee-jerk demand for more uniforms, more soldiers, more sailors. If a bunch of men start making loud comments about how they love a guy in uniform, you have to look carefully to see whether they are on a San Francisco street corner or a conservative convention.

Conservatives fell in love with uniforms during World War II and the Cold War. Leftists were all for World War II, and they loved the military then. Even the Communist Party of America was totally in support of America's fighting men until the middle of 1945. After all, those troops were fighting on the side of our Glorious Ally, Joseph Stalin.

But the second the military ceased to serve the purposes of the political left, the political left ceased to support the American military. When the military stopped supporting leftist purposes and was used against Communism, the left became anti-military. With the left, its principles come before loyalty to any institution.

Not so the right. Since the end of the Cold War, America's military has consistently been used for purposes no conservative could support. During the Cold War, the left had extended its control over foreign policy and the military. Today, any leftist initiative can count on the support of America's generals.

The right continues to worship generals, so the left continues to use them.

The blind conservative backing of institutions over principles encourages institutions to back the left. After all, any institution like the Citadel has the right in its back pocket. It's got uniforms, and rightists will sell out any principle if someone in uniform asks them to. Any institution that's got uniforms has rightist support sewed, so they seek the backing of the left. If you want broad support, the ideal combination is uniforms and leftist principles.

So when Clinton made enforcing racial and ethnic balance by military force America's official doctrine, he got a general to declare it (June 12, "Busing By Bomber"). McCain, an ex-uniform wearer, is his Republican spokesman for this policy of ethnic balance.

And how does the right react to this? The Southern Partisan editorial staff split fifty-fifty on whether to support McCain for president!

The same rule applies in institutional politics that operates in electoral politics -- anyone who can take you for granted is not going to do anything for you. The Republican Party kicks conservatives in the teeth on a regular basis. Its excuse is always, "Conservatives have nowhere to go. They HAVE to support Republicans."

I talked about this blind, completely immoral backing of institutions by conservatives on June 5 in "Blind Loyalty Is the Real Treason." It was obvious to me when I first got into serious politics in the 1950s.

In the 1950's, Northern conservatives blindly backed "The Party of Lincoln," no matter what it did to their principles. At the same time, Southern conservatives just as blindly backed "the Party of Jefferson Davis." While these dodos were blindly backing their respective institutions, liberals took over complete control of both parties. Rockefeller Republicans, who were an infinitesimal part of the Republican Party, held more power over the platform and the presidential nomination than did the overwhelming conservative majority.

The Democratic presidential nomination and platform was simply owned outright by liberals. And the majority of Southerners gave them absolute, blind, unquestioning loyalty. Can anybody call that "moral," a word conservatives are always claiming that they own?

So our blind loyalty to uniforms and other institutions gives liberals a free ride in their campaign to quietly turn them into instruments of leftist policy. So Bob Jones and the Citadel, fresh from enjoying our support in their conservative battles, promptly sell us out.

Until we stop substituting blind loyalty for personal morality, we are going to be sold out. In real world politics, when you give your loyalty blindly, you ask to be betrayed. And in the cold, hard world of power politics, you get exactly what you ask for.

December 25, 1999 – HAPPY SEASON!

December 25, 1999 – BUSH ACTUALLY MAKES A POINT!

December 25, 1999 – AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IS RACIST, BUT NO ONE DARES SAY WHAT KIND OF RACISM IT IS

HAPPY SEASON!

I want everyone who sends out "Season's Greetings" cards to think about this: what would you think of someone who saved some of these cards, and send them out to their Jewish friends at Passover? It would be bad manners, wouldn't it?

You see, Passover is not just another "season" to Jews. It is one of the two most important Jewish holidays. So you wouldn't send a "Season's Greetings" card to a Jew at Passover because Jews have feelings. Fortunately Christians don't have feelings, so you can send all the "Season's Greetings" cards you want to at Christmas.

Almost every time I get a Christmas card from another Christian it has the salutation, "Season's Greetings." No Jew is going to see the card, but it is assumed that the Jewish population will be comforted knowing that no one is saying "Merry Christmas" behind their backs. Do Jews really stay awake at night worrying that Christians may be saying "Merry Christmas" to each other? None of the Jews that I know ever did.

But no one who formulates Political Correctness cares a fig what real, flesh-and-blood Jews worry about. Those demanding that the Confederate flag come down say their only concern is that it offends black people. Polls of real black people do not indicate that the main concern of black people in South Carolina is the Confederate flag. There is no evidence that most blacks were offended by it or even concerned about it until their "leaders" told them to be (See October 30, 1999 article, "What the Flag Boycott Really Means.").

And those black leaders were following liberal orders. This sort of Political Correctness uses minorities as an excuse. But their real aim is to dictate the behavior of the white Christian majority. The aim of Political Correctness is power, pure and simple. Today we have the once free American population blubbering excuses and begging to be told what they are allowed to say and how they are allowed to say it.

Saying what we damned well pleased used to be the hallmark of an American. For those who wanted to rule us, this proud free speech was the first obstacle they had to overcome. If you doubt it has been overcome, look at the cards you receive on December 25, and count the number that refer to Christmas by name.

Happy Season!

BUSH ACTUALLY MAKES A POINT!

McCain, with the all out support of the media, is definitely gaining on Bush. He has Bush terrified. How can you tell? You can tell because George W. Bush got so scared he that actually made a POINT! No conservative ever makes a serious point unless he is in a state of panic.

In the last presidential debate between Republican candidates for the nomination, McCain asked Bush why he opposed campaign finance reform. Bush said he did not oppose it, he opposed the fake McCain-Finegold "reform" bill. Then, in last-ditch desperation, he went further. He actually asked McCain why, if it was such a fair bill, all the Republicans opposed it and all the Democrats supported it!

Now, from the get-go on this bill, conservatives opposed it and the liberal media went wild about it. Republicans opposed it and Democrats supported it. But no conservative ever asked McCain why. For month after month after month after month, no conservative has put this question to McCain.

The reason Republicans oppose it is that the McCain-Finegold "reform" only cuts off Republican sources of support. It leaves the unions free to use the dues their members have to pay to support Democrats. This is solid, understandable, believable point everybody would understand if Republicans ever brought it up. So they don't bring it up.

You see, to ask such a question would violate the fundamental rule of conservatism: never, never make a point that threatens to expose your opponents' weaknesses. Conservatives never ask, for example, why liberal programs never WORK.

In arguing with liberals, each group has an invariable, mindless routine. If you are a moderate, you offer to compromise. If you are a respectable conservative, you apologize. If you are a hard line conservative, you say something ridiculous. In other words, each group has its own means of letting liberals - and their fellow travelers like McCain -- off the hook. They let them off the hook by focusing attention away from the simple fact that leftism is SILLY.

As in Bush's case, only pure desperation will force a conservative to get to the point.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IS RACIST, BUT NO ONE DARES SAY WHAT KIND OF RACISM IT IS

Being black and ignored by the media, Alan Keyes is the only Republican candidate who dares say anything. In the morass of tongue-tied, silly conservatives, he is a major relief. When he appeared on Crossfire, he was a welcome relief from the usual format of conservative mindlessness and gutlessness.

When Bill Press, of whom all conservatives are terrified, jumped on Keyes about opposing military action in Kosovo, Keyes hopped right back at him. Conservatives NEVER talk back to liberals. So when a conservative actually gets tough with a liberal, the liberal acts like he has been bitten by a bunny rabbit. The shock is immense. Press backed down immediately.

Keyes played the race card. He pointed out that the United States took action in Kosovo on rumors of tens of thousands of deaths. Meanwhile a hundred thousand people die every year in the Sudanese crisis, but there is no question of the US taking action there. And he pointed out that there had been a deliberate distortion to get the Kosovo numbers as high as they were reputed to be.

It was wonderful to see a conservative on Crossfire pretending to be a man for a change. Keyes said the decision to go into Kosovo rather than Sudan "wasn't really racial," so he wouldn't sound like Jesse Jackson. But he didn't specify anything else it might be. Actually, the decision was very racial indeed, but not for the reason that Keyes implies. American policy in Kosovo has nothing to do with humanitarianism or the fact that people are being butchered. As General Wesley Clark made very, very clear, the purpose of American policy in Europe is to enforce multiculturalism (See June 12, 1999 article, "Busing By Bomber"). American killing in Europe is an exact parallel to using troops in American to enforce integration and calling out the National Guard in Boston to enforce busing.

It is true that American policy is racist, and that racism is the reason the United States bombed and killed Serb civilians but never even considered action in the Sudan. The fact is that there is a racial policy, but this racial policy is only aimed at one race.

The United States is not interested in bringing non-blacks into Africa, or in enforcing any kind of multiethnic policy on that continent. Likewise, the United States demands open borders for immigration into Europe and the breaking down of European cultures by forcing every country to be multicultural. We are willing to kill to break down European cultures, and we have said so.

Since Wesley Clark wore a uniform when he announced this policy of killing to enforce a multiethnic society on every European country, no conservative is going to object. Clark specifically declared this

policy is aimed at EUROPE. The United States has no interest in bringing immigrants into Japan or China, or in requiring those countries to become multiethnic. Henry Ford once said that "You can buy a Ford in any color, provided it is black." The United States has declared that it is dedicated to killing to enforce a multiethnic policy on countries of every color, so long as they are white.

So Keyes is perfectly correct. America's "multiethnic" policy is indeed racist. But this is not because the United States Government likes the white race or any of the many white cultures. On the contrary, American policy is to enforce the final solution to whiteness and each of his various cultures.

So, are any conservatives going to denounce this program of both cultural and ethnic genocide as racist? No. They will denounce this CRITICISM of cultural and ethnic genocide as racist.

January 1, 2000 - TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY: WHITES REALIZE THEY ARE A THREATENED MINORITY
January 1, 2000 - THE ONLY INEVITABLE LEFT FOR THE NEW MILLENNIUM

TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY: WHITES REALIZE THEY ARE A THREATENED MINORITY

I had difficulty deciding what to write for the millennium WOL, because I write every piece for the new century. The reason I write here is because I am a veteran of over four decades of real political warfare, and the war, not yesterday's battle, is my area of expertise.

The issue that will be the most important in the future is invariably the one today's establishment is most desperate to avoid talking about. Today, that issue is race.

For a short time during the integration battle in the 1950s, liberals kept saying that we had to integrate because whites were outnumbered. They pointed out that colored children were being born in ratios of at least five to one to whites throughout the world. That line of argument stopped abruptly. Liberals suddenly realized that if they kept it up, some whites might realize the real position they were in in the world.

Though few people are aware of it, this is the effect the shrinking of the world through technology is having on a lot of people. Most people are more tolerant racially, but at the same time the idea that whites have a right to feel threatened is growing.

In the long run, a victorious political strategy is one that takes what everybody knows is true and sticks to it, letting the other side discredit itself. The ruling establishment, such as that which enforces Political Correctness today, can always be counted on to rely more and more on brute power and intimidation. That is what destroys it.

One aspect of the leadership that wins in the Western world will be that it will simply talk rationally about race, as about everything else.

I have no trouble discussing white fears with real, flesh-and-blood members of minority groups. In the future, whites with normal concerns will want to be represented, and, once they are, it will become part of the routine political landscape.

I don't think you can imagine how it would cripple leftism if we were to simply make the point that white concerns are real and legitimate, and leave it at that. Right now, every conservative allows liberals to make them prove that they have no racial thoughts whatsoever. In short, they let the other side subject everybody to a Thought Crime accusation from the word "Go."

I have spent four decades as an expert on political warfare.

I tell you the right is doomed if they do not deal with this Thought Crime business. As long as the left has this "racism" weapon UNCHALLENGED in their hands, the right can only retreat.

THE ONLY INEVITABLE LEFT FOR THE NEW MILLENNIUM

Before we discuss what will happen in the twenty-first century, it would be useful to talk about what didn't happen in the twentieth. In 1976, I began my first book with the following words:

"Our most trusted 'inevitables' are collapsing around our ears today. We used to hear that integration would make mankind one, inevitably. It was said that socialism was the most efficient economic system, and would be universally adopted. Bigger, more interfering government was not long ago an inevitable. The United Nations was to lead on a rocky but inevitable road to a united world. Rehabilitation, not punishment, would end crime."

"Public confidence in these certainties has collapsed."

Socialism, Thomas Dewey's New Education, the criminals-as-victims theory, all these things have been obvious disasters.

As you can see, if we had entered the millennium forty years ago, trendy media opinion would have listed a number of things that would "inevitably" develop in the coming decades. Now we are reduced to one.

Today all the "inevitables" are gone but one. That is the inevitable "solution to the race problem" by immigration and integration. This "race problem" exists only in white majority countries.

A white country is said to have a race problem if there is racial friction. But there is also a "racial problem" if there is an area where there is no minority population, no "diversity."

Over a hundred and twenty million Japanese, with a population more racially uniform than in any European country, has no "race problem."

Red China, with ten times as many people and far more racial uniformity, has no "race problem."

Sub-Saharan Africa, with a racial uniformity that would drive the integrators insane if it were white, has no race problem at all. A "race problem" exists only where whites predominate.

"Race problem" means "white problem." The "solution to the race problem" always means "the solution to the white problem."

Respectable conservatives never mention it, but the left uses code words. One of these is "the race problem." This so-called "race problem" only exists in white-majority countries. When Australia

limited immigration to whites only, it was a "race problem." Any area which has an all-white population has a "race problem," and needs to be integrated.

The one inevitable that every person who is allowed to speak out in our society is required to agree with is that, in the next millennium, "the race problem" will be solved.

Analog Magazine is the most prestigious publication in science fiction. Analog had always featured its cover art, beautiful representations of bold warriors and their women in ancient garb or in futuristic space uniforms doing heroic battle. They were all Nordics.

In the 1970s a liberal editor, Ben Bova, took Analog over for a short time. As a good liberal, Bova saw a future where there would be no Nordics. All white majority populations would, by then, be brown.

But Bova could not replace the Nordic features on his covers with pictures of random racial mixes. He did not want to put ugly people on the cover that was to sell his magazine. So throughout Bova's short reign as editor, the uniforms or other clothes on the warriors covered their faces. You could never see what race they were.

Except once.

That one time during Bova's editorship the race of the person on the cover was clearly shown. He was a pure black man, driving what appeared to be an anti-gravity tractor.

Several things were interesting about that one cover, but the one that is important here is something Bova did not even think about.

He insisted there would be no Nordics in the future, but he took it for granted there would be blacks. Africa would always have plenty of them, as would many Caribbean islands and the other solidly black countries of the world.

I am sure that it never occurred to any reader of the magazine that this was a totally racist, totally genocidal attitude. It is, after all, the only acceptable attitude of anyone who dares say a word in public in today's society.

In many countries, you can go to prison for expressing any other attitude.

As we go into the third millennium, only one inevitable is left on which all allowable opinion agrees. That is that the new millennium will see the end of what liberals and moderates and respectable conservatives and the leaders who call themselves "Christian" conservatives all agree to refer to as "the race problem."

All of our liberal, moderate, respectable conservative and so-called "Christian" leaders shout in unison that we must have "a final solution" to "the race problem."

They shout about the dangers of "white racism" when we all know that we are targeted to disappear from the face of the earth. But anyone who even mentions this is declared anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews. And who is shouting the loudest? Respectable conservatives, of course, the people who call themselves the "conservers" of Western society!

Outside the United States, they don't stop opposition to the last "inevitable" just by shouting and oppressing opponents economically. They use straight police state tactics. If you mention your concern with the disappearance of the white race from the earth in Canada, you are subject to criminal penalties. In Britain, under the race hate laws, a judge officially declared that "The truth is no excuse."

In the cause of the code words "ending racism," freedom of speech has simply ceased to exist throughout the Western world. In Canada, this jailing of people for expressing any white racial concern at all is already expanding to include sexism, criticizing gays and all other categories of Political Correctness.

And when it comes to racism, sexism, and more and more forms of Political Correctness, the Canadian courts are following the British judge's dictum that "The truth is no excuse."

There is already a tiny but growing reaction to this. This sort of criminalizing of Thought Crimes will be hard to sustain in the age of the Internet. But today's conservatives will have no part in leading or taking advantage of this reaction.

So the so-called opposition in America shouts even louder that the only real problem in our society is that old code word, "racism." The last thing you can depend on our so-called conservative opposition to the left to point to is the REAL problem.

This conservative dedication to genocide fits the pattern of what the Christian writer C. S. Lewis had in mind when he had Satan's Senior Demon Screwtape give his formula for tricking men into eternal damnation. Screwtape explains to his nephew Wormwood how this sort of fashionable toadying is used to destroy humanity:

"The use of Fashion in thought is to distract the attention of men from their real dangers...The game is to have them all running around with fire extinguishers when there is a flood, and all crowding to that side of the boat which is already nearly gunwale under. Thus we make it fashionable to expose the dangers of enthusiasm at the very moment when they are all really becoming worldly and lukewarm...Cruel ages are put on their guard against Sentimentality..."

So today's conservatives are helping liberals pursue this Screwtape approach. The real danger of the new century centers around the program to eliminate whites -- or "the race problem." Along with this program goes the War On Thought Crimes that is destroying freedom of thought and freedom of speech.

Meanwhile the right, which claims to be so Christian and so moral, is devoted only to being part of Fashionable Opinion on these issues.

January 8, 2000 - BOB JONES AND DAVID BEASLEY

January 8, 2000 - OUR PRO-FLAG MARCH: BEGINNING OF THE THIRD WAY IN AMERICA?

BOB JONES AND DAVID BEASLEY

On December 5, 1998, I wrote an article entitled "Blasphemy." In it I discussed then-Governor David Beasley's convenient announcement that God had told him to abandon his support for the Confederate flag on the State House dome.

In 1996, Beasley was considered a hot candidate for a vice presidential bid on the national Republican ticket. Those pushing this goal said that he needed to drop his support of the flag if he wanted national party support.

But Beasley could not abandon flag supporters before November 1996, because he needed them to carry the state for Dole if he was going to get the vice presidential nod in 2000. But he had to do it quickly after November 1996, if South Carolina Republicans were to get over the shock in time to support him for reelection in 1998.

So he waited one month after the 1996 election.

In December 1996, Beasley said that God told him to abandon flag supporters. His message from the Lord came at exactly the right moment.

At the time, I thought that you couldn't get a more blatant example of blasphemy than that.

Then, in October, Bob Jones suddenly announced that, as a man of God, he must demand that the flag come down. He said it offends blacks and, of course, he quoted scripture.

Like Beasley, Jones used a lot of weasel wording to soften his perfectly timed sellout, but nobody has any doubt what is going on. The bottom line is in the timing.

If the flag is that offensive to blacks, Jones should have had this Revelation twenty years ago. If it offends blacks so much, he could have made that decision a year ago. But the Voice of God only comes to Bob Jones when the NAACP has started a boycott and business leaders and college boards of directors are lining up against us.

How convenient!

Bob Jones is very upset that he is being attacked for this sudden and convenient conversion. He says it is awful to attack him just because he has taken a position grassroots conservatives don't like.

Wrong again.

Liberals keep insisting that if taxpayers don't pay for obscene art, that is censorship. They say that artists have a right to do whatever they want to do.

Artists have a right to do their own thing. They do not have a right to get taxpayer money to do it. Liberals keep acting like they don't understand this distinction.

Bob Jones is pulling a similar deaf act. He is not just "taking a position." He has done exactly what David Beasley did. He has taken a stand with our enemies at the worst possible moment. He has thrown his family name and all the faith we had in Bob Jones University into our enemies' campaign. He has jumped right out in front at the moment he needed to in order to gain the approval of the money people.

Again, as with Beasley, the big question is, why NOW?

I can see why Beasley picked that moment, and so could the people. That is why he is not governor any more.

So how did a minister of God suddenly decide that God has decided to give him the green light at this perfect moment for gaining the favor of the state's moneymen?

I expect a politician to pull a trick like that. The fact that Beasley blamed his perfect timing on God offended me deeply. But he is, after all, a politician.

But with Bob Jones, this is altogether different.

OUR PRO-FLAG MARCH: BEGINNING OF THE THIRD WAY IN AMERICA?

In March 1958, just short of my seventeenth birthday, I became a member of the Euphradian Society of the University of South Carolina. It was a debate society, called a "literary society," which had been in existence since 1806. A new member had to make an inaugural speech, and mine had a title that will surprise no one here. It was "The Dangers of Modern Liberalism."

You can find the record of this speech, like all the other Euphradian notes going all the way back to about 1819, at the Caroliniana Library on the horseshoe at USC.

Back then, I had a lot of loyalties. I connected leftism with socialism, so I was loyal to the interests of big business. In 1962, when President Kennedy forced Big Steel to keep the price of steel from rising, United States Steel had no allies like us young people in the Young Americans for Freedom.

Well, to our cost, we learned better. Every leftist cause had a long list of Big Business sponsors. We Southerners bought Fords loyally, and the Ford Motor Company paid the Ford Foundation to back the left and underwrote the NAACP. Automotive workers' unions poured money into the far left of the Democratic Party, and every dime came from the dumb-and-loyal Ford buyers concentrated in the South.

The churches we supported sold us out every time it looked like it might pay off. The Democratic Party kicked us in the teeth. Then the Republican Party kicked conservatives in the teeth, regular as Big Ben, every four years at the convention. Boy, were we loyal. Boy, were we STUPID!!!

The Methodist Church sold us out. Now Bob Jones sells us out on the flag issue. The South Carolina Democratic Party sold us out to the liberals then, now statewide Republican officials line up on the NAACP side at press conferences to disown us.

Is anybody beginning to notice a pattern?

For the umpteenth time, let me make the major lesson of all this in this column. Politics is a rough business. Politics is a harsh business. Let me tell you how people on Capitol Hill look at loyalty.

There are exactly one thousand four hundred and sixty-one (1461) days between presidential elections. Conservatives can cry and moan and shout "Betrayal!" for 1460 of those days. They can talk about bolting for Buchanan.

Nobody cares, and for a very good reason.

On election day, conservatives always come crawling back.

And that, dear reader, is absolutely all that matters.

When we are all out there marching for the flag on January 8, no one is going to care, and for a very good reason.

The statewide Republican leaders, the Bob Jones alumnae fund, the Clemson Board of Directors, the Citadel Board of Directors, all of them are going to assume that it ends there, and the doglike loyalty will resume.

Leftists never forgive treason to their principles until someone DOES SOMETHING to make up for it. Conservatives demand nothing. Like a puppy dog, rightists just forget about it the next day.

1) Liberals have no doglike loyalty. The left is loyal only to its principles.

2) Liberals do not forget any betrayal.

3) Liberals tend to get their way.

Does anybody notice a pattern here?

Robert Heinlein, the science fiction writer, said many things I did not agree with. But he hit upon one great, eternal truth. When every principle we cherish is dead, his words should be etched on the gravestone:

"THE PENALTY FOR STUPIDITY HAS ALWAYS BEEN DEATH."

So, out here in the real world, there are two forces.

There are leftists, who dedicate their support and their MEMORY only to the goals they believe society should pursue. The other force is conservatism, which worships uniforms, Republicans, church leaders, trendy opinion, and whatever is in today's newspapers.

Guess whose principles win?

Guess why.

If anything we treasure is to survive, we are going to have to dedicate ourselves to a third way.

Please notice I said DEDICATE ourselves. This does not mean a short-term verbal commitment while we preserve our secular worships of uniforms and church officials and Republicans.

It means total secession.

When we march on January 8, it can be another meaningless expression of right-wing frustration. Or it can be one of the most meaningful events in American political history.

On the flag, all the "leaders" we have followed have come out against us. We are taking them all on, left and right. A leftist boycott has frustrated every state's attempt to hold out against fashionable opinion. They crushed Colorado's attempt to deny gays special privileges. Their boycott overcame the Arizona governor's attempt to avoid giving state employees millions of dollars each year in the form of a Martin Luther King holiday. Every state has caved in to interstate economic pressure from the left, aided by "leaders" on the right.

At this point, if we are able to resist the combined pressure of leftists and the rightist "leaders" who always become their allies, we will have done something absolutely unique. They can't afford to lose this one.

But we have some new allies. The Sons of Confederate Veterans (SCV), like the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC), always tried to stay out of politics. But the SCV's new leadership realizes that the left will not allow anything Confederate to survive. They are joining us in this fight.

I understand that even the UDC will have a speaker at the pro-flag rally.

This is major breakthrough. For the first time, a local fight against the forces of Political Correctness has attracted groups that were out of politics before this fight began. This new configuration of forces is the only one that should have our loyalty as we fight ALL the powers that be.

When we all go home after the march, the real question is going to arise: where do we stand? Are we part of a new third way, a new way which is loyal only to our principles? Or will we go crawling back to the second group, the old loser/loyal brand of conservatism?

This choice will determine whether the pro-flag march in Columbia on January 8 will be utterly meaningless or a fundamental event in American political history.

January 15, 2000 - WHITAKER'S LAW ON POLITICAL FINANCING

January 15, 2000 - THE GRASSROOTS' BIGGEST WEAKNESS

WHITAKER'S LAW ON POLITICAL FINANCING

In politics, the money starts coming in AFTER you need it most. You have to prove yourself first. By the time you have proven yourself, you are over the big hump, and the money you needed so desperately is less important.

So much of the really groundbreaking political activity is run in a back room on a shoestring.

The most effective group I ever ran consisted of three people and no bank account. It was called the Populist Forum, and it provided press conferences and other representation to genuine grassroots protests. Independent trucks, anti-busing protesters, and textbook protesters, among others, were working people who were fighting well-organized forces.

We would call up and ask if they needed someone to do their writing for them. In the case of a real, grassroots movement, it was just what they needed. They were new to the political wars, and all the experts and wordsmiths were on the other side.

Once the money starts coming in, your purposes become more and more perverted to the wishes of the money people. Finally, the cause becomes largely a means of employment.

It is often said that people who contribute money tell you what to do. But what is more important is that, when you accept money, there are things you CAN'T do. When the independent truckers began their protest against oil rationing, they pulled their trucks up in the middle of a Washington, DC rush hour and left them there. If we had any big-money contributors, we would have been prohibited from speaking for this kind of costly anarchy.

But that tactic sure got the government's attention in a way no other approach would have. Monied interests would not have allowed us to participate in many of the activities we got into on a shoestring.

Whitaker's Corollary on Political Financing says that groups with lavish funding will often be those which have nothing or, being in the way, less than nothing, to contribute.

THE GRASSROOTS' BIGGEST WEAKNESS

NBC television gave a surprisingly positive report on the January 8 march for the Confederate flag in Columbia. It showed the thousands marching, the Confederate uniforms, the thousands of Confederate flags being carried. But at the end, they said, "The business community in South Carolina is afraid of this image of the state."

"This image" was the Confederate flag. "This image" was Southerners parading their own heritage. I cannot think of a better testimony to what this struggle is really all about. The business community wants an end to everything that smacks of the Confederacy or of genuine Southern history.

So we know where the money interests in South Carolina stand. If there was any doubt, Bob Jones' blatant betrayal of the traditionalist position made it very clear indeed. He went where the money went.

That is where the money is going, but is that where the future of politics is going? That depends on us. So far, interstate leftist boycotts have never failed to force a state into line. Money has enormous power, and money is ranged against us. But money can't go it alone.

There is no grassroots support at all for the campaign AGAINST the Confederate flag. There is certainly no evidence that blacks rank that flag as one of the main concerns they have in political life. It is, as I indicated on October 30, 1999, in "What the Flag Boycott Really Means," strictly a product of white business and its wholly-owned black "leadership."

The battle against the flag is all money. The battle for it is all grassroots.

I doubt that any real people were shocked by seeing thousands of South Carolinians marching behind Confederate flags and wearing Confederate uniforms. People expect Southerners to be Southern. NBC's dire warning is purely a product of money people talking to each other.

But a mass march is not everything. The question that I asked last time still remains: what are all our people going to do after they go home? Are they going to shed their uniforms and become good little obedient conservative servants of the business establishment? Is their bottom-line loyalty to the Republican Party, which dances to the tune the South Carolina business establishment plays?

While we are all being good little Republicans and good little followers of other conservative "leaders," who is going to WATCH our "leaders?" When we are suddenly informed one day that a "deal" has been worked out in the state legislature, how are we going to find out who sold us out? Are we still going to care?

Let me warn you once again: if you do not have a MEMORY, you are going to be betrayed again and again. And most conservatives have no memory at all, as I have demonstrated over and over in these columns. Leftists never forgive a betrayal until those who betrayed them do something to make up for it. Rightists just go back to being loyal.

For example, no liberal would ever forgive a betrayal like that of Bob Jones against us until he APOLOGIZED for it. Now, can anyone imagine any conservative leader ever apologizing to us for any betrayal? Of course not. They never apologize because we forget the betrayal. No one has anything to LOSE by refusing to apologize to us, because we never demand it.

The money men have won in all their interstate boycotts. Then our leaders apologize for not selling us out quickly enough. Liberals won't stand for anything less than a groveling right, and we never object when our leaders do the groveling.

I have done a lot of marching in my time. I have been in many marches larger than the one in Columbia, and I have seen some of those movements fail.

Movements that defy money fail because money has a built-in memory. Watching the NAACP leader interviewed by NBC, the same thought occurred to me that I have each time I see one of these professional leftist activists: "If it weren't for his 'movement,' where could this guy get a job?" Unlike the thousands of people who spend their time and work and money to get to a march, this guy has nothing in the world to do but push the cause his masters pay him to push.

He'd damn well better. Otherwise he'd have to find real work.

Long after the few months it takes for conservatives to go back to whatever is in the papers, those paid "leaders" on the left will have nothing to do for their pay but stay on their masters' issues. That is what defeats grassroots movements.

It is the failure of MEMORY that destroys the grassroots movements. The one overwhelming danger is that we will go back to the old groove and let our enemies come up with a fait accompli, a "compromise," a sellout that nobody is exactly responsible for.

January 22, 2000 - THE RESPECTABILITY FIX

January 22, 2000 - HOW MANY "SWING" VOTES WERE IN THE ANTI-FLAG MARCH

THE RESPECTABILITY FIX

Bill Bennett was on CNN demanding that Bush and McCain order South Carolina to take down the Confederate flag. In case you have forgotten him, Bill Bennett is yesterday's media-beloved respectable conservative. He and his partner, Jack Kemp, fought hard for the position of Liberal's Most Beloved Conservative.

It seems like a long time now, but there was a time when Kemp was a darling of conservatives. He declared himself a "bleeding heart conservative," and the press ate it up. He was the John McCain of the mid-nineties. And he acted a lot like McCain is acting. The media would say something about how great he was, and he would giggle and say more things about how great minorities were and how unfeeling other conservatives were.

In 1996, Dole named Kemp as his vice presidential candidate. Then came the vice presidential debate with Gore. Kemp agreed with every nasty thing Gore said about how bad other Republicans were and how uniquely loving Kemp was. It got so bad even Dole's operatives were sickened by it.

Like Kemp, McCain always says something to put down conservatives and gladden the press. His trimmed-down tax cuts with all the right words about the poor was just what the media wanted. He denounced the Confederate flag as a symbol of bigotry and slavery. But then he said it was up to South Carolinians to decide what to do about it. I am sure he wanted to do what Bennett tells him to do, but he is desperate to win the primary here.

McCain hasn't gone over the edge yet, but four years ago, Kemp hadn't gone over the edge yet, either. But the media addiction is working on him.

HOW MANY "SWING" VOTES WERE IN THE ANTI-FLAG MARCH?

A few years ago, a single national black leader, Louis Farrakhan, called for a million black men to come to Washington, DC, in a show of solidarity. There are no more than twelve million adult black males in the United States. This black population was spread out across the country, with large concentrations of blacks three thousands miles away on the West Coast.

After the Million Man March, the disagreement over how many black men actually heeded Farrakhan's call was intense. In the end, Farrakhan's group sued the National Park Service, which had estimated the crowd at 600,000. The Nation of Islam accused the National Park Service of deliberately underestimating the numbers, and insisted that one and a half million black men had come to Washington.

Lost in all this was the sheer volume of turnout which was the subject of debate. The NPS had said that only five percent of the TOTAL black male population of the United States had dropped everything and congregated in the District of Columbia, while the Nation of Islam said one out of eight of the black male population of this country had done so.

Both estimates are staggering.

The fact that the entirety of the mainline black "leadership" of the United States made a major effort and got what they called almost fifty thousand marchers into Columbia, when put into this context, is not exactly overwhelming.

Now let us turn to the question that I have special qualifications to answer: What do those thousands of marchers mean to a cold-eyed politician? How many meaningful votes do they represent?

How many of the marchers represent a swing vote? The swing vote consists of people who might go from one party to the other on the basis of the issue they are marching about. How many potential Republican voters were in that crowd? How many people's vote might swing from one party to the other on the basis of the stand that party takes on the issue about which they are marching?

Liberals give two answers to this question. One is where they put their mouth, the other is where they put their money. If you don't want to be anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews, you have to say that just because a person is black doesn't mean that he is a Democrat. In the real world of politics, liberals devote their money and effort to getting out the black vote, because it means getting out the Democratic vote.

A few years ago, former Reagan advisor Ed Rollins was running a statewide New Jersey campaign for the Republicans, and he made some disparaging remarks about "walking around money." "Walking around money" is the money Democrats give black people to get them to vote. In the ensuing media fury against Rollins, I discovered that walking around money is not to be criticized. It is a bulwark of democracy.

Liberals insist that it is evil, racist, and unfair to say that, just because someone is black, they are presumed to be a Democrat. All Democratic strategists devote enormous resources to that exact proposition.

So if I were running a campaign, and a reporter asked me, on the record, how many swing voters were in that anti-flag march in Columbia, I would say, "Probably a very small number." But what if a political reporter asked me that question off the record? Well, first of all, no reporter would make a fool of himself that way. If one did, my answer would be, "You're kidding, right?"

But there is not just a swing vote. There is also a "march in" vote.

Once again, the same political commentators who insist that "black" is not almost synonymous with "Democrat" say that the Confederate flag issue could threaten the Republicans by increasing the black vote. It might be a rallying-point to get more of those who marched into Columbia to march into the voting booth.

This may be a valid concern, because the Confederate flag issue is the ONLY issue the black leadership has. Let us return to one of the major themes of Whitaker Online: no liberal program ever WORKS. Black Americans have an ever-increasing load of real, desperately serious problems, drugs, illegitimacy, families collapsing, and all the rest. But no one takes liberal solutions to these problems seriously any more.

After all, no part of our society has been the focus of more concentrated liberal programs than the black community over the past decades. And over those decades, all these problems have gotten steadily worse.

For black leaders, the Confederate flag issue is a godsend. Already in North Carolina, a black man got a professional license from the state that has a Confederate flag on it, and complained to CNN. If anybody thinks this issue ends with the moving of the flag from the capitol dome, they are dreaming.

Practically every street in Columbia is named for a slaveholder. If black "leaders" are going to keep their substitute for earning a serious living, this issue has got to be permanent.

January 29, 2000 - WHITAKER'S LAW ON THE MINORITY VOTE

January 29, 2000 - "APPEALING TO MINORITIES" IS ANOTHER CODE TERM FOR PANDERING TO LEFTISTS

WHITAKER'S LAW ON THE MINORITY VOTE

The Law reads thusly:

"The only time Republicans get a large percentage of the minority vote is in a landslide when they would have won the election without a single minority vote."

I discussed this on November 28, 1998 in "You Never Win With the Black Vote." But this year they are selling the same old myth again, so it is time to go back over this.

Every Bush supporter recites the same old litany about how many minority votes Bush got in his last run for governor. This is supposed to prove he can get lots and lots of minority votes when he runs for president on the Republicans ticket.

He won't.

In 1998, Bush could have won the Texas governorship without a single minority vote. He won in a landslide, and minorities went along with the tide. In 2000, Bush will get the same minuscule percentage of minority votes Republicans always get.

For decades, moderates talked about how many black votes Eisenhower got in 1952 and 1956. He got over forty percent of the black vote. But the fact is that Eisenhower would have won if he had not gotten a single black vote. Like Bush in Texas, Eisenhower won in a landslide, and a higher black vote went along with it. But for decades, we had to listen to the same old line about how the Republican Party would get the black vote if it just got a little bit more liberal.

"APPEALING TO MINORITIES" IS ANOTHER CODE TERM FOR PANDERING TO LEFTISTS

Respectable conservatives say they want to "appeal to Hispanics." They then tell us that "Hispanics want the same thing other Americans want." That may be true of many Hispanics. But it turns out that those regular Americans are not the Hispanics respectable conservatives are talking about when they demand that Republicans "appeal" to them. The Hispanics respectable conservatives want to appeal to demand that we:

- 1) make Spanish an official language wherever possible in the United States;
- 2) impose "bilingual education" programs;
- 3) stop enforcing immigration laws;

4) support affirmative action.

In other words, like every other respectable conservative mantra, this one is used to push the Republican Party to the left.

"Bilingual education" is a code word very similar to "multiculturalism." Bilingual education" is a way to keep Spanish-speaking children speaking nothing but Spanish. There is nothing "bi-" about "bilingual education." It is a means by which Spanish-speaking children are kept monolingual.

In exactly the same way that "bilingual education" is actually a way to keep children monolingual, "multiculturalism" is actually a way to impose a single alien culture throughout the Western world.

"Multiculturalism" is a program that would impose a single set of values on every country that now has a white majority. It would be prescribed by liberals. Each "multicultural" country would be a carbon copy of every other "multicultural" country. There is to be a "multicultural" Germany, which will be exactly like a "multicultural" Britain. The United States will have the same "experts" dictating the same multicultural setup as Britain and Germany do.

"Bilingual education" is code word for a program to keep children monolingual. "Multiculturalism" is a code word for destroying every real Western culture and making the entire West monocultural.

As I said, while teachers teach Hispanic children in that language, there is some pretense that, at some future date which is not specified, the children will begin to learn in English. This reminds one of another liberal program, affirmative action. Affirmative action discriminates against whites to make up for white discrimination in the past.

Liberals say that there will come a time, sometime in the far, far future, when society has made up for past discrimination and affirmative action will end.

We all know when those Hispanic children will begin to learn in English. It will be the same date when affirmative action is no longer imposed. It is the same date when the hottest part of Hell suffers a cold spell.

But you can't say any of this if you are going to "appeal to the Hispanic vote." When the descendants of Germans and Poles demand that English be made the single official language in the United States, you cannot "appeal to Hispanics" and support it. So Bush opposes it. Buchanan's and the Reform Party's demands that immigration laws be enforced is declared to be a direct affront to Hispanics.

After all, Hispanics are expected to side with their fellow Mexicans against American laws.

So what happened to the old mantra that "Hispanics want the same things other Americans want?"

The summation of all this shows us a very familiar, very expected picture. When respectable conservatives talk about "appealing to Hispanics," they mean "caving in to liberals." Nobody can think of a single suggestion by respectable conservatives for "appealing to Hispanics" that does not involve giving up something to liberals.

When they are demanding that the Republican Party move left, the media always talks about a "big tent." They say that the Republican Party has to "move toward the center," which means it must move leftward. But this "moving toward the center" actually means REJECTING REAGAN DEMOCRATS.

At the 1980 Republican Convention, when Republicans had a brief fit of sanity and went to the right with Reagan, "moderate" Republicans were inconsolable. Naturally the media concentrated on the handful of old liberal Republicans - media heroes - who were at that convention. The cameras followed them around as they talked about how all their old buddies were all gone.

One after another, the old liberal Republicans complained about the fact that they didn't know anybody there. All of the old, reliable conservative Republicans who had always supported moderate Republicans against conservatives were gone. Moderates missed the old faces, the good conservative Republicans and moderates with whom they had lost election after election. They didn't put it exactly that way, of course.

What was hilarious about all this was the absolute hypocrisy of it. These were the same moderate Republicans who were always talking about a "big tent." They talked about the "big tent Republican Party" into which every one was to be welcomed. Then, when some actual new faces came in, the media sympathized with moderates who resented all these new faces! Like all liberals, the media have no sense of irony. They never see the fact that they are, yet again, being absurd.

February 5, 2000 - THE OTHER BOYCOTT

February 5, 2000 - NEW HAMPSHIRE PRIMARY RESULTS

THE OTHER BOYCOTT

Austria is almost exactly the same geographical size as the State of South Carolina, and it now has a very similar problem. Just as South Carolina has people throughout America trying to dictate what is on our capitol dome, Austria has all of Europe trying to decide what party it is to be governed by.

Like the rest of Europe, Austria has been slavishly following America's trendy liberal ideas, and has opened the floodgates to immigration. Now one in six people in Austria is a recent immigrant, and they are taking up huge amounts of public money. Austria has the area of South Carolina, and already has twice our population. The cozy coalition of two major parties which has governed Austria since 1955 kept immigration coming.

Not surprisingly, Austrians turned to a new, anti- immigration party, the Freedom Party, with 28 percent of the vote at the last election. The leader of that party has signed onto a coalition to rule the country in the new government.

Let it be said at the outset that the COMMUNIST PARTY is part of the governing coalition in Italy, but no one saw anything wrong with that.

But the European Union is now threatening a boycott of Austria if it dares include the Freedom Party in its governing coalition.

The Clinton Administration is also considering sanctions against Austria if it decides to form its own government on its own terms.

NEW HAMPSHIRE PRIMARY RESULTS

To my amazement, Senator John McCain has not yet demanded that ground troops be sent into Austria if it allows the Freedom Party in its government. That would be the trendy move, and media liberals must be sorely disappointed in their champion. They may rest assured, however, that when they need Senator McCain, he will be there for them.

We all remember that while other Republicans were dragging their feet on bombing Serbia, McCain was trumping Clinton with a demand for ground troops and double the bombing effort.

But McCain looks like the only really live candidate running.

Watching Bradley campaign in New Hampshire, I got the impression that he was a very bored, tired man. Never a smile and no energy.

If "bland" could be a verb, I would say that one got the impression that Bush was trying to bland his way into the nomination.

Gore was Gore.

In fact, a little excitement is the only reason that Bradley wasn't crushed in a landslide the way Bush was. In the closing days of the campaign, Bradley started hitting back against Gore's attacks with negative ads. As a result, polls showed that 68% of the voters who made up their minds in the last three days chose Bradley.

McCain was the only candidate who appeared enthusiastic, and his rallies reflected it. I discussed this side of politics on March 20, 1999 in "BOOOORING!" The Bush strategy has been to keep his image as middle-of-the-road as possible. The normal strategy is to run right of center in the Republican primaries, where voters are more conservative, and then to move toward the middle of the road after securing the nomination. Bush is trying to make it all the way with his speedometer pointed to Bland.

New Hampshire has been tending toward rebels in recent years. They went for Buchanan over Dole, and they went for McCain over Bush big time. South Carolina plodded along with Dole, and saved his candidacy because he was sure to beat Clinton.

All the polls said so.

McCain is coming out of New Hampshire with two things Buchanan did not have in 1996. First, he won by a landslide in New Hampshire. Secondly, and more important, he has the unanimous backing of the national press. This is because, while McCain has a steady conservative voting record in the Senate, he can always be counted on to back the liberals on any issue that really matters to them.

The key word here is MATTERS. McCain can make the usual noises about abortion, but it's easy to avoid action on that. He will make the usual pronouncements about smaller government, but his major initiative on the subject was to push a government windfall tax on tobacco. That would have brought

over five hundred billion dollars into the Feds, and no one can tell me that libs wouldn't have gotten a good slice of that for their programs.

The tobacco taxes would have landed right on the backs of working people, which is where liberals like them. Another windfall for liberals would be the campaign "reform" which McCain is leading the fight for. He is practically the only Republican backing it, and for a good reason. It cuts into Republican and grassroots fund sources, but leaves the big unions totally free to back liberals.

McCain supporters keep claiming he is just being "independent." I cannot give that the slightest credence until McCain takes AT LEAST ONE BRAVE STAND against other Republicans WHICH IS NOT the exact stand trendy liberals want him to take. By any accounting, that is the difference between an independent thinker and a simple sellout.

McCain is a fanatical backer of the liberal agenda in foreign policy. When Clinton wanted to intervene in Kosovo, McCain wanted to make it a full-scale war.

Liberals are not consistently anti-military. During World War II, the entire left, including the Communists, backed the military solidly in its battle against the fascist right. It was only after the Cold War began against the Communist Progressive Peoples' Republics that leftism took a pacifist turn. Since the Cold War, America's military adventures have looked good to the left. As Clinton's Secretary of State Albright pointed out, a big military is fine if it can be used for her purposes (See April 24, 1999, Madeleine Albright Asks, "What Good Are American Lives?").

When the gun bill was dying in the Senate, the two old reliables, McCain and Hatch, tried desperately to save it. Hatch wanted to please Teddy Kennedy (See August 14, 1999, "Orrin Loves Teddy"). McCain wanted to keep his reputation with liberals for being there when they needed him.

Meanwhile, Bush is supposed to be the "electable" one. That means that he is going for the so-called "middle of the road" vote. Now, in the real world, nobody knows where this middle of the road is. The media are constantly telling us that if a Republican takes a "moderate" stand, liberal on some issues and conservative on others, he will win.

In the real world, most people who actually get elected to Congress are consistently conservative or liberal. If this "middle of the road" business actually worked, we would find congressmen clustering right there in the middle of this mythical road. But, to repeat, if you look at their ADA and ACA voting records, you will find that congressmen cluster on the left and on the right.

So, when Republicans nominated moderates, on the basis of the good old, plausible-sounding middle of the road nonsense, they lost. Reagan won twice. Ford lost. Dole lost. Bush, Sr. won once when he ran as Reagan's successor and lost when he ran as his moderate self. The media is always selling Republicans on this middle of the road nonsense and for good reason. It keeps liberals in office.

Liberals are able to sell the middle of the road program to Republicans. They are good at selling their programs. And as always with programs liberals, it doesn't work.

True to a tradition of stupidity, Republicans usually take the advice of their enemies on political strategy.

February 12, 2000 - BOB JONES UNIVERSITY - TIME FOR A NAME CHANGE?
February 12, 2000 - THE OFFICIAL CLINTON-MCCAIN POSITION ON NATIONAL SELF-DETERMINATION
February 12, 2000 - MCCAIN AND BUCHANAN
February 12, 2000 - EUROPE GETS TWO HUNDRED YEARS OF CONSTITUTIONAL "PROGRESS" IN ONE FELL SWOOP

BOB JONES UNIVERSITY - TIME FOR A NAME CHANGE?

Shortly after the NAACP announced its South Carolina boycott, Bob Jones IV joined liberals and respectable conservatives in demanding that the Confederate flag come down off the South Carolina capitol dome. Liberals were delighted, and Bob Jones was King For a Day in the State newspaper.

In joining our enemies, Bob Jones declared that the flag offended blacks, and, as a Christian, one should abandon symbols that offend blacks.

Well, as it turns out, the Confederate flag is not the only symbol that offends blacks in South Carolina. When George W. Bush made a major campaign speech at Bob Jones University, the Vice President of the United States made it clear that that name, too, offended black people.

Respectable conservatives have no memory, but the fact is that this is how the flag became a symbol of offense to African-Americans. Polls showed that the overwhelming majority of real live black people found nothing offensive in a Southern symbol flying over a Southern capitol. It was only after liberals told them that they were offended that it became, officially, an offense. The word that Bob Jones University is offensive to black people has now come from the same source.

I watched a discussion of the campaign on CNN. Since Lee Bandy has to sleep sometime, CNN had to have someone else commenting on the primary. They chose a thoroughly respectable conservative and Tom Turnipseed. Those two agreed that Bush offended black people by speaking at Bob Jones.

When CNN had representatives of the two Republican campaigns discussing the point, neither of them would condemn Bob Jones. There are a lot of Bob Jones graduates voting in the primary. But then again, neither Bush nor McCain would join Jones in demanding that the flag come down.

So we have the same lineup of people condemning Bob Jones as offending black people as we have condemning the Confederate flag as offending black people. Isn't it time for Bob Jones to follow his own idea of Christianity, and change the name of his University?

THE OFFICIAL CLINTON-MCCAIN POSITION ON NATIONAL SELF-DETERMINATION

President Clinton stated the purpose of the Kosovo bombing: "We must remember the principle we and our allies have been fighting for in the Balkans is the principle of multi-ethnic, tolerant, inclusive democracy."

No matter what a country's population may want, it is the announced purpose of the United States Government to impose the melting pot. This will be done by force if necessary.

In case Clinton's statement did not make this clear enough, let us hear from the United States military:

General Wesley Clark stated America's goal for Europe: "Let's not forget what the origin of the problem is. There is no place in modern Europe for ethnically pure states. That's a 19th century idea and we are trying to transition into the 21st century, and WE ARE GOING TO DO IT WITH MULTI-ETHNIC STATES."

The only difference between Clinton's position and McCain is that McCain is far more fanatical about it.

Senator McCain demanded that the United States consider ground troops to enforce this melting pot policy in Europe. He introduced legislation to enormously increase funding and commitment to crush whoever stands in the way of this Clinton-McCain policy.

This is the official United States policy on national self-determination. This is OUR issue. As a Southern Nationalist I am mystified as to how any other nationalist could endorse McCain.

MCCAIN AND BUCHANAN

Bush was depending on South Carolina to save his candidacy against the winner in New Hampshire, John McCain. After all, South Carolina saved his father when Buchanan did well in that state, and South Carolina really saved Dole when Buchanan beat him in the Granite State. But everyone has, as always, forgotten the reason for that.

Respectable conservatives have no memory, so Bush forgot that the reason South Carolina Republican voters saved his father and Dole was because, at the time, the national media were quoting poll after poll that showed that Bush Senior, and then Dole, would beat Clinton in the general election. Needless to say, both were crushed in the general election, getting about the same percentage as Goldwater did in his 1964 landslide defeat.

But the media loves McCain, and the media are not there for Bush this time. This time, the respectable conservatives can go with the candidate that the press - for the moment - dearly loves. Now the media are unanimously insisting that the New Hampshire winner is the one who will beat the Democratic nominee come November.

Maybe, just maybe, the nomination of McCain will give a major kick to the Buchanan campaign this year. I plan to discuss that point in a later WOL.

EUROPE GETS TWO HUNDRED YEARS OF CONSTITUTIONAL "PROGRESS" IN ONE FELL SWOOP

The European Union only took effect recently, and already it has caught up with the United States Supreme Court in dictating social policy throughout Europe. A "rights" activist appealed to the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg because parents are allowed to spank children in Britain. They want the Court to declare all spanking to be criminal assault, as it is in Sweden.

Germany's constitution forbids women to serve in the military. The court struck that down. Britain has a regulation forbidding homosexuals to serve in the armed forces, and nine in ten Britons supports it. The Court struck it down.

Europe follows American trendy liberals, a.k.a. "political correctness," in a slavish way which outdoes American courts. Europe, which was once proud of its unique cultures, has now declared that every country on the continent must now be a "melting pot," just like Uncle Sam. The heavy vote for the anti-immigration Freedom Party in Austria has led Europe to threaten a total isolation of that country if that party is allowed into the government.

No voter reaction to the melting pot in Europe will be permitted. As I have said before, this policy applies only to Europe and other white majority countries. No one minds if Japan holds down immigration to a practical zero. Formosa and China and Africa are welcome to remain ethnically and culturally monoracial and monocultural.

But if Austrian voters or Australian voters or American voters react against massive immigration, the whole world must attack it. This is straight, open, and undisguised genocide.

Given his track record, I am sure that McCain and his supporters would label any objection to this policy as racist. If it is, then I am proud to be their idea of a racist.

The time eventually comes when you must either take their labels or be a complete slave and wimp.

February 19, 2000 - THE MEDIA'S "HONEST ABES" GO STRAIGHT TO DIRTY TRICKS
February 19, 2000 - WHY MCAIN AND CLINTON WILL HAVE TO KEEP USING FORCE

THE MEDIA'S "HONEST ABES" GO STRAIGHT TO DIRTY TRICKS

When Donald Trump announced his candidacy for the presidential nomination on the Reform Party ticket, he denounced Pat Buchanan as a "Hitler lover." He repeated all the wildest nonsense about Buchanan's book criticizing Neville Chamberlain's 1939 policy towards Hitler.

It turned out that criticizing Chamberlain was suddenly being pro-Hitler.

McCain said the same thing, of course.

And when Jesse Ventura announced his withdrawal from the Reform Party, he, too, had an attack to make on Buchanan. He said that Buchanan was evil because David Duke had endorsed him.

Ventura did not say that Buchanan had any control over what David Duke did. He simply said Buchanan was evil for having gotten his "endorsement." Actually, I saw the interview. It wasn't an endorsement. What Duke said was that, as an elected chairman of very large Republican Party unit, he might decide to support Buchanan instead of the Republican nominee.

Several hundred thousand of the rest of us previous Republicans have said the same thing.

Back when McCain was being tortured in the Hanoi Hilton, there was a presidential race going on. The government that was torturing McCain and his buddies made it perfectly clear that it preferred McGovern over Nixon. Nobody, but nobody, blamed McGovern for the fact that the Communists supported him. The media wouldn't allow it.

But when Ventura, who is a media hero for being "honest," uses the same tactic against Buchanan, not one single media outlet made a murmur of protest.

WHY MCAIN AND CLINTON WILL HAVE TO KEEP USING FORCE

In New York City recently, eighteen Klansmen got a permit to demonstrate, and nine thousand New Yorkers turned out to protest it. The Klansmen were denied the right to use a loudspeaker so the demonstration consisted of their standing there silent while the crowd raged.

One woman in the crowd pointed to the Klansmen and said, "They're American citizens, let them speak!" She was immediately attacked by the mob, many of whom were carrying American flags, and beaten seriously.

If those eighteen Klansmen had been, instead, Communists carrying red flags, everyone in the crowd would have agreed with the woman. They would have protested the lack of loudspeakers. Liberal freedom of speech means freedom of speech for leftists only.

The September 4, 1999 article, "Only Nationalism Can Allow Freedom of Thought," explained why.

A union based on nothing but words cannot tolerate any serious diversity of opinion. A union, by definition, must be united by something. It can be united by common ancestry as stated in the Preamble to the United States Constitution: "To Secure the Blessing of Liberty TO OURSELVES AND OUR POSTERITY."

Or a union can be based entirely on "principles." The problem is, "principles" are OPINIONS. All principles are opinions. A union that is based entirely on "principles" is based entirely on OPINION.

It is absolutely impossible for a union that is based entirely on common opinions to allow any real FREEDOM of opinion. You can only be a citizen of such a country if you have the right opinions. Eventually, that means that if you don't think right, you are a traitor.

A natural nation, based on a common heritage, is going to have principles in common. They will flow from the common heritage and they will dominate naturally. But such a natural set of common ideas can tolerate dissent, even extreme dissent. It does not have to constantly force people to "talk right" and "think right." This is because the union of such a people does not depend on their having the same opinions.

Such a nation is like a family. Since they are all members of the same family, they have more in common than some opinions. So even if you disagree, you're still part of the family. But if all you have in common are some "principles," no differences of opinion can be allowed.

It is not accidental that the Civil War was fought under a new president who said that America was based, not on the preamble to the Constitution, but on the words, "All men are created equal." If "all

men are created equal" are the words America was founded on, isn't it odd that the Founding Fathers neglected to put any mention of "all men are created equal" in the Constitution?

Actually, "All men are created equal" was part of the propaganda document called the Declaration of Independence, and it was an appeal to the French liberals for support. It expresses their kind of thinking, the kind of French liberal thinking that led to the French Revolution and the Terror and Napoleon.

As for our own Founding Fathers, anyone who suggested a piece of nonsense like "All men are created equal" be put into our Constitution would have been LAUGHED out of public affairs!

Think about it. Can you imagine any delegate to the serious 1787 constitutional convention getting up and saying "All men are created equal" should be in a document under which we would actually be GOVERNED?

Lincoln's position on "all men are created equal" is also the doctrine of official respectable conservatives. In its bicentennial edition, National Review's official historian, Henry Jaffe, declared that the Founding Fathers conception of America was based entirely on "All men are created equal."

So the establishment position is that America is not a nation dedicated to "Ourselves and Our Posterity." America, according to the official doctrine, is a melting pot based on the words "all men are created equal."

Those who say that America's Founders were multicultural depend entirely on the ignorance of their listeners. America was not only founded on a specifically English governmental system, but the Founders were in every case people who came from the common Western European culture. It was a culture in which, only a short time before, all literate people wrote in a common Latin language. There was, in reality, very little multiculturalism among the Founders, even those who came from different countries in Western Europe. The result was a Constitution voluntarily arrived at among all the different states with their widely different interests.

The result was also a union that could tolerate a huge diversity of opinions, because that union was not based on a single, centrally enforced set of opinions (See May 15, 1999 article, "Wordism").

When Lincoln substituted "all men are created equal" for the Preamble to our actual Constitution, it was the beginning of the end of a nation based on a common culture that could allow diversity of opinion. With Lincoln, French liberalism began to replace the ideas of the Founding Fathers of this country.

As I pointed out last week in "Europe Gets Two Hundred Years of Constitutional 'Progress' in One Fell Swoop," the Lincoln philosophy has been adopted in Europe. So now the European Union enforces the same "principles" on every European nation. They cannot allow some countries to permit parents to spank, because that would violate a "principle" of nonviolence. They cannot allow Britain to keep homosexuals out of its armed forces, because that violates the universal principle of inclusion. Women must be allowed into the German armed forces, because you cannot allow different countries to have different versions of the universal principles of sexual equality.

In a society which is based entirely on opinion, any difference of opinion is treason.

The Clinton-McCain policy of enforcing multiculturalism and multiracialism in Europe is in line with the same doctrine. The many different European nationalities must be crushed, snuffed, made nonexistent.

European nations are based on bloodlines and culture, things people are born into. They are a threat to the only allowable kind of union, that based on common "principles," which, in English, means common opinions.

From this, we can formulate Whitaker's Law On Multiculturalism: "A true multiculturalism can only be united by a universally-held opinion. A truly multicultural state must therefore be constantly rooting out heresy."

This rooting out of heresy is what we call Political Correctness. Multiculturalism cannot exist without Political Correctness.

A union based on what the Founding Fathers would have called "natural" factors does not need to be constantly enforced. But a union where a difference of opinion is treason requires constant monitoring and constant enforcement.

Clinton and McCain stand ready to commit America to this constant monitoring and enforcement, both here and in Europe.

February 26, 2000 - MISCEGENATION DOESN'T WORK EITHER

MISCEGENATION DOESN'T WORK EITHER

On CNN, the former national Republican chairman agreed with Bill Press that Bob Jones' policy of prohibiting interracial dating was "un-American!" All the conservatives and most "religious" conservatives are saying this.

As we all know, every one of the Founding Fathers, regardless of their position on slavery, opposed racial intermarriage, and all the original states outlawed it. As so often happens, I have a choice here between modern, respectable opinions and those of the Founders. As usual, if I choose the Founders, I am being un-American -- which means unModern.

And once again I choose the Founders over the Moderns.

Common sense and observation of the real world always contradicts what liberals are saying. Liberals then assure us that things are not as they appear. They tell us that they are true intellectuals, and they see truths that seem to make no sense to us.

It always turns out that common sense and observation of the real world were right, and liberals were wrong. But we always have to adopt liberal policies and create a total disaster before we dare admit the liberals were wrong.

When I was a university student and professor in the 1950s and 1960s, "intellectuals" knew that socialism was inevitable. Further, it was the only efficient and fair way to run an economy. In plain English, socialism means that the government owns and runs all the industry.

For a rational person, it is obvious that if government bureaucrats run the whole economy, it will be a disaster. True liberal intellectuals made it clear that this was an absurd myth. They said Communism worked just fine, and they firmly believed the faked CIA statistics that showed the USSR overtaking the United States in per capita income.

There is a long list of things like this "socialism-is-efficient" nonsense that was pushed in the name of True Intellectualism. The only thing one was allowed to say in the media was that criminals were not the bad guys. Punishment was useless in fighting crime. In education, all the old standards were declared to be out of date.

We all know what happened with each and every liberal policy. Education scores plummeted. The crime rate went through the roof. Their foreign policy led to Korea and Vietnam. Gun control leads to more crime. Everywhere that liberal policy was applied there was disaster.

Since liberals control the media, they declare which conservatives are respectable and which are not. Conservatives are desperate to be respectable, so they never remind liberals of the list of total disasters they have caused.

Our forefathers noted that every country where the races have mixed is a disaster for the people living there. Even today, the life expectancy of a child born in one of racially-mixed countries, no matter what its history, is extremely low. Poverty is routine. This applies to Brazil, the Dominican Republic, it applies to Egypt and to Panama. It applies where there is a history of colonialism and where there is no history of colonialism. It applies where there once was a great civilization and to new countries.

I do not know why this is true. I know it is true. And I tell you this in all earnestness: nothing convinces me that this is fact more than the unanimous liberal insistence, once again, that what is perfectly obvious simply cannot be the case.

Liberals tell us that this is merely the appearance. They tell us that, like their crime policy and their education policy and their economic policy, this time race mixing will come out just fine. Any conservative who wants to be respectable had better agree.

They do. Every conservative tries to elbow out other conservatives in shouting out his total loyalty to the eventual disappearance of the white race. Anyone who doesn't is anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

And nobody will shout that louder than respectable conservatives.

National "Christian" conservatives join in the shouting.

I don't think there is a single respectable conservative or "Christian" conservative who does not suspect what a future American

version of Brazil or Santo Domingo will be like. It doesn't matter to them. After all, that agony will be left for our posterity. The important thing to these people is that they look unprejudiced and respectable today.

This is not a Christian attitude. That is why I put "Christian" in quotes when referring to these "leaders."

To be a real Christian requires guts. These people prefer respectability.

Judging from real-world evidence, miscegenation is an evil thing, because it dooms future generations to poverty and lives that will be "nasty, brutish, and short." Imagine the whole world being exactly like the third world of today! Imagine there being no Western World, no white-majority countries, to lead the way out of poverty!

I cannot prove this will happen, but those who say it won't are always wrong, and they crush anyone who dares to oppose them.

Liberals and social scientists assure us that miscegenation in the future will lead to a wholly different result this time.

They promised us that rehabilitation would end crime and educational experiments would improve education. They have NEVER been right!

But unlike crime and education policy and socialism, miscegenation is permanent. The disaster that results will not be reversed by its being costly to our living generation. Respectable conservatives and "Christian" conservatives can court liberal favor by pushing miscegenation, and they will die before the results come home.

Judging by what I know of the real world, miscegenation is an evil thing. As is the case with all trendy policy, every country that has mixed white and black races genetically in the real world is a disaster.

But one must be very careful about government trying to prevent it. Like Internet pornography or other social problems, the cure may be worse than the disease, and if the government takes charge of it, it probably won't work.

Nonetheless, these considerations are completely different from saying that an evil thing is good, or that it is morally neutral. The fact I cannot prevent evil does not exempt me from calling it what it is. A private, Christian institution like Bob Jones has not only the right, but the duty, to oppose miscegenation if they feel it is wrong.

I doubt that any intelligent person who was not a hypnotic liberal ever believed that criminals were actually the good guys, or that punishment didn't work. I doubt that any intelligent person who was not a hypnotic liberal ever believed that an economy run by bureaucrats would be efficient. But, when it came to public discussion, they were careful to look as if they took these ideas seriously.

Likewise, I think that any person who is not a hypnotic liberal shares my worry that blithe liberal assurances about racial mixing are wrong.

But to moderates, respectable conservatives and so-called "Christian" conservatives, respectability came before the public welfare. That remains true today.

March 4, 2000 - MCCAIN'S WILD POPULARITY WITH THE MEDIA IS NOT NEW

March 4, 2000 - THE UNION WORKS -- FOR THE NORTHEAST

MCCAIN'S WILD POPULARITY WITH THE MEDIA IS NOT NEW

To be a respectable conservative, you turn in your memory at the gate. So everybody is saying that the love for McCain in the national media is something new. The press is more enthusiastic about McCain than they are about liberal Democrats. For the liberal press to be more in love with a Republican than with liberal Democrats is supposed to be something new.

It isn't. It is just that, since Reagan, Republicans have not had a person the media COULD love the way they love McCain. But McCain offers the press something that no liberal Democrat can offer them: control of the OPPOSITION. I was in the political arena back when the press had liberal Republicans to do their fighting for them. I remember when the press loved the liberal Republican Nelson Rockefeller more than they did any liberal Democrat except Kennedy, and that was only because Kennedy was the President of the United States while Rockefeller was only the governor of New York.

In 1961, the press position was represented by a columnist who said, "Rockefeller stands as much chance of losing the 1964 Republican nomination as he does of going broke." Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania and other liberal Republicans had a press every bit as good as that for McCain today.

The reason for this wild popularity of yesterday's liberal Republicans and today's McCain is that one John McCain or one liberal Republican is worth several times as much to liberals as an outright liberal Democrat is. Liberals want to cut off corporate contributions and leave unions free to use their members' dues to back liberals. They want the media to have more influence and grassroots money to have less. That is what the McCain -Feingold proposal does.

But the simple fact is that McCain-Feingold can spare Feingold. There are dozens of other liberal Democrats ready to sponsor this bill to favor liberal Democrats. But McCain-Feingold would be lost without a McCain to push it.

Even more important, the anti-nationalist foreign policy of using troops and bombs to enforce multiculturalism abroad is opposed by conservatives. Without McCain, it would be a purely liberal policy. But McCain makes it bipartisan. If they could nominate McCain, there would be no major opposition to anything liberals choose to do abroad.

If McCain can get some Americans killed in Europe in the name of multiculturalism, most conservatives will jump on board. To most conservatives, any cause in which American soldiers get killed becomes a holy cause. Conservatives make no distinction between the heroism of American troops and the policies they are sent to enforce. If liberals get Americans killed for their policies, conservatives will declare those liberal policies to be holy.

In Vietnam, conservatives started out saying that we should either fight to win or get out. At first, conservatives said that Americans troops were not just tokens to be spent in a hopeless, no-win war.

But by the end of that war, conservatives were blindly backing the endless bloodbath in Indo-China.

Conservatives have no memory, but liberals remember all of that. That is why the media is crazy about McCain, and why they were just as crazy about Nelson Rockefeller.

THE UNION WORKS -- FOR THE NORTHEAST

You and I are paying for Federal grants to the Northeast to pay for their heating oil this cold winter.

New Englanders are complaining about the high price of their heating oil. Since respectable conservatives have no memory, it is up to me to remind you of why that bill is so high. There is no reason for New England to be using heating oil to warm their houses. That raises the price of oil for all of us.

It is absurd for this scarce resource to be used for heating houses. Atomic power should be doing it.

All or nearly all of the electric power of France comes from safe, clean nuclear power. Oil is for automobiles.

But we are speaking here of leftist New England, where the Jane Fondistas will not tolerate nuclear power. No one ever died as a result of radiation from a nuclear power plant in the Western world, and Europe has a perfect track record using it. But the leftists managed to keep it almost entirely out of the Northeast by their attacks on Seabrook.

The leftist argument is that, while no one has died from nuclear power in the West, there COULD be some risk. By contrast, they say, no one dies producing the good old, "safe" sources of power like coal and oil. That is, no one who matters.

As I pointed out on November 6 in "Leftist 'Champions of the Working Class' Never See Working People", an old rightist like me knows lots of oil rig workers and coal miners who can tell you about many, many people who died producing the "safe" forms of energy. But leftists never meet real working people, so the dangers of other forms of energy, as opposed to nuclear power, are unknown to them.

Back when the anti-nuclear movement was at its peak, New England had a cheap source of oil. The government required Louisiana, Texas, and Oklahoma to provide oil at lower-than-market prices under price controls. So New Englanders preferred to use artificially cheap Southern oil and follow fashion by being anti-nuclear.

It is important to remember that those oil price controls were another triumph of Our Glorious Union. When New England controlled most of the industry in America, Southerners were required to pay a lot more for those products because of government tariffs, which artificially raised the price of New England industrial goods. When the South became the main source of oil, the government acted to be sure that the East got Southern oil cheaply at the South's expense.

The South is still suffering from the decades in which New England railway owners charged several times as much to send industrial products north as sending them south. This internal, private tariff kept

industry out of the South for generations. The New Deal began the process of ending it, but this process was not complete until after the New Deal (and World War II) ended.

As I said, no respectable conservative has any memory of any long-term liberal policy disaster. So no one but me is going to remind you that New England's successful war against nuclear energy is the reason their fuel costs are so high this winter. OPEC has raised the price of oil, and since the Reagan Administration got rid of price controls on oil, New England cannot simply stick its fangs back in the South's throat to get cheap oil.

So New England uses our tax money to burn scarce oil to heat its houses. It is important to remember that their trendy victories over nuclear power costs you and me money each time we go to the oil pump.

March 11, 2000 - OOPS! THE MEDIA LETS SOME TRUTH SLIP OUT

March 11, 2000 - "A COWARD DIES A THOUSAND DEATHS"

March 11, 2000 - RESPECTABLE TIMING

OOPS! THE MEDIA LETS SOME TRUTH SLIP OUT

The absolute refusal of the government and the media to discuss any hate crimes against whites seems to have been noticed. So the authorities decided to charge a black man who set about murdering whites with "hate" crimes. They decided to charge one black person once with a hate crime, so they would look fair.

This is an old ploy. The American Civil Liberties Union defends the Klan or the Nazis from time to time, while devoting almost all of their resources to the political left.

This is called "tokenism" when whites do it in hiring minorities.

So while the government and the press concentrate entirely on "hate" crimes against favored minorities, they can always use this one case to prove they are fair.

But the timing of this one-time charging of a black with a hate crime could not have been worse. It coincided with a very unexpected development in the latest celebrated case for gun control. A six-year-old boy shot a little girl at school. Like most people, I assumed it was accidental.

It turns out that the little six-year-old black boy hated the little six-year-old white girl.

The boy's home was a crack house, and the gun was not there by chance. Nor was his ability to kill deliberately. This turned out to be another instance of the normal situation: a black-on-white hate crime.

This is NOT the lesson the press wanted.

The whole idea was that this innocent little boy had taken a strange weapon to school and a tragic accident had occurred. Instead, we have another illustration of what the token "hate" charge against the black man was supposed to hide: the fact that almost all real hate crime is black-on-white. Black on white crimes occur hundreds of times daily, and every white person in this country is afraid to venture into black areas precisely because we are all aware of this fact.

"A COWARD DIES A THOUSAND DEATHS"

In 1972, the American Independent Party got over a million votes in the presidential election. Its presidential candidate, John G. Schmitz announced, "We have a balanced ticket. I am Catholic, and my running mate is anti-Catholic."

As I noted in my 1976 book, *A Plague On Both Your Houses*, "Such combinations have been routine in American political history." For decades in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the Democratic Party was made up largely of extremely Catholic Irishmen from the North and anti-Catholic fundamentalists from the South.

The Founding Fathers, and every political generation of American politicians since, has had the wisdom to realize that the political system that has the power to ban anti-Catholics from citizenship also has the power to ban Catholics. In the real world, the danger to the very existence of every faith in this country is not Bob Jones University. It is Political Correctness.

Just about every Catholic in this country who might vote Republican is fully aware of just how fanatically anti-Catholic liberals and Political Correctness freaks are. If they didn't realize it before, the rhetoric of the pro-abortion forces and the "women's movement" have made it very, very clear.

Americans of all faiths realize what I just said is true.

So why aren't Republicans saying it?

Instead, when Bill Press demands that a former Republican National Chairman declare Bob Jones to be "un-American," he does what all Republicans do. He simpers and agrees.

The Democrats in Congress are embarrassing the Republicans with demands that the Congress condemn Bob Jones University. Of course they are. And they will continue to do so as long as the Republicans keep simpering and being embarrassed about George W. Bush's appearance at Bob Jones.

Democrats are the opposite of respectable conservatives. Liberals are serious professionals. When they get a hook into conservatives, they keep it in and twist it for all it is worth. As long as Republicans simmer and apologize, the issue won't go away.

"The coward dies a thousand deaths. The hero dies but one."

If Republicans took a hard stand against Political Correctness, they would come out on top. Bob Jones' father's comment about Catholicism and Mormons was about their religion. He said they're cults. So what? That is the whole point of religious freedom: you can say bad things about other people's religions.

That is what Bush was thinking when he went to Bob Jones in the first place. But now that he has been criticized by liberals, it would take guts to say that. And "a courageous respectable conservative" is an oxymoron.

RESPECTABLE TIMING

After losing his tax deductibility over it and fighting for years, Bob Jones has abandoned his University's ban on interracial dating. He says it obscures his religious message. As before, the problem with this belated justification is his timing.

It was at the height of the liberal anti-flag push that Bob Jones switched sides and called for the removal of the Confederate flag from the South Carolina capitol dome. Business leaders and the Board of Trustees at the Citadel had all lined up in a demand to remove the flag, and the NAACP had just declared a boycott on South Carolina.

At that moment, Bob Jones declared the flag should come down. He said that had nothing to do with the momentary popularity it bought him with the liberals. He said he had suddenly decided that the flag should come down, and he quoted an almost two-thousand-year-old passage from St. Paul to the effect that convinced Christians should yield in minor things to those of lesser faith.

I emphasize the age of that quote to point out what a coincidence it was that Bob Jones discovered it just when the liberals needed him.

Bob Jones and the Republicans backing down on everything at this moment will cost us dearly. As Israel has found out, if you yield to terrorists, the human cost always ends up being greater in the long run.

Once again, Bob Jones has shown the liberals that, if they shout loud enough, we will cave in.

Many a person has been moaning to me about the fact that the Confederate flag is now classed with the swastika as a liberally-banned symbol. In Boston, the SHAMROCK has been banned in some places for the same reason! But this has been a natural result of a long process.

When the courts made it law that you could fire someone for being a right wing extremist -- a bigot -- but not for being a left wing extremist -- a Communist -- no one objected. We were too afraid of being labeled bigots to stand up for the rights of hard-core racists. Europe freely attacks the US death penalty, but we consider their ban on right wing extremism to be their own business. Meanwhile, European countries now have proud former Soviet supporters IN THEIR RULING COALITIONS, while they unite to ban Austria from including an anti-immigration in party in its government.

So, when the liberal full-court press is on, Bob Jones backs down again.

As I said, the term "courageous respectable conservative" is an oxymoron. So naturally if we keep courting respectability we are going to keep backing down like Bob Jones and Bush. So naturally the terrorists will win this time and demand more the next. The Confederate flag is just the beginning. We are just beginning to pay for our former cowardice.

This has always been the way of the left. They would attack the far right, then the not-so-far-right. By this time, what was once the moderate right is now the "far right." All they needed was for the rightists to abandon people they did not approve of, and wait for the leftists to come to them. That is exactly what we have done.

If we are going to be Southern nationalists, we are going to have to pay some attention to international stands. If we wait until Austria is crushed and everyone to the right of us is banned by the international community, an independent South is going to mean exactly nothing.

After crushing Austria and other European rightists, the international community will not tolerate any deviation from a Southern nation. They will simply ban us from doing anything the United States Government is not already doing. They will not tolerate privately-owned firearms or a death penalty. They will not stop until everyone, including the independent South, does what they want them to.

And, as in American hiring, only the right will be banned. The extreme left will have all the rights, and they will be enforced by the international community and our own Confederate courts.

And, of course, we will claim we are only backing down because the Bible told us to.

March 18, 2000 - WHEN WAS THE LAST TIME YOU SAW A NEWSPAPER ARTICLE ABOUT A PERSON USING A WEAPON IN SELF-DEFENSE?

March 18, 2000 - OUR MASTERS ARE UPSET THAT THEY NO LONGER OWN THE GUN PERMIT BUSINESS

WHEN WAS THE LAST TIME YOU SAW A NEWSPAPER ARTICLE ABOUT A PERSON USING A WEAPON IN SELF-DEFENSE?

The right to bear arms cannot survive tragedy after tragedy being reported in the news as a simple failure to control guns. We never read about the two million times a year that private guns are used to prevent crime.

Professor John Lott of the University of Chicago did extensive studies of FBI statistics and wrote a book called "More Guns, Less Crime." It gave instance after instance of how armed, HONEST citizens prevent crime. He did statistical studies proving this fact. The book lived up to its title.

Let me tell you how effective Lott is. I saw a 1990's debate between him and gun control advocates on public television. No one is going to accuse public television of not giving the left all the odds it can. Lott was outnumbered, but he made an unbeatable case that when the honest public is armed, crime goes DOWN. His case was so good that the gun control advocates were reduced to arguing that allowing honest people to carry concealed weapons had NO EFFECT on violent crime!!!

Now here is the CRITICAL point: this occurred in the mid-nineties. This was when concealed weapons permit laws were being passed that gave the public more access to firearms. In response to these proposals, these exact same anti-gun people were shouting "BLOODBATH!" They were saying that if these new concealed weapons permit laws were passed, "It will be Dodge City!"

Respectable conservatives don't remember that, but I do. The very second a roomful of these anti-gun screamers had to face a knowledgeable scholar, they were reduced to arguing that the permits shouldn't be allowed because they didn't MATTER.

The laws they were screaming against were passed and they have worked beautifully.

If the nonsense they were screaming in the mid-nineties were repeated today, the anti-gun nuts would be laughed to shame. If respectable conservatives had any memory at all, the gun-grabbers would be in

very deep trouble. But respectable conservatives are an intellectually inbred bureaucracy of city people who know nothing about guns. Whenever the subject comes up, they are truly pathetic.

The problem is that they speak for us in public debate, and we never object.

OUR MASTERS ARE UPSET THAT THEY NO LONGER OWN THE GUN PERMIT BUSINESS

There have always been concealed weapons permits, despite the fact that liberals speak of them as if they were a right wing innovation. What has changed, and outraged the left, is the WAY the right wants such permits to be handed out. In South Carolina and other states, it used to be that you got a gun permit because you knew the right people. Now you have to EARN a permit, and the media considers that a dangerous and evil thing.

The old concealed weapons permits, the ones you got by knowing the right people or having political pull, had no restrictions. In South Carolina, if you helped the sheriff win his election or otherwise pleased him, he could appoint you a Special Deputy, an unpaid police officer. You would get a badge and the right to carry a gun anywhere a deputy could. Judges and other petty officials got unlimited permits routinely.

For citizens in general, there were no permits except under extreme conditions. If you wanted a permit and didn't have political pull, the burden of proof was on you.

Then came what is now known as "the concealed weapons permit movement." A majority of states, including almost all of the South and west, have passed laws which shift the burden of proof from the honest citizen to the petty officials. In other words, if a person proves his qualifications to have a permit, and if the CITIZEN feels he needs one, it is up to the police to prove he SHOULDN'T have one.

This movement, from political pull for permits to making people EARN permits, has infuriated the media, the political left, and many of our pettiest petty officials.

South Carolina's version of the EARNED permit is contained in the Law Abiding Citizens' Self-Defense Act of 1996. To get a permit, one must take a day long course, demonstrate competency on the firing range, and then undergo a three-month background check by SLED.

As what was called "the concealed weapons movement" advanced, the establishment panicked. To repeat, there had always been a concealed weapons law in every state and every county in the United States. The change was that one would have to EARN a permit rather than simply being a buddy with the local authorities.

"There will be a BLOOD BATH!" shrieked the press from coast to coast. Since then, some 24,500 permits have been EARNED in South Carolina. Nation-wide, the number of EARNED concealed weapons permits is well into the hundreds of thousands.

For the last half of the 1990's, the national and local media searched hungrily for some instance of misuse of these permits. There were NONE.

Since respectable conservatives have no memory, no one will ever remind the media that they screamed "BLOODBATH" when these EARNED permits were proposed. It would embarrass them, and respectable conservatives never say anything to embarrass liberals. That's how they stay respectable.

So, now that we have hundreds of thousands of permits and many years of experience with EARNED gun permits, it would seem obvious that the opponents were not only wrong, but laughably wrong.

Back when the establishment was screaming "BLOOD BATH!," liberal legislators could not stop the EARNED permits, so they did what the gun grabbers considered the next best thing. They heaped special restrictions on EARNED concealed weapons permits that were never even considered for permits handed out under the old buddy system.

Clearly, permit holders have earned the right to rid themselves of the special restrictions they are under, the ones no one even considered putting on permits awarded under the old buddy system.

Back in 1996, when they were shrieking "BLOODBATH!," the press demanded that people not be allowed to carry guns to the bank. They had lines like, "the law would allow armed men to go into banks!," evoking images of bank robbers. Needless to say, not one instance of any problem has been recorded anywhere when a permit holder carried his gun into a bank.

Now the papers say, "people carrying guns in bars!!" Right now, someone who has an EARNED concealed weapons permit cannot carry his gun into any place that serves alcoholic beverages, including most restaurants. Once again, no such restriction was ever considered when permits were awarded on the buddy system.

It turns out that criminals like this restriction. Criminals know that if they see someone coming out of a restaurant that sells beer, the law guarantees that that person will not be armed.

Grassroots, South Carolina (<http://www.scfirearms.org>) is leading the growing fight in the state legislature to get these absurd limitations removed.

Many states do not have this restriction. And once again, where this restriction has not been applied, there has, once again, been NO INSTANCE of abuse of it by EARNED permit holders.

Nonetheless, once again the shriek is "BLOODBATH!," and all permit holders are portrayed as drunken bums who will shoot up the place.

There is a fundamental point here, though, that goes beyond whether or not a person has a gun permit. The theory of the media is that the average law-abiding citizen is exactly the same as the criminal population. A person who EARNS a permit and undergoes a three-month background check to prove he has no criminal record or any other problem, should be banned from self-defense as completely as a career criminal. They are the same.

This is not only factually absurd, it hideously insulting, and not just to permit holders. It reflects the establishment's attitude toward all law-abiding citizens. It is time for everyone to back the regular citizens who have EARNED their permits.

March 25, 2000 - JOHN ROCKER RETURNS TO REBEL YELLS

March 25, 2000 - THE COMING FOREIGN POLICY SELLOUT

March 25, 2000 - MCCAIN: SECRETARY OF STATE OR SECRETARY OF DEFENSE?

JOHN ROCKER RETURNS TO REBEL YELLS

John Rocker, the baseball player for Atlanta, made politically incorrect remarks about New York City. Those liberals in baseball who claim they love free speech suspended him for it.

When he returned from suspension, he received a standing ovation from the fans. They cheered, they roared, they rebel-yelled.

Funny, I didn't see much about that in press, which has faithfully reported every condemnation of Rocker.

People, real people, don't like political correctness. Real people consider political correctness a lot more of a threat to their own freedom of speech than any bigoted remarks by a baseball player might be. So when the libs condemned Rocker, he became a hero to the fans.

So while respectable conservatives crawl and drool at every media condemnation, they could gain popularity by standing on their hind legs and defending the rights of those who offend the left.

Don't hold your breath until that happens.

THE COMING FOREIGN POLICY SELLOUT

Belatedly, Bush people have begun to hit the real weakness of the McCain-Feinold-Gore "reform" program. As their poll numbers against Gore went steadily down, they became desperate. And, as I have pointed out before, it is only when they get desperate that respectable conservatives ever make a point (See December 25 article, "Bush Actually Makes A Point"). After being beaten half to death with the issue, they are finally pointing out that this so-called reform would cut Republican financial sources but leave union bosses absolutely free to spend all they want to.

But on the gun issue, Bush people are, like all respectable conservatives, utterly helpless. Former Democratic Texas Governor Ann Richards, whom Bush beat to become governor, was discussing the fact in a recent debate that she opposed the concealed weapons law Bush signed. No one asked her the obvious question, whether those permits have been misused at all in Texas.

As liberals have already pointed out, Gore is going to beat Bush to death with that concealed weapons law, not because it wasn't a success, but because respectable conservatives can't deal with it.

But the one gaping difference between regular Republicans and McCain that was almost totally unmentioned was the one that a Southern nationalist might find most critical. That is the difference in foreign policy.

Only Buchanan is pressing this issue.

The use of American armed forces to mix ethnic groups in Europe is of critical importance to the left. It is something Gore and McCain are united about, with McCain the more fanatical. Liberals don't mention it, which indicates they don't want it emphasized. Naturally, if liberals don't want it mentioned, respectable conservatives aren't going to bring it up.

Respectable conservatives will not discuss an issue where liberal policy is potentially disastrous. Such issues are also the ones on which they are most likely to sell us out.

MCCAIN: SECRETARY OF STATE OR SECRETARY OF DEFENSE?

The fact that McCain lost the nomination is not the end of his usefulness to the media and other liberals.

McCain defied almost the entire Republican Party in his desperation to enforce the multiethnic policy on Kosovo with American blood.

The media did not even mention that issue in their coverage of the campaign. Bush naturally did not mention it either.

Bush could have gained considerably in the campaign by pressing this issue to a Republican primary electorate which is not enamored of fighting liberal wars. But the liberal media made it clear that this would not be respectable. So Bush and his crew went along. It is distinctly possible that the Kosovo situation is going to blow up between now and November. If Bush issued warnings on this, such a blowup will put Gore in a bad position. No respectable conservative is going to press an issue that could be that embarrassing for a liberal.

So clearly Bush has to somehow adopt the liberal foreign policy position.

But there is a limit to how openly even a moderate Republican like Bush can sell out. He would do anything to court liberal favor, but openly advocating their foreign policy right now would be too much. But it can be done under a Bush Administration. When it comes to moderate Republicans, liberals find nothing impossible if they really want it.

And they really want a Clinton-McCain foreign policy.

So it turns out that the media are just worried to death about the split between Bush and McCain. They look forward to a "deal" between them. All for the good of the Republican Party, of course. I must have heard liberals mention McCain for Secretary of State at least five times recently. If not Secretary of State, one liberal opined, then McCain might accept Secretary of Defense.

Now I wonder why they happened to pick those two positions? Secretary of State and Defense are the positions which determine where American force will be used. After such a deal, does anybody think McCain would quietly accept the present Republican policy on ethnic mixing and the like?

As the British would say, "Not bloody likely." With all the media and his own Defense or State Secretary demanding American blood for liberal policies, how long would a weak-kneed middle of the road Republican hold out?

Liberals know that all they need to do is get some Americans killed for liberal foreign policy. As soon as that happens, liberal foreign goals will become a holy cause to American conservatives. This is what happened in Vietnam. Conservatives started by demanding that America either fight to win or get out, but liberals did not want to fight Communists the way they would a right-wing enemy, and they did not

want to be the ones to lose America's first war. So they chose the gradual escalation of the war in Vietnam.

As soon as Americans began dying over there, conservatives declared American blood expendable. Here was a chance for a vast increase in military expenditures, the one thing for which conservatives salivate. You may expect the same reaction when Bush adopts a McCain war policy.

April 1, 2000 - LEFTISTS SHOW US HOW NOT TO DEAL WITH TOMORROW'S TERRORISM

April 1, 2000 - MCCAIN: THE NEW ROCKEFELLER REPUBLICAN

LEFTISTS SHOW US HOW NOT TO DEAL WITH TOMORROW'S TERRORISM

Technology moves very fast. Those of us who are older carry around time capsules in our bodies. Most of us still have some of the old silver fillings in our mouths. And on our arm, all of us from my generation have a piece of yesterday -- a smallpox vaccination scar.

Everybody had to have them. As late as the 1970s, you had to prove you had had a fairly recent smallpox vaccination in order to travel into many countries. Now the only living smallpox viruses left are in a handful of laboratories. Smallpox does not exist outside of a few laboratories. The World Health Organization has recommended that even those disease stocks be destroyed.

Smallpox is probably the only disease that human effort has so far destroyed completely all over the world. But Europe got rid of leprosy almost as completely centuries ago.

You know all those movies you see where evil superstitious Europeans are forcing innocent lepers to live in their own places? This is usually presented as the old fashioned ignorant approach to such diseases.

But in the real world, it worked. Leprosy was made to disappear from Europe by isolating it.

The reason WHO says the remaining smallpox virus should be destroyed is because of its potential use in biological warfare.

We are facing a large number of threats of this sort. We are trying to prevent nuclear proliferation, bacteriological warfare, and other types of mass terrorism. The only real answer is to take advantage of our advancing technology to spread the threatened population out. As I explained on March 6, 1999, in "How Tomorrow's Confederacy Will Deal With Tomorrow's Reality" the real solution to this is to use our technology to SPREAD OUT.

The ruling leftist policy is the exact opposite of this rational policy. We are told that the solution to our problem is to force Serbians into living as closely as possible to Albanians, blacks and whites must be mixed together in prescribed percentages for racial balance, and the like.

None of this is necessary for the PROFESSED liberal aims. Through computer technology and simple travel, we will in any case have more CULTURAL INTERACTION between different groups than we have ever had before. We don't have to be jammed together physically to have cultural interaction.

Like everything else liberals propose, forcing groups together won't work. Once again, we must do the opposite of what liberals propose. In a world where a single extremist can destroy a city, we will have to spread out, not integrate.

I have watched liberals for decades, and this is typical. Every day it becomes more possible for terrorists to kill everybody in a confined area. The liberal solution to this is to jam as many potentially hostile groups as closely together as possible.

Can you imagine that leftists would recommend anything else?

MCCAIN: THE NEW ROCKEFELLER REPUBLICAN

I don't think we can be warned too much about how similar today's McCain is to yesterday's Rockefeller. And not since Rockefeller has there been a Republican the national media loved as dearly as they do John McCain.

They had reason to love them both.

Rockefeller did his work for the leftists a generation ago.

Back then, Rockefeller pushed their policies as an openly liberal Republican. Such outright liberalism has been discredited, even for a national candidate of the Democratic Party. So today McCain does his work for the liberals, not as a liberal, but as the most respectable of respectable conservatives.

The fact that McCain lost the nomination is not the end of his usefulness to the media and other liberals. Rockefeller did his best job for them after he had lost a nomination. That was in 1960.

In 1960, the Republican Convention that nominated Richard Nixon for president passed a very, very conservative platform. The conservatives who would nominate Goldwater in 1964 were already showing their muscle.

As a moderate, Nixon of course immediately sold out the conservative Republican convention. Conservatives had always supported Dewey, a liberal Republican, when he was nominated in 1944 and 1948. Needless to say, liberals were not so accommodating. Governor Rockefeller of New York made it clear that, unless Nixon rewrote the platform for him, he and his fellow liberal Republicans would not support him.

So Nixon got on the phone in California and called Governor Rockefeller in New York. Over the next several hours, he and Rockefeller rewrote the whole platform. Republican conservatives at the convention did what they always did. Nixon kicked them in the teeth and they came up smiling. He told them to do what Rockefeller wanted and, as always, they did. Not one conservative even hinted he might not support Nixon.

To pile it on thicker still, Nixon made Henry Cabot Lodge, a Massachusetts liberal, his running mate.

No one today understands how difficult it was for Nixon to lose the 1960 election.

Even after he made every possible mistake, it took Democratic Mayor Daley of Chicago all night following the 1960 election to steal enough votes to put Illinois in Kennedy's column. The margin was razor-thin.

Theodore H. White, in "The Making of a President, 1960," made a point which no one since has disputed. He reviewed the tight races in state after state in the election, citing one after another where Kennedy barely won. White pointed out that if Nixon had been just a little bit more conservative, he would have carried a few more Southern states, and won the election. He also said that if Nixon had moved to the left, he would have carried several eastern states and won.

It took a liberal Rockefeller and a moderate Nixon all night on the coast-to-coast telephone to work out the only deal that could have lost the 1960 election!

The liberal media look for the same kind of performance from their new ally in the Republican Party, John McCain. You can almost see the liberal media's tongue hanging out as they discuss a deal between Bush and McCain. If history is any guide, it will be a second Deal of the Century for the left, a repeat of 1960.

April 8, 2000 - RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES LINE UP AGAINST FLAG

April 8, 2000 – FINGERPRINTS

April 8, 2000 - DISCRIMINATION AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

April 8, 2000 - CUBA IS UNIQUE

RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES LINE UP AGAINST FLAG

Liberals have fired most of their ammunition against the Confederate flag flying over the South Carolina State House. Now they're calling in their reliable second team: respectable conservatives. William Buckley's NATIONAL REVIEW has been demanding the flag come down since it got its latest editor, Richard Lowry. Since he took over, NR has stopped capitalizing the word "Southern."

NR's latest effort was a screaming piece called "Rebels Yell," which caused at least one Charlestonian to write them saying he was canceling his subscription.

In other words, NATIONAL REVIEW has given up its pretense of being a spokesman for the American right nation-wide. It has always been a theocratic, east coast magazine making a few gestures to others. NR has simply given up the gestures.

David Broder, the token semi-conservative writer for the Washington Post, has come out with an article demanding that the flag come down. Like McCain, his comment on Bob Jones ending its policy against interracial dating was a kick in the teeth. Funny how people who back down get no respect.

In other words, we have the usual formula: liberals have screamed their lungs out on the flag issue, so their second team has volunteered to earn its "respectable" credentials again. Stabbing other conservatives in the back is the main job of respectable conservatives.

FINGERPRINTS

A study shows that women with hands that are shaped more like men's hands are more often lesbian than those who don't have this feature. This is statistical CORRELATION. This does NOT mean that ALL women with man-like hands are lesbians. It means that a few MORE of them are.

We have the same sort of general correlations with IQ. Height CORRELATES with IQ. That is, the average tall man is more intelligent than the average small man. But Napoleon was smarter than almost anybody. Health also CORRELATES with IQ. People with better brains TEND to have better health. But the greatest expert on cosmology -- the physical nature of the universe -- is confined to a wheel chair.

What really convinced me that this lesbian study was valid was that a social scientist declared it was "simplistic." Just about every time a liberal social scientist says something is "simplistic" it turns out to be right. It turns out that common sense is right, and the liberal social scientist can't stand that. Which is why they're always wrong.

Lesbianism is a male characteristic in a woman. So are male-like hands. It makes sense they would CORRELATE. Naturally, a liberal social scientist has to say that any study which bears out common sense can't be right.

Which is another way of saying that if common sense is right, leftism is wrong.

DISCRIMINATION AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

A question is growing in my mind that is also growing in the mind of anyone who watches the TV show, "COPS." That question: Can a real-life policeman of any color really ignore race?

This question has grown with the shooting of unarmed black men in New York City, where it went along with a successful crackdown on crime.

A crackdown on crime means taking clues very seriously. There is nothing illegal about being young. There is nothing illegal about driving at 3 in the morning. There is nothing illegal about driving very, very slowly on most city streets.

But if a policeman sees young people driving very slowly at 3 am on a city street, he takes notice. Why? Because of a CORRELATION. All young people driving slowly at 3 am in a city street are not breaking the law. But a lot MORE people like that will be buying or selling drugs or doing something else illegal than drivers in general.

Likewise, if someone pulls something out of his pocket and points it at you on a city street in the dark, the chances that it is a gun is simply a lot higher if that person has black skin. If you are a lawyer for the ACLU, it's easy to say skin color is irrelevant in a speech in a nice safe courtroom. But if you are a cop on a dark street you had damned well better know the difference.

This is terribly unfair to most black people who are not lawbreakers. But it is also not the fault of the police. As I explained on July 17, 1999, "Racial Profiling Is the Fault of Black Criminals."

CUBA IS UNIQUE

On the issue of returning Elian Gonzalez to his father in Cuba, both liberals and conservatives have been making comparisons that are not applicable. Leftists point to examples where the United States has returned children to Syria, for example. They say Cuba is the same thing.

But mostly, of course, liberals are playing the race card. They are saying returning immigrants to Jamaica or Haiti is the same as this case in Cuba.

Conservatives who are against returning him to Cuba talk about children in dictatorships and oppressive regimes in general.

To my surprise, one conservative actually had the guts to ask a black congresswoman who was demanding the boy be returned whether she would ask the same thing if the child had been a black refugee from South Africa in the days of apartheid. She looked him straight in the eye and lied that she would.

But even that is not fair to oppressive regimes in general. There was no blockade to keep the general population inside Franco's Spain or South Africa. No rightist regime ever built a wall with machine gun towers to keep its people in, as ALL Communist regimes must.

Certainly no black mother ever died getting her child out of South Africa under apartheid. Blacks were free to leave. Their only major problem with black population movement was the massive flow of blacks INTO South Africa.

Castro announced that if all of the twenty-something people he wanted to come to the United States were not allowed in, he wouldn't allow any of them to come. He withdrew that comment, but it was a good reminder that you only get out of Cuba with special permission.

So after that, on CNN's Crossfire, a black congresswoman said Elian should go back to Cuba and decide to leave at thirteen or so if he wanted to. The pet conservative on the show just sat there silent. This proved once again that she has the room temperature IQ that is required to be a respectable conservative.

April 15, 2000 - BARBARA WALTERS WONDERES WHY GAYS ARE SO SUPERIOR

April 15, 2000 - CONSERVATIVES NEVER SAY, "HOW DARE YOU!"

April 15, 2000 - THE RIGHT ARGUMENT IS EVERYTHING

BARBARA WALTERS WONDERES WHY GAYS ARE SO SUPERIOR

Barbara Walters did a piece some time ago on the death of so many male clothes designers from AIDS. As everybody had long known, male designers of female clothes were largely, if not all, homosexual.

It has been forgotten, by liberals and therefore by respectable conservatives, that you were not allowed to say that in the past.

AIDS made this fact too obvious to dismiss. So Barbara Walters ended her program speculating about the special brilliance of homosexual males that made them natural geniuses in the field of clothing design. Naturally, one wouldn't be allowed to say that the reason gays control that field is because

female clothing design is absolutely a matter of personal opinion, and therefore a perfect place for a single group like gays to take over.

You're not allowed to say that, so naturally that is exactly what I will point out here.

The "special talent" gay males have for designing clothes is the same "special talent" black men used to have for being railroad porters. After all, they were all black, so it must be a special talent, right?

Straight white males dominate the management of most major firms. Can you imagine Barbara Walters doing a piece on how straight white males have some sort of "special talent" for high level management?

CONSERVATIVES NEVER SAY, "HOW DARE YOU!"

The one good thing about liberals is that they are not morons when it comes to argument. If you watched conservatives only, you would think everybody in American politics was retarded. For weeks, every media outlet has been deploring the awful Cubans in Miami for making the Gonzalez case political. They condemned it, they urged us all to stop being emotional.

Above all, they condemned the knee-jerk reaction against Castro.

And the next time children get killed in school by some nutcase, what will liberals say? They will say, "This is just more proof that we must carry out the liberal program of gun control."

No national conservative has ever repeatedly said, as liberals do over Elian, "How dare you use such a tragedy for your political purposes!" No national conservative ever will.

It has been mentioned -- but very briefly -- that in each case the liberal gun control policy would have no effect whatever on the tragedy the liberals are using at the time. When the black man used an illegal automatic weapon in New York to slaughter whites in what he declared was a hate crime, no one argued that gun laws could have stopped that hate crime. But liberals used it shamelessly, and one of the white victims' wives got herself elected to congress on a gun control platform.

When a six-year-old white girl was murdered by a little black boy of the same age in a pure hate crime, it was grounds for another liberal demand for gun control laws. Those laws would not have stopped there being an illegal weapon in the crack house the boy lived in, but that made no difference at all.

No conservative will ever get excited and furious about the shameless leftist use of tragedy to push their political program, though that program admittedly has no relation to the tragedy.

Conservatives are pathetic, because liberals select their leaders. Respectable conservatives can always be counted on to miss the point.

THE RIGHT ARGUMENT IS EVERYTHING

I often express frustration in these pages over the fact that conservatives simply never get their arguments right. To some, this may sound pedantic, or it may sound like I am simply a political expert who is unduly concerned with details.

Wrong. What I am saying repeatedly here is that the whole mental process of conservatives is off base. You simply cannot deal with the real world unless you understand what the real questions are. Conservatives get their arguments wrong because they do not understand what the real questions are.

Elian Gonzalez is a case in point. Conservatives talked about everything but the real point. So, as usual, they lost.

Conservatives argued that Castro has an oppressive regime. They argued that America was a better place for a child than Cuba. They argued that the dead mother had the rights to the child, not the living father.

And, because they missed the whole point, they lost every single argument. Certainly the United States is a better place than Cuba for a child to grow up in. But if you follow that argument, as liberals were quick to point out, every child in every Caribbean country has a right to be in the United States. Liberals naturally hit the race card on that one, as they had every right to do. Certainly Haiti is horrible place for its children. It is also oppressive, despite or because of the huge sums the United States spent to save it from dictatorship.

If a Cuban child has the right to get out of a bad place, why not any black child, too?

And conservatives, true to their ever-losing strategy, said exactly the wrong thing about the dead mother and custody.

I think almost everybody is aware of the raw deal fathers get in custody battles. I have seen practicing female dope addicts get custody over clean and sober fathers. Conservatives saw a mother who died getting her child out of Cuba and, as always, they got precisely the wrong message out of it. Instead of emphasizing the fact that she died in an escape from a national prison, they talked about how she died to give her child a better life.

As I pointed out last week, the ONLY -- let me repeat that -- the ONLY valid argument against Elian going back to Cuba is the nature of Cuba as A NATIONAL PRISON.

It was never mentioned. It was never mentioned once. As I pointed out last week, when a black congresswoman said that Elian should go to his father now and make his decision about where he wanted to live when he was thirteen or so, the conservative on Crossfire just sat there, and didn't say a word. But no other conservative made that point, either.

If they had pressed this point, conservatives might have gotten some sort of concessions about Elian having the right to decide when he was older. Such a promise may have been of little practical use, but it would have kept the question open, and the emphasis right.

As it is, the question never came up. So now if he is sent back Elian will be just one more trapped Cuban, and no one will ever be able to protest that. That is because, in order to get to the point, conservatives would have to first screw their heads on right. That means getting their argument right.

April 22, 2000 - THIS REPUBLICAN PARTY "PRINCIPLE" HAS NOT CHANGED
April 22, 2000 - WHEN DOES FREE SPEECH BECOME HATE SPEECH?

April 22, 2000 - BUCKLEY SAYS PINOCHET SHOULD HAVE BEEN TURNED OVER TO LEFTISTS.

April 22, 2000 - IF WE DON'T DUMP RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES, WE WILL LOSE EVERYTHING

THIS REPUBLICAN PARTY "PRINCIPLE" HAS NOT CHANGED

After Reconstruction ended, the Southern Republican Party began to dwindle. By the beginning of the twentieth century, no one was elected on the Republican ticket to anything in the Deep South, so everybody with any ambition left it.

In fact, there was only one reason to be a Southern Republican by 1900. Every state had a minimum number of delegates to the national Republican Convention every four years. So each four years a tiny group in each state would get together, call themselves Republicans and send some people to sell their convention votes to the highest bidder.

This was not a secret. At the 1912 convention, a reporter asked a drunk Southern delegate how the South would be voting. The delegate replied, "Some of us are for Taft, some of us are for Roosevelt, and ALL of us are for SALE!"

The majority of South Carolina's Republicans in the state senate voted to pull down the Confederate flag that 76% of Republicans in their primary had voted to keep flying over the state house. Their openly stated reason? They said that standing on principle might cost money, estimated at a maximum of a dollar or two per South Carolinian per year. Principle is nice, they agreed, but money is nicer.

So the only difference between the majority of Republican state senators today and Republican delegates in 1912 is that in 1912 they held out for a better price.

WHEN DOES FREE SPEECH BECOME HATE SPEECH?

Leftists, with the help of respectable conservatives, are now trying to limit access to "Hate" on the Internet. They are also trying to get the power to decide what "hate" is, and the right to ban it everywhere.

How much power should we give liberals and respectable conservatives to decide what kind of speech should be banned? The left and its conservative allies say that free speech should be permitted, but hate speech should be banned.

So one regularly runs into a question that is debated in the media these days: "When does free speech become hate speech?"

The answer is: "From the word 'Go.'" All MEANINGFUL free speech is somebody's Hate Speech.

You don't have freedom of speech if you are only allowed to say things that don't offend anybody. Real freedom of speech means precisely the opposite. Your freedom of expression doesn't need any protection if you only say things that everybody approves of.

So the first amendment right to free expression is only necessary to protect you when you say something that offends somebody. In other words, every word of real free speech is what somebody would call hate speech.

Both Hitler and Stalin could have readily agreed with the present liberal-respectable conservative definition of free speech. Both Hitler and Stalin thought that anybody should be allowed to say anything they wanted to, so long as it didn't offend their deeply held beliefs.

For example, Hitler would agree that you could say anything you want to, so long as it didn't offend a dedicated Aryan like himself. Stalin would allow you free speech except where he felt that your words were offensive or harmful to his ideas of what was good for the working class.

In other words, all dictators take the same position our American censors do. The dictators agree that people can say anything that isn't "offensive" to important opinions. They just have a little different answer as to what is "offensive."

But Stalin, Hitler, liberals and respectable conservatives all start from the same place: Some OPINIONS must be outlawed as Hate Speech.

BUCKLEY SAYS PINOCHET SHOULD HAVE BEEN TURNED OVER TO LEFTISTS

On April 8, in "Respectable Conservatives Line Up Against Flag," I showed how respectable conservatives earn their "respectable" title by knifing other rightists in the back. My specific example was NATIONAL REVIEW, which is answering liberal cries to help them against our Confederate flag in South Carolina.

William Buckley, who owns NATIONAL REVIEW, might be called the founder of modern respectable conservatism.

The publisher of NATIONAL REVIEW, William Rusher, did the Foreword to my first book, A Plague on Both Your Houses. In that Foreword he had to separate himself from my nasty remarks about Buckley. Since then, Buckley has continued to earn my attacks and liberal applause.

Buckley's latest offering was one of his daily columns reprinted in the April 3 edition of his magazine. In it he says that Chile's Pinochet should have been arrested while in England and sent for trial to Spain (Please see November 13, 1999, "Another European Government Kidnaps a Foreign Rightist" for background).

Buckley freely admits that no leftist, specifically no Castro or Gorbachev or the like would ever be tried in this way for any crimes, no matter how extreme.

Buckley freely admits that the only reason Pinochet was singled out was because he was a rightist who pushed the Communist government out of Chile. If it had been the other way around, Buckley admits, there would be no question of a trial, much less of extradition. To her credit, Margaret Thatcher backed Pinochet while he was in Britain and raised Cain about the British government's attempt to extradite him to Spain, saying it was "an act worthy of a totalitarian state."

But Buckley, as a respectable conservative, says Spanish leftists should have been allowed to try Pinochet. Buckley is right in there with the leftists demanding that rightists they don't approve of should be tried.

This is a typical respectable conservative performance. He states that the left is doing this, and that they would never do it to a leftist. So far, so good, he sounds like a conservative. But in the end, he comes down on the side of the leftist, with the knife stuck firmly in the back of the rightist. That is what respectable conservatives routinely do. Their bottom line is what the leftists want. When you need them most, they're on the other side.

IF WE DON'T DUMP RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES, WE WILL LOSE EVERYTHING

I told people in the 1960s that the Confederate flag would eventually be banned. Like every other correct prediction I have made through the decades -- and Lake High will testify to how many there were -- I was laughed at for saying this.

I saw Germany outlawing the Nazis, but allowing the Communists free reign. The same thing happened in other countries. With respectable conservatives as our spokesmen, we could not demand rights for right-wing haters. But the left demanded all the rights for left wing haters any mainline political party had, and they never apologized for it.

When an American Nazi was lured to Denmark and seized there and taken to Germany for trial, the left cheered. They said he had been "hiding behind the first amendment" in America and putting Hate Speech on the web. Everybody agreed Germany was right to arrest someone got putting "Hate" on his Internet page, though it was legal in America.

But no liberal or respectable conservative will ever say a Communist who puts his hate on a web page is "hiding behind the first amendment." He is "exercising his constitutional rights."

In other words, through our respectable conservative spokesmen, we agreed that the right could be jailed for Hate, but the left was always innocent of it.

Now here is the point: In real world power politics, if you give someone the first step, they will take the second. That is how people who deal in power ALL do things.

The left had no intention of STOPPING with Nazis. They used Nazis to get our agreement that the left had freedom, but the right didn't. Next, they got Britain to agree that Pinochet, who was not a Nazi, could be seized, but no leftist could be. The right became a happy hunting ground for leftists out to crush anything they decide to call a hate crime.

So now the Boston Housing Authority has declared the SHAMROCK to be an official hate symbol! So the Confederate flag is now a sign of Hate, and respectable conservatives shout their agreement. I saw that coming as soon as I saw that the Buckleys of the world are the liberals' official wimps on call.

April 29, 2000 - A HAPPY MCCAIN DELIVERS ANOTHER POUND OF FLESH TO HIS LIBERAL FANS

April 29, 2000 - DAVID IRVING CASE SHOWS THE NEXT LEFTIST MOVE

A HAPPY MCCAIN DELIVERS ANOTHER POUND OF FLESH TO HIS LIBERAL FANS

During the primary campaign, I quoted John McCain as saying that "the Confederate flag is a symbol of slavery and oppression." McCain fans sent me e-mails saying that that was quoted out of context. I saw him say it, and it was not quoted out of context. Someone else said it was the result of editing. I have done a lot of tape editing in my time, and this was no edit.

But someone else did say something about that comment which was true. He said McCain had disavowed that statement on his website. He denied it throughout the primary campaign.

Now McCain has come to South Carolina to say, yes, that is exactly what he did say and that is exactly what he did mean.

McCain is so happy. The press is proud of him again.

During the campaign I pointed out that every one of what the press calls McCain's "bold, independent statements" was devoted to catering to liberals. Not once did he defy THEM, and they loved him for it. As the most respectable of respectable conservatives, McCain was crazy about all that liberal praise. It hurt him to have to bow out on attacking the flag during the primary campaign. It disappointed his leftist fans.

For McCain, all is now well. Granted, he admitted to an outright lie. But he gave the media a way to save its old "He's so honest" mantra. He did this by admitting he was afraid he would lose the primary if he came out against the flag back then. So that makes him honest, you see.

This is supposed to charm us and everybody can say what an honest, fearless man he is.

This is how respectable conservatives operate. Last week, I explained how William Buckley wrote a column in which he started off sounding conservative. It said that Pinochet was being kidnapped from Britain and sent to Spain for trial by leftists because he was a rightist who had driven the Communists out of power in Chile. Buckley stated that that no former leftist official would ever be tried for any crime. So he sounded conservative.

But at the end of his column, Buckley insisted that the leftists should have had their way and gotten Pinochet. Like McCain, he sounds conservative or honest at first, but he reserves the bottom line for anything liberals really want. And what liberals really want is that leftist extremists be treated as misguided idealists and rightists as criminals.

By the same token, McCain saves the bottom line for the liberals.

The bottom line is that he said what I heard in the first place. The bottom line is that he lied about it. But betraying the right is what makes him so bold, independent -- and above all HONEST-- in the eyes of the liberal media.

DAVID IRVING CASE SHOWS THE NEXT LEFTIST MOVE

David Irving is a British historian who has written many books minimizing the Nazi slaughter of Jews. He sued a writer for calling him a "holocaust denier." Naturally he lost, and he lost big. In Britain he

could not get a jury, so a judge decided it. Can you imagine the future of any judge who did NOT condemn him utterly?

The defense had spent some \$3.1 million fighting Irving, and the court ordered Irving to pay the costs of the defense.

Needless to say, Irving has nothing like that much money. But he had asked for contributions during the trial, and a lot of people sent him money to cover his costs. Now the plaintiffs who won the case are petitioning the court to force THOSE DONORS to pay the rest of the \$3.1 million!

Here is where this situation becomes so important to us.

I am about the only political writer on the right who has any memory at all. That is why I am so worried about Buckley selling us out on the Pinochet case. The left started this by luring an outright American Nazi to Denmark, and then having Denmark extradite him to Germany. The charges were, among other things, putting Nazi stuff on the Internet which was illegal in Germany, but NOT illegal in the United States where it was done.

This case established the right of the left to prosecute the right for anything it says anywhere. It also ratified the right of Germany to do this only to extreme rightists, and never to extreme leftists.

The next step occurred when Britain agreed to extradite the rightist, but non-Nazi, Pinochet.

As I pointed out in the last article, the respectable conservative William Buckley earned his "respectable" title once again by agreeing that, while no one would ever prosecute a leftist, the left should have the right to grab any rightist from anywhere and prosecute him.

Does anybody anywhere think this process will end with Nazis and ex-dictators? Or will more and rightists find themselves prosecuted?

I know this sounds alarmist and extreme. I have made this sort of prediction dozens of times over more than forty years. In the end, I don't think I was ever wrong. The nightmares I predicted came true.

I warned about the wild extremes to which the left would take a precedent they had established. Everybody agreed I was being an alarmist. I always ended up being right. The left went as far as I said they would.

The only times I was in error was in cases when I myself thought the left couldn't go much further. They always went farther than anyone at the time would have considered possible.

Now let me ask you this: just how far can the left take a precedent which allows them to sue contributors to rightist causes? How long will it be before the suits against gun makers become suits against contributors to the National Rifle Association?

But the right is going to let this slide because of their desperation to keep liberals from calling them names. Leftists can praise Castro, but no conservative dares to defend the rights of someone who says anything they shouldn't say about Hitler.

Hitler is what the leftists always start with, because they know that the word "racist" will throw every conservative down on his belly, drooling for forgiveness for crimes he never committed.

What I say here strikes everyone else as alarmism, I know. But to me it is just a continuation of over four decades of watching respectable conservatives in action, and watching the whole right sign its own death warrant.

May 7, 2000 - LIBERALS CELEBRATE THE LITTLETON MASSACRE

May 7, 2000 - ONLY MEDIA DEATHS COUNT

May 7, 2000 - MICROSOFT CASE: A LIBERAL GETS MUGGED

LIBERALS CELEBRATE THE LITTLETON MASSACRE

People in Littleton, Colorado say they are very upset about the release of tapes showing the shootings there. I saw one person after another in Littleton expressing disbelief about how their tragedy was being "used."

But I didn't hear any such complaints about the blatant use of the tragedy by liberals.

Like vultures, liberals swoop in on every tragedy that involves a gun, and everybody seems to think they have a right to. Nobody argues that the same old gun control measures would have had any effect at all in preventing the Colorado tragedy. But those who act so outraged about the tape seem to agree that anything the left wants to use as grist for its mill is just fine.

So I am less than impressed by Littleton's supposed outrage at those who made the tape. And the liberal media are right in there showing wild resentment at anyone ELSE who uses their tragedy for their own purposes.

Recently I read an editorial where a liberal was quoting a law enforcement veteran who opposed gun control. Then he said, "In fairness to him, he expressed these views before the Littleton incident." In other words, one was to assume that everybody's mind was changed on gun control by the fact that two kids went on a killing rampage in Littleton, Colorado.

Now let me ask you, is there anyone who can take the liberal crocodile tears about the incident at Littleton seriously? Are any liberals really concerned about the people killed there?

As the anniversary of the tragedy was marked by intense media attention, some people in Littleton were asking why. Why, they ask, don't we put the tragedy behind us?

The reason is that liberals consider Littleton one of the finest occurrences of the decade, and they want to savor it.

ONLY MEDIA DEATHS COUNT

Two people died in a nuclear plant accident in Japan. It's the first time anybody died in nuclear energy production in a developed country. But only those two deaths are important. The Jane Fondaista media is licking its chops, declaring that this will probably end Japan's use of nuclear power.

Japan uses coal and oil for its non-nuclear power. Would anybody care to estimate how many people in South African coal mines and on oil rigs died producing that gigantic amount of energy? No, of course not. People who die producing coal and oil are just working people. They don't matter.

By the same token, the kids that died at Littleton matter. Their deaths can be used to push gun control. Hundreds of people who die defenseless throughout America each week are never mentioned.

So working stiffs who die on oil rigs or in coal mines make no difference. People who die in nuclear incidents matter. People only matter if liberals can use them.

MICROSOFT CASE: A LIBERAL GETS MUGGED

Some years ago, when the Internet was much smaller, I was in a political newsgroup shortly before an election. As we argued along, a message came in from, I believe, billgates@microsoft.com, though I am not sure that was exactly right. What was clear from the address was that it came from Gates himself.

Gate's message was three words long: "A loyal liberal."

Bill Gates is a limousine liberal, just as his family is. They are affluent northwestern people. Despite his own genius, it was his mother's connections that got Gates in with the big-money people. He came a long way on his own brains and drive. But he did not, as the conservative debater on CNN put it, go from being a college dropout operating out of a garage to billionaire status.

I don't like liberals. Their entire program is always aimed at taking what is mine or attacking my people -- white people, Southerners, Americans in general, and even, in their environmentalist extremism, being flatly anti-human.

Respectable conservatives always talk about how nice liberals are. They say leftists are just a bit mistaken. Not me.

I feel that liberalism is evil. It is also unnecessary. We could have a complete, and far better, national dialogue if this kind of traitorous self-hatred were not part of it.

Gates is rich, so conservatives love him dearly.

Conservative reaction to anyone with money is an instant grovel, just as their reaction to anyone with a uniform is an instant grovel.

In my early twenties, I was somewhat that way myself. Then I discovered that we and our heritage are just some more of the things businessmen love to sell out. Anyone who doubts me should take a look at the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce, which was fighting to get rid of our Confederate flag long before the NAACP weighed in.

So when the Justice Department and the Federal judiciary decided to break Microsoft up for being a monopoly, conservatives went straight to the Wailing Wall, tore their clothes, and screamed as loud as they would if somebody wanted a dollar less spent on the Pentagon.

I remember reading William Buckley's columns back when Ferdinand Marcos was a billionaire dictator and invited Buckley to visit. One worshipful column after another poured from Buckley's typewriter. It was stomach-turning worship, even for a respectable conservative falling at the feet of the wealthy.

Respectable conservatives worship Gates. I look at the situation a different way.

Gates is a loyal liberal, and two liberal icons, the Clinton Justice Department and the Federal Judiciary, have united to split his company up.

I was a professional economist and professor in economics, so I realize how hideously complicated the question of monopoly can be, even when it does not involve high tech. What I enjoy about this situation has nothing to do with the merits of the case.

To me, Bill Gates is a liberal getting mugged, and I love it. Liberals who love criminals are asking for me and mine to get mugged, and they consider racial and national treason to be the highest virtue. When they get mugged, they get what they asked for all of us. When their beloved muggers rob and beat them, I see it is as simple justice. They got what they asked that all of us should get.

Gates is a liberal who got mugged by those he and his fellow limousine liberals have wished on all of us. As far as I'm concerned, they deserve each other.

May 13, 2000 - REPUBLICANISM GOES BACK TO THE COUNTRY CLUB BY ABANDONING THE FLAG

May 13, 2000 - WHAT'S NEXT?

REPUBLICANISM GOES BACK TO THE COUNTRY CLUB BY ABANDONING THE FLAG

Back in 1962, I was the first chairman of the Richland County Young Republicans. Lake High and I were Goldwater Republicans. The Republican Party had elected its first two Republican state legislators since Reconstruction in off elections that year.

The Kennedy Administration had sent federal troops into Mississippi to integrate the University of Mississippi. The 101st Airborne Division was in occupation of the town of Oxford. But the Republican Party of South Carolina didn't want to talk about that. It might sound unrespectable.

They could have won if they had done what Barry Goldwater did, and screamed the outrage of a people invaded by a Democratic Administration. Goldwater pointed out something Boston would find out some years later. He said the North should not cheer too loudly, because if Federal force could be used to push Social Progress in the South, it could be used everywhere else in the United States.

His prediction has come true again, and again and again, in every area of American life.

So while our region was actually being invaded, what did the Republican Party talk about in its campaigns for a United States Senate seat and a seat in the US House from our state? They talked about "fiscal responsibility."

Lake and I kept trying to persuade these dolts that, if all they talked about was "fiscal responsibility," they would lose all the working class white vote we could have gotten. Just as we predicted, South Carolina Republicans lost everything in 1962. Not only did they lose the House and Senate seats, they even lost the two state house seats they had won before.

But they were respectable. As good Republicans, they had put the conservative cause back by years, but that was of no importance to them at all. They had kept the South Carolina Republican Party respectable for the country club set. The Chamber of Commerce was very happy with them.

It would be many years before the Republican Party would address the traditionalist vote and get the white working class vote, the votes we now call Reagan Democrats. From 1962 to 1980, when they finally really went after those issues, we may have lost America irretrievably. I spent all those years fighting to make this transition.

And what was our reward for losing America? Republican respectability.

Now it's back.

David Beasley has stated nationally that he lost his governorship by switching sides on the Confederate flag in South Carolina. Here was a losing strategy, and there is nothing that respectable conservatives go for more hungrily than something that is bound to lose. So they smacked their traditionalist constituency in the teeth in 2000 on the flag, exactly as they did in 1962 on Mississippi.

Only the Chamber of Commerce and liberal opinion matters. To hell with the base vote of working whites and people who see themselves as Southerners, not as mere economic conservatives.

Respectable conservatives have no memory. They think they are doing something new. But for someone who has a political memory, they are doing the same old disastrous thing one more time.

WHAT'S NEXT?

I read Barry Goldwater's book, "The Conscience of a Conservative," about 1959. From that day forward I was a Goldwater Republican, and dedicated my efforts to getting him nominated. Lake and I and others pushed the Southern Strategy for winning the presidency long before it became popular. If Kennedy had not been assassinated, something we could hardly anticipate, we would have done very well in 1964, and set the Republican Party's course to conservatism from then on.

But after the trauma of Kennedy's assassination and a change of presidents, the public was not about to consider another upheaval of the kind Goldwater represented. With the press and the left side of the Republican Party against us, we were crushed in 1964 instead of merely defeated. So the party went back to the old, reliable, losing "center" for sixteen disastrous years.

It turned out that had we nominated Goldwater again in 1968, we would have won the presidency easily. The Wallace vote -- 14% of the total vote which was made up mostly of renegade Democrats -- would have gone solidly for Goldwater in 1968. But it did not go for Nixon that year. In 1968, Nixon and Wallace combined got over 57% of the vote. Nixon alone barely won against the Democrat Humphrey.

So the Wallace Democrats did not become the Reagan Democrats until 1980. That probably ruined America irretrievably. Had the Republican conservatives held onto the party four more years, all this could have been avoided. But the conservatives were embarrassed because Goldwater was beaten so badly in 1964. They were terrified liberal Republicans would be mad at them, and they couldn't surrender fast enough.

Within weeks of the 1964 election, moderates and liberals were back in control of the party.

As it turns out, as William Rusher points out in his "Rise of the Right," the Goldwater movement represented the rise of the national conservative movement to national organization and national clout. But as soon as conservatives had built all the power and machinery it took to nominate Goldwater, they quit.

Almost every rising political movement is beaten the first time it gains a national spokesman like Goldwater.

Andrew Jackson lost his first bid for the presidency in 1824, and four years later he took over national politics. The Republicans under Fremont lost in 1856, and, however unfortunate it was, the lesson of history is that they persevered and won in 1860. William Jennings Bryan got his party's nomination and lost three times, but by the time he finished, the old Cleveland Gold Standard Democrats were gone forever. Franklin Delano Roosevelt lost his bid for vice president in 1920 and the man he made the nominating speech for in 1928, Al Smith, lost in a landslide as bad as the one that beat Goldwater.

But FDR's movement has ruled America ever since 1932.

Each of those who made these revolutions treated their first defeat, no matter how bad it was, as the first step. They didn't rush to surrender the way the conservatives did in 1964.

Many groups consider the Confederate flag to be the be-all and end-all of their movement, just as conservatives in 1964 considered their defeat to be the end of everything for them. As a result, they made it just that. They did not realize how far they had come. They had built a major political network of conservatives and had captured control of one of the two national parties. They had a chance to build on all that, and they threw it all away.

The flag battle was a step along the way. We lost that battle, but we came a long way during it. I have seen thousands of South Carolinians march on the streets of Columbia with our flag for the first time in decades. I have seen us organize a true MOVEMENT.

In fact, the flag defeat has taught Southerners a lesson they had to learn for our nationalist movement to succeed. Southerners are forced to realize that we now face a stark, brutal choice. If we remain good little yankees, they will accept nothing less than the total obliteration of everything that makes us Southerners. We are a nation or we are nothing.

Please note I said that we ARE a nation. All the time that Ireland belonged to Britain, it was still a nation. When Poland was repeatedly partitioned between other powers in Europe, it was still a nation.

We are not a people seeking to become a nation. We are a nation seeking our freedom. With this defeat, the eventual success of our movement should begin.

May 20, 2000 - THE DEAD MAN'S FLAG

May 20, 2000 - DEMOCRATS OF PRINCIPLE

May 20, 2000 - THE APPOMATTOX COMPROMISE

THE DEAD MAN'S FLAG

As I have pointed out before, when I was a senior editor of the Partisan, they decided to be Shrewd. Instead of backing the diagonal flag all living Southerners recognize, some at the magazine proposed that the Partisan back a square flag. All they ever showed from then on was the blocky, ugly square flag.

The Partisan did end up backing the flag we had, but their constant cries of "Navy Jack!" did us a lot of harm, and liberals gratefully took up that cry.

You see, said the Partisan, the Klan waved the diagonal flag, so they would give that up and ask for a square flag, the 1860's-style battle flag.

Others have proposed other flags.

But the NAACP doesn't want any of them, so what's the point, except to begin the surrender process?

Back to the real world. In the Year of Our Lord 2000, there are no square flags flying over the heads of any living human beings. Every flag on earth is DIAGONAL, except Nepal's, which is shaped like snake's tongue. The square flag is a period piece, a flag that was carried by men long dead.

If the flag is merely a memorial, with no meaning for modern Southerners, then it should be square. It should also be pure cotton, made in the South, and so forth. It should be, in short, a relic.

And that is exactly what will fly behind the Confederate Monument: a hidden Dead Man's Flag.

For those who are only interested in the South as a memorial, this is just fine. But the simple fact is there is no place in modern America for Southern memorials. We have a Politically Correct national religion, a single culture, called "Multiculturalism," which has been formulated by professors and planners and changes daily according to the feelings of Federal judges. No Southern memorial will last.

Just as everybody's property is nobody's property, everybody's culture is nobody's culture. For those who consider the Confederate flag to be a Dead Man's Flag anyway, this hardly matters.

But those of us who live in the real world know that there is no place for anything Southern in modern American society. We are a nation or we are nothing.

DEMOCRATS OF PRINCIPLE

The only reason conservative Republicans have ever had any influence inside their own party was because they could point to Democrats of principle.

At the 1948 Republican convention, moderates and liberals once again took the party away from the conservative majority and nominated Dewey over Taft. Republican conservatives all took that kick in the teeth and came up smiling and backing Dewey.

The only time Republicans ever won nominating a moderate was when they nominated a war hero or the Democrats went far, far left. So they lost with Dewey.

Over at the Democratic Convention of 1948, Southern Democrats got kicked in the teeth and marched out. Many of them might have backed Taft. With Dewey, they backed the hopeless but principled candidacy of Strom Thurmond. Not one single Northern Republican offered to join them. So moderates and liberals would rule Republicanism for almost two generations, until they made the switch to get Reagan Democrats to vote Republican.

In 1964, we Goldwater Republicans could point to conservative Democrats who were willing to desert the party of their fathers if the Republicans went conservative. Later, they became Reagan Democrats. In 1964, when Goldwater faltered, there was talk of a Wallace third party candidacy. If Goldwater had lost the California primary, there would have been a moderate or Rockefeller nominated.

But if Wallace had been the only conservative left, and Rockefeller had been nominated, how many Republican conservatives might have lined up behind Wallace? Probably practically none. Only Democratic conservatives have ever put principle above party. No matter how near the Democrats they went, moderate and respectable conservative Republicans could always depend on absolutely slavish Republican loyalty.

THE APPOMATTOX COMPROMISE

Robert E. Lee was an honest man, and no modern conservative. He would say that he SURRENDERED at Appomattox. He demanded no conditions. But since Grant unilaterally showed some mercy to the Confederates, modern conservatives would say he COMPROMISED.

On April 9, 1865, General Lee reached what a modern conservative would call a compromise with Union General US Grant. On the one hand, Lee's country ceased to exist, all the principles of the South were lost, the South was condemned to Reconstruction for twelve years and permanent inferiority within the Union. But Grant, on his own, let Lee keep his sword and he let Lee's men keep their horses, and Lee was convinced he was dealing with decent, honorable people.

Lee said later that, if he had known what was in store, he would never have surrendered.

So Appomattox was what today's conservatives would call a compromise. It was the sort of compromise that won half the world for the Communists. They had a regular policy called, "Two steps forward, one step back." They would seize something or demand something, and then the "useful idiots" ruling the West would compromise with them, giving them half of what they had seized or demanded. If socialism hadn't been such a silly economic proposition, they could have ruled the world that way.

So now we have an Appomattox Compromise on the Confederate flag. We got what the legislature would have given us if the Republican Party had never existed in South Carolina. And even that worthless compromise won't last, as we all know. The liberals demanded two steps forward this time, but only got the first step by this "compromise." They'll get the second, as they always do.

And then there's the overarching "compromise" that probably made the United States unsalvageable. This is the one where people tell us that Republicans may sell us out all the time, but one must "compromise." You have to give Republicans your vote no matter what they do to us.

I got into this business fighting Rockefeller Republicans. According to today's conservatives, the Rockefeller Republicans were right. They said that Rockefeller Republicans were "more conservative" than the Democrats, so we should have supported them. But if we had, they would still control the party.

If we always support someone who is "more conservative," no matter what, we will lose everything. We will elect people who will go along with the liberal "two steps forward, one step back." That is, after all, exactly what the "more conservative" strategy is all about. It means compromising ourselves to death.

We are getting messages from people who want to vote for turncoats on the flag because they are Republicans, and are "more conservative."

If South Carolina Democratic legislators, particularly in districts now controlled by Republicans, find they can get our vote against traitors, they will become more conservative, too. So will the Republicans. But if we give our votes to the traitors, both parties will move left, as they have been doing.

If you vote for any traitor, you are asking both parties to move left. And in real world politics, you get what you ask for.

In the politics of the real world, if Republicans can say, "conservatives have nowhere else to go," all their efforts will be dedicated to be being accepted and praised by liberals and moderates.

Let me repeat this for the hundredth time: in politics, you get no more than you ask for. If all you ask for is that someone be a little more conservative than the other side, your time would be better spent learning to accept total defeat.

May 27, 2000 - CNN REPORTS ANTI-ROCKER GOONS IN LOS ANGELES, BUT NOT HIS ATLANTA FANS

May 27, 2000 - KENT STATE CRYBABIES

May 27, 2000 - RULE BY GUIDELINES

CNN REPORTS ANTI-ROCKER GOONS IN LOS ANGELES, BUT NOT HIS ATLANTA

CNN has its headquarters in Atlanta. But when the fans in Atlanta gave John Rocker a screaming welcome after his suspension for making politically incorrect remarks, CNN didn't report on it. They faithfully reported every attack on him, but just happened to miss his supporters.

Fans gave Rocker the wildest greeting anyone had ever received in the Atlanta stadium. CNN wasn't there. But when a bunch of goons threw bottles at him in Los Angeles, three thousand miles away, it

was faithfully and repeatedly reported on CNN in Atlanta. In addition, not a word of criticism of those goons came from Mr. Fonda's network.

If those crowds had been that rude to someone for making pro-Castro remarks, the entire national media would be incensed. As it is, no respectable conservative is going to mention this, so I have to.

KENT STATE CRYBABIES

On the anniversary of the incident, all the media were crying about the killing of Kent State University rioters by National Guardsmen in 1970. Like the Littleton, Colorado incident, Kent State is something liberals love to celebrate.

When I was working on Capitol Hill, my boss, Congressman John Ashbrook, represented an Ohio district in Congress. Each year, while leftists were bemoaning the Kent State "Massacre," he would put a speech into the Congressional Record called, "Kent State Crybabies." The students, he said, were acting like thugs, and they were treated accordingly.

Al Capp, the creator of Lil Abner, who described himself as "a New York Jewish liberal who learned better," made the basic point about the Kent State riot. He wrote, "what these so-called young revolutionaries seem to have forgotten is that, in a revolution, BOTH sides are allowed to shoot."

Capp also said, "It doesn't take a college education to know that the best way to get killed is to throw bricks at armed men." But until Kent State, it was considered the right of leftist rioters to throw bricks, rocks, and anything else at anybody in uniform, and the uniforms could do nothing back.

In one case of a full-scale race riot in the 1960s, the National Guard was sent in WITH EMPTY GUNS, for fear they might hurt some of the thieves and burners they were sent against.

This sort of leftist whining occurred a few years ago in North Carolina. A Communist speaker demanded that the Klan come out and fight. The Klan did come out and fight the Communists. Both sides were shooting. Several Communists were killed, and others wounded. No Klansman got a scratch. The leftists went to court to demand the Klansmen be punished for their violence against poor, innocent, armed Commies.

Even with the special rights the left has, this didn't fly. The Klansmen were acquitted.

Back to Kent State. The average age of the Guardsmen was almost certainly lower than the average age of the students. The Guardsmen were largely a bunch of teenagers facing a screaming mob throwing what could have been dangerous missiles at them..

Liberals make good mobs, because cowards run in packs. If you have ever been on the receiving end of a howling mob, as most active rightists have, you will realize that it takes a lot of maturity and experience to face it calmly.

RULE BY GUIDELINES

Commentary magazine had an article in its April issue called, "The Era of Big Government Is Not Over," which includes a discussion of the way in which government is expanding its power in subtle

but very effective ways. One the most effective of these is by implying -- but not specifically threatening -- punishment if one does not comply.

I was glad to see someone bring this up. I have seen it in action for many years.

Federal agencies are able to get away with specifying race quotas by calling them "goals." This does not sound like a quota. All the agency says is that, if you follow the rules they don't call rules, you will be safe from government action.

These guidelines can be enforced on big companies by implying that they will be denied government contracts if they don't comply. With small businesses, it's even easier.

Many conservatives were surprised to find that small businesses often supported specific racial quotas. The reason for this is that, while large firms have permanent legal staffs, small business is lucky if their response to agency actions, even legal letters, only costs them one or two hundred dollars an hour.

In other words, legal fees amount to a fine on small businesses for doing anything an agency can QUESTION. If you don't meet their "guidelines," you can expect a substantial fine in the form of legal fees, which very soon becomes a burden that can put a small company out of business. An agency can destroy a small business without even bringing a serious action against it.

So when it comes to the hopeless complexity of hiring by race, sex, sexual preference, disabilities, and a dozen other things, small businesses are apt to say, "Please just give a straight, simple QUOTA!"

The latest example of this sort of extralegal takeover by Federal agencies is now occurring between the Justice Department and the Los Angeles Police Department. The Justice Department is deciding whether it will charge the police with civil rights violations. They are openly saying that they won't charge Los Angeles police if the police department adopts "reforms" specified by the Justice Department.

So if the police accept dictation from the central government, there will be no prosecution. Once again, we have here centralization of police authority, not by open fiat, but by threat.

Back when the parents of missing children were trying to get a national tracking system for missing children, liberals fought it tooth and nail. Liberals said it would lead to a "national police force." As always, liberals were afraid the police would unite against their clients, the repeat felons liberals love so much and degenerates in general.

But now that a national police policy is being enforced by the Justice Department for liberal goals and race quotas, we don't hear a peep from the liberals.

June 2, 2000 - GUN CONTROL AND BUSING -- BOTH ARE MEANS TO TEACH CHILDREN THAT THEIR PARENTS ARE POWERLESS

June 2, 2000 - THE COMMONWEALTH OF SOUTH CAROLINA?

GUN CONTROL AND BUSING -- BOTH ARE MEANS TO TEACH CHILDREN THAT THEIR PARENTS ARE POWERLESS

One of the major effects of busing was to show the children that their parents could not protect them. In Louisville, a child would have to show up at the school bus stop at 5 AM, ride for hours, be sent into a hostile environment to school, and spend hours getting home exhausted. And his parents could not do anything. The Powers That Be could do anything to them that they wanted to, and their parents, whom they thought were giants in their world, could do nothing.

Lake High informs me that in Britain, burglars just march into private homes and take wthey want, with the parents and children right there.

In Britain, gun control performs the same function busing did here. In Britain, burglary is much more frequent than in the United States. And the burglars no longer strike when the family is away. Some 43% -- or three in seven -- robberies in Britain occur WHILE THE FAMILY IS AT HOME.

Any means of self-defense is absolutely forbidden by British law, so the thugs just march in.

In the evil and self-defense-minded US, only six percent of burglaries occur when the family is at home.

Can you imagine the effect this has on the children in the United Kingdom? Having their parents at home means absolutely nothing. The thugs just come in and push them out of the way.

The big liberal kick right now is to get all guns out of homes with children in them. Naturally, like busing, this is just for the good of the kids. But it also removes the ability of parents to protect their children.

Every single judge I know of who ordered busing had grandchildren in PRIVATE SCHOOLS. Likewise, Rosie O'Donnell, the leader in this anti-gun movement, has hired an armed bodyguard for her kid. She and the liberal judges can protect their children. But they fight to prevent the average American from doing it.

If you believe that violence is the worst thing that can happen to people, then you have no right to be a free human being. We have to be willing to face violence in extreme cases to protect our freedom AND OUR SELF-RESPECT. But the British are willing to destroy all the faith of their children in them to keep out weapons for self-defense. They think getting rid of weapons by law-abiding people will prevent violence. Obviously, they are wrong. But even if they were right, can you imagine allowing thieves to take over your home, with your children there, for anything in the world.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF SOUTH CAROLINA?

At the University of South Carolina, I was a member of the Euphradian Society, one of two debating societies dating back to 1806. When I joined the Euphradians, there was a single vote at the end of each debate.

That vote only decided which side had made the best case. I pushed through an amendment which changed that to two votes, one on the best debaters, and the second on the question itself.

In other words, we had one vote to decide which side debated best, and another vote to decide which side of the question we actually favored.

Each year the Euphradians held a joint debate with the other debate society, the Clariosophic Society. Once while I was there the debate was on the question: "Resolved, that South Carolina should be become a Commonwealth in the United States."

It is true that Virginia calls itself "The Commonwealth of Virginia" and that Louisiana 's official title is "The Commonwealth of Louisiana," but that was not what we had in mind. What we meant was the real, legal commonwealth status only one area of the United States enjoys: the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico has all the advantages of statehood with the exception of congressmen and senators. It has only a single non-voting delegate in congress. But in return for giving up its right to help legislate for the rest of the country, Puerto Rico HAS ABSOLUTE SOVEREIGNTY WITHIN ITS OWN BORDERS AND THE RIGHT TO SECEDE.

So the question we were debating was this: Would South Carolina be willing to give up its rights to make laws for the rest of the United States in return for complete sovereignty within our own borders?

The vote that resulted was very revealing. On the first vote, it was decided that those arguing for continued statehood had made the best points. But on the second vote A SOLID MAJORITY FAVORED COMMONWEALTH STATUS FOR SOUTH CAROLINA!

Those of us advocating Southern sovereignty today have the impression that no one has favored it since 1860. This vote proves that that is not so. This vote was not the result of a movement, or of any preparation at all. In the late 1950's, when the question came up, a roomful of pretty representative educated Southerners voted that they would prefer sovereignty over our own affairs to running the affairs of the rest of the country.

June 9, 2000 - IF A BLACK MAN KILLS A WHITE MAN, THAT MAKES THE WHITE MAN A RACIST

June 9, 2000 - MEDIA'S STORY ON THE MILLION MOM MARCH - - THEY DON'T EVEN PRETEND TO ACCURACY ANY MORE

June 9, 2000 - EVERYBODY LOVES DANFORTH – AGAIN

IF A BLACK MAN KILLS A WHITE MAN, THAT MAKES THE WHITE MAN A RACIST

A little while back, a liberal group reported that blacks got longer sentences than whites for the same crimes. Turns out that they said it wrong. Actually, six times as many blacks, as they later admitted, commit serious crimes as whites, and get sentenced for it. They made no apology.

The media, which had unanimously reported that six times as many blacks got longer sentences for the same crime, did not make any retractions.

We are told that the death sentence is racist. The reason that it is racist is because so many more black people kill white people than vice-versa, so a lot more black people get executed. Obviously, the black murderer is not the criminal here. So who is?

Well, there are two people involved, the black killer and the white victim. So the victim must be the racist, sending the poor black man, a victim of racism, to his death. That is the kind of logic our society operates on today.

MEDIA'S STORY ON THE MILLION MOM MARCH - - THEY DON'T EVEN PRETEND TO ACCURACY ANY MORE

James Duclos -- who says he's a "New England Yankee Copperhead" -- informs us of two very important web sites. These web sites expose the utter absurdity of the claims media are making about the "Million Mom March."

The media reported, vaguely, that "hundreds of thousands" of women were there. That was the vague lie they actually stated. Then they left it to other leftists to inflate the figures without contradiction.

The web sites on the "million Mom March" are:

<http://www.freerepublic.com/forum/a391f959078aa.htm>

<http://www.etherzone.com/mmm052300.html>

I had wondered why the media had been so vague about the actual numbers of the "Million Mom March" for gun control. The reason is as I suspected: it was a dismal failure, so the media didn't report that fact.

EVERYBODY LOVES DANFORTH – AGAIN

Time for another Whitaker's Law: "It is impossible to underestimate the intelligence of a moderate Republican."

Since P.T. Barnum pointed out that, "Nobody ever lost money by underestimating the intelligence of the American public," you would think intellectually underpowered moderate Republicans would be the very people to get elected by that same public. But it isn't so. Moderate Republicans sell out their principles to be "pragmatic" -- to win --and they lose doing it. They are both immoral and unsuccessful.

Probably the prime example of a moderate Republican is Gerald R. Ford, the man of whom Lyndon Johnson made the original observation, "He's so dumb he can't walk and chew gum at the same time."

Needless to say, good old Dumb Ford was beloved of liberals. So when Nixon and Agnew resigned, everybody readily agreed to make Ford the new president. He promptly made Nelson Rockefeller his vice president. This was the ultimate kick in the teeth to conservative Republicans.

As America's only unelected president, Gerald Ford got the Republican nomination in 1976, but he barely got it against the insurgent candidacy of Ronald Reagan. To show conservatives what he thought of them, Ford did not select a running mate to satisfy the half of the convention which went for Reagan. Instead his vice presidential choice was a fellow dumb midwestern moderate, Bob Dole.

As is normally the case with middle of the roaders out here in the real world, Ford lost. As a famously dumb man, he has never ceased to push his brilliant "middle of the road" strategy at every opportunity for the entire quarter-century since his defeat. He never slowed down during the Reagan triumphs of 1980 and 1984. The big Gingrich win in 1994 didn't phase him.

Likewise, the fact that Bush and Dole both lost as moderates in 1992 and 1996 did not cause Ford to slow his campaign for "pragmatic" moderation one iota. Such placidity in the face of all reality is the reward of the truly, deeply, and sincerely stupid.

Liberals always say moderate Republicans are winners. Meanwhile, back here in the real world, almost every congressman and senator who is actually elected to office has a very conservative or a solidly liberal voting record. In national elections, Republicans only won when they went forgot the "middle of the road" nonsense and went far right. This happened with Reagan in 1980 and 1984, and with the Contract With America in 1994.

But reality never bothers an official political expert. They are selected by liberals, and it is not for accuracy.

Bill Schneider is Ted Turner's - aka Mr. Fonda's -- official political expert on CNN. In 1992, Schneider kept insisting that Republicans could win if they went "to the middle of the road" with Daddy Bush's new (anti-Reagan) image. They lost, of course. In 1996, he said that Republicans could win if they went "to the middle of the road" with Bob Dole. They got the same bare forty percent of the vote with that strategy in 1996 that they had gotten with Bush's "new image" in 1992.

In December, 1996, Schneider declared David Beasley's switch against the Confederate flag to be really Shrewd Politics. He gave Beasley his "Political Play of the Week." Beasley has since said that that Shrewd Move cost him the governorship.

So Schneider is delighted with the rumor that Bush will make John Danforth his vice presidential running mate. I discussed former senator Danforth on September 18, 1999 in "Everybody Loves Danforth." That was when it looked as if Attorney General Reno would tap Danforth to look into the Waco mess for the official record. The fact that Reno trusted him to produce her kind of report gives you a clear idea of what kind of Republican Danforth is.

There are more reasons for the delight about Danforth on the part of Schneider and his owner, Mr. Fonda. He supported the Panama Canal giveaway. He engineered a compromise to pass the "Civil Rights" Act of 1991.

But in one aspect, Schneider's delighted discussion of Danforth was dead accurate. He said that the nomination of Danforth as Bush's vice presidential candidate would "complete the Bushification of the Republican Party."

June 17, 2000 - KINKY SEX, AGAIN

June 17, 2000 - THE DEATH PENALTY: LET'S MAKE A DEAL

KINKY SEX, AGAIN

Longtime readers know what this means. I used to be professor of economics, so I know that if you want to say anything about economics, you should never warn your reader about it. So I title anything about economics "kinky sex."

I learned my economics in graduate school, but I got a postgrad course in lying in politics.

People are STILL giving politicians credit for the record-breaking length of the economic boom we are experiencing, and it's ridiculous. The reason for this boom is obvious if you just take off the ideological blinders.

There was a long economic boom after World War II, and nobody had any trouble saying why that was. The entire economy of Europe had been destroyed in the war, and had to be rebuilt. All that capital had to be bought, and those huge capital purchases caused a sustained period of good times in the postwar United States.

Nobody had any trouble with that, because all that destruction could be blamed on a right-wing dictator, Adolph Hitler.

Our boom today is exactly the same. For over fifty years, the third world remained in a state of inhuman poverty. Econometric studies have shown that people in the third world were much, much poorer after World War II than our ancestors were in the depths of the Dark Ages. The average black person in Africa lives far, far more poorly than the average slave in the Old South ever did.

But with the end of the Cold War, these countries -- except Africa -- began to grow economically for the first time. All that had been holding them back were the socialist policies they had learned from our Western "intellectuals." As soon as the market economy was adopted with the collapse of Communism, the horrible misery of those countries began to end.

With the end of socialist planning, most of the third world is growing into a human standard of living.

The third world is importing capital at rates greater than Europe did after World War II. They are growing fast, and we are benefiting from those purchases.

So why is this obvious point never mentioned? The reason is simple: it is no longer a right-wing Hitler who can be blamed for over half a century of misery in the third world.

Fifty years of desperate poverty are the direct result of leftist policies. Billions of lives were destroyed by it in the third world. More horror than Hitler and even Stalin produced, many more times, is the direct result of socialist planning and its failure around the world.

So the real reason for our economic boom is something you will only read here. That sounds incredible, but it's true. The left doesn't want to discuss the incredible misery they caused, and so respectable conservatives will never discuss it.

THE DEATH PENALTY: LET'S MAKE A DEAL

Nothing liberals advocate ever WORKS. So no one is allowed to ask how many children's futures were ruined by their inability to read after phonics was abandoned in so many schools. People killed by repeat felons let out by liberal lawyers and judges don't count at all.

Liberals want an end to capital punishment for a very interesting reason. The death penalty is evil, they say, because innocent people get executed. The liberal rule when it comes to punishing murderers is that you can't have capital punishment unless it is perfect.

We could make a deal with them on this: No program will be adopted if it can cause permanent harm to people if it fails.

If anyone is executed who turns out to have been innocent, liberals say the damage is "permanent." Now, it doesn't matter if every single leftist program has failed and done permanent and horrendous damage to innocent people. Those honest people don't matter, because they are of no particular importance to liberals.

But repeat felons are one of the groups that leftists consider to be their special clients. Like minorities, they MATTER. If you do permanent harm to convicted felons, especially convicted felons who belong to a minority group, you are dealing with real people. They are not like children whose education is ruined, or people who are killed on the streets because repeat liberal judges release felons. Those don't count.

Another leftist idea that destroyed millions of lives was the anti-family propaganda of the women's lib movement of the 1970s. One of their mottoes was, "It is just as important to paint a picture as to have a baby."

They recommended that women concentrate on their careers, and that they learn to live alone. Within a couple of decades, women's libbers began to admit they had gone way too far. Hundreds of thousands of alone and lonely women were the result.

In the '90s, a lot of these libbers began to admit they had been too anti-family and anti-male. Once, and only once, I heard a conservative ask one of them how many lives their fanaticism had ruined. Needless to say, like all leftist errors, this one was ignored, and conservatives stopped asking such a heretical question.

So the rule on capital punishment is this: government can do anything to anybody, and make disastrous mistakes that kill and ruin lives, as long as they do it in the name of leftism. This is just an unfortunate result of social experiments. But there is a VERY IMPORTANT EXCEPTION to this rule. This exception applies to groups leftists care about. So if you are dealing with a repeat felon or a member of a minority group, all government action must be perfect.

What if we applied this rule to ALL government action? What if we considered innocent people who get mugged on the streets to be as human as repeat felons or minority groups? What if we decided that the education of children was important, too? In that case, what would happen to all those leftist "experiments" that never work?

There are mistakes that matter and there are mistakes that don't matter. When we freed tens of thousands of hardened felons to prey on citizens, the resulting slaughter was simply one of those slightly regrettable results of a glorious social experiment. But if you execute a single person who didn't do it, that is forever evil and inexcusable.

So let's make a deal with the liberals. We will abolish capital punishment if they will agree that, from now on, we should be as careful about ALL social experiments as liberals and respectable conservatives want to be about capital punishment.

Leftists cannot agree to this, and therefore respectable conservatives cannot agree to this. The reason liberals and their pet conservatives cannot agree to this is very simple. Capital punishment is usually applied to the RIGHT people, so there is an argument for it. But in the case of the left, NOTHING they recommend ever WORKS. The deal I am proposing would DESTROY the left.

June 24, 2000 - POLITICALLY CORRECT DISCRIMINATION

June 24, 2000 - WITH ENEMIES LIKE THAT...

June 24, 2000 - CAN A MELTING POT REALLY EXPECT LOYALTY?

POLITICALLY CORRECT DISCRIMINATION

If a white man commits a crime against a black man, he should be more severely punished for it because it is a "hate crime." If a black man commits a crime against a white man, it should not be punished more severely because that would be discrimination.

Everybody got that?

WITH ENEMIES LIKE THAT...

I cannot imagine a Bush running without Reagan beating a grownup in a presidential election, but if it can be done, it will be done by his enemies. The media has some fascinating ideas about Bush's weak points. They are saying that Bush will be unpopular because Texas carries out the death penalty. Most people support the death penalty. Media is jumping on Bush for opposing gun control. Fighting gun control is an issue which unites the Republican Party's conservative base like no other.

On a CNN debate, Mr. Fonda's "political expert," Bill Schneider, was charmed by a new label. He called the Bush campaign, "The Bob Jones Redemption Tour." It turned out that the person who coined that phrase happened to be the very Democrat who was on that same program.

With the title, "Bob Jones Redemption Tour," Schneider is saying that neither his friends nor his master would vote for the conservative image Bush projected in the South Carolina primary. Bush must move to that magic "middle of the road," where his father and Dole were, to be a winner like they were.

But the result of this "extremist" image that the media has put on Bush has been a steady rise of Bush in the polls. This doesn't surprise me. "Middle of the roaders" never win presidential elections on the Republican ticket. The elder Bush ran as Reagan's heir in 1988 and won. He ran as a moderate in 1992 and lost, as did Dole in 1996.

And, as I keep pointing out, in the real world, people actually elected to the Senate or to Congress have voting records that are clearly liberal or clearly conservative. "Middle of the road" is simply something the Schneiders of the world use to pull Republicans left. As a strategy, it doesn't work in real elections.

So why are Bush's enemies helping him so much?

The media have been using this "middle of the road" nonsense for a long time to pull Republicans to the left, but they never BELIEVED it. The problem is that if a whole group of people keep saying something over and over, many of them are going to begin to believe it. This seems to have happened to the media. They are portraying the son of one of history's great political wimps as just the opposite, an extremist in favor of capital punishment and against gun control. As a direct result, Bush is rising in the polls.

But many in the media have actually swallowed their own "middle of the road" nonsense. They actually believe that this sort of "pro-gun, pro-death penalty" labeling will hurt Bush.

With enemies like that, he doesn't need many friends to get elected.

CAN A MELTING POT REALLY EXPECT LOYALTY?

The retired Army colonel who has just been arrested for decades of giving secrets to the Soviet Union is the latest in a long line of security problems. The high rank of that colonel was not higher than the civilian rank of the CIA spy Aldrich Ames, a White Anglo Saxon Protestant from a good family.

Even liberals are admitting that Alger Hiss, one of the most privileged people in America in his time, was a Communist.

In a Clintonesque twist, Department of Energy hard drives with secrets on them that everybody had been searching for turned out to be in an obvious place, a place that had been searched before. Shades of billing records!!

Then there is Jonathan Pollard, who gave the most sensitive secrets to Israel, and was sentenced to life imprisonment for it. Instead of being embarrassed by such spying, the Israeli government is regularly demanding that Pollard -- whom it regards as merely a Jewish patriot -- be released.

The main argument for Pollard's release on the part of Alan Dershowitz and Pollard's other defenders is that he "just spied for Israel." Obviously, there is nothing wrong with giving secrets to one's real country if you are a part of a melting pot to which one has only theoretical loyalty.

It is hard for those of us who were born here, and whose loyalty is a natural one, to understand these reasons. But you have to remember that none of these people think of America in the same terms we do.

On September 19, 1998, in "Why I Will Not Denounce Southern Racism or American Imperialism," I said

"...only a clown can be loyal to a melting pot. By definition, a melting pot is nothing specific. Anyone who can be deeply loyal to nothing specific is in urgent need of psychiatric care."

Anyone who is charged with enforcing a liberal governmental policy must BELIEVE in that policy. Congress would raise Cain if a person charged with enforcing the Federal fair housing law turned out to be someone who didn't believe in it. But I watched the head of Jimmy Carter's Immigration and Naturalization Service declare that, if it were up to her, America's borders would be open and anybody

who came here could stay. She felt no loyalty or obligation to the people who were already here (Please see July 3, 1999 article, "Why Wordists Love to Say, 'That's what America Is All About'").

To a liberal, and therefore to a respectable conservative, no one owes loyalty to the PEOPLE of the United States. The United States, they tell us, is just a set of principles. It is a country that consists entirely of words. During the Vietnam War, peace marchers felt that the Viet Cong were upholding true American principles, so they marched with the Viet Cong flag. Likewise, when Caesar Chavez led his Hispanic workers to strike in the United States, he made their symbol the flag of Mexico.

Millions of liberals joined in Chavez' farm workers grape boycott, and not one of them objected to the use of a foreign flag as their symbol. I cannot imagine that anyone who has attended an American university could find this the least bit surprising. The old patriotism is "out of date." The idea that we are a particular people who deserve a special loyalty is an attitude now denounced as the idea of anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

It is no accident that just such an old-fashioned loyalty was the basis of America's battle against Hitler. While we all knew that Hitler was a dictator, we did not declare war on Germany because of that. It was only when American soil was attacked that the United States declared war on Japan.

And it was then Germany, as an ally of Japan, which declared war on the United States. The United States did not declare war on Hitler. The left, including the Communist Party, was happy to encourage this old-fashioned patriotism as long as it served the interests of their Great Hero and Ally, Joseph Stalin. Loyalty to Americans as a particular people did not become out of date until it was turned against the Communists in the late 1940s.

If you insist that your country is nothing but a set of "principles" -- words -- then you cannot denounce someone who is giving secrets to a country he feels has even more American principles than America does. A Communist certainly believes that. A leftist will not admit that Cuba is any less American than America is. Who can argue? By definition, all those principles are strictly a matter of opinion.

As always, liberals and therefore respectable conservatives, pull out Hitler to justify their position. Hitler, they say, talked about "Blood and Soil," so anyone who says America is more than a private opinion is anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews. But the fact is that the United States did not enter World War II until American soil had been attacked, and American blood spilled.

July 1, 2000 - WHY THE FLAG IS COMING DOWN

July 1, 2000 - ORRIN STILL LOVES TEDDY

July 1, 2000 - WE CANNOT CRITICIZE FEDERAL COURTS ANY MORE

**July 1, 2000 - YOU CAN'T DEFY LIBERAL OPINION, OR YOU'LL BE
ANAZIHOWANTSTOKILLSIXMILIONJEWS**

WHY THE FLAG IS COMING DOWN

There are two general reasons that the Confederate flag comes down off the state house dome in Columbia on July 1, 2000: The first is the respectable conservative terror of being called a "racist" by liberals. The second is their respect for liberal opinion.

Polls showed blacks were not upset about the flag until liberals told the black "leadership," which they own outright, to act upset. The "leadership" told blacks to be upset, so they were. So conservatives sought a "compromise" with this legitimate liberal opinion -- and to avoid "racism."

People who are looking for great conspiracies or other obscure origins of our defeats don't see the simple reality that 1) and 2) above are at the basis of almost all our defeats.

Below I give more examples from the news where the exact same combination -- a scream of "racist" and a "compromise" with "legitimate" liberal opinion -- led to defeats for traditional values.

ORRIN STILL LOVES TEDDY

Poor John McCain had to disappoint his liberal admirers during the South Carolina primary when he had to back down on his words condemning the Confederate flag as "a symbol of slavery and oppression." Fortunately, he was able to repeat that condemnation AFTER the primary, making him and the media happy. Because he admitted that had used an outright lie on purpose, the media was able to declare him a man of perfect honesty.

In the August 14, 1999, Whitaker Online, "Orrin Loves Teddy," I pointed out the fact that Orrin Hatch, as Senate Judiciary Chairman, worships his Democratic vice chairman, Teddy Kennedy. He even writes poems to him.

Kennedy offered an amendment to begin the federalization of criminal law in the name of "hate crimes." We all know that once the Feds are able to prosecute any case they decide to call "hate," the old primacy of states in criminal prosecution will be totally gone.

Facing his hero's outrageous "hate crime" bill, poor Orrin had McCain's problem. He couldn't hold his political followers and back Kennedy's bill. So he offered a compromise which passed 50-49. That broke the solid conservative front against the very idea of federalizing criminal law in the name of "hate crimes." As a result, Kennedy's bill then passed the Senate 57-42.

This is the old leftist "two steps forward, one step back" approach. A liberal demands that total federalization begin in the name of fighting racism. Then, a conservative who desperately wants liberal approval, and who would rather shoot his children than be called a racist, offers a compromise. So the liberal agenda asks for two steps and is given one. Eventually, the liberal gets it all, and more.

A liberal-worshiper like Hatch or McCain is worth more to the left than an outright liberal like Kennedy.

WE CANNOT CRITICIZE FEDERAL COURTS ANY MORE

The Supreme Court has ruled unanimously that students may not have a voluntary prayer at a sports event. Please don't tell me the courts are abusing their power. They are using the power we gave them.

In 1968, the Supreme Court ruled that no state could have a law against miscegenation. The Court cited the Bill of Rights and the fourteenth amendment. Every state that proposed and ratified the Bill of Rights had anti-miscegenation laws. Almost every state that proposed and ratified the fourteenth

amendment had anti-miscegenation laws. The court made no pretense that its decision had anything to do with the intent of those who wrote the Constitution.

In that decision, the Warren Court set a precedent like no other in history. It would do what the members of the court felt they should do, in open defiance of the Constitution's actual meaning. They justified it by saying that if you object to the anti-miscegenation law, it makes you a racist, and nobody dares object to that.

A lot of the people I knew in 1968 were conservative Catholics.

I warned them, with a Southerner's feel for the Constitution, that this precedent would mean a disaster for everybody in the near future. They explained patiently to me that Racism was an evil, evil thing, and that to make an omelet, you have to crack some eggs. In this case, the egg was constitutional intent.

Then came the abortion decision in 1973. The same people, conservative Protestant and Catholic, were outraged. How dare the Supreme Court invent this kind of "right of privacy" in the teeth of the meaning of the Constitution!

I could have explained to them that all the Court was doing was cracking an egg it had already cracked completely in 1968. They whine and they moan and they shout and they talk about the DRED SCOTT DECISION!!

They talk about the Dred Scott Decision because that way they can sound anti-racist. It was not a Supreme Court decision in 1857 that gave the Court a license for Roe vs. Wade or for its recent decision on prayer.

What gives the court the license to decide anything it feels like deciding is the 1968 decision to which no one dared object then, and no one but me dares to object to now. In that decision, I repeat, all precedents and all the clear meaning of those who wrote the Constitution was not merely ignored, it was OPENLY DEFIED.

The simple fact of the matter is, for all the shouts about "baby killers," the life of any child takes a back seat to these so-called Christians' desperation to avoid being called "racists." Until they object to the decision they dare not criticize, all critics of the Supreme Court should shut up.

National anti-abortion spokesmen and "Christian" conservatives are happy to shout down all other conservative issues in the name of "stopping the baby killers." But they are not willing to openly take on liberal opinion where it would really hurt, and to risk the label racist for those same babies.

Which makes them absurd. Unlike the 1973 Roe decision, the outlawing of anti-miscegenation laws was not merely a STRETCH of the Constitution, it was an OPEN rejection of constitutional intent. There is no question of a question that any of the Founding Fathers or even the authors of the Fourteenth amendment intended to prohibit states from having anti-miscegenation laws. If that is valid, the Roe decision is MORE than valid.

I am sick of listening to cowards bellyache.

YOU CAN'T DEFY LIBERAL OPINION, OR YOU'LL BE ANAZIHOWANTSTOKILLSIXMILIONJEWS.

So the latest bellyache about the courts is the decision outlawing voluntary student prayer at public school sports events. The obvious thing to do in the prayer case is to force the Feds to enforce it. Can you see the impact of Federal marshals arresting students for praying? That's how the left wins its battles. But the left has a trump card on the right that never fails. They would simply say that the idea of defying the court on this issue reminds them of George Wallace defying the court for "racism."

Now, the old segregationist George Wallace was actually in a real war against real Nazis. But that has nothing to do with it. Liberalism now condemns such attitudes as just like the Nazis, and if you don't agree, they'll say you're like a Nazi.

The labels wouldn't scare off the students from defying the Feds, but it would scare off all respectable conservatives. They would rather abandon prayer anywhere than be called "racists."

Which brings us back to why I am making such a point of the anti-miscegenation decision. Why do you think liberals are so desperate to keep anyone from criticizing this one Supreme Court decision? Why do you think this is the one landmark Warren Court decision that no conservative dares even MENTION?

I point to it because THEY consider it so important.

If the court can declare that America's constitution must be openly defied in the name of anti-racism, who can be surprised that every Southern symbol must now be abandoned in the name of anti-racism?

When the word "racist" is mentioned, conservative spokesmen begin an instant grovel. As long as this is the case, they cannot win a single battle against the "two step forward, one step back" strategy.

As long as we consider liberal declarations, no matter how anticonstitutional, as somehow "legitimate," we must keep retreating.

July 8, 2000 - WHY DIDN'T THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY SOLVE THE ENERGY PROBLEM?

July 8, 2000 - OIL AND HATING SOUTHERNERS

WHY DIDN'T THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY SOLVE THE ENERGY PROBLEM?

A quarter of a century ago, a national energy emergency faced America. To deal with this emergency, liberals set up the Department of Energy in 1977. So this emergency solution has been in place for almost a generation.

In the 1970s, the energy crisis was used to push economic stagnation. We were not just to stop growing, we were to shrink economically. Bureaucrats were to divide up the oil.

For over two decades, the Department of Energy has been funded with endless billions of dollars to prevent exactly this kind of problem. Now that we have the same situation again, no one mentions anything DOE ever did about it. It wasn't SUPPOSED to really deal with any such crisis.

As with every other liberal "solution," we are wasting resources on bureaucrats while we wait for technology to solve the real problem.

Now that OPEC has raised oil prices again, and we have spent billions every year for 23 years on the Department of Energy to deal with just such a crisis, can anyone name a single way in which we are better off? Of course not.

This was what the Energy Department was given DECADES to take care of, and it never occurred to anyone to imagine that this liberal program would deal with the problem. Liberal programs not only don't work, it never occurs to anyone that they should work.

OIL AND HATING SOUTHERNERS

Unlike a good conservative, I do not think that all businessmen are good and virtuous and that all rich people are automatically good (Please See May 7, 2000 -- "Microsoft Case: A Liberal Gets Mugged"). Likewise, unlike liberals, I do not automatically hate productive people.

When the public was polled on who was to blame for the present rise in gas prices, 32% blamed the government, 32% blamed OPEC, and 23% blamed the American oil industry. So the Administration is going after the oil industry.

Oil makes a great villain. First of all, it is the only major industry left that is dominated completely by people who are the ideal villains from the point of the view of the media, that is to say, of Eastern liberalism. Those who dominate it tend to have Southern "accents."

Even in the 1920s, the editor of the New Yorker kept a sign on his desk that said, "Hate Southerners" (James Thurber, "My Years With Ross").

Let me repeat, I have no doubt that, like any other businessman, an oilman is perfectly capable of gouging the public if he gets a chance. But when there is a fuel shortage, liberals go after the industry because it is the only thing they CAN go after. They can't do anything about OPEC. They can't blame government, because they favor government action, especially price controls and rationing. So all they can do is attack the oil industry as the culprit in all of our energy problems.

For decades, the rich Northeast kept the price of Southern oil low through government price controls. So their prejudice paid off, big time. "Hate Southerners" was a very profitable motto.

When the energy crisis of the 1970s hit, this prejudice went wild. Conservatives demanded that we get rid of price controls in order to increase domestic production. The liberals responded that not only would deregulation reduce government controls, which is always poison to liberals, but it would also take away the gigantic exploitation of the South by which Our Glorious Union had robbed the South of tens of billions of dollars.

So liberals had two answers to America's energy problems in the 1970s: 1) blame it all on the oil industry, and 2) lots of government programs and a new Department of Energy.

Let me tell you something that is going to surprise you right out of your seat: The liberals had an energy policy, and that energy policy didn't WORK! No liberal policy ever works, and they did not destroy their perfect record with the energy crisis. Those of us who lived through the late 1970's

remember it as a period of despair. We were introduced, for the first time in American history, to "stagflation," where we had both inflation and huge unemployment at the same time.

First, let us look at what a sane person does when a crisis like this develops. If there is a national shortage in any industry, you subsidize that industry. What the Carter Administration did was to attack and punish and defame the oil industry and try to force down domestic prices when we desperately needed to increase production.

Naturally things just got worse. To repeat, any sane person would know that the last thing you need to do when you have a shortage is to attack the domestic producers. This is not because oilmen are nice, or that rich people should be trusted, but simply because, when you face a domestic shortage, you have to make breaks for your domestic industry.

The liberal solution in the 1970s was to have the government ration all the energy and to have the government sponsor searches for alternative energy sources. The government did as well at that as it does with everything else. "Punish, tax and ration" is a summary of the policy of the late 1970s. Oddly enough, the supplies went down and prices skyrocketed.

A frustrated President Carter told Americans that it was all their fault. He accused us of a "national malaise" which had somehow caused the problem.

It has taken me many words to explain the complications and mental aberrations that led to this liberal insanity which as always didn't work and which as always was incredibly destructive. What happened next shows that the entire problem was, as it so often is, the liberal policy that was supposed to deal with it.

What happened next takes few words: Reagan got rid of price controls, the energy crisis ended, and prices went back down.

Now Gore is demanding that the oil industry be regulated and limited. It is the same policy as the 70s, but this time he wants to do it in the name of "The Environment."

But while no respectable conservative is going to call this a replay of the seventies strategy that cost Carter the presidency, too many of us remember that time of failure and despair. For once, despite all respectable conservatives can do, the liberals seem to have gotten the blame for one of their failures. Gore is playing the old Carter song, and nobody wants the Carter years back.

July 15, 2000 - FOR THE RECORD

July 15, 2000 - WHERE ARE THOSE "MORE CONSERVATIVE" SOUTH CAROLINA REPUBLICANS WHEN IT COUNTS?

FOR THE RECORD

John Roker was sent down from the Atlanta Braves to the Richmond team for a few games because his pitching had suffered from the abuse he received from the thugs in the stadium and in the media. If he had been black, and his comments had been about killing cops he would have had no trouble with

them. Rappers make money pushing that stuff. But Rocker attacked New York's diversity, and nobody is allowed to attack diversity.

At his first game, Richmond at Toledo, Rocker was once again given a roaring welcome by the fans which was completely without precedent. You are not going to read this in the regular media, only on the Internet.

WHERE ARE THOSE "MORE CONSERVATIVE" SOUTH CAROLINA REPUBLICANS WHEN IT COUNTS?

On March 18, 2000, in "Our Masters Are Upset That They No Longer Own the Gun Permit Business", I explained that the 25,000 concealed weapons permit holders in South Carolina are a potent new force in our politics. They are organized in Grassroots, South Carolina, which is doing a really spectacular job of lobbying. We have a link with them here on the SCLoS site, and we can learn from them.

Grassroots South Carolina has won some victories, but it lost the big one this year. As I pointed out on March 18, the old gun permits, which were given out on the basis of political favoritism, had no restrictions on them. But when new permits were made available that you have to EARN, petty politicians loaded them with restrictions. One of the biggest is that if you go to any place that serves drinks, you can't carry your weapon with you to or from that place.

Well-dressed people going in and out of expensive restaurants are the prime targets for muggers, and they need to carry more than others.

Other states do not have this restriction and they have had no more incidents of trouble with permit holders than we do.

Which means NONE. If one of the hundreds of thousands of people who have had permits for the last five years of this decade did do anything bad, you may be sure the media would trumpet it from coast to coast.

The simple fact of the matter remains that honest citizens with guns are never the problem.

Contrary to what gun control advocates tell you, a policeman is not a god. A major part of his function is to be an honest, law-abiding citizen who is armed to protect himself and his fellow citizens.

We don't need Clinton's fake fifty thousand new cops as much we need hundreds of thousands of new permit holders to make crime a desperate risk for muggers.

Surprisingly enough, there was almost no opposition in the South Carolina legislature to this reform of the concealed weapons law. Twenty-five thousand people, militant and almost every one a voter, is a formidable force. The reform was going through easily until three legislators stopped it.

Guess what party those three belonged to?

I am not surprised that it was three Republicans who stopped the gun law reform. Remember, it was Republican governor David Beasley who switched on us on the Confederate flag. When a hot button conservative issue comes up, it is usually Republicans who take "credit" for selling us out on it. If a Democrat takes the lead on a liberal policy, he will pay for it in the next election. But if a Republican

takes the lead, as Beasley did, he thinks he can gain liberal support and not worry about conservatives. They'll vote for him anyway. So he thought it it would pay him to turn on us.

We taught Beasley reality by voting for the Democrat running against him. We came very near to scaring the Republicans away from taking the flag down. But they still think they can sell us out on the flag and on gun control. The question is, can they? A straight Republican ticket in 2000 is a resounding "Yes!"

When Nixon withdrew recognition from Taiwan, he had the full backing of the Democratic Party. If you sell out people on your own side, you are safe from having a problem with it in the general election. After all, your most solid supporter on such issues is the party you will face in the general elections. Right after World War II, Jacob Javits decided to run for Senate in New York as a liberal Republican because the Democrats couldn't use his earlier Communist affiliations against him. As long as he called himself a Republican, he could do anything against the United States he wanted to. Most Republicans will sell anybody or any principle out in the name of Republican party loyalty.

It was the Republican Richland county sheriff Sloan who was a main advocate for gun control in South Carolina until his own incompetence finally got rid of him. As always, he could afford it, because Republicans would vote for him slavishly, principle be damned.

This slavish Republicanism has an another effect no one seems to notice: it keeps Democrats liberal. Politicians go for the swing vote. As long as conservative voters will back Republicans regardless, conservatives have no effect whatever on Democratic elected officials. Democrats will only do conservative things if they stand a chance of getting conservative votes for it.

Some Democrats did support the flag, and many more would have had there been some potential votes in it for them. It was a few conservative Democrats who dared speak up against our caving in to the Supreme Court's gigantic anti-constitutional power grab on the anti-miscegenation laws (See July 1, 2000, "We Cannot Criticize the Federal Courts Any More").

No respectable Republican would dare do that.

Now Republicans take the lead in betraying us on the gun issue, right after selling us out in a "compromise" on the flag. And the more blindly we support South Carolina Republicans the more they will do this to us.

Once again, in real world politics, you get no more than you demand.

July 22, 2000 - WHY WE ALLOW OURSELVES TO BE BLED TO DEATH

July 22, 2000 - DOES LAWYERISM "WORK?"

WHY WE ALLOW OURSELVES TO BE BLED TO DEATH

In December of 1799 George Washington died, a victim of his doctors. His infection didn't kill him, but their "treatment" did. Like all medical "experts" of his time, what they did for his infection was to drain him of a quart or two of blood.

The theory of the time, from the Roman doctor Galen, was that disease was caused by an imbalance of mythical things called "humors." So you bled the patient to "balance the humors."

So a sane person asks, "Didn't those medical clowns NOTICE that the patients they bled weakened and died?"

Well, look at us today. Professors and experts constantly recommend leftist programs. They demand that criminals be "rehabilitated" instead of punished. The crime rate soars. They demand an end to phonetic teaching of reading in schools. Literacy rates collapse. They insist that if the government owns all the industry, it will be efficient. Over half the world, Communist and socialist third world, used this system and sank into ever more desperate poverty.

It is not just that no program recommended by our social experts ever WORKS. The fact is that, like medical bleeding, every program recommended by our respected AND PAID experts is a DISASTER.

So a sane person asks, "Didn't those social experts ever notice that everything they did weakened and killed? Why should they? As long as they have degrees given them by other social experts who caused other disasters, we pay them, we respect them, and we listen to them.

When no one demands that a policy WORK, the right degree has always been a license to kill and wreck while getting paid for it, whether in the social sciences today or in yesterday's medicine.

DOES LAWYERISM "WORK?"

The argument is that the more lawyers we pay for, the more justice we get. There is not the slightest trace of evidence for this. But we don't ask for any. Lawyers have degrees and judges have credentials. Since we worship those degrees and credentials, and are happy to pay for them, we assume that they are of some use.

Thinking that credentials are necessarily related to justice is exactly like the medical bleeding that went on for almost two thousand years. It is more than useless, it is destructive, but we pay for the degrees and experience and credentials without asking for any proof that they provide justice. Again, we have never asked for any such evidence. And, as I keep pointing out, in the real world, the public gets absolutely no more than the public demands.

So people pay through the nose for legal credentials, and then they say, "There is no justice." They are exactly right. There are credentials, not justice, because all they demand is credentials, and not justice.

Justice is not synonymous with acquittals. It is true that a fortune spent on appeals and legal technicalities will provide more acquittals. But there is no evidence that a complicated legal procedure acquits more INNOCENT people than a system without the experts would. As in the Miranda case, where the person acquitted was a confessed and known murderer, these technicalities do demonstrably free a lot of guilty and dangerous people, and they lead to the use of precedents to free more guilty and dangerous people.

So, the argument goes, since the system frees lots and lots of guilty people, it must be fairer to innocent people. But technicalities are seldom if ever used to bring in more proof of what is true. It is used to suppress evidence and hide the law from reality. All that legal "expertise" is intended to help the guilty.

There is no evidence that, in the end, it helps the innocent more than it hurts them. As always when we don't ask for any evidence except credentials, we get the OPPOSITE of what we are paying for.

I believe that many innocent people have been executed, but that is not the question. The question is, would more lawyers and more appeals and more technicalities have saved INNOCENT people? We know it saves GUILTY people, and prevents the conviction of lots more guilty people.

We have thousands of examples of that. But we do not have, nor do we ask for, a shred of evidence that all those dollars for experts saves INNOCENT people.

For legal "expertise" to help the innocent, it is not enough to say that innocent people get convicted. There is another condition that is absolutely never mentioned. Those who make the case that legal "expertise" is worth anything at all must show that legal technicalities would have SAVED the INNOCENT person.

We do have plenty of proof that legal expertise KILLS lots of innocent people every day. The only cases we know about for sure are those where the Expert Opinions we pay for and live under freed GUILTY people to kill innocent ones.

As I said, this blind faith in experts gives us the OPPOSITE of what we pay for. To fully understand this, we must discuss a fact which liberals and the pope, in their desperation to look good by attacking the death penalty, never mention:

This fact is that not all the innocent people on earth are on Death Row.

By blindly allowing "legal expertise" to be worth money and respect, we all agree that innocent people killed by repeat felons released by legal experts are not real people. Only an innocent person on Death Row is really innocent.

A ball park figure: I would guess that for every innocent person executed on Death Row, several hundred innocent people are killed on the streets by a repeat felon who is let go or not arrested because of "legal expertise." And we worship this expertise and we pay for this expertise.

A sane public would never agree with this. Practically everybody in America agrees with this. So we spend untold sums of money on the possibility that, to repeat, TWO conditions are met: 1) innocent people are executed, and 2) - please don't forget this one - that the efforts of all those expensive legal technicians would have freed the INNOCENT ones.

All respectable conservatives agree with the present system. No respectable conservative ever asks if those appeals save more INNOCENT people than they KILL. Just as no respectable conservative will ever ask any liberal to define the word "racist," no respectable conservative will ever demand that "legal expertise" somehow correlate with JUSTICE. As with bleeding, we are paying for expertise, and killing people by doing it.

The simple fact that never got asked through the centuries was whether bleeding actually did any GOOD. In plain English, were those medical "experts" providing us with MEDICINE, or were they just showing us their degrees and their "medical experience." Until we demanded medicine, not degrees or experience, millions of people, including the Father of Our Country, died under the "experts" knives.

As long as we demand only degrees and Judicial Opinions, with no evidence they provide us with the slightest bit --- and I mean the SLIGHTEST bit - of JUSTICE, we will die like dogs on the street.

Why?

Because we asked for it.

July 29, 2000 - WHAT LIBERAL ADVICE IS WORTH TO REPUBLICANS

July 29, 2000 - ANOTHER WRITER IS PROUD TO HAVE NO FEELING FOR HIS HOMELAND OR HIS PEOPLE

July 29, 2000 - FONDA'S APOLOGY

WHAT LIBERAL ADVICE IS WORTH TO REPUBLICANS

As soon as McCain folded, Bush bounced ahead of Gore in the polls. Liberals said it was all because he was "moving to the center."

Liberals told Bush he had to get to the magic "middle of the road." After all, that Magic Center was the way Robert Dole and Bush Senior made themselves such successes in the post-Reagan era.

But let's take a look at reality. Recently, Bush was beginning to falter in the polls. Then he picked a vice presidential running mate who was to the right of the NRA on gun control, and solid on other conservative issues. Margaret Carlson led the liberal mourning, with Bill Schneider following up: This was a disaster! This was away from the Magic Middle liberals and Jerry Ford (another big Republican middle-of-the-road winner) always recommend for Republicans.

So, immediately after the Cheney move sank in, Bush took a bounce in the polls, and is back in double digits. This demonstrates again that Republican middle-of-the-road politics are only successful from the DEMOCRATIC point of view.

ANOTHER WRITER IS PROUD TO HAVE NO FEELING FOR HIS HOMELAND OR HIS PEOPLE

In case you think I repeat "anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews" too much, let me point to recent reviews of Mel Gibson's movie, "The Patriot." In these reviews, Gibson's character is repeatedly portrayed as a Nazi type, as are his fellow patriots.

Absolutely everything, according to these reviews, is Nazi.

For example, the movie is criticized for showing atrocities which review writers say should only be blamed on Nazis!

Serious atrocities are reserved for attacking Nazis. If you blame them on anybody else, including those who actually committed them, you are anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews!

This is a new twist: if you mention atrocities and don't mention Hitler, you stink of Nazism!

Here's another one. In its continuing campaign to remove both the Confederate flag and the Confederate monument, "The State" had an editorial by a guy named Asquith. Asquith uses another aspect of the "anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews" line.

Asquith explains how he is above any feeling for the South:

"My blood is patriotic, not for a place or a people (that's nationalism) , but for a constitutional order that my nation represents."

Asquith does not have to state the Establishment line as to what "nationalism" means. We have been told that many times:

Nationalism = National Socialism = anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

In "CAN A MELTING POT REALLY EXPECT LOYALTY?" I discussed this form of "patriotism." Asquith is proud to say that he has no loyalty to his people or his place of birth. He only needs to be true to some words. So what if, in his opinion, somebody comes along who has a slightly better set of words? What is to keep him from betraying his country without a second's hesitation?

This condemnation of anyone who has any feeling for his people or his place of birth is supposed to be in the name of fighting Hitler. But, as I pointed out in "CAN A MELTING POT REALLY EXPECT LOYALTY?," the United States refused to enter the war against Japan until OUR SOIL was attacked and AMERICAN BLOOD spilled.

We did not begin to fight Hitler until he declared war on us.

And why did Hitler declare war on us? He said he was honoring his alliance, and taking the side of "heroic Japan." Not only was the Pacific War NOT being fought on German soil, it was literally as far away from Germany as it could be on the planet Earth. And Hitler took the side of the non-white Japanese against an overwhelmingly white America!

WE fought because our land had been violated and OUR blood spilled.

As I understand it, this makes the Americans nationalists and therefore it makes us the real Nazis in World War II! To reach liberal conclusions, you have to add some amazing twists!

Meanwhile, back here in the real world, loyalty to words is "Wordism," (May 15, 1999) and it has killed more people than a hundred Hitlers.

FONDA'S APOLOGY

Wordist thinking made liberals feel free during the Vietnam War not just to criticize the war itself, but to carry the flag of the enemy in their Peace marches. In Havana, Bella Abzug cheered loudly as a film was shown of an American plane being shot down by the North Vietnamese.

It is exactly this idea, that a nation is just a set of words, and you can pick the best set of words to be loyal to, that made outright treason such a routine thing in the 1960's. Abzug's loyalty was with her

good guys, the Cubans and the Viet Cong. She felt they had a better set of words. The fact that the pilot going down was from the country where she was born and raised meant nothing at all to her.

That would be nationalism, you see. If she didn't cheer the killing of Americans, Abzug would have been a Nazi, you see

During a trip to visit her heroes in North Vietnam in the 1960s, Jane Fonda posed for a picture manning a Communist anti-aircraft gun which was used against Americans. She apologized for that again last week.

But, if we use Asquith's argument, why should she regret what she did? Unless she is at all loyal to "her" land of birth or "her" people, she did exactly what she should have done. In the 1960s, Fonda proclaimed that, if Americans knew what Communism really was, they'd fall to their knees and pray for it. Unless she was a Nazi, how could she not be for shooting down American pilots?

At the time she posed at the controls of that gun, she felt the Communists offered a better constitutional order, or set of principles, than did the United States. In that case, loyalty to the United States would have made her a nationalist, or anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

Like many on the right, I was against the Vietnam War. Like Reagan, my position was that we should fight it seriously or get out of it. Unlike Reagan, I stuck to that position.

But my loyalties have always been to my own people and my own country.

Nowadays, old liberals say they were completely patriotic in the 1960s. They say they were just for Peace and Love. Naturally, when they say that on television, respectable conservatives get that goofy grin on their face, nod vigorously, and wipe the drool from the side of their faces.

During the Gulf War, all the old leftists claimed they had been against the war in Vietnam, but they were all for the troops. Respectable conservatives nodded and drooled.

Back on planet Earth in the 1960s, the standard terms the leftists used for American soldiers in Vietnam was "paid killers" and "baby killers." Some of them also bombed buildings. At Kent State, they burned down the ROTC building and every leftist peacenik I know of defended it.

Another thing some of those Peace Lovers used to do was to call parents and wives of soldiers in Vietnam, pretend to be from the Defense Department, and tell them their son or husband had been killed in action.

But they were all for the troops. Right, respectable conservatives?

Fonda's treason during Vietnam was not unique. It is just that that photo put her beyond the protection of respectable conservatives. Seeing that photo, even they can't grin and say she was just being sweet.

August 5, 2000 - LOOK WHO'S AFRAID OF BEING CONNED**August 5, 2000 - IF A PARTY CAN HAVE A MINORITY BASE, WHY CAN'T THE OTHER PARTY HAVE A WHITE BASE?**

LOOK WHO'S AFRAID OF BEING CONNED

Bush set up the whole convention to reflect media criticism of the Republican Party. His "compassionate conservatism" is the same as the "kinder and gentler America" that his father ran on.

This was such an extreme appeal to the media version of politics that even the media were taken aback. They listened to Colin Powell demand that Republicans follow Clinton. They listened as the open border of the United States was not criticized at all. They watched as the Republican platform approved of the Department of Education, the Department of Energy, and the liberals' taxpayer-supported propaganda units, the National Endowment for the Humanities and Public Broadcasting.

In one area, the media began to sound like the Republican base used to. In the last three presidential elections, the Party wrote a very conservative platform. Each time the conservative base worried that Bush or Dole would sell out the platform. They did.

This time, a major part of the platform was written to appease the media. Media commentators wondered aloud, over and over, whether the Party would betray THEM. Would Bush give them Powell's speech, all those minorities and exclusion of conservatives and conservative rhetoric (in the name of Inclusion, of course), and then go back to the old rightist Republicanism that won in 1980, 1988, and 1994?

Bush has sold conservatives out so obviously that it is no longer a question of his betraying his base. He isn't even pretending to go with them. It is the media who feel he may betray them.

IF A PARTY CAN HAVE A MINORITY BASE, WHY CAN'T THE OTHER PARTY HAVE A WHITE BASE?

There was a ritzy meeting of moderate Republicans down in Florida.

Gov. John G. Rowland of Connecticut told the group that the party platform ought to change because it is offensive to women, teachers, unions, homosexuals, and immigrants. "I will report to you that the good news is that the rich people and the business people still like us," said Rowland. "But that's about it."

Actually, Republicans get less women and more men. So they don't lose "women." Women are in the majority, so if Rowland were right, Republicans would never win a single election.

The Republicans certainly don't turn off union members. In a typical election year, Republicans get forty percent of the union vote in direct defiance of union leaders.

Presumably, then, what moderates are talking about is not union PEOPLE, but union MONEY. Unions are the only institution in America that can take money by force and use it in politics any way they want to. Media, moderates and McCain want to keep it that way.

So we are left with what the media and moderate line really is: "Republicans can't win if they don't appeal to women's libbers, teachers, homosexuals and immigrants." Rowland leaves one out of the groups in the standard formula: "Minorities."

Rowland's conclusion is even more revealing: "the rich people and the business people still like us." This is what liberals, moderates, and respectable conservatives always say: If you are not a minority, a homosexual, or an immigrant, you are a rich white man. This might give you a hint as to why moderates, who religiously follow this liberal line about voters, so seldom seem to win.

This moderate-media line is so insane that we need to repeat it, because no respectable conservative ever will. They imply, and often state, that anyone who is not women's libber, homosexual or minority is a rich white male. I challenge you to listen closely and not realize that that is what they are saying!

The media and the moderates completely leave out the group Reagan and Gingrich actually won with. These were the Wallace-Reagan Democrats, those who are increasingly unhappy about where this minority-immigrant-homosexual line is taking the country.

Yet the same media announced in 1994 that it was "the angry white males" who took both Houses of Congress away from the Democrats.

They said that because the line is that an angry white male is really anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews. Anything they don't like always ends up being called Nazi.

The base of the Republican Party is white. The Democrats are a coalition of minorities. According to the line of all moderates and all the media, the latter is easier to hold together. Meanwhile, back in reality, as the minorities grow, their competition grows.

Only one thing keeps the Democrats from being a permanent and shrinking minority, and that is Republican strategy.

Democratic strategy is to give more and more of what the "haves" have to the "have nots." And remember, to them a "have" is anybody who is not a women's libber, a homosexual, or a leftist in a minority group!

But there is a definite limit to how long one can win elections and buy minorities with white money. As minorities grow, their competition for "rich white money" grows, and only so many fleas can live on one dog.

The decades-long Republicans pursuit of the "Negro vote" is hopeless. Blacks have spent their political history in lock step. They will vote as their leaders tell them, and the liberals own their leaders outright. But other minorities are not so uniform.

For example, the same media that says Hispanics only vote for Democrats also insisted during the Gonzalez flap that the huge Cuban-American vote in Florida could be ignored because it was lost to the Democrats anyway.

The media-moderate argument is that minorities will never vote for a party whose base is white racially and Western European culturally. They then argue that the white population WILL vote for a party based on a minority coalition. In the meantime, the white majority gets more Republican when Republicans go for them, and minorities are learning that competing for dominance with other minorities causes serious problems.

The tendency of moderates and the media to use the word "Hispanic" and the word "immigrant" interchangeably represents the kind of real-world problem they have. To liberals, these two groups are the same.

To Americans with Hispanic names, there is lot of difference. Very few real American Hispanics want to trade in their American standard of living for an open border. But in Mediaspeak, anyone with a Spanish name who wants to restrict immigration at all is "a rich white man."

The deciding factor, strange as it seems, may be the truth: liberal programs don't WORK, rightist programs WORK. A party which is devoted to that proposition, rather than to following the polls and the fads, may be the one that wins in the long run.

August 12, 2000 - ONLY THE RIGHT ACCEPTS WOODEN NICKELS

August 12, 2000 - PROPERTY RIGHTS AND LEFT WING ARTISTS

ONLY THE RIGHT ACCEPTS WOODEN NICKELS

Respectable conservatives allow liberals to be loyal only to the left, and to claim to be patriotic. As I pointed out on October 31, 1998, in FIVE WORDS AND EMMA LAZARUS, leftists wave the American flag and say that they are loyal to "all men are created equal" and open borders, but not to America or Americans.

Respectable conservatives are always saying how patriotic their liberal opponents are. Not only is liberal flag-waving not patriotic, liberals insist that anyone who is loyal to America as a land or a people is anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews (See July 29, 2000, ANOTHER WRITER IS PROUD TO HAVE NO FEELING FOR HIS HOMELAND OR HIS PEOPLE).

So when leftists wave the American flag it is absolutely meaningless, and conservatives are always grovelingly grateful to them for making even this token gesture. Liberal patriotism is a wooden nickel, and conservatives gobble it up.

Liberals, however, will not accept such fake currency when a symbol is important to them. For example, when you saw the Mexican flag being used as a symbol of the leftist grape boycott, it is meant to represent the interests of MEXICANS.

Likewise, when Mexican music was played and the first all-Spanish speech was spoken at the Republican Convention, it was not a meaningless token like Democrats waving the American flag. The media said over and over that they didn't want to be betrayed by Bush. They demand that this mean that Bush will do things for the PEOPLE OF THE REPUBLIC OF MEXICO.

It means no more talk of protecting the US borders. It means no more English-only initiatives.

When Colin Powell got up there, he did not ask for symbols, either. He said he wanted affirmative action from Bush. He said Bush was trying to enforce affirmative action in Texas universities despite the fact that the Federal courts had outlawed it.

The crowd roared.

Another fascinating thing that Powell demanded was that conservatives abandon any effort to reach out to any minority "leaders" who are not firmly liberal. He said that today's black leadership, which is owned outright by the left, is the "real" leadership of the black community.

Republicans, he said, must only deal with these NAACP types.

CNN had talks with a group of "typical American voters." Most of the questions were aimed at the two black members of the tiny panel. They asked what these gentlemen wanted if they were to vote Republican. One said "affirmative action." The other said he might consider voting Republican if Republican Senators would confirm the Federal judges appointed by Clinton and blocked by the Senate.

Naturally CNN did not ask why your average American voter -- especially one who might vote Republican -- would just happen to be solely interested, not in education or taxes, but in the quick approval of Democratic judges. But that is not my point. My point is that both blacks, with perfect predictability, wanted specific liberal policies.

If you wave a Mexican flag at the left, you had better give something Americans have to Mexicans. If you talk about blacks, you had better be ready to give something white people have to blacks.

The left wants American jobs for Mexicans. They want university slots and jobs for blacks in place of more qualified whites.

They also accept hard cash.

By contrast, the right will take liberal flag waving and other wooden nickels and cry with gratitude. Those wimps wouldn't last five minutes in the hard left.

PROPERTY RIGHTS AND LEFT WING ARTISTS

Hollywood is very worried about computer sites that give away music without paying for the copyrights. Right now it's music, but as technology advances, it will be easier and easier to reproduce and send everything on the net that Hollywood puts out. So the same Hollywood money machine that pours out money against everybody else's property rights now has its own rights threatened by technology.

Sometimes there IS poetic justice. I am very much a free market type, but that is my academic and economic side. But I am also a thoroughly political creature, and when liberals get torn up by the leftist institutions they built and they promote, I go from being a reserved intellectual ex-professor to a happy, vengeful Pontiac, South Carolina redneck.

(For proof, see the May 7, 2000 article - MICROSOFT CASE: A LIBERAL GETS MUGGED).

To show that other serious political beings think exactly the same way that I do, I point to a recent congressional action on our trade treaty with China. Suddenly, LIBERAL senators and congressmen were loudly demanding that AMERICAN RIGHTS be protected and AMERICAN SOVEREIGNTY be respected. I checked to see if there were any hallucinogens in my food.

I read on, and the explanation of this unliberal behavior became clear. All this sovereignty and defense of property rights had to do with COPYRIGHTS! China was selling videotapes and CDs of HOLLYWOOD output. Suddenly, property rights were sacred to the liberals. Unlike respectable conservatives, liberals are deadly serious about their politics. When THEIR side's property rights are threatened, they turn on a dime.

If only this had happened in the 1960s, even the respectable conservatives would have been FORCED to talk about liberal hypocrisy! That was when all the folk-singing lefties made millions on their albums as they spoke of how unimportant wealth was to True Idealists like themselves.

One 60s leftist hero, Abbie Hoffman, wrote a book called "Steal This Book!" Naturally, his leftist fans bought the book, and he never turned down a dime's worth of royalties. As a result of this and other profitable activism, Hoffman never had to do a day's work. Exactly like Marx and Engels, exactly like Lenin and Trotsky, he got to praise the virtues of the working class and thereby avoid doing any work himself.

Back in the 1960s, this kind of sudden threat from technology to the property rights of the lefties would have been really hilarious. After all that idealistic talk, we could have watched them out there suing for their money the way leftist "artists" are doing now.

The leftist Time-Warner crowd is in on today's lawsuits. Meanwhile, they say they are for minorities and foreigners against other people's property rights. But no respectable conservative will ever bring this up.

I can guarantee you that every politician who cashes Barbra Streisand's political contribution checks is going to battle for her royalty rights harder than any Texas congressman ever did for the oil business. Can you imagine a liberal allowing government regulations to hold down the price of Hollywood movie tickets the way the Federal government held down the price of Southern oil for decades (July 8, OIL AND HATING SOUTHERNERS)?

So while all the respectable conservatives are crying for poor, persecuted little Bill Gates and the property rights of Hollywood, I am having a good, loud, knee-slapping laugh.

August 19, 2000 - WHEN THE WAGONS FIRST ROLLED WEST

August 19, 2000 - POLITICAL CORRECTNESS OR REAL HISTORY?

WHEN THE WAGONS FIRST ROLLED WEST

The ancestors of today's Americans began their westward trek many, many years ago. But today's historian has almost no interest in most of that westward movement, the part that took place before they crossed the Atlantic into America. Few of today's Americans are aware that most of the real and historical "Wagons West!" saga ever took place.

For thousands of years, the ancestors of today's white Americans traveled from the ancient Indo-European homeland somewhere far to the east of Poland. They migrated steadily west and south from there. Our Indo-European ancestors moved steadily westward into Europe.

Only after they had been in Western Europe for many, many centuries did a part of this Indo-European people go on to settle America.

Americans who arrived on these shores over a century and a half ago would not have recognized ancient Roman or Egyptian or Grecian housing and clothing. But the homes of the Germanic and Celtic "barbarians" would have looked very familiar indeed.

The "barbarians'" clothing was not the togas or robes of Greece or Rome, much less that of Egypt. They wore shirts and pants. An old Celtic outfit looks like a suit of primitive but very recognizable Western clothing.

But our children are taught that THEIR ancestors had no history. History comes from Egypt, up through Greece and Rome, and on to our brutish, scarcely human ancestors in Northern Europe.

Back in the real world, real Western history goes back to a westward trek our American ancestors would have readily recognized.

We have no idea when the first wagon set out.

We do know that the first wagon journey that led to today's America was at least four thousand years ago. Some of our ancestors were probably called "Scythians" in the ancient Middle East. They brought the wheel to Egypt. Before them, the Egyptians had no wheel. Egypt had no iron until another group of people rolled south, an Indo-European group called the Hittites, and brought it with them. In fact, there is no real evidence that the Egyptians' rigid, priest-ridden, pyramidal society ever INVENTED anything.

Egyptian history is filled with these northern invasions. Greek history is also a series of northern invasions. Then Roman history becomes a series of northern invasions. In fact, the Italic tribes, some of whom became Romans themselves, were almost certainly northern invaders into the Italian peninsula before history takes note of them.

But the people who rolled into Egypt and into Greece and into Rome were not only from the north, but from the northeast as well. They rolled into Iran about two thousand years Before Christ and the name "Iran" -- as you probably know -- means "Aryan." Aryan is also the word those who invaded India from the north and set up the caste system called themselves.

"Caste" is a Portuguese word. The old Indian word for caste is "varna," which means "color."

All of these groups were part of the great movement of the same people, the people the ancients called "Scythians" and "barbarians." Other branches of this same westward drive ended up in America and bred you and me.

Ireland was named "Erin" by the Celts for exactly the same reason that "Iran" and the Indian "Aryans" got their names. Erin, Iran, Aryan -- they are all the same name. One of the great linguistic discoveries of the nineteenth century was that many words from ancient Persian and ancient Indian, or Sanskrit, are almost exactly the same as the same words in English, Old Irish (Gaelic), German, Greek, Latin, Russian and all the languages related to them.

And what is the excuse for this total perversion of history? It is the same one that pops up everywhere else in our perverted society: Hitler talked about Aryans, so anybody who traces their history this way is anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

POLITICAL CORRECTNESS OR REAL HISTORY?

Before World War II, the settlement of America was looked upon by most historians as one more phase of this long, long westward movement of the "Aryans" or Indo-Europeans which began thousands of years ago.

In fact, descriptions of the Celtic and Germanic "barbarians" moving down toward Rome sound very familiar today. Those gigantic wagon trains looked a lot like older versions of the Conestoga wagons that reached California. They were.

Nothing that the Romans ever wore is as familiar to us as the pants and shirts the Celtic invaders wore. And the houses they built two millennia ago look very much like European housing a century ago. They were the same types of houses we have today.

Before World War II, the millennia of Indo-European wagon trains was routinely referred to by historians as "the great racial movement." The settlement of America was routinely referred to as simply an extension of the thousands of years of "racial movement." It moved from some unknown starting place of the Indo-European people somewhere east and north of today's Iran, and it conquered India and Western Europe. In fact, it conquered Western Europe many times, in wave after wave.

"Barbarians" rolling in from the east brought the original Romans - the speakers of "Italic languages." Then came the Celts.

Then came the Germans. Then the Slavs. As far as we know, they all came from same place because their languages are so closely related at the base. And the base of their languages is the also base of today's Hindi and Persian languages.

This real history of the push west, across half the globe, was a titanic adventure. It involved thousands of years of adventure.

The REAL HISTORY of OUR CHILDREN'S ancestors is absolutely fascinating, and the wagon trains of the Old West were simply an extension of it. That would FASCINATE our children. If today's history students could hear it, they wouldn't be bored sick in class. So why is it taboo?

The usual reason: mention of it now makes you anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

Hitler talked about Aryans and Aryan supremacy. So any discussion of the real history behind Western Civilization, exciting as it would be, is now condemned as Nazism.

Why do I bring all this up? First and foremost, I bring this up because a Nice Person is absolutely forbidden to discuss it. As you well know, I love offending the rigid taboos of our day, just for the fun of it if nothing else.

But, as always, I offend these taboos with a purpose in mind. It is to show why the history we have has so little to do with reality.

Instead of this great adventure, history talks about Aztec pottery and Incan pictures as if they were a part of real history. Any real history leading to modern society would be based on the thousands of years of our forgotten westward trek. But anything that is not Nazism has to show that all history comes more or less equally from All Mankind.

To keep from being naziswhowanttokillsixmillionjews, much of our history seldom touches on reality and is tortuous boredom for our children.

August 26, 2000 - JUSTICE IS *NOT*** FOR SALE**

August 26, 2000 - REPARATIONS FOR SLAVERY -- A LIVELIER ISSUE THAN YOU MIGHT THINK

JUSTICE IS *NOT*** FOR SALE**

Watching rich people get away with things while the poor are executed, the media like to say that, in America, "Justice is for sale." It is very important to understand why this is not true, and what that means.

What is for sale in America is ACQUITTALS, not JUSTICE.

If you spend lots of money on lawyers, as OJ Simpson did, you can get acquitted. But acquittals are not justice.

When the media say that JUSTICE is for sale, they are saying that, if we spent more money on judges and lawyers, we would have more justice.

Meanwhile, back in the real world, you could spend the entire national income of this country on lawyers and judges and have no more JUSTICE. Lawyers learn all those technical legal points and the latest Opinions of courts, but there is not the slightest bit of evidence that all that rigmarole provides any more justice than a simpler procedure would. All the stuff that lawyers learn has nothing to do with justice, and nobody claims that it does.

More lawyers mean more acquittals, not more justice. There is no evidence whatsoever that any of those procedures or legal papers or motions or Opinions provide the slightest bit of JUSTICE.

The bottom line is:

- 1) We don't demand justice, therefore
- 2) We don't get any.

REPARATIONS FOR SLAVERY -- A LIVELIER ISSUE THAN YOU MIGHT THINK

So the Southern Baptist Convention, trying desperately to get liberal approval, votes an apology for slavery. I wasn't surprised at this pointless grovel. I have watched "Christian" conservatives for decades, and their bumbling desperation for liberal approval on race issues is old news.

But then LIBERALS started pushing for a national apology to blacks for slavery, and I figured there was something more than a token involved.

As I pointed out in ONLY THE RIGHT ACCEPTS WOODEN NICKELS, August 12, 2000, liberals, unlike respectable conservatives, don't accept token gestures for their clients. If you want Mexican votes, you give American jobs to Mexicans. If you want black votes, you have to give jobs and school openings to them that would have gone to more qualified whites.

Now that respectables have begun groveling over slavery, liberals are out, as always, to turn that token grovel into something solid. They want real money reparations for slavery, and lots of it.

This is not a new issue, but they are serious now. Respectable conservatives are piling up apologies and grovels that can be used as evidence. We're talking lots of hundreds of billions of dollars, and however unlikely it may seem to you that they'll get it, never underestimate the liberals' ability to kick around the conservative wimps who speak for us.

Before you start beating your chest over how we won't pay, remember when race quotas were unacceptable? I remember the 1960s, when they were considered impossible. You just saw a Republican Convention's highlight speaker demand that we not only allow them, but that Republicans take a lead in enforcing them.

Anything the left wants is just a matter of time to respectable conservatives. When reparations come, it will be "Christian" conservatives who shout about how they will kill anybody who objects, just as today's "Christian" conservatives try to outshout liberals about how anyone who ever criticized Martin Luther King is anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

This "reparations" business is so old that in the mid-60s when I was professoring economics, I would address it. I put on the blackboard the argument liberals use (and conservatives will not challenge) to justify black reparations. I would write up the per capita income of blacks in America and the per capita income of whites in America. The difference, say liberals, is owed to black people.

So I put up the per capita income in a few representative black countries in Africa. Then I put up the average black income in the United States. I then asked whether BLACKS owed WHITES that difference. After all, as a direct result of their being slaves, blacks have had an income several times that of black Africans for generations.

According to the only serious econometric studies of the subject in "Time On the Cross," African slaves in America netted much higher incomes than many Europeans in their day, much less the so-called "free" black Africans of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries

Respectable conservatives protect liberals from that kind of argument.

The movie "Roots" begins with Kunte Kinte, a free African black man, being captured by white men.

ACTUALLY, THERE IS NO RECORD IN ALL HISTORY OF ANY WHITE MAN EVER ENSLAVING A BLACK MAN. Like all nonwhite societies, black Africa had plenty of slaves. There is no record of any black African refusing to sell another black African to a white man. They were cheap,

so it made as little sense for a white man to capture a black slave himself as it would make for you to grow and refine your own sugar.

But the left has a way to prevent all such arguments. Everything that the most alarmist segregationists said would happen with racial integration has happened with racial integration. Liberals deal with this by simply not allowing anyone to mention the facts. If anyone brings them up, they simply sic the "religious conservatives" on them. These fake Christians shriek their loyalty to Saint ML King, and look back to the libs for approval, the way a dog looks to his master.

I think the left will get its reparations, because, the left doesn't give up, while the right caves in predictably and completely (See October 24, 1998 - LIBERAL SPORES). And remember, when they get that for the blacks, they will get something - - probably a totally open United States border, for Mexicans.

All at our expense, of course.

At the Republican Convention, Colin Powell got up and demanded that the Party back racial quotas to favor his race. With their worship of uniforms and their endless, goofy pursuit of "the Negro vote," respectable conservatives got up and cheered. Obviously, now that racial quotas are secured, it is time to go for more.

"According to one fairly typical source, the present claim for reparations would be around one trillion dollars, if interest is not included."

If liberals get serious in their push for reparations, they can get plenty of money from whites. They need to keep up the drumbeat for hundreds of billion in guilt payments from whites to blacks, and to collect more and more conservative grovels for the record like that of the Baptist Convention. Before long, as always, conservatives will be desperate to compromise.

And soon conservatives will begin to shout down anyone who dares to question reparations.

With blacks demanding more, it will be time for other minorities to get more.

And remember, Bush thinks he can outbid even liberals for the minority vote.

September 2, 2000 - ONLY AN EVIL PERSON WOULD SAY WHAT WE ALL KNOW ABOUT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

September 2, 2000 - WE ALL LIVE IN SOWETO NOW

ONLY AN EVIL PERSON WOULD SAY WHAT WE ALL KNOW ABOUT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

So I will.

A couple of years ago in a Philadelphia suburb, a teenage boy was being beaten to death. One after another, people called in increasingly desperate please for help. The emergency operators, all of them black, said they would call it in, and they didn't.

I'm sure this was not the only time this happened. But it is the only time non-white behavior was reported nationally as a disgrace. Recordings of call after call after call were replayed, and the emergency operator, in every case, was irritated at being bothered. Finally a couple of them were fired. The only regret any one of them ever expressed was one who pointed out that he was being fired right at Christmas. He was very sorry for himself.

I have heard nothing like this since. I am willing to bet that the reporters who made this a national sensation caught hell for it. They couldn't be stopped while it was going on, but as I say, it won't happen again, now that the NAACP and the General Powells have weighed in on it behind the scenes.

Affirmative action means putting in affirmative actors. Affirmative actors are people who are paid to act like they are qualified. This would be merely harmful if everybody admitted that it was a silly game. Then all the incompetents would be isolated in some harmless areas, and the quotas would be filled. But preventing such token measures is exactly what militant liberalism is all about. Nobody who wants to be called a respectable conservative would dare speak this truth.

So every time the space program has a major catastrophe, what occurs to me is to wonder exactly who was the affirmative actor in this enormously complex project, where any slip kills. It can be an affirmative actor anywhere along the line. It can be a pipefitting project handled by a major contractor which was one of the sublets to an affirmative actor firm.

I am not saying this is the case most or even much of the time.

My point is that no one but an Unspeakable Person like me would dare to mention this possibility. And the space program is certainly not the only complicated, interrelated, and dangerous enterprise in our society. Every day more and more lives depend on more and more complexity.

The next time you get on a jet plane, try to feel good about affirmative action. While you're sitting waiting to take off, have some fun trying to imagine where, in all those complicated and interrelated parts, the affirmative acting took place this time.

And the simple fact we all know, and no one dares mention, is that life and death make no difference whatsoever in this equation. Those who die at the hands of affirmative actors are never discussed and will never be counted.

WE ALL LIVE IN SOWETO NOW

Most of us have heard of a butler called "Jeeves." The inventor of Jeeves was P.G. Wodehouse.

In his first book after World War II, called "The Return of Jeeves," the wise English butler is quoted as saying, "We live in the age of the welfare state, sir. This means, as nearly as I can tell, that everyone is destitute."

Right after World War II, in order to make everyone equal, Britain's new socialist Government had imposed confiscatory taxes, rationing, and regulations to the point where nobody had anything. It was called a welfare state. It was also called Austerity. And boy, was it ever austere!

So while America had a post war boom, the British managed to make themselves miserable, all in the name of Equality.

The United States Constitution assigns the United States Government the role of pursuing "the general welfare." Not only is this not the same thing as "equality," it is very often the opposite.

Austerity was one example of how equality and the general welfare conflict. Another is South Africa today. In South Africa today, every honest person is worse off, in every measurable category, than he was under white rule.

There is real genocide going on in Africa today. That real genocide is taking place under the name Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome, or AIDS. The old apartheid Afrikaners would have come down on this epidemic in a mercilessly Politically Incorrect way. They would have imposed testing and isolated HIV-positive people in a way that would have outraged civil libertarians and saved millions of lives.

But instead of being treated as politically immature subjects, black Africans are being made equal. And, as in the rest of Africa, they are dying like flies. In the AIDS emergency, what is being pursued is not the general welfare, but equality. No one cares what happens to real people as long as Holy Equality is the announced goal.

In the 1950s, I used to read about high rates of illegitimacy and dope addiction. But back then, this was called a "Negro" and a "Puerto Rican" problem.

Things are "better" now. We are more equal.

By "better," I do not mean that the rate of illegitimacy and drug addiction among blacks and Puerto Ricans is down. In fact, both rates have skyrocketed. Things are better now in this sense: the white rate of drug addiction and illegitimacy is now what the black rate was in the 1950s. There's more of it for everybody, but it's more equal because now it's general.

"Progressive" forces used to point to the black township of Soweto to show what was wrong with the old white-ruled South Africa. The crime rate was enormous, and poverty was rampant in Soweto.

But things are better now. The crime rate is now higher in Soweto, and there is certainly no less poverty. Quite the opposite is true. Crime, poverty, and disease were bad but getting better under the old regime. Now they're worse and getting even worse, and there is no prospect that the new downward trend will ever change.

But that doesn't matter, because everything is now worse for whites, too. The crime rate is unbelievable in white areas, even compared to American ghettos! South Africa's currency, the rand, was at a quarter of the old value the last time I looked.

The old "safe" areas no longer exist. To paraphrase Jeeves, "South Africa lives in the age of Equality. This means that EVERYBODY is destitute, and living in terror."

September 9, 2000 - AIR DEFENSE FOR ISRAEL, BUT NOT THE US

September 9, 2000 - THE UN DECIDES TO "USE" RELIGION

AIR DEFENSE FOR ISRAEL, BUT NOT THE US

This week, American Patriot missiles were put on alert for a possible Iraqi missile attack on Israel. There is a lot of debate about the effectiveness of Patriot missiles. But Israel's defense is more important than any question of cost, so they are deployed.

Meanwhile there is a huge debate about the United States deploying a missile defense.

Russia and the usual Communist states are attacking the idea. So America liberals are attacking it. So our NATO "allies" are attacking our deployment of such a weapon.

During the Cold War, this same parade would attack any effective new weapons deployment by the United States. The neutron bomb was a classic case of this alliance preventing a weapon that was distinctly favorable to the United States against the USSR.

The Strategic Defense Initiative - renamed "Star Wars" by Teddy Kennedy - was the idea that finally broke the Soviet Union's will. Their technology and economy simply could not match such a US system. So Gorbachev called on his liberals and his - sorry, I mean our - NATO "allies." But Reagan wouldn't yield.

But no one objects to our protecting Israel, its seacoast, its land borders, and its air.

The only two places in the world where the First World has a border directly on the Third World is at the Rio Grande and on the Israeli border. American Democrats are dominated by liberals, and they look forward to plenty of third world minorities coming into the US and voting for the left. The Republican presidential candidate is fanatically in favor of erasing that border completely to bring in cheap labor.

Bush is for the missile defense, of course, but only because conservatives are kneejerk supporters of anything in a uniform.

Meanwhile, both parties are absolutely committed to the protection of Israel's border. And both parties would cheerfully kill to protect Israel from air attack. Nobody in NATO has breathed a word against that.

We spend billions each year to protect Israel's ground borders, while our own are as open as the government can get away with. These are policies Bush will not merely preserve, but advance.

And Israel's air missile defense is sacred to the United States, unlike our own.

I am against almost all military expenditures right now. Neither Bush nor Gore will do anything with American forces except push the liberal agenda. I tend to favor a missile defense, because it protects the United States, which is, to me, what the US armed forces are all about.

My mild support becomes stronger when I see the Communists and our "allies" - and, of course, the liberals -- line up against it. These are the same people who always lined up against any military systems the Soviet Union didn't want, precisely because they later proved to be effective.

THE UN DECIDES TO "USE" RELIGION

The United Nations is hosting an ecumenical religious gathering "to try to use religion for the cause of peace."

Well, it's kind of ecumenical. The Dalai Lama wasn't invited because China didn't want him there.

My hackles rise when anyone says he wants to "use" religion. Mine are, after all, very old-fashioned hackles. They are also Bible Belt hackles.

For me, religion tells you, as part of its doctrine, exactly what it is to be "used" for. In the Bible Belt, the purpose is to avoid damnation and to attain salvation. I think a person has a right to believe in and preach the Gospel of salvation. I also think a person has a right NOT to believe in the Gospel of salvation.

What upsets me is people who do not believe in the purpose for which the churches were established, but want to take the money and influence generations of believers have given the church and use it for their own goals. They want to use what is God's to make their version of Caesar.

Modernist preachers who have lost all faith in Heaven and Hell try to justify themselves by keeping their church salaries and trying to "use" religion for some "sophisticated" goal -- like peace.

One of my problems is that the founder of my faith said specifically that He did NOT come to bring peace.

Those who consider themselves "sophisticated" and those who consider themselves Modern and Ecumenical do not understand what a triumph religious freedom was for Americans. To them, refusing to fight over religion is easy, since they consider it all a joke anyway.

In the real America, our ancestors took their religion very seriously indeed. Most of them believed that having the correct theology made the difference between eternal joy and eternal agony. Religious freedom was not an easy thing for them to allow, and it is a triumph, IF YOU UNDERSTAND REAL HISTORY. To make this refuge for serious beliefs, they had to give up imposing something they felt was endlessly important.

The result is that we have a country that, among other things, was the last best hope of faith against Communism. In much of Europe, religion has almost died under the burden of being state-sponsored.

For those who value faith, America's freedom of religion has more than justified itself.

But there are those who insist that religion has no value in itself. They want to "use" it for what they consider "real" goals, as the UN is doing now. They insist that what the Founding Fathers really meant by "freedom of religion" just meant not taking religion seriously.

Some years back someone at a Baptist Convention stated that, in his opinion, God did not hear the prayers of Jews. Naturally there were shrieks that he was "anaziwho wanted to kill six million Jews." Freedom of religion, the Modernists said, means that you can't take religious differences that seriously. Jews constitute a minority, so you have to say that their religion is as good as yours.

As usual with "modern," sophisticated" opinion, this is not merely wrong. It is the OPPOSITE of the truth. The fact is that if you cannot state publicly that you believe someone is going to Hell or that God does not hear them, neither freedom of speech nor freedom of religion means anything at all.

You might as well say that "freedom of speech" means that you can only state opinions that don't offend others.

Most of the people I worked and marched with in politics took their religion, or their nonreligion, AND THEIR RELIGIOUS DIFFERENCES, very seriously indeed. In college, the anti-liberal Young Americans for Freedom had one absolute requirement: a member had to believe in God. The other strong ally against the liberals were the Objectivists, who had one absolute requirement: you had to be an atheist.

Being Americans, we had no trouble working together against the common enemy.

In Washington, my regular allies included large numbers of serious Catholics and serious Calvinists, and the members of each group were convinced that the other was going to Hell.

To a European, the fact that these groups were firm allies against the common enemy would be terribly puzzling. But to old-fashioned Americans, it has been routine for centuries.

Our ability to work together BECAUSE we take our religion or our non-religion seriously is something unique that Americans established. That is why it is so easy for Modern people to confuse freedom of religion with freedom from religion.

These self-styled "sophisticates" are very unsophisticated people. Serious American Catholics are not shocked that Bob Jones might consider their religion absurd. They return the favor.

But what really shocks, astonishes and totally confuses liberals is that these two groups, having freely put down each others' religious doctrines, then turn around and vote together, AGAINST LIBERALS.

Liberals simply do not understand America. They talk endlessly about "sophistication" but they will never be sophisticated enough to understand us.

September 16, 2000 - WHITAKER ONLINE IS A GROWING TWO-YEAR-OLD
September 16, 2000 - REPUBLICANS CAN STAND UP AND CHEER
September 16, 2000 - FBI REPORT ON SCHOOL VIOLENCE IS 100% POLITICALLY
CORRECT

WHITAKER ONLINE IS A GROWING TWO-YEAR-OLD

Whitaker Online started on September 12, 1998. Our readership has indeed grown at the pace a normal child does from birth to age two.

The overwhelming majority of today's readers were not with us just one year ago. If this were print, we would be repeating a lot of the earlier WOLs because they make points we consider important. But

computers make that unnecessary. I can simply refer you to earlier writings I would like you to read, and, if you feel like it, you just hit the button.

We also have our complete Archives at the top of the page here, so you can review all the misstatements I have made.

In the case of a child, this age is called "the terrible twos," because the child has just discovered the use of the word "NO!" and uses it for the whole twelve months. In the case of Whitaker Online, I hope you agree we have been using that precious word from the beginning.

You will see it again.

REPUBLICANS CAN STAND UP AND CHEER

In his address to the Republican Convention, General Colin Powell said that it was awful that Republicans would give breaks to corporations but didn't push affirmative action in colleges. He said they gave breaks to big corporations, but they didn't have the guts to take away college education from qualified whites and give them to affirmative acting blacks.

This idiotic statement, of course, made perfect sense to Republican Firsters, whose only interest is the Party over country, culture, race or family. Actually, Powell could have given them the finger and they would have cheered.

Colin Powell represents a half a century of hopeless and destructive pursuit of the "Negro" vote. He also has something else Republicans worship -- he wore a uniform. And, of course, all respectable conservatives worship liberals. It is, after all, the liberals who condescend to call them "respectable."

He's black, he's liberal, and he's got a uniform. The Republicans would love to kiss him on all four cheeks.

Last week I discussed the one instance where affirmative actors were criticized for being incompetent. In Philadelphia, a boy was being beaten to death in the suburbs while people made more and more frantic 911 calls for help. Operator after operator, each one black, acted bored and hostile, said he would call it in, and didn't. A few were fired.

I have never heard such an affirmative action scandal reported again, and I won't. The General Powells of the world don't like it, so respectable conservatives will compete to condemn it more loudly than their liberal heroes.

Powell and his Republican kiss-ups can stand up and cheer. I am told that, according to an "Investigative Reports" rebroadcast on the A&E network Tuesday at 10pm, September 5, 2000, the emergency operators who were fired have been reinstated with full back pay.

I will not comment on the rumor that W's Secretary of State is going to give them medals.

FBI REPORT ON SCHOOL VIOLENCE IS 100% POLITICALLY CORRECT

One of the predictions we evil segregationists used to make about integrated schools was that they would lead to violence. This did not take a great deal of prescience, since the District Of Columbia

schools had been integrated by Eisenhower in 1954 and they were already well on their way to being all black the next year.

As I pointed out in "We All Live in Soweto Now," it is not that all the disasters we predicted with integration did not take place. They all took place, but we accept them now as routine. Respectable conservatives would be the first to shriek for the lynching of anybody who dared remind liberals that every disaster we predicted with integration has taken place.

Likewise, when the FBI gave its report on its "study" of school violence, they said the problem was not forcing naturally hostile groups together. The kids just have to be manipulated to accept the whole disaster without resentment.

The FBI also wants school authorities to check children's "access to guns," which is a liberal code term. Actually, the interest is not in "access," but in discouraging people from owning guns. Schools have already begun to ask children about whether their parents have a gun, and this will help make teachers into BATF watchdogs.

As I pointed out before, Professor Lott has pointed out that in one instance in Mississippi, school violence was ended by a teacher who went and got his own gun and faced down the shooter. Several people were killed because Federal law requires that a person -- meaning only law-abiding people, of course -- keep no gun within a thousand feet of a school, so the teacher had to take precious time to run and get his gun from that distance.

Oddly enough, this Federal law did not keep the shooter from bringing HIS gun into the school. It did, however, force the teacher to run at least four blocks to get his weapon. This teacher's facing down the attacker was an act of true heroism, but, as Professor Lott pointed out, the press carefully avoided discussing it.

Did the FBI "study" discuss this insane law's effect?

What do you think?

Another cause of school violence, says the FBI, is a lack of enforcement of Political Correctness. Teachers don't need guns to fight guns, but they do need to police humor. "Inappropriate humor," the FBI says, is a danger sign.

Let's see, gun control, Political Correctness, the presence of whites in schools, what else could the FBI come up with to make the Powers That Be happy?

Oh, yes, more money for professional help. Social experts, those people who have enforced the theories that have made our public schools such runaway successes over the last couple of generations, need more money to deal with school violence. Doubtless they will do just as good a job with that as they have with everything else.

The FBI, like the military, tends to be worshipped by conservatives. So this report won't be criticized by them. As for those of us in the sane minority, we cannot take anyone seriously whose reports come straight out the PC Codebook.

September 23, 2000 - WHAT IF MAURICE BESSINGER WERE A LEFTIST?

September 23, 2000 - THE SOUTHERN CRAWL DOESN'T WORK

September 23, 2000 - HATE IS NEVER A ONE-WAY STREET

WHAT IF MAURICE BESSINGER WERE A LEFTIST?

Wal-Mart and Sam's are taking Bessinger's BBQ sauce off their shelves because he is "controversial." They insist this boycott is not because of his specific stands, but because he has made himself the object of controversy, which they avoid.

If Bessinger were a LEFT WING protester, they wouldn't remove his sauce. No matter how extreme left a business goes, its products are never off-limits. This applies only to the right.

Not only that, but everybody KNOWS that this sort of suppression only applies to the right. The reason for this is that the right has no guts, and spends most of its time on its belly, groveling and apologizing.

THE SOUTHERN CRAWL DOESN'T WORK

Morris Dees' heavily financed "anti-hate" group, The Southern Poverty Law Center, has declared the League of the South, the Heritage Preservation Association, and even the Sons of Confederate Veterans, to be "hate" organizations. I understand he has even included the UDC!

First, let's get over the idea that this condemnation could have been avoided by the Southern Crawl. There are those who insist that, if we grovel and declare that the South was always wrong about everything in the past, leftists won't condemn us.

To anyone who has ever had anything to do with real world power politics, there are two obvious fatal defects in the Southern Crawl. First of all, if you were always wrong, why should I believe that you have a point now? You were so wrong you are groveling and sobbing about every position you took until last week. You will be sobbing and groveling next week about whatever you're objecting to now, so it would be absurd to take you seriously.

The second reason the Southern Crawl is fatal can be seen by the simple fact that Dees could now condemn the UDC as a hate group and be taken seriously. First, leftists say that all of the Old South's racial views must be denounced by anybody who wants to be a good Southern Crawler, so Crawlers denounce them. The next hoop a good Crawler has to jump through is to say no one has any right to doubt that integration turned out to be a wonderful thing.

Next, the Crawlers have to denounce all anti-busing movements, then anyone who criticizes homosexuality. And soon Crawlers find that there is no bottom to this slippery slope.

Now it's the League. I would have expected the libs to condemn the League and then wait a while before going after the SCV and the UDC. But the Crawlers have been so vocal lately that they didn't even have to wait this time.

Almost every time I see a so-called "Christian" conservative debating a liberal, he is going for liberal brownie points by praising Saint Martin Luther King, and condemning anyone who ever dared disagree with him.

These self-styled "Christians (and a "Christian" is NOT a Christian) denounce everybody the left wants denounced. Then they go into a state of shock when THEIR organizations are denounced by the left as "hate groups," and their former allies join in the attack on them.

The left doesn't Crawl, only the right does. Liberals defend the legitimacy -- "They have something to say" -- of every single leftist group, no matter how extreme. Meanwhile, respectable conservatives ask their liberal masters for nothing more than the right to lead the lynch mob against critics of Saint King or any group leftists condemn as a "hate group."

To Crawl or not to Crawl? Here is the bottom line: In Boston, the SHAMROCK has been declared a "hate symbol," and the BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA are being moved into the "hate group" category.

Meanwhile, nobody, but nobody, calls the Communist Party of America a "hate group."

HATE IS NEVER A ONE-WAY STREET

A medical specialist I go to is of Russian Jewish extraction. He was explaining to me why people like him tended to favor socialism in America. He said that his forefathers had been persecuted by the Cossacks, and I should understand that that would make him radical.

My response was, "Great, bring all your old hates over here with you, why don't you?"

He was stumped, because he had never heard HIS hates called "hate." Where would he have heard it?

But in the real world, if he brings his hatreds over here and joins the radical left, it will cause a right-wing reaction. And that reaction deserves as much attention as his leftist actions which use dead Cossacks as an excuse.

Not only is this kind of imported hatred never criticized, it is allowed to get completely silly. On October 16, 1999, in ALAN DERSHOWITZ, HATEMONGER, I told about an incident of such silliness I saw on a CNN interview with Harvard leftist Alan Dershowitz. Dershowitz was earnestly explaining how his Russo-Jewish family was afraid to speak out. He said he spoke out and his mother was quietly proud of her heroic son.

Now where did this heroic son have the courage to speak out despite the danger of the Evil Gentiles all around him? Were the Cossacks threatening him? Was it Hitler's SS?

None of the above. Dershowitz said he was defying the suppression of all liberal Jewish opinion in --- BROOKLYN!

It is easy to see why this is insane. But what is really essential here is to see why such attitudes are fatal to American freedom.

This sort of paranoid hysterics leads to a good and evil world, and a good and evil world leads straight to tyranny. Tyranny is based on the idea that there are only two groups: the good guys, who must be blindly backed, and the bad guys, who must be blindly destroyed. If you read Communist literature, you will find it justifies everything it does on the basis of "fighting the fascists." Fascist governments routinely say they are just being anti-Communist.

Our Founding Fathers recognized that both sides, no matter how extreme, usually have something to say. Everybody recognizes this when it comes to the left. If people go extreme left, we are told, it is simply because the System has failed them. Liberals say their leftist policies are necessary to keep people from radicalizing to the left.

But if someone goes extreme on the right, we are told he has nothing to say. He must be crushed, because he is nothing but a "Hater." The key term here is "nothing but."

We are in a world in which all types of genocide are denounced, except for one. There is one ongoing genocide which you must accept if you are not to be anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews. Every white majority country on earth, and ONLY white countries, are REQUIRED to accept "the melting pot," or "multiculturalism." This means that ALL white majority countries, and ONLY white majority countries, must take in millions of third worlders and, above all, INTEGRATE with them.

This program is specifically aimed at solving the white problem, which is referred to by the code words "the race problem."

But it does not apply to all-black countries in Africa or all-Mongoloid countries in Asia. It is aimed at one race, and one race only, and you have to agree to it to be respectable.

Until those of us who see this reality are allowed to speak out about it, all reaction will remain underground, and only its ugliest manifestations will surface.

This leads to the radicalization of whites who see what is going on. But this is not to be regarded as a legitimate, human reaction, a reaction that deserves some attention the way leftists do.

To be respectable or a good Crawler, you must agree that those who go radical left are entitled to do so, but those who are ignored and go radical right are to be suppressed.

If legitimate complaints are given no airing, you are asking for trouble. The Founding Fathers recognized this. They also recognized that, if one side is legitimate and the other side is just "hate," you are on your way to tyranny.

September 30, 2000 - THE KEY TO PROSPERITY: DON'T BE A DUMBASS

September 30, 2000 - OUR IMMIGRATION POLICY SAYS THAT MONEY IS MADE BY MAGIC

THE KEY TO PROSPERITY: DON'T BE A DUMBASS

In rich countries, there is a Mother Goose story for children about the goose that laid the golden eggs. A child understands that if you cut open the goose that lays golden eggs, you get no more eggs. But in Cuba and Mexico, they tried to achieve prosperity by seizing foreign investments.

So they didn't get many investments for a long time, either from their own people or from the outside, and they got poorer.

A reasonably intelligent child in a developed country could have told you that would happen, but for the leftist "intellectuals" the third world listens to, "The Goose That Laid the Golden Eggs" is just too complicated.

So nobody wanted to invest in those countries. Even inside such countries, people didn't want to invest. Instead of American investment in Latin America, those with money in Latin America have historically tended to put their money in the rich countries.

So we have just explained one of many, many, MANY reasons why public policy in the third world makes them poor. It is because it's SILLY.

The Industrial Revolution is now about a quarter of a MILLENNIUM old, and those countries have still not gotten to the level of sophistication offered by Mother Goose.

Leftists would make America poor by killing the geese that lay the golden eggs. George W. Bush would make America poor by flooding it with the kind of people who vote with less sophistication than is routinely expected of a small child.

The third world is poor because its people are not wise citizens and voters. But Bush tells us that, if we import the population of the third world, they will not bring those reasons with them.

Many people on the right imply what Bush says. They want the borders opened up. They can't say that it is the stupidity of the third worlders themselves that makes them poor.

This brings us to one of the most crippling aspects of respectable conservatism: If you are going to have liberals say you are "respectable," you can't talk in plain English. You have to watch what you say, so you can't say too much.

In Michigan, a lady in a restaurant was upset about all the Spanish-speaking customers, and she said - to her companion, "Why can't these spics learn English?" She was reported, arrested, and sentenced to FORTY-FIVE DAYS IN JAIL!

Yes, she was in America. And no, respectable conservatives are not going to make trouble about it.

The most obvious -- though not the only -- reason the third world is poor is because third worlders keep making the same dumbass political mistakes. You should avoid using insulting labels to tell them this. But they have GOT to be told, and there is no way to make it sound nice.

We can import the entire Mexican excess population, and become leftist and poor ourselves. Or we can make it clear that Mexicans have to convince the world that they are not going to be stupid any more, and prosperity will come to them. Those are the only real choices.

But if anyone says out loud that third world people are responsible for third world poverty, respectable conservatives will beg their liberal masters to allow them to lead the lynch mob against him.

So if you value political respectability above speaking plain English, you're going to lose.

OUR IMMIGRATION POLICY SAYS THAT MONEY IS MADE BY MAGIC

In my last years as a Methodist, the bishops of that church came out with a declaration on redistributing income. They had all sorts of standard leftist proposals, but what interested me was their constant repetition of their ideas about where wealth comes from in the first place.

The bishops kept saying "the land produces" over and over, as if land, all by itself, produced everything. All they had to do was redistribute what was magically produced by the land, all by itself.

Karl Marx said that labor, just effort all by itself, produced everything. He built Communism on that idea. He also said that it was ridiculous to say that water was worth more in the desert than on a pond, or to a thirsty man than to a man without thirst.

He said its value depended entirely on how much labor it took to get it.

Basically, leftists argue that money comes from Magic. What matters, they say, is just to redistribute it.

The Libertarian Party is one group that is great at knocking down this nonsense. They point out that money doesn't just come from effort, as Marx said, or from "land," as the Methodist bishops say. It takes brains, enterprise, and INCENTIVES. So if you take away everything a person should get for making money, he won't make any, and everybody ends up poorer.

As I say, Libertarians are good at showing how silly leftists are on this point, and in insisting that magic does not produce everything.

They explain that how money is distributed also determines how much money gets produced. So far, so good.

But then you start to discuss with a libertarian why the United States is richer than Mexico, and he has an instant answer:

He says that Americans have more money than Mexicans because of Magic.

So the Libertarian says that all it has to do is redistribute it. He says Mexican labor is worth more on this side of the border than on the Mexican side, so you should let all the Mexicans into the United States, and everything will be fine. Leftists say that the only reason one person has more money than another does is because of Magic. Libertarians say that Mexicans have a lower per capita income than Americans because of Magic, not because they are doing anything wrong.

Libertarians insist that third worlders should pour into America, because they bring in cheap labor, which is worth as much as our expensive labor. But labor is not all they bring in. They bring in votes. They bring in the same votes that produce the public policy that makes labor cheap in their own countries.

No libertarian would put his money where his mouth is. They say that there is no good reason why LABOR should be worth more here than there.

So if that's true, how about CAPITAL? If LABOR should be paid the same on both sides of the border, shouldn't CAPITAL be worth the same?

No way, Jose!

Try to get an American libertarian to put money into third world investments at the same interest rate he would take here.

No way!

And why is it that an American is not about to put money into the third world for the same interest rate he would ask in America?

Because MEXICANS are in charge of Mexico. His money isn't safe down there.

When it comes to real money, THEIR money, the idea that Mexicans are just as good as Americans for running a country is screamingly laughable.

But when it comes to bringing in cheap labor, they will look you straight in the eye and insist that labor is labor, period. This is a fatal bit of stupidity on the part of otherwise highly intelligent people. They get so tied up in their free-market philosophy that they finally lose contact with reality on a vital point.

October 7, 2000 - THE RESPECTABLE RIGHT IS DOING ITS USUAL THING TO MAURICE
October 7, 2000 - IN YUGOSLAVIA, THE PEOPLE ARE RIGHT AND THE COURTS ARE
WRONG. THAT NEVER HAPPENS HERE

THE RESPECTABLE RIGHT IS DOING ITS USUAL THING TO MAURICE

Most of our readers are not in South Carolina, so some may not know of the big stores' boycott against Maurice Bessinger. Bessinger has a big Confederate flag in front of his bar-b-cue stands and a lot of right-wing pamphlets inside. Big grocery chains used to carry his sauce all over the South, but, because of his political views, most of them have taken his sauce off the shelves. This is an openly political move.

The Wal-Mart line on boycotting Maurice Bessinger's bar-b-cue sauce now is that they object to one of his pamphlets.

In the 1960's, I went into a grocery store in Georgetown, DC. It was a low-price place where hippies and students shopped, an alternative to capitalism. You brought in your own bag. Its theory was that capitalists were taking so much money by markups that it would be easy to undercut them. It didn't last long.

There were pamphlets in those stores with quotes from Chairman Mao, who was then ruling and killing in China, and Che Guevara, who had been killing in South America.

What would the liberals say if such a grocery store existed in Columbia, and big companies wouldn't sell them anything because of their pamphlets that openly praised leftist totalitarians and murderers? Liberals, with the State newspaper leading the way, would raise hell. To these overage hippies, freedom of speech for the left, and only for the left, is sacred.

But no one is going to ask if these people would allow a restaurant to be boycotted for leftist views. This is a question the right never asks. It is taken for granted by now that you can do anything to suppress the right, and the left has freedom of speech.

I know a lot of regular conservatives, and every single one of them seems to be angry at Bessinger for challenging our rulers in this way. Not a single legislator from the Republican Party -- that "more conservative" party, you know -- is supporting his rights. Nor is any businessman.

In the meantime, these same conservatives are shocked that more and more facilities are being closed to the Boy Scouts because they won't take homosexual scoutmasters. Conservatives ask, "Where did the forces of Political Correctness get such power?"

The correct answer is, "They got it from you. Every time they condemned someone as an extreme rightist, you were on their side, as with Bessinger. Then they went after somebody a little less radical with the same tactics, then less radical, until now they're after the Boy Scouts."

Liberals won't let anybody pick on the extreme left. They know that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. The right has not learned this. That is why the Boy Scouts and other traditional institutions are in trouble.

IN YUGOSLAVIA, THE PEOPLE ARE RIGHT AND THE COURTS ARE WRONG. THAT NEVER HAPPENS HERE

Yugoslavia's ruler Slobodan Milosevic didn't like the way the election turned out, so he went to his Supreme Court. His Supreme Court said those in power were right and the people were wrong, so it nullified the election. The Western media roared its disapproval.

That same thing happens in America all the time, and the media always takes the side of the courts. The only difference is that, over here, the popular majority against the court position is usually larger.

In the case of busing, the courts invented and enforced busing against eighty to ninety percent disapproval, but the press was all for the courts. When over sixty percent of California voters voted that illegal aliens should not receive public services, the courts simply overruled them.

The media cheered.

In plain English, the rule in America is that the public can decide an issue only if the courts don't feel like it (Please see January 2, 1999 Whitaker Online, WHAT DOES IT MEANS WHEN YOU SAY YOU HAVE "A LIVING CONSTITUTION?" IT MEANS IT'S DEAD). But in Yugoslavia, where the American media is on the side of the people, the courts should bow to the populace.

Every United States Supreme Court decision is said to be a matter of "constitutional law." But no one pretends it has anything to do with what the Constitution actually said.

A "strict interpretation of the Constitution" is a purely conservative slogan. But no conservative would DARE require strict interpretation when it comes to the court's decision -- in open defiance of constitutional intent and all previous decisions -- to strike down all state anti-miscegenation laws.

Even when they demand that the United States federal court decisions take precedence over the people, liberals freely admit it has nothing to do with the real Constitution. When the court adds something that the Founders did not mean to the Constitution, liberals say the Constitution "grows."

When you "grow," you are clearly adding something that wasn't there before.

Our rulers, like Milosevic, simply appeal to the courts and get the people slapped down. But over here that's just "democracy by other means."

October 14, 2000 - ONCE AGAIN - REPUBLICANS NEVER WIN WITH MINORITY VOTES
October 14, 2000 - HATING SOUTHERNERS IS POLITICALLY CORRECT

ONCE AGAIN - REPUBLICANS NEVER WIN WITH MINORITY VOTES

The Hispanic vote is a new version of an old Republican illusion. In 1952 and 1956, with Dwight D. Eisenhower at the top of the ticket, Republicans crushed the Democrats in the presidential race. As often happens, once the election was already won by a huge majority, a lot of minorities joined the winning side. Ike got over 40% of the black vote.

Even in 1952, with Ike at the head of the ticket, Republicans did not get those black votes in congressional races where it would have counted. They only got black votes in elections that were already won.

So for a half a century, Republicans lost election after election trying to get that "Negro vote" that Ike got. Liberals loved it, because the code words "appealing to the minority vote" merely mean going liberal.

Now the illusion is the Hispanic vote. In Texas, when he had the election won by a landslide, Bush picked up over 40% of the Texas Hispanic vote. Once again, he got the minority vote in an election he had already won.

When they say "the Hispanic vote," what Bush and the liberals mean is the LIBERAL Hispanic vote. When Republicans backed the Cubans in Miami over Elian Gonzalez, the media agreed that THAT appeal to the Hispanic vote was pointless. They said that Republicans already have the votes of anti-Castro Cubans. Reagan got many Hispanic votes in California.

But the Hispanic population of California has tripled since Reagan got so many of their votes in 1984. The new population is single-mindedly dedicated to the interests of the Republic of Mexico and to the liberal agenda. That's the vote that liberals and Bush mean when they say "the Hispanic vote."

Bush won't get the Hispanic vote in an election where the competition with the Democrats is fierce. But he will turn off a lot of potential voters who are concerned about the immigration issue by courting Hispanics by offering open borders.

After half a century even the dumbest Republicans don't really believe they will ever get that "Negro" vote. So now the liberals are telling them to go after the Hispanic vote.

Are Republicans that gullible?

Do you remember that Mexican Convention Bush held?

HATING SOUTHERNERS IS POLITICALLY CORRECT

Lately there have been a number of TV commercials where someone shoves his face into the camera and shouts at the viewer. You may be wondering why anybody thinks this would sell anything.

It is the result of New York City provincialism.

Some years ago on a late night talk show, I remember a Jewish comedian from New York making fun of the very idea of "Alabama Jews." He pronounced Hebrew words with a wildly exaggerated Southern accent. This was allowed because, 1) he himself was a Jew of the Only True, or New York, variety, and 2) all Southerners -- even including Jewish Southerners -- are fair game.

You can say almost anything and be Politically Correct if you can throw in an insult to Southerners.

Most of us old guys remember the comic strip "Lil Abner." It was a national comic strip written by a self-described "liberal New York Jew" which ridiculed Ozark hillbillies without stint.

A little question: What would have been the fate of a self-described "Ozark hillbilly" who tried to start a national comic strip ridiculing New York Jews?

Don Rickles, "the insulting comedian," is an outstanding example of New York Jewish humor. He had rich New York City backers who laughed themselves sick over his getting in people's faces and insulting them as a form of humor. It's called "In Your Face" humor, and it has people in New York and Miami rolling on the floor laughing while the rest of the country is changing channels.

Commercials reflecting this sort of New York taste appear from time to time. One recently was for a computer services outfit. In this commercial the chairman calls on someone in the board room. As soon as the man tries to talk a young guy jumps up on the conference table with a megaphone and begins to shout.

Why would anybody think that loud rudeness would sell anything?

Let me explain the New York thinking here: computers are for Young People, you see, and this guy is what truly provincial New Yorkers think of as America's Youth. It is a cross between Jewish humor and Gangsta Rap.

Another such in-your-face commercial is for Diversity. It shows a black man in a spacesuit. The black man in the suit informs us that we are "shocked" by seeing a black man in an astronaut outfit. He then shoves his face into the camera and yells at us to "get over it." New York Brotherhood in action!

Actually, no one is surprised to see a black man posing as an astronaut. It is required in every science fiction movie. We would be shocked if he were a fully qualified astronaut who got into the space program without any reference whatsoever to affirmative action.

But this guy isn't.

I think we are all aware that one of the main rewards for people attacking the tobacco industry is the fact that it gives them a chance to attack the region where the tobacco companies are found. When Dick Van Dyke made his anti-smoking movie "Cold Turkey," the first scene representing a tobacco company was a close-up of a Confederate flag. In the same spirit of the Love Generation, today's anti-smoking ads are "in-your-face" and seething with hatred.

The tobacco settlement gave anti-smoking groups huge amounts of money to put on "anti-smoking" ads. The ads I have seen spend most of their time attacking tobacco COMPANIES rather than giving any education on smoking itself. Not long ago, one of these ads had someone riding down the streets of a suburb in a tobacco company area at night waking people up with a megaphone. They don't do that in liquor or beer-making areas.

But everybody knows what section of the country that megaphone was being used against..

That, after all, is what most of the people in these groups are in on this movement for. As Joe Sobran pointed out, the reason the left finds it so easy to label everything on the right "Hate" is precisely because that is their motivation and they assume it is ours.

October 21, 2000 - THE HINDUS IN ROMAN PALESTINE
October 21, 2000 - NATIONALIST RULES APPLY TO ISRAEL, TOO
October 21, 2000 - WHERE WAS EVERYBODY?

THE HINDUS IN ROMAN PALESTINE

Jesus said, "No man reaches the Father but by me." In other words, according to Jesus, you were either a Christian or you were not.

But many people assure us that when He said that, He did not mean that it applied to the Jews. Jews are special, Jews are an exception, and a Jewish homeland has a right -- because of our religion -- to claim Christian lives and money to defend it.

Which brings up an interesting question. When Jesus said that no man reaches the Father but by Him, who exactly was He talking to? Those who tell us he did not include the Jews know their Bible very well, so obviously He was talking to somebody else besides Jews.

That means that Jesus was talking to non-Jews. When Jesus went through Palestine, no Jews heard Him. The place was obviously full of Hindus and Buddhists.

Obviously, those who have made this great historical breakthrough need to explain it to those of us who didn't know that, at the time of Christ, Israel was full of Hindus.

NATIONALIST RULES APPLY TO ISRAEL, TOO

I was astonished at a remark one English commentator was allowed to make on CNN about the violence in the Middle East. She pointed out that, if the United States had used live ammunition against WTO protesters in Seattle, the world would be furious. In fact, if even Milosevic had used live

ammunition to put down his protesters, even those who consider him a war criminal would have been shocked.

But the Arabs in Palestine are shot from the get-go, and that's taken as routine.

Such invalid distinctions are a part of our day-to-day thinking. Any neutral observer would be completely puzzled by many things we take for granted.

As a result, we can't understand why nothing our dialogue produces makes sense in the real world. Our social science is based on something like a Flat Earth Theory, and we can't understand why its predictions that ships will fall off the edge don't work out.

Israel, contrary to what some preachers tell us, is not God. The same rules work there as work anywhere else. So, in the name of multiculturalism, Israel has an Arab minority. They are officially Israeli citizens. But when the shooting starts, that means nothing. Most Arabs will take the side of other Arabs, just as so many Mexican-Americans here tend to take the side of the Spanish language and of their own country.

Israel needs a nation made up of Jews if there is to be an Israeli nation. This violates the absolute requirement of multiculturalism, but it is the only solution for the real world. Palestinians, as a people, need their own, fully independent, fully separate nation.

Period.

WHERE WAS EVERYBODY?

Newsmen keep asking people about something in this year's election that puzzles them. Why, they say, is Gore having problems when the economy is in such great shape?

There is indeed a general rule that the party in the White House should have an automatic win when the economy is in good shape. Nobody claims that the party in power need prove it is responsible for the economy being in good shape. Everybody agrees it is usually largely a matter of luck. Nonetheless, the party in power is expected to benefit from it.

So the wide-eyed newsmen ask how it is possible that Gore should have a problem when Clinton has experienced eight years of boom. Conservatives share their puzzlement. Everybody is respectable, wide-eyed, and says "DUH!" in unison.

Apparently I was all alone as I watched the enormous embarrassment of the Clinton Administration in the Lewinsky affair and the cover up. Now, the media was unanimous in agreeing that Clinton shouldn't be impeached, but nobody outside of Geraldo Rivera said that what Clinton did was OK. Even the media admit it was a gigantic scandal.

At any other time in American history, that scandal would have meant total defeat for the party in the White House in the next election.

As I explained on May 22, 1999 in KINKY SEX, the reason we are in an economic boom is so obvious that it takes the combined efforts of the media and respectable conservatives to ignore it. The reason for

the present boom would be a major embarrassment for the political left, so the respectable right will never discuss it.

So Clinton had nothing to do with the continuing boom. But that is not necessary for him to get credit for it. Regardless of the reason for it, the Administration normally gets credit for it if the economy is good, and Gore will share in that. It isn't fair, but it is the reality.

Likewise, the scandal which I spent a year watching on television -- all by myself, apparently -- was also not Gore's fault. But the fact is that when you are the heir apparent, you take both the good and the bad of your predecessor. Gore gets a boom, and Gore gets a scandal, neither of which he earned.

This explains another Major Media Mystery.

At the time of the Republican Convention, when Bush had a huge lead, there was no gender gap for the first time in decades. I saw a number of liberal women interviewed who said that they were infuriated by what Clinton had done and were seriously considering voting Republican because of it.

Naturally the media said Bush's lead was all due to his Mexican Convention and his mealy-mouthing on issues. But his "moderation" and his "appealing to the minority vote" doesn't explain anything about the temporary disappearance of the gender gap, which is what really put him in front for a while by double digits. So let us explain all these Major Media Mysteries at once: women were upset at Clinton's behavior and blamed Gore.

For the same reason that Gore gets credit for a boom he doesn't deserve, he gets blame as the heir apparent to Clinton for Clinton's misdeeds.

October 28, 2000 - KEEP IN THE VOTE!

October 28, 2000 - PRINCE DIANE AND PRINCE GRACE

KEEP IN THE VOTE!

The governing parties in France are very upset. They put a plebiscite before their people and nobody came.

Actually, thirty percent of the electorate came, but for obedient Europeans, that is an unbelievably minuscule turnout. American media point to the fact that ninety percent of Europeans turn out for every European election, even when there is absolutely no real choice offered. They want us to be like that.

So the French electorate, as always, approved what their rulers wanted in the plebiscite. But a thirty percent turnout did not say, "Yes, Master!" with the traditional European enthusiasm.

The fact is that the French Constitution, written for Charles DeGaulle, is out of date. To make matters worse, huge segments of public opinion, such as LaPenn's Party which wants to cut down on immigration, get no attention at all. That is fifteen percent of the vote that is simply written off as naziswhowanttokillsixmillionjews.

So the "reform" proposed for the plebiscite -- reducing the presidential term from seven to five years -- had absolutely nothing to do with the real problems there. Normally that would not matter, and Europeans would all troop to the polls anyway. But this time, faced with no choice that mattered, the French did what Americans would have done. They said to hell with it and stayed home.

Refusing to take part in meaningless political ritual is very, very unEuropean. In Western Europe, ninety percent of voters show up for the most meaningless exercise. Behind the Iron Curtain the people have been what our "Get Out the Vote" media would call even Better Citizens. Over ninety-nine percent of the voters showed up at the polls for every Communist "election." In North Korea, they once claimed one hundred percent participation in the voting, including those on deathbeds and in comas.

Nobody on earth has as low a voter turnout as America does. So, according to the "Get Out the Vote" philosophy, the worst citizens in the world are in the United States, and the best citizens in the world are in North Korea.

If you don't know the details about what Communists call elections, you've missed a good laugh. Here is what happens.

The Good Citizen, or Comrade, walks into the polling place. A Party official marks his name off the list and hands him a ballot. The ballot is already filled out, one line for each office, and the Communist Party candidate's name is the only one beside each office.

Standing there in front of a Party official, the voter now has two choices.

First, the voter may do what absolutely everybody else does and take the already-filled-out ballot directly to the box and drop it in, thereby voting a straight Communist ticket. Please remember that he is standing in front of a Party official who has just gotten his name and who is sitting there with pencil poised to put down further information beside his name.

Keeping that in mind, our voter in a Progressive People's Peace-Loving Democratic Republic can take the ballot and scratch out some names and substitute others. If he goes back to scratch and substitute that way, you can bet he will get a visit from some other Party functionaries who will want to congratulate him on his independent spirit.

So, as in America, the ideal of the Progressive People's Peace-Loving Democratic Republics is for all the voters to show up and make whatever "choice" they are told to. That is the essence of "getting out the vote."

I say keep it in.

PRINCE DIANE AND PRINCE GRACE

We have all been in situations, especially when we were kids, where we acted polite when we were being hostile. "Yes, SIR!" we would say mockingly, or we would say "I guess Your Majesty would..." and so forth.

The same thing happens with Political Correctness. If you get too formally PC, you begin to sound insulting. When I was working in the Polish steel district of Chicago, I would not have DARED to refer

to those people as "Polish people." They were proud of being pretty rough working people, and they called themselves "Pollacks."

I grew up calling myself a Rebel and a Methodist. Both of those words were originally insults. But as we matured we became proud of our identity, and adopted the insult as a compliment. That, to me, is the best kind of revenge.

In fact, in American and Anglo-Saxon history, that has normally been the final revenge of new groups. Instead of forcing everybody else to call us by some Politically Correct term, we just adopted what was an insult as a term of pride. That is how the Mormons adopted that term. That is how the Whigs and the Tories got their names. That is how Yankees got their name.

The list is very, very long, including Sandlappers, Sooners, Tarheels, Buckeyes ("a bean of no value"), and just about every nickname we now take pride in. The donkey and the elephant that the major parties use today were both originally used to represent them in HOSTILE cartoons.

I have pointed out how many Jews of my acquaintance -- like the "Pollacks" -- were very suspicious of the Politically Correct terms. People I associate with tend to be proud of what they are, and I have often heard some version of the words, "I'm not Jewish, I'm a Jew."

It surprised me to see one PC advisor on television the other day AGREEING with me. He said didn't know any Jews who would refer to themselves as "Jewish persons" or "adherents of the Hebrew faith," as many overcautious gentiles do.

But his next sentence brought me face to face with a new Politically Correct breakthrough. He said, "We don't use the old term 'Jewess,' though, because it is a put-down, LIKE THE WORD ACTRESS."

Well, I had noticed actresses are often referred to in the media as "actors," but I had not realized that "actress" was in the same category as The N Word.

Which brings up the case of Prince Dianne. Now if "actress" is a put-down, "princess" is even more of one. An "actress" has legal equality with an "actor," but a "princess" is legally inferior to a "prince." No matter what age she is, a princess loses the all-important promotion to monarchy to a prince of any age.

So if you refer to "the late Princess Grace of Monaco," you are being insulting. They don't still execute people for insulting royalty any more, but if the progression of Hate Laws continue, they may start throwing you in jail for this sort of thing.

November 4, 2000 - THE NADER VOTE

November 4, 2000 - HATE IS ALIVE AND WELL IN THE NEW YORK SENATE ELECTION

November 4, 2000 - THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY: THE PROBLEM IS NOT THEIR PERSONNEL BUT THEIR POWER

THE NADER VOTE

Nader presently has five percent of the vote in most polls. That would get the Green Party Federal funding in the next election. If they get Federal funding, they will, like everything else the government funds, become permanent.

There will be people who will want that Federal funding, and that will make it certain that there will be a Green Party next time. The old hippies are alive and well. There are a lot of kids who like the Green Party, but the real base is the 1960s hippies and Hollywood lefties.

The media, which is largely run by these overage hippies, still likes to say the old New Left, now the Green Party, is a Young People's Movement. They still think they're Flower Children. Actually, even in the Sixties, the New Left was largely made up of the children of limousine liberals. All the kids these old time rich leftists saw were leftists, so the media thought all the young people were.

Actually, the World War II generation was much more liberal politically than the actual mass of young people in the 1960's. I saw lots of young people at Wallace rallies, but you never saw A SINGLE ONE in the media.

So the old hippies like Phil Donahue might have a platform from now on. That is worth thinking about. And I don't see how it can be anything but good for us, as it pulls the Democrats to the left and splits liberals.

HATE IS ALIVE AND WELL IN THE NEW YORK SENATE ELECTION

Hillary Clinton, that product of the Love Generation, has ads out about an Evil Race. These ads warn that people from this Evil Race are going to take over the Senate if her opponent wins and helps maintain a Republican majority.

New York voters are being warned that, if Lazio is elected to the Senate over Hillary, he will help elect Jesse Helms as Chairman of the Judiciary Committee. "Lazio," the campaign charges, "wants Trent Lott as Majority Leader."

Then comes the capper: "Jesse Helms is from NORTH CAROLINA. Trent Lott is from MISSISSIPPI." These Loving New Yorkers go down the list, naming the top Senate Republicans and, to make their point, the Citadels of Evil they come from -- all Southern states.

Meanwhile, the Gore campaign is attacking just about everything in Texas. In 1992, Republicans tried doing that to Arkansas, and Clinton raised hell about sectional bigotry. On CNN, he even backed down a BLACK reporter about it!

A couple of quick questions. What if a Republican-produced ad for a congressional seat showed the picture of black after black who would be chairman of a House committee if Democrats won the majority there? Can you imagine the outcry and the screams of "anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews!"?

What if an ad pointed out what a disaster the CONSTITUENCIES of these black congressmen are? What if those ads pointed to the disease, crime, and poverty these black congressmen had in their districts, the way Gore is attacking Texas?

The Hillary ads end up by saying that Lazio would give all those positions to Southerners, while Hillary "represents New York." So our hypothetical ad would end up saying that the Democratic opponent wants to give everything to blacks, while our candidate represents whites.

Liberals would scream bloody murder, and every Republicans would rush to back them up. As always, conservatives would ask only to be allowed by liberals to lead their lynch mob -- good old Brownie Points!

So how long will it be before one single Republican anywhere, especially Bush, breathes a word about this sectional bigotry?

Don't hold your breath.

THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY: THE PROBLEM IS NOT THEIR PERSONNEL BUT THEIR POWER

The big argument for Bush is that he will appoint conservative Supreme Court justices. This is the kind of wishful thinking that makes conservatism lose every long-term battle.

As long as we play the game for more slightly more conservative Supreme Court justices, we will lose. The real problem, the problem we cannot avoid forever, is that our elected representatives let the courts rule America. As long as you base your politics on getting more justices on your side, you avoid the real fight. But just counting justices allows you to be respectable to liberals.

Anyone who demands that the power of the courts themselves be restricted is declared a radical. He loses the all-important "respectable" title that liberals give out.

For this reason, all of our legislative bodies give the courts the right to do anything they want to do. They do not dare take on the expansion of judicial power itself.

Congress has just forced every state in the Union to adopt a lower blood alcohol level for drunk drivers. This violates the most obvious of state's rights. It also takes attention away from the real problem.

Drunken drivers kill people, not because of a .02% difference in blood alcohol level, but because drunken drivers keep getting their drivers' licenses back. The killers have a record and the courts won't take their licenses away.

But the legislatures are not about to take on the judges. Judges are killing people, but that is no reason for congressmen to get so fanatical as to challenge them. So congressmen and legislators concentrate on blood percentages, because the courts are willing to leave that issue to them.

Exactly the same mentality rules when it comes to gun control. We all know that it is repeat criminals being put back on the street that causes crimes of violence. But the courts let them go, and no matter how loud public protest gets, the congress will only take token measures to rein in the courts' power. So it passes gun control laws.

Gun control laws don't work, but they are aimed at non-criminals, people the courts don't mind government pushing around.

We could lock up the repeat felons for life, but the courts won't let us. The courts make it too expensive. You can keep prisoners at a low cost, as the famous hard-nosed sheriff in North Carolina has shown us.

But the courts won't let us be hard on a poor, innocent repeat felon. It is the courts that make prisons too expensive for the public to afford. It is the courts that order repeat felons released because prisons are too crowded, and because that is hard on prisoners.

And what is the response of conservatives to this murderous court tyranny?

"Maybe Bush will appoint another conservative or two to our masters on the Federal Bench."

Now, if even the most dedicated conservative agrees to play the court game for respectability, what are the odds that poor, wimpy little BUSH is going to stand up and appoint people who will take on this same establishment?

I know that having a memory is not fashionable, but let me remind you that when the Democrats didn't want any conservatives, Bush, Senior appointed the most liberal man on the court, Justice Souter.

Gore's election would have at least one upside. Maybe he would put so many liberals on the court that conservatives will have to give up nose counting and go after the real problem.

November 11, 2000 - ELECTORAL COLLEGE OR A TRULY NATIONAL ELECTION
November 11, 2000 - WHERE ARE ALL THOSE MEXICANS?
November 11, 2000 - THE BOTTOM LINE

ELECTORAL COLLEGE OR A TRULY NATIONAL ELECTION?

One thing that the present electoral college does is to limit each state's influence on the presidential contest. That is, if a political machine in Chicago manufactures votes, the votes it influences are the property of the citizens of Illinois in the first place. So each state conducts its elections with a great deal of independence. The fight over Florida, though it affects us all, is still mostly a matter of Florida law and jurisdiction.

Because of the electoral college, there has never been a truly national election in the United States. Even the ratification of the Constitution proceeded state by state. So, while abolishing the electoral college seems like a routine step, it isn't. With a truly national election, direct control of elections would move inevitably to Washington. After all, what is done in New York would affect me as directly as much as a vote in Columbia.

Abolishing the electoral college would have been a lot harder in the past, when states actually had rights. On the upside, such abolition would soon remove much of the distinction between the Deep South and the rest of the country under the Voting Rights Act, which puts us under special Federal regulations.

The first truly national election now would not be nearly the revolutionary move it would have been just a few decades ago. But it is still a much more radical step than most people think. An intermediate

step would be to keep the electoral votes assigned to each state, but get rid of the human electors, who, in a very close election like this one, could theoretically wreak havoc.

WHERE ARE ALL THOSE MEXICANS?

Do you remember Bush's Mexican Convention, the one that included the first speech to a national convention in Spanish? Do you remember all those Hispanic voters who were going to turn out and give California to Bush?

Nobody else does either. For a while there, the media could speak of nothing but the coming wave of Mexican votes for Bush. But when the real election day approached, everybody forgot about it.

So who gets credit for the increased Republican presidential vote? The answer, said the media, was a group to which the networks have given a brand new name. I saw it splashed across the screen on network TV.

They called it "The White Christian Right." Sounds like the Klan, doesn't it?

What a coincidence.

It is the first time I had ever seen that label. Apparently it was conjured up just for Election Night. I forget whether it was used by CBS or CNN. Or both.

But it turns out that the Mexicans did not pour out to give the "inclusive" Republican Party their support.

The reason Bush did so well, said the media, was because he got over 90% of this "White Christian Right," while his father and Dole had gotten less than 80% of it. In other words, after selling out for all those minority votes and liberal votes, Bush got a basic Republican vote, and little else. It was his gestures toward conservatism that won for him.

Once again, this was the opposite of what the media predicted.

The press called Bush's post-South Carolina campaign, "The Bob Jones Redemption Tour." As always, they said he had to go left and win all those Hispanics who were just panting to support him in California.

But in the end, it was his rightward shift to win South Carolina away from McCain that saved his base for him.

The press -- always unanimously -- gave an equally absurd analysis of why Republicans lost California. It was, they said, because Republicans had earlier sponsored popular initiatives to take public services away from illegal aliens and to abolish bilingual education. Both those initiatives won overwhelming majorities in California. But the media unanimously agree that the Mexicans who were against them on those initiatives would have voted for Bush this time if Republicans hadn't sponsored them.

Let's translate this into English. The media declares that the people who embrace bilingual education are natural Republicans. They say that the kind of Hispanics who are more worried about their illegal

brethren than they are about American taxpayers would actually have trooped over to Republicanism this time.

It's insane when you state it that plainly, but all the media agree on it.

It's weird how liberals can state the most insane propositions, but they only look as ridiculous as they are when somebody translates them into straight talk. And if a conservative spoke plain English, he couldn't be respectable, so the liberals get away with it.

THE BOTTOM LINE

The bottom line is population changes. Everybody knows that is the one thing that determines a country's future. It is also the one thing no conservative is allowed to talk about. And nobody enforces that prohibition more ferociously than respectable conservatives seeking liberal approval.

With the vast increase in liberal Hispanic population in California and other minorities elsewhere -- along with blatantly anti-white liberalism -- the Republican base at its best cannot get this close for much longer. As time passes, we will have more and more disadvantages in this respect.

It is not hopeless, unless we keep playing this mad little game of fake inclusiveness. In this game, libertarians and "Christian" conservatives wimp out on major issues and help liberals label serious opponents "racist." In return, these respectable conservatives get "anti-racist" brownie points from liberals.

They live for that.

In other words, the Great Prohibition on the right is thinking in terms of "us" versus "them." At the same time, liberals openly talk about absolutely nothing BUT "us" versus "them."

We could get some allies if we got some spine. Orientals, for example, have a lot to lose from a minority-ruled America. Even the anti-Communist Republican Cuban vote is melting away, as they move toward their fellow Hispanics. They are moving toward what is clearly the long term winning side.

As so often happens with Whitaker Online, I am simply stating what might be called a Public Secret. I am saying what everybody knows, but nobody dares mention. Population trends are determining the future, and at this time white cowardice makes liberals the sure winners.

As I have said before, I think this whole equation will change as whites become a SELF-CONSCIOUS minority. In twenty years, the political landscape will be unrecognizable, and today's respectable conservatives will be as laughable as the old Whig Party.

In the meantime, no one goes to a sure loser. We have to address who we are and how to deal with the liberal battle for immigration and other identity issues before anyone can take our long-term chances seriously.

It is hideously DIFFICULT to survive if you have to deal openly and intelligently with the issues of race, language and culture. But, in the not-so-long-run, it is IMPOSSIBLE to win if you don't.

November 18, 2000 - WHEN THE VICE PRESIDENT BROKE THE TIE

November 18, 2000 - REPUBLICANS AND THE BLACK VOTE -- "FROM THE HORSE'S MOUTH"

November 18, 2000 - DO YOU KNOW WHO DECIDES ELECTIONS IN THE LAST RESORT

WHEN THE VICE PRESIDENT BROKE THE TIE

On November 4, in HATE IS ALIVE AND WELL IN NEW YORK SENATE ELECTION, I talked about some Democratic ads. They said that, if Lazio was elected over Hillary Clinton, he would vote for Evil Southerners to be in leadership positions. By contrast, the ads conclude, "Hillary Clinton would represent New York."

The party in the majority in the Senate elects all the committee chairmen and other critical positions. What the ad says is that Lazio would vote for the Jesse Helmses and Trent Lotts from the hated South, whereas Clinton would vote for unspecified people outside the South. This apparently means she represents New York, which is for anything but Southerners.

In the national election, Florida's recounts made the national news, but I think we all noticed that poor little Oregon also just sat there undecided. The Northwest seems to have had a bad year because Washington State had a similar problem. The incumbent Republican Senator up there was also in a race that was too close to call.

And, as in the presidential race, it was the undecided one that made all the difference. If they lost that race, Republicans would split the Senate 50-50 with Democrats. Commentators were saying that, in that case, whoever is elected Vice President would break the tie and determine the majority.

This has actually happened once before in my lifetime. In 1952, liberal Republican Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon got upset with the Republican platform and became an independent. But when the new Senate convened in 1953, he still voted with the Republicans, splitting the Senators down the middle, 48-48. The newly installed vice president, Richard Nixon, broke the tie and gave the majority to the GOP.

But in 1955, exactly the same thing happened AGAIN! There were 48 Democrats, Wayne Morse the independent, and 47 Republicans. This time, Lyndon Johnson persuaded Morse to go to the Democrats and Johnson became Majority Leader, 49-47.

Another vote that decided the majority at the last minute was in 1931, in the House of Representatives. The Republicans won a razor-thin majority, but just enough of them died before Congress convened to give the Democrats a one-vote majority!

REPUBLICANS AND THE BLACK VOTE -- "FROM THE HORSE'S MOUTH"

I read an interesting Tribune Media Services column editorial by a young black woman (Deborah Mathis, November 12). It was entitled, "GOP must really change to attract blacks." She was amused by Bush's minority-dominated show at the 2000 Republican convention. She concludes by giving the conditions under which she and other blacks would actually vote for the Republican Party:

"It will be because the GOP did more than sling open a door. It will be because it tore out the room, threw out the old fixtures and carpeting and wallpaper and built a new place....."

If you do all that, where does that leave today's Republicans?

Of course, the moderates will tell us that we must do what the black woman said. They would say "We Republicans must make SERIOUS concessions to minorities." But it's the same thing she said, and she put it much more honestly.

Tearing up old principles would be fine with moderates. It would also not hurt the huge bureaucracy that makes its living running the Republican Party. As long as it has that name, it gets paid.

And there are a lot of other people who would vote Republican if Old Nick himself were on the ticket. After World War II, Southern Democrats and conservative Republicans, whose beliefs were almost identical, refused to unite because of party names.

Conservatives were split between militant Democrats and militant Republicans. Liberals and moderates decided every presidential election.

You have to think about it to fully realize how purely evil this obsession was. It ruined America.

So the old words will no longer be accepted without question. When you say, "We Republicans," do you mean those whose only interest is in the Republican name? Or do you mean decent people who call themselves Republicans because that institution happens, at this moment, to be useful to their principles?

DO YOU KNOW WHO DECIDES ELECTIONS IN THE LAST RESORT?

National polls have been showing that if Gore was declared winner in the presidential race, about 85% of the population would accept him as legitimate. If Bush were the winner, only 74% would accept him.

Conservatives tend to be blindly loyal, but liberals have a hard and ruthless core.

When I was in graduate school, the very, very close Kennedy-Nixon race was recent history, so close elections were discussed a good deal. In seminar, we described more and more situations which were more and more difficult to decide. Finally, we got to one in which even the professor could not imagine how a clear choice could be made.

"So," asked a student, "Who would decide the election?"

The professor answered, "The Air Force."

Democratic politics is a substitute for settling things by violence, as is done in a police state. So if a solution within the republican framework cannot be reached, the whole question goes back to the original decision: who controls the means of violence?

In 1960, the officer corps in all services was overwhelmingly conservative. So, if it just came down to their preferences, a conservative would have been put in power by the military, as described in the 1960s movie "Seven Days in May."

But to show how divided this country is, there is no such certainty today. Army officers might be conservative, but their command is largely minority, and would probably go the other way. Officers in our day of affirmative action -- and after the experience of fragging in Vietnam -- could not force their troops to obey orders.

Besides, in our get-along-by-going along military, where you don't get promoted if you have strong convictions, there are no more MacArthurs or Pattons around.

The Army is largely minority, the Air Force is much more white, especially the pilots who control the weapons. Would we have the situation we have seen in many Latin American countries, where the Army is on one side and the Navy and/or the Air Force is on the other?

Anybody who thinks that the United States is one country these days has got to be on drugs.

November 25, 2000 404 Not Found

December 2, 2000 - PAUL BAGALA EXPLAINS WHY MIDDLE AMERICANS ARE NAZIS WHO WANT TO KILL SIX MILLION JEWS

December 2, 2000 - THE FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT SAYS NOTHING TODAY. THAT SAYS A LOT.

PAUL BAGALA EXPLAINS WHY MIDDLE AMERICANS ARE NAZIS WHO WANT TO KILL SIX MILLION JEWS

A color-coded map of the United States, showing how each county voted in the presidential election, told a story everybody seemed to recognize. On that map, America's clear division was shown with ruthless clarity: middle Americans voted solidly Republican. The East and West Coast and the self-styled "elites" and professional minority groups voted even more unanimously for liberalism.

This was not really news to anybody. Everybody knows that all the resident aliens who hate Middle America and white people use liberalism as their vehicle. Liberalism today is simply a hatred of Middle America, and a way to destroy it.

But the fact that liberalism is simply a hatred of white people and middle Americans is what I call a Public Secret. A Public Secret is something everybody knows, but which the media and respectable conservatives prevent from ever being mentioned.

Anybody who mentioned what those color-coded maps made painfully obvious would have been a racist, anazi who want to kill six million jews. It is fully expected for all blacks to "vote black," which means to vote liberal so that liberals will force white people to do what black people want them to do.

But for whites to vote the other way is racist.

That map was an excruciating embarrassment to liberals. They claim to represent "populism" and real America.

But the map showed that Middle America is precisely the enemy that liberals hate. Any conservative who dares mention this fact will lose his respectability. And being respectable in the eyes of liberals is more important to conservatives than any principle, any people, or any country.

So the map said something no one was allowed to say, and it really upset liberals. It showed that liberals and their clients are on one side and real America is on the other.

That map stunned the regular liberals into silence.

What they plan to do about it is to use respectable conservatives to keep this embarrassing fact from being mentioned. The public memory is short, and they can count on the respectables to help them put this down the Memory Hole.

Most liberals were stunned into silence by that map.

But one thing you can say for Clinton's crowd: nothing shuts them up. One of Clinton's closest buddies and spokesmen, Paul Bagala, spoke up about the fact that Middle America had turned on the liberals. He said that those so-called Middle American counties included the place where a homosexual was killed in a hate crime. Those counties included the site of the Oklahoma Bombing. Middle America, he added, included the county in Texas where a black man was dragged to death on a chain behind a truck.

In other words, the only reason Middle America votes conservative is because it represents Hate. Middle America is a bunch of naziswhowanttokillsixmillionjews.

Bagala is from the South. There is no loudmouth traitor like a SOUTHERN loudmouth traitor.

THE FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT SAYS NOTHING TODAY. THAT SAYS A LOT.

There are three Reconstruction Amendments, which were passed in the aftermath of the Civil War.

The first Reconstruction Amendment was the Thirteenth Amendment, which freed the slaves. The second was the Fourteenth Amendment, which gave black people citizenship. That one got through only by open cheating.

The last Reconstruction Amendment, and by far the hardest to shove and cheat its way through, was the Fifteenth, which gave blacks the vote.

As the presidential election went to the courts, there arose a chorus of people who say that voting "is the most basic right of every American citizen." One of the LAWYERS who is arguing the Bush case before the United States Supreme Court said that "VOTING IS A FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT." He said that you have as much right to vote as you do to practice your religion, or to free speech.

To repeat, the Fourteenth Amendment gave black people CITIZENSHIP. But it took a real fight to get through the Fifteenth, which gave blacks the VOTE. A lot of people who supported black citizenship

did not want all non-whites to be given the vote. This was especially the case in California, with its huge Oriental minority.

In fact, a groundbreaking Federal Court decision was necessary to save the Fourteenth Amendment. It barely squeaked by, cheating and all. Before it was passed, California actually rescinded its ratification. If that had been allowed, the amendment would have failed.

What happened was that Californians suddenly noticed that there was no reference to "black people" in the new amendment. It not only gave Southern blacks citizenship, but it also gave the same rights to Orientals! California tried to pull back its ratification when it realized that the Fourteenth Amendment gave Orientals NON-VOTING citizenship.

California would never have touched the Fourteenth Amendment if they had thought from the beginning that it gave Chinese immigrants the VOTE. In other words, if the people who ratified the Fourteenth Amendment had thought that voting was the right of every citizen, it would never have gotten into the Constitution.

As it was, in order to save the Fourteenth Amendment, the Supreme Court had to rule that no state could back out once it had ratified an amendment.

But when the fight over giving blacks the vote came up, they were already citizens. It never occurred to anybody that they therefore had the right to vote.

Nowadays, it never occurs to anybody that, if you are a citizen, you might not have full voting rights.

Actually, what the Fourteenth Amendment gave blacks was what everybody insists cannot exist. It gave blacks citizenship, but no vote. The Fourteenth Amendment, in other words, made blacks official second class citizens. If it hadn't, there would have been no Fifteenth Amendment.

In 1954, in *Brown vs. Board of Education*, the Court changed the Fourteenth Amendment. They said that it forbade any distinction at all, of any kind, being made between white and black citizenship.

Today, it is impossible to explain to anybody why the Fifteenth Amendment was necessary. In 1868, it would have been just as impossible to explain to anybody why it wasn't.

There is no overlap whatsoever between the thinking of those who wrote the Constitution (even the most radical) and the judges who claim to interpret it today.

December 9, 2000 - CHRIS MATTHEWS, A SMART GUY, BUT AN INCURABLE YANKEE

December 9, 2000 - DECEMBER 8-11, 1941

December 9, 2000 - STUPIDITY CARRIES A DEATH PENALTY

CHRIS MATTHEWS, A SMART GUY, BUT AN INCURABLE YANKEE

Chris Matthews used to be the main man of the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives. Now he hosts "Hard Ball" on MSNBC. Usually, his talk reflects his knowledge of real world politicking, and is a relief from the silly and predictable comments of the usual media commentators.

But Chris is still a Yankee, and in some ways that's incurable. He said the other day that he would often use big words to confuse Southern congressmen.

He said it worked.

Yea, right. I used that Southern accent gambit plenty on Capitol Hill. You can ALWAYS trick Yanks with it, and I was endlessly astonished at their inability to catch on.

Tennessee Senator Howard Baker was talking to North Carolina Senator Sam Ervin years ago. Ervin said, "Well, I'm just a country lawyer from North Carolina." Baker said, "Sam, you are a MAGNA CUM LAUDE graduate of the Harvard Law School."

Old Ervin leaned back and said, "Yes, Howard, but nobody will ever know it."

Least of all Chris Matthews.

I was watching while MSNBC pulled out its inside-the-beltway political expert to talk about the unique situation in the Senate. With a Bush victory, the Senate would be 50-50, with Vice President Cheney breaking the tie and making Republicans a majority. The commentator said such a thing has not happened in over a century.

Because of this novel even split, Democrats are saying they should not be treated as a minority usually is. Actually, as I pointed out earlier in Whitaker Online, the exact same situation did occur in 1953, when Vice President Nixon broke the tie in the Senate.

And in 1953, the minority was treated as the minority, just as it was in 1955, when Democrats ruled by a single vote in their turn. The old Southern senators would know that. Sam Ervin might humor Chris Matthews by acting like Chris' big words impressed him. But he, not Chris, would know the basics cold.

Not so today. Today Southern Republicans are so bound up in the beltway culture that they probably don't know this. Outside of Helms and maybe Thurmond, your Southern Republican today is just one more Republican, dumb as a brick and with the courage of a rabbit. I have often seen them ignorant of the basics, just like the Yankees.

You would do well to write your senator and remind him of 1953. Don't give the Republicans another excuse to act like a minority when they have a majority.

DECEMBER 8-11, 1941

Right now, all the Democrats and Republicans are talking "what ifs" and regretting dumb moves. The Democratic official who put in the butterfly ballots in Florida probably hates herself right now, as do millions of others in her party. "What if she hadn't done that?" is often on every Gore partisan's mind.

Most of us have been there. We loyal Confederates all have a hundred "what ifs" from the Civil War. All of us know many examples of incredible stupidity on the Confederate side, and wonder what might have happened if this or that had not happened.

"What if" and stupidity are home territory to us Confederates.

But the most extreme example of pure stupidity I am aware of in history happened almost exactly fifty nine years ago today, and it had nothing to do with today's election or with the Old Confederacy.

On December 7, 1941, Japan attacked Pearl Harbor. For President Roosevelt and Churchill, this was a dream come true. Roosevelt called on Congress to declare war on Germany, Italy, and Japan, all three.

But on December 8, 1941, Congress handed him a major defeat by declaring war **ONLY AGAINST JAPAN**.

America was mad at Japan, and wanted to fight the attackers of Pearl Harbor.

Nobody should have known better than Adolf Hitler what a major boon it would have been **NOT** to have to fight America. After all, he had been a front-line soldier in the German army that American power crushed in World War I.

So did Hitler do the sane thing, and thank his lucky stars that America was out to crush Japan, and not him?

No way.

On December 11, Hitler performed what was probably the biggest piece of fatal stupidity in history. After Americans had refused to make war on Germany in defiance of Roosevelt, Hitler gave Roosevelt exactly what he wanted. He declared war on the United States!

On December 11, 1941, Hitler declared war on the United States, which had refused to declare war on him. It was on that date, not in 1945, that Hitler committed suicide.

STUPIDITY CARRIES A DEATH PENALTY.

Pure stupidity killed Hitler, but it has killed a lot of others, too. The word stupidity naturally makes us think of respectable conservatives.

Robert Heinlein pointed out years ago that, "The penalty for stupidity has always been death."

When you are aware of the fact that stupidity is fatal, the blind stumbling of George W. Bush makes the hair rise up on your neck.

Let's take a look at a couple of the most recent examples of Bush stupidity in action.

George W. Bush lost many states by a hair. With just a few more resources spent getting votes they really could have gotten, Republicans would have carried all of them.

Where did all those resources go? The entire Republican Convention was devoted to getting liberal minority votes. Many millions of dollars were devoted to getting liberal minority votes. The Republican platform was made hopelessly weak on critical issues to get minority votes.

Once again, as in every other election, Republicans got no liberal minority votes. But this has been a consistent theme of moderate Republicanism for decades: they ignore the right and go after minority votes.

So Bush threw away a clear victory by going after minority votes. So what did Bush do as soon as he thought he had won?

Bush went after the minorities. Everybody was told that his first move would be to make a black woman his advisor on foreign affairs, and Colin Powell his Secretary of State.

This is just the beginning.

We all know that the one thing that respectable conservatives hunger after is a good word from the liberal media. The media have a gambit that uses that hopeless desire of Republicans to be loved by the press when an election has been as close as this one has. It is called The Unity Gambit.

The press is crying about how America has been split by this election. They are saying that, since the election was so close, the only way Bush can unite the nation is by giving in to the liberals even more than usual.

You see, in order to attain National Unity, Bush must go left. Now, it so happens that every time the media commentators recommend anything, it is always that the Republicans move left. By a strange coincidence, they tell us that National Unity after a close election requires Republicans to move left, too.

After a close, divisive election, we are told, Bush can be a True Statesman if he will just move to the left. Like every other recommendation of the national media commentators, this one says the same thing -- Republicans must ignore conservatives and move to the good old "middle of the road."

Needless to say, Bush is going all out for this promise that the national media will love him. There simply isn't anything so stupid that it doesn't work on a Bush.

December 16, 2000 - THE ADAMSES WERE ONE-TERMERS, TOO

December 16, 2000 - THE THING THAT WOULDN'T DIE

THE ADAMSES WERE ONE-TERMERS, TOO

With George W's victory, it will be the second time in American history that a father and a son were both presidents. John Adams was president from 1797 to 1801, and his son, John Quincy Adams, was president from 1825-1829.

There are other similarities between the Adams duo and the present Bush duo. John Adams, the father, was elected because the sitting president, George Washington, designated him as his successor. When Adams ran on his own in 1800, he lost.

Exactly like the other president who was father of a later president, George Bush, Senior, was selected by Ronald Reagan as his successor. But when he ran on his own in 1992, he lost.

George W. Bush was elected by less popular votes than his opponent. John Quincy Adams got a lot less votes in 1824 than the man he defeated, Andrew Jackson. Like John Q., George W. is likely to lose in 2004.

I doubt there are many knowledgeable people who disagree with me that Bush, Jr. is a one-termer. We also all know that the Republicans will lose their majority in both Houses of Congress in 2002.

Remember that what Bush is trying to do is please the media by being completely different from that evil partisan Gingrich. And what the Republicans have right now is the same majority that evil Gingrich won for them six years ago. The media want the good old fashioned bipartisan moderates back, the ones who always lost. Bush will bring back those good old days.

There is one more little similarity between the Adamses and the Bushes that needs mentioning. After John Adams, his opponents, the Jeffersonian Democrats, took over American politics for twenty-four years, from 1801-1825. . After the senior Bush, the Democrats got their first elected two-term president since Franklin Roosevelt.

After John Quincy Adams had his four years, his opponents, the Jackson Democrats, took over American politics until 1861.

I think we all know what happened then.

THE THING THAT WOULDN'T DIE

In 1800, as I said, John Adams lost the election overwhelmingly. But something else happened in 1800. George Washington and John Adams had been Federalists. But after Adams' defeat in 1800, that party began to die. It got only the votes of New England in elections after 1800, and soon it disappeared even there.

In 1932, 1934, and 1936, the same process began with the Republican Party. It began the historic process of dying, so that by 1937, it held only 86 out of 435 seats in the United States House of Representatives. Like the dying Federalist Party, it got electoral votes only from two New England States in 1936.

But the Republican Party did not die. Instead, it became a "me too party." Anything the liberal Democrats did, the liberal Republicans soon said was just fine. Conservative Republicans, in order to save the Republican Party, gave it to the liberals and moderates.

Everybody talks about how the middle of the road is the majority and is supposed to dominate elections. But after World War II, the Southern Democrats were conservative almost to a man. The Republican Party was solidly conservative. Northern ethnic Democrats were socially very conservative indeed. In fact, there were two huge blocks of conservative voters that made up the base of each of the two parties.

But during all those years, it was the liberal Democrats and the liberal Republicans who ruled their parties nationally.

Today, conservative Republicans do exactly what the 1936 Republicans did. Instead of killing the stupid thing, they sacrifice everything to get a few mythical votes from minority groups in order to keep the stinking carcass of the Republican Party alive.

What if, like the Federalists in 1800, the Republican Party had done the honorable thing and simply DIED? Republicans, the overwhelming majority of them conservatives, would have become part of the Democratic Party, and that party would effectively have ceased to exist with its Republican rival. A new Era of Good Feeling would have come upon America, as it did with the demise of the Federalists.

What if all those Republican conservatives had joined the Southern conservatives and the Northern ethnic social conservatives in the Democratic Party? Would Roosevelt have gotten a third and fourth term? Would Democratic liberals have taken over our national politics, with the connivance of Republican liberals, moderates, and now respectable conservatives?

No way. If the Republican label had died, the American nation might have lived.

December 23, 2000 - VOTING BY OTHER MEANS

December 23, 2000 - WHEN THE PRESS PROMISED TO LOVE NIXON FOREVER

VOTING BY OTHER MEANS

Ted Turner's far-left Cable News Network (CNN), now has two major competitors, MSNBC and Fox Network News. Those competitors, especially the latter, deserve our support.

Fox Network News, believe it or not, has a conservative bent. We have dreamed for years of some slight break in the solid liberal front presented by the media. There has been talk of conservatives buying a network.

Fox is not far right enough for me - who could be? -- But it is a major step forward.

As usual, practically no conservatives seem to have noticed.

I mentioned Chris Matthews last week. He has the most popular program on MSNBC News Network. During election time he actually beat CNN in ratings!

Matthews is not a conservative, but he is far, far fairer to conservatives than any CNN program will ever be, and he makes our points sometimes. His program is the sole surviving program of three similar programs MSNBC had early on. The other two had Standard Issue Liberals like Charles Gordon in charge.

Those standard liberal programs died. Matthews' program survived.

CNN has two networks in competition, and they are both moving to the right to compete. I think this bodes very well for the future.

In the days before cable, there were three commercial networks, all three far left, and Public Broadcasting which was even farther left. But the number of competing information sources is

increasing rapidly because of technology. Nobody should know that better than those of us who use the Internet.

These outlets give us opportunities regular conservatives would never recognize.

We need to take advantage of the opportunities technology is giving us. We need to discuss them and support them.

The most important vote we cast this year may be turning our cable dials away from CNN.

WHEN THE PRESS PROMISED TO LOVE NIXON FOREVER

Many if not most of the readers of Whitaker Online know a lot of history. I think about all of you recognize the truth in the saying, "He who forgets history is doomed to repeat it."

Bush is repeating some history right now.

Republicans are politically dumb. The big mistakes they make are not only not new, they are boringly repetitive. I have seen them so many times I have given them names.

The one Bush is falling for right now is the one I call The National Unity Gambit. It always works in close elections, but the most egregious example was in 1968.

In November of 1968, the three leading contenders got the following percentage of the vote.

Richard Nixon(R) 43%
Hubert Humphrey(D) 43%
George Wallace (A) 14%

Wallace's platform was "Send them a message!" and that's what he did. Governor George Corley Wallace of Alabama, still an open segregationist at that time, got by far the largest third party vote in American history up to that time.

Wallace's voters were largely white working class people who had never voted Republican. His vote and Nixon's together made up 57% of the total electorate.

Wallace's voters were social conservatives, Southern whites and Northern ethnics. They were what we called "Reagan Democrats" in 1980 and thereafter.

So in the 1968 election, Wallace's ten million voters sent Washington a message, big time.

Did the Administration elected in 1968 get that message?

We are talking about Republicans. What did Nixon and his geniuses decide the message of the 1968 election was?

The only message Nixon got was from the media. The media told him that it was a very close election between him and Humphrey. They called on Nixon to unite the divided nation by promoting a National Unity program, just like Bush today. He had to reach out to liberals, they said.

He had to be bipartisan, they said.

If Nixon ignored the Wallace vote and went to the liberals, the media broadly indicated that its whole attitude would change, and it would love Nixon forever after.

And Nixon fell for the bait.

Yes, Richard Nixon fell for it. Yes, this was the same Richard Nixon who said in 1962, when he thought his political career was over, that ""the press won't have Richard Nixon to kick around any more."

Yes, this was the same Richard Nixon who was hounded out of office by the press in 1974.

As soon as he was elected, one of Nixon's first moves was to name a PRO-BUSING Commissioner of Education (This was before the Department of Education). Roughly ninety percent of Americans and ALL Wallace voters opposed racial busing to achieve integration, but Nixon was after the handful of far leftists who liked it.

Nixon tried to get Humphrey himself to accept an appointment.

Nixon proceeded to push affirmative action harder than any previous administration. As with racial busing, the overwhelming majority of Americans and ALL Wallace voters opposed that. In every area, he pushed policies to please liberals. Nixon recognized Red China and expanded government in every area.

After his presidency, Nixon said his single biggest regret was that he didn't unite social and economic conservatives, Republicans and Reagan Democrats.

So Nixon, the political genius, made the same mistake the poor stupid little Bushes both made. Why?

It just shows how much power the media siren song has. You are sitting there in Washington, DC, with everybody courting you as the president-elect. All those big names promise to love you forever, and tell you how to be presidential.

Yes, friends, there is a reason that the elephant is named Dumbo. If an operator like Nixon falls for the National Unity gambit, retards like Gerald Ford and the Bushes stand no chance at all.

We are going to listen to another Bush whine for four years. Any time he is accused of being a partisan he will back down and whimper, just like Dear Old Dad. He will say he is a conservative and then back liberal policies. This routine National Unity Gambit after a close election is just the last straw.

It's going to be a LONG four years.

December 30, 2000 - THE FIRST SECESSION - Article is missing from the server
December 30, 2000 - THE FIRST INTERNET - Article is missing from the server

January 6, 2001 - AT LEAST ONE THING IS GOING OUR WAY

January 6, 2001 - ANOTHER RIGHTIST BEGS FOR LEFTIST BROWNIE POINTS

AT LEAST ONE THING IS GOING OUR WAY

Looking at the shambles around us, it is hard for young people to believe that anything has improved in any area since the 60s. But I remember that back then a debate would consist of liberal Republicans arguing on television with liberal Democrats. Things were so bad that liberal propaganda was declared to be a public service, AND NO ONE PUBLICLY DISAGREED.

Television is still solid leftist propaganda, but they don't brag about it any more or call it public service-type "messages." It is now called propaganda when it is mentioned.

Back in the 1950s and 1960s, movies and television shows would have "social messages" in them. These "social messages" would call for integration or peace with the Communists. A "social message" would explain to us that what we called criminals were actually innocent victims of society.

Some New York writer would appear on television and tell us how he tried to get "social messages" into his work. He would chide others for not having enough "social messages" on television. Everybody would agree with him.

It was taken for granted that we were all to feel grateful for these "social messages." Back then, though no one else seemed to question this, I was absolutely puzzled by it.

"Why," I wanted to ask, "Are we to be grateful that someone puts his political propaganda into my television entertainment?" But, as I say, no one on the talk shows ever asked this question. It was just something that was supposed to be good for us.

Today, I am in the same quandary when it comes to all the media urging people to do me a big favor and vote. Why on earth should I want somebody to vote? Why is a disinterested person doing the country a favor by staggering to the polls and casting a mindless vote? You see almost no one protesting this nonsense, though I know it makes no sense to any of us. We were the same way back then about those "social messages."

Younger people cannot imagine what a relief it is to have any nationwide means by which to criticize the left.

There is one nice thing about speaking for truth that has long been suppressed: the more avenues that open up to us, the more the old ones which are locked in by liberals lose the power to prevent Americans from telling each other the truth. As Lake High says, "If you're not on the Internet, you're not in politics."

We are getting new avenues also in the explosion of cable channels. And the Internet and cable help each other. Back in the old days, even if we could have brought up points on the Internet, the three major networks and PBS could and would have ignored us. But today, with so many cable outlets and so many competing talk programs, there is less and less time between the buzz on the Internet and public discussion.

Meanwhile all this is killing network news, which means it is destroying one of our deadliest enemies. Information technology is our friend, and it's moving faster all the time.

ANOTHER RIGHTIST BEGS FOR LEFTIST BROWNIE POINTS

Conservatives whine and they cry about how biased the press is against them. Then they do exactly what the liberals tell them to, and the bias just gets worse.

So they whine some more, then do exactly the same thing again.

One after another, conservatives denounce "Racism." They scream and they yell at anybody who is further right than they are about white people. They shriek "racist" and "Nazi" at anyone the left does not approve of. They say that if they cut enough "racist" throats, those sweet, fair liberals will see that they are not racists and approve of them.

So what would any sane person expect to happen?

The minute you denounce everybody to your right on race as a "Nazi," the liberals start denouncing YOU as a Nazi. After all, it was YOU who made the screaming of Nazi so legitimate.

Justin Raimondo is a columnist I had begun to enjoy reading. But like so many others, he suddenly went into hysterics with a wild attack on a major portion of the right that is just what the leftists ordered.

Raimondo just let out a poisoned-pig shriek about how anybody who wants to limit immigration or has any concerns about immigration and integration is not merely a racist, but a NAZI -- or at least a Nazi sympathizer (<http://128.121.216.19/justin/pf/p-j120400.html> December 4, 2000).

It turns out that one of the people he says is working with these "Nazis" is David Horowitz. Horowitz is a Jew, but when these nutcases start shrieking Nazi, no factual information can get in the way.

This Raimondo character considers himself a libertarian, but he has no interest whatsoever in anything but racial heresy. He indicates that anybody who doesn't go after the minority vote -- which is just a code word for pandering to the left -- is some kind of Nazi or in collaboration with Nazis.

Worst of all, Raimondo specifically identifies any belief in racial purity with Nazism.

Why are so many self-proclaimed "libertarians" interested only in a person's stand on race and not on his stand on FREEDOM?

It is not a person's stand on race that makes him a Nazi. That is what liberals want us to say. It is one's stand on FREEDOM that makes one a totalitarian, either Fascist or Communist. You can be a perfectly good right-wing totalitarian with no racial views at all. Franco of Spain and Salazar of Portugal followed a policy of "assimilacion," the intermarriage of whites and blacks to form a single fascist nation.

It is not racial or economic theories that make one a Nazi or a Communist. Willy Brandt was a Democratic Socialist and a leading anti-Communist as mayor of West Berlin. The point is not his economic theory, but the fact that he was for FREEDOM against TOTALITARIANISM.

Practically every congressman and senator before 1960 disapproved of racial intermarriage, including that civil rights hero, Harry Truman. Following Raimondo's logic, the army that invaded Normandy was Nazi, because it was segregated.

Liberals love that kind of talk on the right, because it makes their own witch-hunts and denunciations successful. But the Raimondos of the world think that it makes the right safe from being accused of "racism" if they shout the word loud enough. It never works.

All it does is make it that much easier for liberals to denounce all of us.

January 13, 2001 - WHY RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES ARE NOT TALKING ABOUT THE NEW CONSERVATIVE NETWORK

January 13, 2001 - FOX NEWS KEEPS GETTING BETTER

WHY RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES ARE NOT TALKING ABOUT THE NEW CONSERVATIVE NETWORK

Respectable conservatives used to make a lot of noise about how they wanted a conservative network on television. Now that Fox News is providing exactly that, I can't find mention of it in those same respectable conservative media.

Since I am one of those who used to make my living speaking for the American right, I think I can explain this silence.

People who make their living as respectable conservatives have found a cushy niche in our society. They can ignore touchy issues like immigration or the insane Republican pursuit of the liberal minority vote. They never have to do anything hard, like asking a liberal to define the word "Racist," which they use as a club against us.

Respectable conservatism has become a formula. Those who make their living as respectable conservatives have found that if they get in the right groove, and avoid saying anything that would hurt the left, they get lots of exposure on the liberal media as the "opposition."

This formula requires no courage and very little intelligence. In fact, any sign of intelligence or courage on the right threatens liberals. As a result, today's conservative spokesmen are lightweights who ignore the big, dangerous issues and make liberals feel comfortable. So the liberal media monopoly lets them in.

I often had to follow those rules myself, and I am ashamed of it and refuse to do it any more.

But this happy little world of respectable conservatism can only last as long as there are no big and professional conservative media. All we have speaking for us today are the selected lightweights that liberals allow to speak for conservatism.

Now that the real thing is here, respectable conservatives have found out an unpleasant truth:

If the big-time professionals like Fox News are now going to take over safe, respectable conservatism, there will be no place for the liberals' pet conservatives.

Right now, on any debate on a liberal network, all the respectable conservative has to do is look at the Internet and talk about the stories the solid liberal media simply don't mention. But if the big leaguers like Fox News take over reporting, what are the little lightweight respectable conservatives going to talk about?

Suddenly, lightweight conservatives are finding that the idea of a real, professional conservative network is a threat to them. If the pros take over respectable conservatism, those who want to make a living in this business may have to start talking seriously about serious issues.

FOX NEWS KEEPS GETTING BETTER

Recently Fox News had a special feature on the coming publication of Reagan's radio commentaries. It shows a knowledgeable, highly intelligent man, the opposite of the regular news stereotype of a dumb and bumbling old man. Fox directly attacked this stereotype, and ended by pointing out that the media has used his Alzheimer's to clinch its stereotype of Reagan as dumb.

You can't get much lower than being cruel to a man with Alzheimer's, but no one else in the media has dared attack this stereotype.

Bill O'Reilly, of the Fox News regular program "The O'Reilly Factor," is hot after Attorney General Reno. He is pointing to the total blocking of all investigations during Clinton's second term.

O'Reilly has the kind of guts you don't see in regular respectable conservatives.

O'Reilly brought in Clinton's own former chief advisor Morris to testify that Clinton had hated Reno in his first term, saying she was the worst appointment he had ever made. Clinton was going to get rid of her, said Morris. But after meeting with Reno at the beginning of his second term, Clinton gave her a year to shape up. After that, he kept her on as Attorney General.

By an odd coincidence, it was after that meeting with Clinton that Reno threw a bodyblock against all serious investigations. She brought the appointment of special counsels to a screeching and complete halt. I defy you to find any other media that would report that little coincidence.

There have been a number of office shootings lately. The regular media just point to a lack of gun control and leave it at that. Fox reported that one of the reasons for these shootings is a law that will not allow employers to look into the mental health of employees. It is the first criticism of an anti-discrimination law I have seen in the media in a long, long time, if ever.

When I heard that Fox News founder Rupert Murdoch was conservative, I had expected a somewhat larger token conservative pretense on Fox than on the other cable channels. But Fox News is coming out swinging.

Fox's move to get the conservative viewers seems to be paying off. They took a huge step forward during the big election 2000 story, in the same way that the Gulf War originally established CNN.

At long, long last, the absolute two-generation-long monopoly of liberals over all television is broken, at least for now.

That absolute liberal media lockup was no accident. The Big Media knew that they could only suppress inconvenient stories if there was not a single competitive network to break them. The Internet and Talk Radio began breaking that monopoly, but Fox News is different: It's right there in their back yard.

Talk Radio was largely responsible for the 1994 victory that won the Republicans majorities in both Houses of Congress.

That 1994 defeat was also attributed to the growing ability of people with suppressed information to reach the public on the Internet. The Internet is bigger now -- MUCH bigger -- and it has been a major factor in making the network news the public's LEAST TRUSTED information source.

But now Fox News has broken the liberal monopoly on TELEVISION itself!

It is up to us to help make sure the Fox News appeal to the non-liberal audience pays off. We must spread the word to make sure that conservatives start watching CNN's new competition.

January 20, 2001 - ASHCROFT AND ANOTHER FORGOTTEN BIT OF HISTORY
January 20, 2001 - ARE WE JUST GOING TO PANIC, OR ARE WE GOING TO APPLY
MORALITY TO GENETICS?

ASHCROFT AND ANOTHER FORGOTTEN BIT OF HISTORY

Liberals are attacking the Ashcroft nomination by saying this:

Ashcroft is opposed to some laws, so he cannot enforce them as Attorney General.

As I keep pointing out, one thing you have to do to be a respectable conservative is to have no memory at all. In this as in so many other ways, I am not respectable. I remember.

I remember in 1977, when President Carter's Director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service said that, if it were up to her, no immigrant would ever be turned away. She said she only enforced the law because she had to.

Nobody said a word except my boss, Congressman John Ashbrook.

You could find incidents of liberals being against laws they had to enforce in every administration, but if you did, it would convict you of having a memory, and therefore of not being respectable.

Remember that the liberal argument against Ashcroft is that you cannot enforce a law you do not approve of. That would seem to mean that every member of the entire Federal bureaucracy will have to

be given ideological clearance. Their job is enforcing the laws. How do you think they would come out on prohibitions on abortion funding?

Another little memory. Remember that the Supreme Court voted five to four in the Florida decision that made Bush, Junior, president?

One of the four liberal justices who fought Bush all the way was Souter. After the liberals attacked his more conservative Supreme Court nominee, Bush, Sr., wimped out and appointed Souter, probably the most liberal justice on the Supreme Court.

So if you were worried about whether Bush Junior would do to Ashcroft what he did to Chavez, you had every right to be.

Respectable conservatives forget anything they are ordered to. When liberals come up for confirmation, they will forget what was done to Ashcroft.

Respectable conservatives forgot what was done to another conservative, Newt Gingrich..

When Hillary Clinton got her eight million dollar book deal, a few conservatives mentioned that liberals ruined Newt Gingrich because he had a four million dollar book deal.

But when liberals told them to, respectable conservatives shut up about the double standard between Hillary and Gingrich.

Thank God for Fox News! They are respectable conservatives, but they still dare to have a memory.

Everybody else barely mentioned the fact that Hillary was getting an eight million dollar book deal while Gingrich was ruined by the liberals for half that. On CNN, Greta Susteren told conservatives to forget the Gingrich campaign of personal destruction, and the respectables obeyed their orders as always.

But not on Fox News. Fox News has Gingrich himself on regularly and O'Reilly simply won't shut up about Hillary's book deal.

Fox is taking over conservative respectability, and they have more guts than the minor league conservatives they are taking over from.

ARE WE JUST GOING TO PANIC, OR ARE WE GOING TO APPLY MORALITY TO GENETICS?

A baby ape has just been genetically altered, and everybody is up in arms.

Until now, fashionable morality did not apply to genetics, because if you worry about genetics, you are anaziwhowsantstokillsixmillionjews.

To be respectable, I have to agree with today's genetics policy. Today, the countries in the world whose children are starving and live in misery produce the maximum number of children. The only morality we have is to wait for the hundreds of millions of children to be produced, and then cut back on families in developed countries so the third world overflow can move in.

That's the only "morality" we have, and if you question it, you're anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

It is moral to let any teenage welfare mother do anything to the gene pool she has the physical capacity to do. We breed for stupidity and ugliness the way Hitler tried to breed for Aryanness, but no one dares to question today's immoral genetic "morality."

Sure, scientists playing with the gene pool is dangerous. But what can they do to us that we are not, in the name of morality, doing to ourselves right now? If our so-called morality, agreed on by liberals and "Christians" (and a "Christian" is NOT a Christian) keeps on the way it is going, we all know very well the horror our descendants are going to face.

But you can't say that, because conservatives are like dogs waiting for a word from their master. If the liberals say "anzaiwhowsantstokillsicxmillionjews" or any other cliché, conservatives cease to pretend to have any kind of morality at all.

Nobody knows exactly what to do about cloning or genetic alteration, but everybody is demanding meetings and discussions on the subject - RIGHT NOW!

But if I bring up the genetic catastrophe we are uncritically sanctioning now, everybody tells me I have to know exactly what to do about it before I mention it. Even thinking about it makes me anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

It goes contrary to all of our conservative instincts, but it seems to me that scientists simply couldn't do much more harm to future generations than we are doing now.

What I am saying is that no person who joins in the fashionable panic about evil scientists has any right to open his mouth until he has the courage to take a stand on TODAY'S genetic immorality.

January 27, 2001 - FOR THE SOUTH, RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES AND LIBERALS ARE TWO OF A KIND

January 27, 2001 - CLINTON AND COOLIDGE: AN UNLIKELY-SOUNDING DUO

FOR THE SOUTH, RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES AND LIBERALS ARE TWO OF A KIND

On Chris Matthews, one of the commentators said something that, for a second, sounded really good. He said, "Bush's inaugural speech was an attack on multiculturalism."

That sounded too good to be true. And it was.

To me, "multiculturalism" is a liberal code word. If liberals achieve their policy, every white majority country will be transformed into a brown country that will be exactly like every other brown country that used to have a white majority.

Liberal policy dictates that each formerly white school and each formerly white area have a prescribed "racial balance" dictated by liberal social experts. In other words, what liberals call multiculturalism

would make all formerly white countries exactly the same - each would become a socially planned culture with uniformly brown skin.

Any hope that Bush may have his doubts about this genocidal "multicultural" policy would be a welcome surprise

No such surprise was forthcoming. The commentator who said that Bush had repudiated multiculturalism was speaking Lincolnesque. He, too, wants uniformly brown skin and a uniform culture in every country that presently has a white majority. His only disagreement with liberals is about WHICH uniform culture needs to be imposed.

Liberals want to subject all America to a single "multiculture" dictated by social scientists. Conservatives want to impose a single culture as dictated by New England through New York.

Those who read NATIONAL REVIEW will know what I am talking about. NR wants those Confederate flags ripped down as much as any liberal does.

So both the liberal and conservative establishments agree on one thing: Whitey's gotta go and "regionalism"(they call it "tribalism") must go.

Liberals want to destroy all traces of any particular INTERNAL American diversity and impose nonwhite cultures. Conservatism wants to impose New England culture on us all. They call that true Americanism, as did Lincoln.

The conservative ideal is open borders for cheap labor. That would make America "racially diverse." But it would be united by an imposed version of East Coast culture.

Colin Powell is certainly the epitome of conservative "Unity." He is black, but in every other way he is a Nelson Rockefeller. The New England ideal has always been to have a Jackie Robinson or a Colin Powell at their home for tea, while the rest of white Americans get mixed with Harlem.

When conservatives attack "multiculturalism," they are not thinking the same way we do when we attack it. The South and the Midwest and the West are just as alien to them as immigrant cultures are to us.

CLINTON AND COOLIDGE: AN UNLIKELY-SOUNDING DUO

Bill Clinton may be leaving office at just the right time. With OPEC once again squeezing America and a wimpish American response, some say we could be ready for a major economic downturn.

In other words, Clinton is leaving office after two terms of unbroken peace and economic prosperity, and just as he leaves office there is an economic cloud on the horizon. The last time this happened, the outgoing president was Calvin Coolidge.

One thing that keeps people from comparing those situations is that the two men, Coolidge and Clinton, are so different as to make any comparison seem hilarious.

Clinton tends to be fat, Coolidge was always gaunt-looking. Coolidge never spoke one word more than he had to. As a wild understatement, let us just say that Clinton doesn't mind the sound of his own voice.

Coolidge was absolutely moral and monogamous. I think you may have heard otherwise about our Bill. Coolidge slept twelve hours a day. It is hard to imagine Clinton sleeping at all, and certainly not with his wife.

It is certainly hard to make the intellectual leap that is required to see Clinton and Coolidge in any common category.

But in the two areas where the Federal Government is pivotal, there are a number of chilling parallels between the president who left just before the last depression and the one who might be leaving just before the next depression.

Today, international affairs look a lot like they did when Coolidge left office. Both Coolidge and Clinton served their terms when it was assumed that The War To End War had ended -- World War I in Coolidge's case, the Cold War in Clinton's.

During Coolidge's term, a treaty was signed making war illegal.

Winning the Cold War seemed to make the world safe for democracy, just as the 1918 defeat of Germany made the world safe for democracy. All that was left after World War I was to distribute the lands of the empires we had defeated in World War I and to establish a peaceful New World Order.

Sound familiar?

But in the 1920's, our defeated enemy, Germany, was in one crisis after another. In fact, our defeated enemy then looked a great deal like Russia does today.

In Coolidge's time, Germany's next ally, Japan, was a poverty-stricken underdeveloped country, no real threat.

With a little imagination, it is not hard to see Iran and the Arab countries, which we do our best to alienate, as the Japan of our day.

As I pointed out on May 22, 1999 in KINKY SEX, there is no excuse today for having anything but a continuing boom. But that doesn't mean that government policy or international problems can't PRODUCE a depression.

One more thing to keep in mind: Coolidge was never blamed for the Depression. He remained a fondly remembered public figure until his death in 1933. The shacks of the unemployed were called Hoovervilles, not Coolidgevilles, even though Hoover had been in office less than a year when the Depression began.

In short, if the parallels hold, Bush will take the rap.

February 3, 2001 - FOX CABLE NEWS NETWORK SHOWS THE VICTIM!

February 3, 2001 - CALIFORNIA GETS WHAT IT ASKED FOR

February 3, 2001 - THE ASHCROFT GROVEL

FOX CABLE NEWS NETWORK SHOWS THE VICTIM!

Some Whitaker Online readers thought that the Fox Network I was praising was the one that appears on regular broadcast television. The Fox News Network I am praising is the one that is cable only. It is direct competition with CNN.

They are respectable conservatives - Holy Diversity and all that -- but they seem to be much more serious than the usual respectable conservatives.

When a thirteen year old black boy was convicted of killing a six-year-old black girl, Fox Cable News Network did something you simply cannot imagine happening on any other television outlet. The other stations would show the poor little murderer on and on and on, so that we would be on the side of the "so-called killer."

But Fox Network News, as the discussion proceeded, kept a photograph of the VICTIM, the little girl he beat to death, on the screen.

They didn't make a big thing of it, but I think that says a lot.

CALIFORNIA GETS WHAT IT ASKED FOR

When the rolling blackouts hit California, all the regular media reported that the shortage of power in that state was due to "deregulation."

That story would have been the final word, I believe, had it not been for Fox Cable News Network. The Fox Cable News Network had conservative economists on who pointed out that so-called "deregulation" did not deregulate. It was what was NOT deregulated that caused the problem.

So the Associated Press article which appeared on America Online is not able to repeat the standard line that it was deregulation that did this to California. It said,

"But PG&E and the state's other major utility, Southern California Edison Co., have lost at least \$10 billion because of soaring wholesale prices for electricity and because rate caps imposed under deregulation have prevented them from passing on those costs to customers."

Only a liberal could call that "deregulation!" Deregulation is letting prices go where they need to go, without regulation. So while the press says deregulation did it, it turns out that it was the new regulations imposed in the name of deregulation that did it.

Another thing has caused the power crisis in California. First, they fixed prices below the real level, which is a standard leftist trick. Second, the state's economy has grown vastly in the last decades of economic boom. But California has stopped all building of all new electric production facilities.

In power policy, the "environmentalist" portion of the liberal establishment rules California.

California fixed the prices and froze the supply. Liberals call that "deregulation." To a sane person, fixing prices and freezing the supply is the classic way to bring on an energy crisis.

THE ASHCROFT GROVEL

Ashcroft was grilled by liberals in his confirmation hearings. Teddy Kennedy led the attack. Ashcroft apologized to Kennedy for opposing a racial balance program in Missouri schools when he was state attorney general.

Ashcroft repeatedly begged Kennedy to understand that he was "for integration." He has been in the Senate with Kennedy for a long time, and he knows very well what being "for integration" means to Kennedy.

Kennedy sends his grandchildren to private schools, and he backed the imposition of busing on South Boston. It was ordered by Judge Garrity, who also sent his grandchildren to private schools, as do all judges who order busing. Kennedy fully supported the use of the National Guard to enforce busing on South Boston.

Kennedy backed busing in Louisville, where children would be out waiting for the buses at 5 am so they could be bused into dangerous inner city schools. They returned home long after dark. In other words, they had the same hours that we so deplore in child labor from the nineteenth century.

Ashcroft apologized to Kennedy for daring to oppose "desegregation" programs in Missouri. He assured Kennedy that the ONLY reason he opposed that particular program was because of the COST. He made it clear that any cost to the children was of no importance to him whatsoever.

Needless to say, most conservatives had no problem with that, but they were sickened by Ashcroft's groveling in other areas, such as abortion. He licked Kennedy's boots clean and shiny.

I enjoyed it, because conservatives were seeing what I watched close up over the long, long years. I watched all those loudmouth conservative "heroes" do the same crawl when they were closeted with liberals.

When Mel Laird was in Congress, he was in committee with my boss John Ashbrook. He started off a negotiation by saying that pretty well anything the Democrats wanted was reasonable. Ashbrook leaned toward the microphone and said, in a stage whisper, "What a prostitute!"

Laird was rewarded by Ford with the position of Secretary of Defense. He was a true Bush-Ford Republican.

Please don't say you are disappointed in Ashcroft.

Surely no one is ignorant enough to believe that what you saw was some kind of changed man. What you were looking at was a typical conservative leader dealing with liberals.

When Mitch McConnell was fighting campaign finance "reform" legislation last year, the word went around that "He fights like a Democrat." He was that unique in not backing down on the issue most important to him.

Inside the beltway, all conservative "leaders" are wimps when they are dealing directly with liberals. I watched them cave in and crawl before the liberals year after year after weary year.

A couple of years ago, I saw Trent Lott regaling a conservative crowd with his brave criticism of liberal press bias. A couple of days later, while he was being interviewed on a network program, a reporter asked him how the press dealt with conservatives. He declared they were fair!

So all this is no secret. When faced with a real reporter or a real Teddy Kennedy, these conservative "leaders" will grovel right out there in public. Conservatives pretend they don't see it.

No matter how many exhausted children are bussed across Louisville or how many Boston working people might have to be killed for integration, Teddy Kennedy will never offer the slightest apology for anything he does. Nor will Barney Frank or any other liberal. Their liberal supporters won't stand for it.

But if a liberal shouts "racist" or "extremist" or any of the many versions of "anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews," any conservative who wants to get ahead drops on his knees instantly.

February 10, 2001 - M. STANTON EVAN'S LAW ABOUT "OUR" PEOPLE

February 10, 2001 - THE LEFT SURVIVES ON OUR COWARDICE

M. STANTON EVAN'S LAW ABOUT "OUR" PEOPLE

Last week I wrote about "The Ashcroft Grovel." At the hearings on his appointment as Attorney General, we watched Ashcroft crawling around and begging Ted Kennedy for the chance to prove he will follow Kennedy's policy.

As I said, Ashcroft's boot-licking performance is nothing new among professional conservatives. If you think Ashcroft was bad on television, you ought to see the average conservative begging for liberal approval IN PRIVATE. It's nauseating.

The fact is that conservatives do this selling out in private all the time. But when they get a chance to get some kind of appointment, they regularly do what Ashcroft did and sell us out in public.

This is so routine the conservative leader M. Stanton Evans turned it into a rule:

"As soon as one of our people gets into a position where he could really help us, he stops being one of our people."

THE LEFT SURVIVES ON OUR COWARDICE

Jesse Jackson's education fund took in twelve million dollars and only spent forty-seven THOUSAND of it on education. Maybe he cheated, do you think?

O'Reilly of Fox Cable News Network's "O'Reilly Factor" is demanding that Jackson's tax-deductible groups be investigated.

A tax DEDUCTIBLE organization is very different from a "tax-exempt organization." A tax-exempt organization is one that pays no corporate income tax. General Motors is a taxed corporation because General Motors is in business, it makes profits, and it pays corporate taxes on those corporate earnings.

The Democratic Party is a tax-exempt organization. The Democratic Party pays no corporate income taxes.

People often use the word "tax exempt" when they mean tax deductible. But if you give money to the Democratic Party, you can't deduct that money from your income taxes. A tax-deductible organization is a church or charity given that status by the Internal Revenue Service.

If you want people's gifts to your organization to be tax deductible, you have to jump through a lot of hoops. The application is complex, and there are rigid rules about how your money can be spent.

Unless you're a liberal group, of course.

As you probably know, Jackson admitted to fathering a baby with his mistress, who worked for one of his tax-deductible organizations.

She got over forty thousand dollars in moving expenses and an undisclosed salary out of it. O'Reilly says that's a lot of moving expenses. He says Jackson has had his troubles with IRS before.

Tax-deductible organizations are supposed to be purely charitable or educational. They are strictly forbidden from engaging in political advocacy.

Unless they're liberal.

Since part of the money they are spending is tax money, everything about a tax-deductible outfit is supposed to be a matter of public record.

O'Reilly can't get any answers out of Jackson.

What a surprise, eh?

With all this, the IRS has not looked at Jackson's organizations in twelve years. O'Reilly says he is shocked by this.

Surely he is not that naïve.

A North Carolina Republican congressman was invited onto O'Reilly's show because he was the only congressman with the courage to ask for an investigation. But he was very frank about the prospects. He said Congress simply didn't have the stomach -- the guts -- to do anything of the sort.

We all know what happened to Jim Bakker, and we all know what would happen to Jerry Falwell if he did what Jackson has done. You may be sure the IRS looks at Falwell regularly, and any discrepancy would have been big news long ago.

Nobody ever demands that the political left obey any rules insofar as tax deductibility or even outright government grants is concerned.

All of our publicly financed universities are openly liberal seminaries, dedicated to propagating leftist ideology with student fees and in the classrooms. They are the origin and bulwark of Political Correctness.

National Public Radio and Public Television are unapologetically dedicated to leftist propaganda. Propaganda is strictly forbidden for tax deductible organizations and for organizations receiving public funds. But absolutely nobody takes that seriously in the case of liberal propaganda.

Ralph Nader will raise Cain about the relatively small sums given to Republicans by corporations. But that money is counted in millions. Nader will NEVER complain about the billions of dollars in PUBLIC money that liberals use to push their agenda and hire more liberals.

Certainly no one will accuse the federally financed Legal Services Corporation of ever taking a conservative case, or of ever turning down a fashionable leftist one.

Like the USSR during the Cold War, our enemies could not survive without our help. If it were not for government programs and tax-deductible organizations, most of the people on the left wouldn't have jobs.

But it will be a long cold day in the Bad Place before any conservative legislator dares raise the slightest protest to any of this.

At universities and in my time on the House Education and Labor Committee staff, I became accustomed to the simple fact that leftists rightly regard public money as their own. They never hesitate to use it freely to promote their ideology and to pay for their public jobs. They use public money to lobby for more public money. That is a good part of what the left is all about.

There is nothing Jesse Jackson is doing with millions that is any more flagrant than what the whole left is doing with billions of dollars and the special access we give them to our young people.

Jesse is not as smart about misusing tax-deductible money and federal grant money as are the other liberals, but he is no more blatant.

If we went after the leftists who pick our pockets, the left would collapse. You may be sure that no respectable conservative will even mention doing such a thing.

February 17, 2001 - COLIN POWELL PUTS OUR MONEY WHERE HIS MOUTH IS
February 17, 2001 - THE BRASS IS WIMPING OUT ON AMERICAN SERVICEMEN

COLIN POWELL PUTS OUR MONEY WHERE HIS MOUTH IS

Whenever a black liberal condescends to speak to conservatives, they turn into mindless turkeys.

Some years back, when busing was being enforced by troops and racial quotas were everywhere, Jesse Jackson was invited to address the South Carolina Republican Party. Jackson lectured them about how bad it was to criticize these wonderful programs.

Jackson wanted Republicans to stop criticizing these programs and to begin demanding new ones. He concluded, "We need a CONSERVATIVE civil rights movement!"

Republican victory or defeat in elections is a very simple proposition. Nationally and in South Carolina, the Party is run by the country club set. When they go for minority votes, they always lose. When they get enough white workers' votes, they win.

To get the approval of Jesse Jackson or other liberals, Republicans go for the minority vote.

So when Jackson demanded they go after minority votes, the South Carolina Republicans roared approval and began planning their electoral strategy on that basis.

Thus seduced, the turkeys marched forth to lay eggs.

We all watched the National Republican Convention do the same thing again. They cheered when Colin Powell told them they just did not have the GUTS to take college educations away from white young people and give them to blacks, a.k.a., "affirmative action."

True to his words at the Convention, Powell's first act on becoming Secretary of State was to begin a program to give high-level jobs to minorities.

Another thing the turkeys roared for at the Convention was Powell's demand that Republicans not deal with conservative blacks. He told them to deal only with the present -- meaning the liberal -- rulers of the civil rights movement.

Powell loves every kind of professional liberal. As soon as he got to the State Department, he declared his foreign policy would be run by their "regular professionals." I think we all know the political complexion of that crowd.

Powell let us all know his interpretation of President Bush's "National Unity" or "bipartisan policy" by asking GEORGE MCGOVERN to keep his post. If you want Powell's approval, you just can't get far enough left.

THE BRASS IS WIMPING OUT ON AMERICAN SERVICEMEN

During the Cold War, American Navy ships were forced into humiliating positions. When Soviet ships would come up and push them out of the way, the American ships just ran away. We would all like to forget the incident when a Romanian jumped off his ship to an American vessel, asked for asylum, and was sent back to Romania to go to prison.

We found out after the incident of the USS Cole that wimpishness is still the policy of the Navy brass.

As one of the USS Cole crewmen told the New York Times, "If we had shot those people we'd have gotten into trouble for it. That's what's frustrating about it. We would have gotten into more trouble for shooting two foreigners than losing 17 American sailors."

All the guns on the USS Cole were unloaded. Two sailors patrolled the deck with 9mm pistols, but they too were unloaded. Like Barney Fife, those two were allowed to have two bullets each, but they couldn't load their guns with them.

Said another crew member, "In the military, it's like we're trained to hesitate now." When someone is attacking you, hesitation is routinely fatal.

The report on the terrorist attack on the USS Cole had Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen upset, because he wanted to fix blame on the captain of the ship.

The man who informed me of all this is an old navy man, and he points out what all of us who have been in the government know: this sort of general policy is not invented by a ship's captain.

But Cohen is a moderate Republican, and he follows the rules.

The rule is that you never blame the brass. You sacrifice somebody outside the Pentagon each time something like this happens. Back when the Romanian jumped on an American ship and was sent back, they blamed the captain. This was absurd. During the hours that man was on the ship, you may be assured that the captain asked the Pentagon for orders and was told what to do.

But nobody in the brass is going to stand up for the captain.

Today, you do not get a star on your collar unless you are a bureaucrat first and a soldier way down the list. Do you remember during the campaign, when Pentagon generals lined up to say the Clinton military policies were fine and Bush was wrong? Those same generals are now shouting that they need emergency appropriations to keep the military from collapse. They now say that there's a crisis in the military. We all expected that.

This will all be Evil Heresy to regular conservatives, who worship anything in a uniform. They worship Colin Powell because he had on a uniform.

The simple fact is that wearing a star may have meant something honorable in the days of Douglas MacArthur, but those days are long, long gone.

February 24, 2001 - ANOTHER BUSH LEAPS TO CLINTON'S DEFENSE

February 24, 2001 - FOX'S GOLD MINE

February 24, 2001 - THE EVIL WHITAKER RETURNS

ANOTHER BUSH LEAPS TO CLINTON'S DEFENSE

One of the basic items of Western thought is called Occam's Razor. Occam said that you should not make more assumptions than you need to explain what's going on. My Pontiac, South Carolina, rendering of this highly intellectual premise would be, "What you see is probably what you get."

President Bush has asked us, essentially, to forget anything Clinton might have done wrong.

I wouldn't mind that so much if I didn't have one thing that no respectable conservative is allowed to possess: a memory.

I remember that almost every time Clinton was squared off against the Republican Congress, the same scene would appear on TV screens:

There stood former Presidents Bush and Ford, backing Clinton.

It would be nice to believe that Bush's defense of Clinton resulted from statesmanship or from a desire to "move on." But when what he does is simply a repeat of what a Bush always does, Occam's Razor sort of requires me to think it's just another Bush wimpout.

FOX'S GOLD MINE

On July 10, 1999 in NO, IT'S NOT DR. WHITAKER, I bragged that two of my professors in graduate school later won Nobel Prizes (and admitted I didn't finish my doctor's degree).

That article also explained why such a gold mine of talent flowed onto one campus: it was almost the only really conservative graduate department of economics in America. With the almost total ban on hiring non-liberals on American faculties, the few conservative places where they could be hired had a mine of talent available.

The Fox Cable News Network just put former Reagan speechwriter Peggy Noonan on as one of their commentators. They have former congressman Kasich and they have former Friend of Bill, Dick Morris, who is now considered a traitor on the left.

The proof of REAL discrimination is that if you tap the talent that is shut out by it, you get a windfall.

THE EVIL WHITAKER RETURNS

On September 2, 2000 I wrote an article entitled ONLY AN EVIL PERSON WOULD SAY WHAT WE ALL KNOW ABOUT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION. It began it with these words: "So I will."

Watching Clinton moving in to a hero's welcome in Harlem, I do not hear anybody else speaking out loud about another fact that we all know. Once again, only an Evil Man would dare bring it up.

Blacks are the bedrock of Clinton support. Clinton is a corrupt man. But the fact no one mentions is that the overwhelming majority of the black population never hesitates to support corrupt people.

Remember Mayor Marion Barry, who was Mayor of Washington when he was convicted on drug charges? He was then overwhelmingly reelected Mayor of Washington. This is one of many examples where the overwhelming majority of the black electorate simply will not throw out the crooks.

The fact is that black countries and black portions of the United States are wretchedly governed by the officials they elect.

Robert Novak actually said that Home Rule in Washington is a failure. Everybody knows that. But every other jurisdiction in America has home rule. The big difference between DC and all the others is that the Washington electorate is black.

Normally, condemning DC Home Rule would therefore make Novak anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

But DC's Home Rule is costly to rich people, bureaucrats and media types. To liberals, these are the only real human beings. So Novak can get away with saying something they all know is true.

At the same time that he says that DC Home Rule is a failure, Novak also declares that there is something wrong with a Republican Party that isn't attracting enough of this wise and right-thinking black electorate.

Repeating that ritual nonsense helps preserve Novak's respectability.

The July 17, 1999 article, RACIAL PROFILING IS THE FAULT OF BLACK CRIMINALS, explained why my sort of Evil Speech is necessary. If innocent blacks are not to be unfairly targeted for police suspicion, they will have to start blaming black criminals for their predicament. Until then, they are simply excusing the real culprits.

So, should a Hate Crimes Commission arrest me and maybe Bob Novak for racial heresy?

You can either go to that logical extreme or you can encourage people to talk about unpleasant realities. We can either do what we do now, and refer to blacks as a wise electorate that must be appealed to, or we can demand that the erring majority of black voters start to think and vote like adults.

Blacks are certainly right when they say whites in general have white supremacist attitudes, but they don't want to face what that really means. What it really means is that whites think that blacks CANNOT become politically mature. Liberals and respectable conservatives insist that such a demand is cruel and unusual, and that the mass of blacks is simply incapable of doing any better.

So when Colin Powell tells Republicans that they must cooperate with the present black "leaders," he is saying that they cannot do better. When Republicans say they must "appeal to black voters" by abandoning principles and intelligent policy, they are demonstrating the most white supremacist of attitudes.

Since I am an official Evil Man, my attitudes are probably white supremacist. So maybe the unspoken attitude is correct. Maybe the mass of blacks can't grow up, and should be accepted as permanent political juveniles.

But we should refuse to give black voters any slack in our demand that they grow up politically before they are accepted politically.

March 3, 2001 - WE NEED A MEDAL FOR SUFFERING

March 3, 2001 - ARE FACTS RACIST?

March 3, 2001 - WHY MODERATION DOESN'T WORK

WE NEED A MEDAL FOR SUFFERING

A lot of right wingers have been arguing that John McCain was not a hero in Vietnam. He did not claim to be.

I looked up his interview with "US News and World Report" from the seventies, and he admits that his first words when he was captured were an offer to give information in return for medical care. McCain himself has said repeatedly that anyone who did not cooperate with the Cong in the Hanoi Hilton did not come out alive. He's named the real heroes, and they are dead.

His medals have been denounced as "boiler plate," because they are awarded to everyone in his category. Normally, such a medal is only awarded to those who are seen by witnesses to show courage "above and beyond the call of duty."

But there were no witnesses when McCain was questioned by the Cong, and the other survivors, all of them American airmen doing their duty, went through the Hanoi Hilton and came out alive, just as he did.

But none of us, I think, would say that he and his comrades do not DESERVE medals. They went through hell for this country, when America's media and a major portion of our population were condemning them, and the Fondas were giving aid and comfort, in America and even in North Vietnam itself, to their tormentors.

On the other hand, this is a disservice to those who, in the sight of witnesses, did more than their duty to their country, and often died doing it.

We should separate courage above and beyond the call of duty from having put a duty upon a group of fairly typical American servicemen that no human being should have to bear. We should be proud of how high a duty Americans can perform as part of their call.

We all have a right to be proud of the Hanoi Hilton survivors precisely because all of them did all that in the name of duty. No one should deny them medals for their suffering above and beyond what should be the call of duty.

ARE FACTS RACIST?

If you don't want to be stereotyped, don't act like a stereotype. Now that conservative points are being made on the Fox Cable News Channel, the response of almost every female liberal interviewed is to scream. This kind of hysteria is exactly what the women's' lib movement claimed women do NOT do, but that is what they do when challenged.

In fact, the root of the word "hysteria" ties it to women. I think women have every right to resent that deeply -- unless they get hysterical about it.

A redheaded black woman spoke for reparations to black people for slavery on Fox Cable News Network. She made herself into a living, breathing stereotype of feminine hysteria.

On August 26, 2000, in REPARATIONS FOR SLAVERY -- A LIVELIER ISSUE THAN YOU MIGHT THINK, I said that even in the 1960s, I was dealing with this issue of reparations. In my economics class, I pointed out that descendants of blacks who were enslaved are economically

infinitely better off than the offspring of those who were not. In terms of money, if we are going to do this, black Americans would owe vast sums to the evil white race.

No one disputes this. The anti-reparations man on Fox pointed out to the red-headed black lady that the children of American slaves now receive FIFTY TIMES the income of those who avoided slavery.

Absolutely nobody disputes this. So what was her response?

Her response was the same one that scares off all respectable conservatives: a shriek. She began loudly demanding how he dared say such a thing.

As well she might. Nobody else dares point out facts like this to her.

She shrieked "racist" at him for stating this fact, and went into the usual hysterical fit.

Nothing liberals advocate ever WORKS, but no respectable conservative is ever allowed to state this fact. One of my friends on a national talk show once pointed out that every year we have given more money to public schools, and each one of those years test scores have headed downwards.

Once again, no one disputes that the test score decline has gone hand in hand with Federal increases, but the liberal on the show sounded a lot like that red-headed black woman. He didn't shriek, but he did shout, in effect, "heresy."

My friend was never invited back.

We all know that exactly the same thing happened with the book "The Bell Curve". No one disputes the facts, but every conservative will help suppress any discussion of those facts.

By the way, the co-author of that book was a Jewish Harvard psychology professor named Richard Herrnstein. When the book was published, he was dying of cancer. The only argument liberals make about the book is to say it is a pack of lies cooked up for money by white supremacists.

The best argument against this rather obvious liberal shriek is that Herrnstein cleared the book for publication when he knew he was dying. When liberals have made this particular shriek, I have asked them why a Jewish Harvard professor would sign on to such a piece of heresy for future gain, when he knew he had no future.

"The Bell Curve" is a deathbed statement, and those are notoriously truthful.

No respectable conservative will ever ask this. They tacitly admit the liberals' premise: facts are racist.

WHY MODERATION DOESN'T WORK

And this, in turn, explains why moderation, which sounds so good as a Shrewd strategy, is such a disaster out in the real world. In order to be respectable or moderate, you have to hold totally contradictory positions, and you get called on it.

For example, many conservatives like to criticize affirmative action programs because "they demand not only equal competition, but equal RESULTS." That is, they require that blacks get as many positions as whites no matter how they perform.

But you get called on that, because if you say that blacks do in fact actually perform differently, the liberal is going to start shrieking at you for being racist. And if he shrieks, you lose YOUR respectability.

Bob Novak said that Home Rule in Washington, DC, has failed. But a liberal could point out -- loudly -- that DC is the only BLACK electorate in America, so to say that DC Home Rule is a failure is racist. Novak can face that down, but no other conservative spokesman could get away with that if he didn't want to be screamed at.

And the average moderate or respectable conservative would cheerfully sell his mother to a bawdy house rather than be screamed at by a liberal.

This is not the only area where moderation or even respectability makes a consistent argument absolutely impossible. Respectable conservatives have to be silly and inconsistent in order to be respectable, and no one can take over a country if they are in that position.

March 10, 2001 - A MAN WITH A MEMORY SPEAKS TO CONSERVATIVES

March 10, 2001 - WHY WE DON'T HIRE DUCKS

March 10, 2001 - SHOULD WE OUTLAW DEFENSE ATTORNEYS?

A MAN WITH A MEMORY SPEAKS TO CONSERVATIVES

The liberal media decide who is "respectable" and who isn't. No conservative can be respectable if he shows that he has a memory, which is a dangerous thing to liberals.

Take the two big issues right now. On the Clinton pardons, Democrats insist that Clinton got lots of money from those he pardoned, but there was no quid pro quo. In other words, the liberals say that there is no reason to think he did it for the money.

But every time the NRA or a business gives money to Republicans, Democrats quote the amount and say they are selling favors. No respectable conservative will ever remind them of that.

On the tax cut, liberals insist it will benefit the rich. But the liberals also insist that the rich don't pay their share of taxes. The fact that the tax cut helps the rich presupposes that the rich are paying their share of taxes, but no conservative will ever mention that.

Actually, very rich people can avoid a lot of tax. It is the small business or family farm that gets hit hard. That is why limousine liberals don't mind the heavy estate tax. They use tax deductible foundations to keep family control over their funds, and they have plenty left over for their descendant's personal use. We see this in the Rockefeller, Ford, and Mellon Foundations, for example.

WHY WE DON'T HIRE DUCKS

One of the easiest ways to spot bias is to listen for one side's buzz terms. If you hear "pro-choice" you're listening to the pro-abortion side, and pro-life means one is on the anti-abortion side (unless the same speaker says both).

So, when the newscaster on CNN refers to "investment in education" instead of "expenditures on education," you know he is so liberal he doesn't know he's using Libspeak.

Since only Libspeakers have been reporting the news, those for more Federal spending on education get away with a really childish trick.

They know that the more years of school a person has, the more money he makes, ON AVERAGE. They then say that education alone has produced all that extra income.

Meanwhile, back on earth, you can do the same thing with almost any expenditure. The more expensive the car a person owns, the more money he is likely to make. The bigger the house he was raised in, the more likely he is to have gone to college and graduate school.

In other words, by exactly the same statistical process by which we justify "investments in education," we could justify an "investment" in a limousine or a home in Beverly Hills.

If your parents spend more money on education, it means that they are probably richer. If your parents spent more on their home, it probably means they were, ON AVERAGE, richer and just plain smarter than people who have smaller homes. Their kids will then be smarter and make more money.

It's too bad the "investment in education" logic is so silly, because it would be wonderful if it worked. It would mean that education is magic, and that any moron could be made a brain surgeon by "investing" money in training him. It would mean you wouldn't even have to be human to make millions. You could take a horse, a duck, or a puppy dog, give them the magic training and they would be able to make all that money.

It takes training to develop somebody's natural talent. But you have to have the talent first, and that is what all education statistics leave out. A psychologist writing a column was recently asked if you have to be SMART to be a "gifted child." The implication was that if he said you had to be born smart to be "gifted," he would be anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews".

OH, no!, said the good doctor, you could be born retarded and still stand just as good a chance of being "gifted" as one of those smart kids.

You can see that this sort of logic leads straight to silliness.

The fact is that education or training is used to develop the gifts you already have. You are paid not only for training, but for BEING TRAINABLE.

Being trainable, in turn, is a matter of genetics. Hitler believed in genetics, so our entire national policy is rooted in the idea that anyone who mentions innate intelligence is anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews.

For those who make their living in education or other supplements to genetics, this is a wonderful label. It means that those who sell social sciences like education or psychology or sociology can say that they can cure anything. They don't say you can hire ducks and make them brain surgeons, but they say you can do absolutely anything else by "investing in education" or financing other social programs.

And if you disagree with them, they shriek that you are an *anai* who want to kill six million Jews. All of our silliest misconceptions are defended by that label.

Until we stop screaming "HITLER!" and begin to apply logic to education policy, it is going to keep failing, no matter how much you "invest" in it.

SHOULD WE OUTLAW DEFENSE ATTORNEYS?

Immediately after the student shootings at Santee, California, a defense lawyer was asked about it. He blamed the right to own guns for the shootings. I addressed this argument on May 8, 1999 in *ARMED SWITZERLAND AND THE COLORADO SHOOTINGS*.

But another question arises: Why interview a defense attorney? The death toll of shootings like this one is nothing compared to the number of people slaughtered by the criminals that defense attorneys put back on the streets.

Professional criminals commit the overwhelming majority of violent crimes in this country, and they are only on the street because of defense attorneys. That shooting in California took two lives. Every day, those let loose by defense attorneys and sympathetic judges kill more than that.

America has more lawyers than the rest of the world combined.

In other words, everything that can be said about guns can also be said about defense attorneys: we have more lawyers than any other country, and we have more guns per capita than any developed country except Switzerland.

But those who call themselves "civil libertarians" want more defense attorneys, and they want guns outlawed.

Now, why do the ACLU and other liberal groups demand more of these defense attorneys who cause so much havoc? They say that any person accused of crime has a right to be defended.

Liberals tell us that every person **ACCUSED OF CRIME** has a right to defend himself. That principle cannot be compromised no matter how many people get killed.

But unless you are accused of crime, this right does not exist. If you go into a dangerous area, you have to go unarmed, because you have no right of self-defense.

March 17, 2001 - AMERICA'S ESTABLISHED RELIGION AND THE DESTRUCTION OF HISTORY

March 17, 2001 - HARMLESS FREEDOM IS AN OXYMORON

March 17, 2001 - STATISTICS ARE AN EFFECTIVE ARGUMENT AGAINST GUN CONTROL, BUT NEVER FORGET THE FIRST ONE

March 17, 2001 - SHOULD WE OUTLAW PRESS COVERAGE OF SCHOOL SHOOTINGS?

AMERICA'S ESTABLISHED RELIGION AND THE DESTRUCTION OF HISTORY

The whole world is upset because Moslem fundamentalists in Afghanistan are ordering the destruction of huge pre-Moslem statues of Buddha. They are the biggest statues on earth, says the US, and they are part of history.

The ruling group in Afghanistan says those statues offend their faith and must be destroyed.

The UN has protested, the US has protested, and so forth.

Recently, the body of the Kennewick Man was discovered in the United States. Anthropologists noted that Kennewick, 1) was older than any American Indian skeleton, and 2) he bore no relation whatever to American Indians.

Scientists wanted to study him. Indians wanted to get rid of him.

You see, the Kennewick Man was a threat to AMERICA'S established religion, which is Political Correctness and white racial guilt. If the Indians were just one more group of invaders taking America from the people of the Kennewick Man, all the white racial guilt they get money out of might be threatened.

So the Indians said they had the right to bury Kennewick Man because of their religion.

The US Government agreed, and buried Kennewick beyond the reach of anthropology.

If anybody complains about what the Moslems did with the statues in Afghanistan, we should mention the superstition that hid the Kennewick Man from science.

HARMLESS FREEDOM IS AN OXYMORON

According to modern liberal and respectable conservative theory, all the slaves were actually free. Slaves had the right to do what they wanted to, as long as what they wanted did not infringe their master's rights. Liberals say we should have freedom only if it does not harm or inconvenience anybody else.

That sort of freedom is meaningless. Liberals want hate laws, because they say you should have freedom to speak as long as no one on the left is offended. We could be official slaves and have that many rights.

JOSEPH STALIN'S 1936 Constitution of the USSR gave Russians "freedom of speech." It said they could use it if it did not harm the Soviet State. They also had a death penalty for saying anything anti-Semitic.

Any meaningful freedom, any freedom above that of a slave, can be used to harm others. You must make a BALANCE between real freedom and the harm a person can do.

Respectable conservatives tacitly agree with liberals that people should be allowed to have guns only if guns are harmless. But the freedom to own and carry weapons for self-defense should be stipulated, no matter what the statistics say.

STATISTICS ARE AN EFFECTIVE ARGUMENT AGAINST GUN CONTROL, BUT NEVER FORGET THE FIRST ONE

It happens, as Yale University Professor John Lott demonstrates in his book, "More Guns, Less Crime," that the private ownership of guns does reduce crime. Once again, even liberals can't argue that liberal policy -- in this case gun control -- actually WORKS. When the gun controllers were in a debate with John Lott on Public Television, they only tried to argue that private gun ownership did not actually DECREASE crime, not that it increased it. They still lost.

Police representatives there did point out this was an odd argument for those who wanted to outlaw guns to use, but there simply is no practical case for gun control. About the lowest crime rate on earth is in Switzerland, where people carry not only guns, but real automatic assault weapons (May 8, 1999 - ARMED SWITZERLAND AND THE COLORADO SHOOTINGS).

In Britain, where gun laws are really tight, forty- three percent of all burglaries are what the British police call "hot." That means that the criminals come right in the house when the family is AT HOME and rob them! See June 2, 2000 article, GUN CONTROL AND BUSING -- BOTH ARE MEANS TO TEACH CHILDREN THAT THEIR PARENTS ARE POWERLESS.

Just how safe would you feel if criminals felt as safe in America as they do in Britain?

Also, the general crime rate in Britain, once so low, is now higher than the American crime rate. This is not so in Switzerland.

Guns prevent crime, but that is not the FIRST reason I am against gun control. I believe that, if the state cannot guarantee your personal safety in all areas, you have the right to carry a gun if you choose.

Like all liberal policy, gun control doesn't WORK. But in any debate with liberals, we should make it clear that the right to defend oneself is not a matter of statistics, even though, as always, statistics are against the liberals.

SHOULD WE OUTLAW PRESS COVERAGE OF SCHOOL SHOOTINGS?

When President John F. Kennedy was shot and killed on November 22, 1963, Lyndon Johnson was at a dead end. He was an older vice president under the young president. He and Kennedy greatly disliked each other. Johnson was shut out of White House decision-making.

Also, contrary to all accepted history now, John Kennedy was enormously unpopular just before he was killed. If Kennedy had lived, Goldwater stood an excellent chance against him in 1964. The prejudice against Southerners in the presidency was at its peak. Johnson was from Texas.

In other words, Johnson's career was blocked.

So when Kennedy was killed and Johnson was sworn into the office of his lifelong dream, he had to act as if he were deeply saddened at Kennedy's death. But I don't think any human could have been entirely unhappy in his position.

The media were in the same situation when the school shootings took place at the high school in Littleton, Colorado. Liberals had to act sad. But they were also ecstatic. Liberals thought that this, at last, had cinched their case for outlawing private guns. One magazine, when presenting a column against gun control, said, "It should be added that this was written before the school shootings at Littleton, Colorado."

In other words, the media assumed the Littleton shootings would end all arguments for private gun ownership. But they also had to act sad about it, like Lyndon in 1963.

The media thought they had it all, and boy did they celebrate -- under the guise of covering the deaths, of course. There is no room in the media to report black-on-white hate crime or a couple of million incidents of self-defense with weapons, but boy was there ever room for Littleton! It seemed that every student at the school was interviewed, and all the parents of victims - except the one who was against gun control.

Even the whole funeral of the students was covered coast-to-coast live.

But the media are used to respectable conservatives, and they assume everybody on the other side is that weak and stupid. Just before the 2000 election, they assumed the American public would not understand it if the president was elected with a lesser number of POPULAR votes. They thought it would cause a crisis. Actually, people were not even all that surprised.

Likewise, the Littleton incident did not cause the uprising of ignorant peasants that the media had expected. Gun laws will not prevent that sort of thing, and everybody knows it. The media's Littleton celebration was premature.

But a lot of bullied kids did see all the coverage the Littleton murders got. The less stable of them learned that, if their meaningless life was to change and they were to get national coverage, all they had to do was produce one of those school killings. Recently, in Santee, California, a bullied student did just that.

March 24, 2001 - THE "NEOS" HELPED CAUSE TODAY'S SUPPRESSION OF FREE SPEECH

March 24, 2001 - THERE CAN BE NO FREEDOM WITH A RACIAL ORTHODOXY

THE "NEOS" HELPED CAUSE TODAY'S SUPPRESSION OF FREE SPEECH

David Horowitz is the leading opponent of slavery reparations. He could not have any debate on American campuses about it, so he decided to put paid ads in campus newspapers. Most student papers banned those, too.

The few campus papers that took Horowitz' ad faced major campus uprisings. At the University of California, the Daily Californian ran a front-page editorial apologizing for having allowed the anti-reparations ad.

At the University of Wisconsin, 100 students confronted the student editor demanding her resignation.

On other campuses, gangs of students openly took the papers from distribution racks and trashed them.

Leon Botstein, president of Bard College in New York, said that Mr. Horowitz was clearly on a campaign of provocation but that colleges were easy prey. Contrary to their image as arenas of intellectual debate, Mr. Botstein said, colleges tolerate dissent poorly.

Botstein said this was particularly true of race, which he called "the central question of life in America."

David Horowitz, like all accepted spokesmen for the right against today's racial excesses, is a neoconservative. This means that he backed the leftist approach to race issues all the way until recently. According to him and his fellow "neos," everything was fine with liberal policy until, suddenly and inexplicably, it went to extremes just recently.

Horowitz was a good leftist until he sent a friend of his to work for the Black Panther Party. She was murdered there, he said, "for asking too many questions." He said the Panthers were a front for criminal and drug activities

It took that kind of shock for him to see what had happened. Until now, according to neoconservatives, the race issue was being handled just fine. Respectable conservatives not only agree, but do not allow anybody but a "neo" to represent the right on racial issues.

But if you take the line that "neos" and respectable conservatives take, the anti-Horowitz protesters are perfectly correct. Horowitz argued, for example, that American blacks don't deserve reparations because the slaves' descendants today earn fifty times as much money per capita as blacks whose ancestors were not slaves.

That's true, but according to the rules agreed to by neos and respectables, you are not allowed to talk about race just because what you say is true. No one is allowed to point to white achievements, and every conservative publication agrees to this. A British court sent a man to prison under the Hate Laws with the flat statement, "The truth is no excuse."

White people are only to be mentioned when something they did was bad. If it's good, "humankind" did it. All through the civil rights battle, liberals made it clear that if you are free to discuss what each race actually did, that leads you straight into white supremacy.

You could not have gotten integration, much less the total suppression of all dissent on campuses, if racial heresy were allowed.

THERE CAN BE NO FREEDOM WITH A RACIAL ORTHODOXY

Needless to say, the Thought Police are now in charge of any discussion of genetics on campus.

The Human Genome Project is based on the ground-breaking research of three scientists. To prove his political orthodoxy, one of them donated all his prize money for the project to the Black Panthers.

Anyone who wants to do genetic research must first make his declaration of ideological orthodoxy up front. The Human Genome Project declared that race does not exist. Otherwise, it would not exist.

Books like "The Bell Curve" demonstrate the impossibility of liberal -- and now conservative -- orthodoxy on race. So does real history. But truth has nothing to do with what is now allowed on campus, and no one will enforce racial orthodoxy any more fanatically than respectable conservatives.

So every conservative discussion begins with, "I'm not talking about race" and continues somewhere in the middle with a declaration of personal orthodoxy on race. They end with a tribute to the liberal days of the "neocons" and a salute to Saint Martin Luther the King and all he stood for.

The neocons are right when they say that no free society can allow this kind of ideological Goodthink to be enforced and obeyed. But that orthodoxy was necessary for their own earlier liberal policies (which, like all liberal policies, don't WORK) to be enforced.

Contrary to respectable and "neo" orthodoxy, this problem did not suddenly appear yesterday. Liberal policies, even the holy racial policies, don't WORK. So the only way they can be enforced is by suppressing serious opposition as naziswhowantokillsixmillionjews and so forth.

Mr. Botstein, president of Bard College in New York, said there was another common misperception:

"Anybody who tells you once upon a time you could say anything you want on campus is romanticizing the past," he said. "Once upon a time you were labeled a communist."

Many today say you cannot discuss racial questions freely today because different races are on the campus. In other words, a multiracial society cannot be a free society (though no one is allowed to put it that way).

But the previous orthodoxy had the same excuse. Back when Communism and socialism were deadly epithets, a very small percentage of the people went to college. Students were from relatively well-to-do families, or were working to become rich.

Back then, anyone who discussed anything relating to income distribution was directly insulting those who paid the bills and the families of most students. It seemed impossible that such topics could ever be broached on a college campus.

So what happened to that orthodoxy?

What happened was that mainstream liberals finally had the guts to say that there could be no freedom of speech until even Communists were allowed to share in it.

There was a time when liberals hid under the table every time income redistribution was mentioned. They, like respectable conservatives today, asked only that if the ruling establishment was lynching heretics, they be allowed to lead the mob and prove their orthodoxy.

Only when liberals stood up and demanded free speech for extreme leftists did the old orthodoxy end.

As long as everything conservatives say reads like the argument I outlined above, as long as neoconservatism remains the only position anyone is allowed to take on the right, you can forget freedom of speech.

And if you can forget freedom of speech, you can soon forget all freedom.

If no discussion is allowed unless it "is not about race," then liberals know what to do. They inject race into every discussion, one way or another, and then bring in a black spokesman to shriek for them and scare off the conservatives.

And they are perfectly right to do so. Race is central to modern America. No great issues can be dealt with without race entering somehow into it. Leftists are going to use that hammer as long as the so-called opposition keeps hiding under the table.

March 31, 2001 - NO MATTER WHO DIES, LIBERAL PROGRAMS ARE NOT SUPPOSED TO WORK

March 31, 2001 - REAL HISTORY IS STILL NEWS TO SENATE WIMPS

March 31, 2001 - FIFTH COLUMN CONSERVATISM

NO MATTER WHO DIES, LIBERAL PROGRAMS ARE NOT SUPPOSED TO WORK

After the school shootings in Santee, California, the usual demand for gun control was muted. By now, everyone knows that that demand is just another opportunistic attempt to use human tragedy to push the liberal agenda. Though, of course, no respectable conservative ever puts that in plain English.

So liberals have used the latest school shootings to push another part of their agenda.

Liberals want more money spent on social programs and social experts. Those "experts," after all, are their people, and the more students that are exposed to such programs, the more liberalism can advance.

Naturally, no respectable conservative is going to point this out. When the liberal "experts" recommend something, they agree.

So the only recommendation everybody agreed on was that we need to institute lots of school "anti-violence programs." Practically no one mentioned that just such a program -- a BIG one -- already was in force at Sanatana High in Santee, California long before the shooting took place.

The fact that a program doesn't WORK means nothing.

The Santee "anti-violence" program spent \$132,000 last year. It would be hard to imagine a more blatant proof that something didn't work.

But the media and public response made two things clear: 1) absolutely nobody is surprised that it didn't work and 2) it never occurs to anybody that such a program will actually work.

In one interview I saw, one of the experts was demanding that more money be spent on people like him. He tried to explain why their anti-violence exercise at Sanatana didn't work. He said it was because 1) there were guns around and 2) we have not yet learned to enforce the difference between free speech and hate speech.

Point 2) is what everybody says who wants to limit freedom of speech. See March 17, 2001, Whitaker Online: HARMLESS FREEDOM IS AN OXYMORON.

So let's go back to the real explanation of why it failed: Nothing liberals recommend ever WORKS.

But if we all know it won't work, how do they sell it?

Liberals have won by convincing us that all we need is to DO SOMETHING, even though that something is not supposed to do any good. If it costs us money and freedom, that shows we are trying, and that's enough.

But this "do something" logic is more than just ineffective. While a tragedy like this is used to push the liberal agenda, it has another effect.

When we just "do something," knowing it won't work, we ask for more deaths. We will only find out what is effective when we ABANDON THINGS THAT DON'T WORK.

In the meantime, liberals benefit, respectable conservatives make them happy, and children die.

REAL HISTORY IS STILL NEWS TO SENATE WIMPS

Senator Pete Dominici is Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee. He is complaining that one of the major roadblocks to the Republican tax cut is the fact that his committee has the same number of Republicans and Democrats. He can't get the support of a single Democrat, and that allows them to block action.

Commenting on the pardon hearings, Senator Spectre said he was largely crippled by his inability to issue subpoenas. This is because he needs a majority of his committee to vote for a subpoena, and half the committee members are now Democrats. Trent Lott set it up that way.

Lott calls it "power sharing" with the Democrats, which is just what the liberal media asked for.

To back their "power sharing" demand, the media claimed that "the Senate has not been this evenly divided in one hundred and thirty years." Lott is a respectable conservative, which means he has no memory, so he went right along with this.

Meanwhile, back in the real world, this exact same thing happened in 1953. The Senate was split 48-48, and Vice President Nixon voted with the majority Republicans. Back then Republicans did what the Democrats would have done in the same situation. Each committee had one more Republican on it than Democrats, because Republicans were the majority party in the Senate.

If you cannot get a majority in a committee, that fact can be used to delay and kill a lot of legislation. So whether Lott's new precedent is just wimpishness or ignorance or both, it will be very costly for at least the next two years.

But the fact remains that Republicans have the majority, since the vice president is a Republican. Believe me, if the Senate were split fifty-fifty and the Democrats had the vice presidency, the media wouldn't be pushing "power sharing." And no Democrat would fall for it if they did.

FIFTH COLUMN CONSERVATISM

For younger readers, let me explain that the "fifth column" refers to enemies within the gates, those who help the enemy from inside the country or the party or whatever.

The fifth column must be more subtle than the ones doing the outright attacking from outside. In the 1970's, for example, terrorists who were called "freedom fighters" were slaughtering whole villages of black people in Rhodesia. Every group was supported and run by Marxists. The World Council of Churches, as always, wanted to support the Reds.

But even the leftists found it hard to swallow that a religious body would be supplying arms to terrorists. So the WCC gave the money for "medical supplies." With their medical supplies paid for, the terrorist groups could spend all their money on weapons. John McCain is loved so fanatically by liberals that during the campaign they had to repeat that they were for Gore, not McCain. The liberal media swooned over him. Yet McCain gains liberal support without going all out for avowedly liberal causes. What he does is exactly what the WCC did for the leftist terrorists.

McCain provides support for causes leftists all favor, but which don't sound liberal. That allows liberals to spend all their time on more liberal issues. So we see McCain cosponsoring liberal Democrats' version of "campaign finance reform," the one which leaves unions free to use union dues to support liberal Democrats.

We see McCain side by side with Ted Kennedy sponsoring Kennedy's version of a patient's bill of rights. And we see McCain taking the lead in getting all loopholes in gun sales closed, something which liberals would otherwise have to do.

In other words, McCain is able to devote himself entirely to liberal causes while claiming to represent his conservative constituency.

We saw the same sort of fifth column Republicanism each time the Republican Congress took on President Clinton. Each time you would see Gerald Ford and George Bush, Senior, hold a press conference to back Clinton, and add to the Democrat's resources.

The media call it bipartisanship or moderation. We should call it what it is.

April 7, 2001 - MILOSEVIC - THE STORY THAT MATTERS

April 7, 2001 - WHAT ABOUT SOME RESTRICTIONS ON LIBERAL CAMPAIGNS?

April 7, 2001 - CALIFORNIA BROWNOUT

MILOSEVIC - THE STORY THAT MATTERS

Milosevic is being sent to the War Crimes Trials.

No one on the winning side has ever been convicted of a War Crime.

No one on the winning side has ever been indicted for a War Crime.

No one on the winning side has ever been accused by any tribunal of a War Crime.

While all we ever talk about is naziswhowanttokillsixmillionjews, the fact is that the crimes of Communists have dwarfed those of the Nazis. No one has seriously mentioned a figure under 100,000,000 for the killings carried out in the twentieth century in the name of Equality.

But no one pushing Equality is blamed for those deaths.

In fact, according all the War Crimes Tribunals, those killings never happened. There are millions of people drawing government pensions today for having helped with that murderous tyranny around the world, and no one has mentioned indicting them.

The political LEFT hates Milosevic, and that is his crime. No one the left likes has ever been accused, much less condemned, in a War Crimes Tribunal.

So the next time a leftist shrieks at a conservative about naziswhowanttokillsixmillionjews, what will the conservative say?

He'll say, "Please forgive me, Master," like he always does.

WHAT ABOUT SOME RESTRICTIONS ON LIBERAL CAMPAIGNS?

Under the McCain-Feingold Bill, almost every non-party group would be banned from campaigning during the sixty days before the election.

I say "almost" because one industry is totally exempted: the media.

If you restrict anybody else, it's just a needed reform. If you restrict the media's endorsements and outright campaigning, it's a violation of freedom of the press.

Nobody disagrees, least of all respectable conservatives.

Even some conservatives have mentioned that one of the things leftists love about McCain's latest effort is that it increases the power of the liberal media. What they do not mention is the fact that it also reinforces the double standard liberals love, the double standard that respectable conservatives exist to support.

So the idea is accepted that the MEDIA'S right to push the liberal agenda is true freedom--- freedom of the press. No other Americans have that right.

CALIFORNIA BROWNOUT

Two big stories have been coming out of California. The first is that the state has abruptly ceased to be America's special Land of Opportunity. Its power supply is collapsing under the weight of those who are already there, and even they are paying out-of-sight prices for it.

The second big story out of California is that it now has a majority of non-whites and non-Anglos for the first time in a century and a half.

No one is allowed to say this, but the two stories are related.

As soon as a person crosses the border from Mexico to the United States, his wages explode upward by several times. We are required to believe that this is the result of Magic. There is a Magic Formula that makes the United States what it is.

Liberals say that America is built entirely on some liberal formulas. NATIONAL REVIEW, representing respectable conservatives, says that America is based on five words: "All men are created equal." (Please see October 24, 1998 article, Five Words and Emma Lazarus).

What you are not allowed to say is that the difference between the United States and Mexico is a product of the PEOPLE who inhabit the United States and Mexico. (Please see May 15, 1999 article, WORDISM).

Only a heretic like me will say what everybody knows to be true. The major reason that Mexico is so poor relative to the United States is because Mexicans do such an awful job of governing themselves.

Mexican politics has historically been a seesaw of revolutionaries who promise to right all wrongs and military dictatorships which impose stability after the revolution.

So as Mexicans come into America, they will enjoy the American standard of living for a while. But eventually they will take over, and the United States will begin to enjoy Mexico's standard of living. The California energy shortage is a first step in this process.

The environmental kooks took over California and forced both parties to accept their program. This program has caused the state, despite its enormous growth, to stop the building of all power plants for the last twenty years. That is liberal policy, and everybody agrees that, if you want Hispanic votes, you have to appeal to the left.

After all, America's left is just like the politics of Mexico: liberalism makes enormous promises, and what it does never WORKS.

Revolution after revolution promised to give Mexicans a high standard of living. No country has ever been given a higher standard of living by a leftist regime, but particularly foolish people keep supporting them. What happens next is that, after the revolution fails again, reactionaries take over again.

Then the revolutionaries promise that, when they overthrow the ruling reactionaries, everybody will be well off.

And so on, ad infinitum.

People who will fall for that will fall for anything.

And they do. That's why their side of the border is poverty-stricken.

Liberals say, for example, that the first generation of anti-Castro Cubans voted conservative, but their children are voting "more traditionally Hispanic" -- meaning liberal Democrat.

Liberal Democrats now dominate everything in California. The minorities put them in power and will keep them there.

Republicans have two simultaneous arguments to make about this. First, they say that multiracialism is a holy cause, and racial differences are not important to anything. Secondly, they say that, while conservative policies make sense and work, you simply will never sell them to brown and black folks.

And no one ever asks if this is not just a little bit racist. The only people who would be allowed to point this out are liberals, and they won't say anything because liberals like that kind of thinking.

This explains why Republicans adopted disastrous liberal energy policies in California. They take on leftist, sound-good policies that appeal to the brown and black electorate, as well as to white liberals. So environmentalists were in charge even when Republicans held power.

What happened to energy in California was that, until the collapse came, everything that led to it and sounded good was OK. That is third-world thinking.

So California now looks third world, and thinks third world. Respectable conservatives will be the first to lynch anyone who says this, which is why it is both true and unmentioned.

April 14, 2001 - THE CHINESE ARE WRONG -- THAT'S OUR PROBLEM

April 14, 2001 - A MAN WITH A MEMORY TALKS ABOUT THE IRANIAN HOSTAGE CRISIS

April 14, 2001 - THE "ALLIES" GAMBIT

THE CHINESE ARE WRONG -- THAT'S OUR PROBLEM

If the crew hadn't landed in China, I am willing to bet we STILL wouldn't know about this incident. It would have been too embarrassing for the Chinese.

I pointed out on February 17, 2001, in THE BRASS IS WIMPING OUT ON AMERICAN SERVICEMEN, that Soviet ships regularly swerved against American ships all through the Cold War, and the American ships were ordered to back off.

I have no information on air incidents, just as we had no information that air incidents of this kind that have been taking place near China for the past year.

The Chinese were well aware that American conservatives would never publicly object to their aggressiveness because business loves cheap Chinese labor. And liberals are loath to criticize a Loving Democratic People's Republic.

So the Chinese pilot did what had become routine: he was being a bully. His Mach 2 jet flew too close to an American surveillance (not spy) plane with a 460-mph maximum speed. That 460-mph is less than a third of Mach 2.

But this time he got caught at it. The Chinese pilot hot-dogged a plane that couldn't hit back and he got himself killed.

That is about as childish a death as one can imagine.

What's more, the bully got what he deserved and all the Americans survived. How much face can one lose at one time?

A MAN WITH A MEMORY TALKS ABOUT THE IRANIAN HOSTAGE CRISIS

When the Iranians seized the American embassy and took Americans hostage in 1979, the media called those people "hostages" almost from the word go. But they kept calling the Iranians who took and held them "students." It wasn't that Iran approved this, you see, it was just a bunch of unruly students who had stormed the Embassy.

It took the press a long time to finally stop calling those Iranians "students."

In the 1979 case, the problem was that the media did not know which side to be on. In Vietnam, only a few years earlier, they had been solidly on the side of those killing Americans. Until the American people made it clear they wouldn't stand for that this time, the media did a lot of pussyfooting. All that is forgotten today.

In 1979, when the Iranian hostages were taken, Teddy Kennedy had already announced that he was challenging sitting Democratic president Jimmy Carter for the nomination in 1980.

What you hear today is that the Iranian hostage crisis beat Teddy, which is true. But they also say that was because of the way Carter handled the hostage crisis early on, which is not true.

Teddy Kennedy reacted to the taking of our hostages in Teheran in the old Vietnam manner. He loudly attacked the United States and blamed the whole situation on us. In other words, he was a standard liberal. It didn't take long for that to destroy his bid for the presidential nomination.

You won't hear about that anywhere but here.

THE "ALLIES" GAMBIT

Recently, American officials have been telling the press that "Russia is not our ally."

The reminder was necessary, because press and government use the term "allies" about any country that is not actively at war with us.

When China seized our airmen, it never occurred to anybody that a single one of our "allies" would jump to our defense, even verbally. We are obligated to help European "allies" defend and police Europe, but they owe us nothing. We are obligated to "consult with our allies," but they owe us nothing.

Like "hostages," the word "allies" has a different meaning when the United States Government, also known as Uncle Sucker, uses it.

So what does "ally" mean to an English-speaking person?

In 1812, the United States declared war on Great Britain. France was already at war with Britain. But we were not allies.

This had very practical implications. For example, it sometimes happened that a huge British Man of War was in a neutral harbor with an American warship and a French warship. When this happened, it was almost always the case that the British ship totally outclassed its two enemy vessels combined.

If they had been allies, the Americans and the Frenchmen would have had to coordinate a mutual defense for the time when they had to leave the safe harbor. But since they were not allies, one ship could sneak away while the other went out and got shot to pieces.

Uncle Sucker has half that relationship with our "allies" today. If somebody attacks Europe or Canada, we must come to their aid. If there is trouble anywhere in Europe, we must take the lead in taking care of it. If we get into trouble, our "allies'" only obligation is to sit back and criticize.

During Vietnam, the people we called "allies" were almost all havens for our draft dodgers. If they were really allies, that was a historical first.

This one-way relationship is reflected in the constant demand that we "consult with our allies." If Uncle Sucker is about to do anything, it must get the permission of its "allies." If we ask them to consult with us, that's American imperialism.

You cannot mention this because Hitler was a bad man. Liberals and respectable conservatives accuse anyone who criticizes our one-way relationship with our "allies" of being an "isolationist." "Isolationists" were people who opposed America's entry into World War II before Pearl Harbor.

So if you don't kowtow to our "allies," that makes you anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

April 21, 2001 - MAURICE BESSINGER, WAL-MART, AND CHINA

April 21, 2001 - A MAN WITH A MEMORY LOOKS AT THE CINCINNATI RACE RIOTS

April 21, 2001 - MODERN SLAVERY

MAURICE BESSINGER, WAL-MART, AND CHINA

According to the media, about half of Wal-Mart's products come from Red China. When American hostages were held by that country, Wal-Mart had absolutely nothing to say.

But Wal-Mart led the boycott of Bessinger's products when he committed PURELY VERBAL heresy on the political RIGHT.

Another point: when it comes to Maurice's taking down the Federal flag and when they want to attack the right for being "naziswhowanttokillsixmillionjews," the left is always talking about "our men who fought in World War II."

But during the recent hostage crisis, our men who fought the Red Chinese in Korea were never mentioned.

Maurice Bessinger was one of those FIGHTING the Red Chinese in Korea. Maurice put HIS life on the line for that Federal flag when he felt that side represented his homeland.

The EDGEFIELD JOURNAL and other spokesmen of the League have previously brought up Wal-Mart's support of Red China versus their boycott of Bessinger. Now that the real nature of Red China is front and center, this is no time to pass over this point.

We have got to keep repeating it, because no one else is going to mention it at all.

A MAN WITH A MEMORY LOOKS AT THE CINCINNATI RACE RIOTS

As the only man with a memory, I need to mention something about the Cincinnati race riots.

I remember the 1960s race riots, and I remember one thing about those riots that no one mentioned in the media then and that no one talks about now.

One of the things that happened in the recent Los Angeles riots and the Cincinnati uprisings was that the mob pulled whites out of their cars and beat them. During the 60s riots, that happened in the Watts Riots in Los Angeles and in many other Northern riots as well.

But in the 1960s they did not pull one single white person out of their cars south of the Mason-Dixon Line.

The liberals would love to say that that was because evil, bigoted Southerners would have chased down and prosecuted the attackers more vigorously down South. So the poor, persecuted Southern blacks didn't dare drag whites out.

But some of those Northern rioters wore masks. Nobody grabbed a person out of his car in a Southern riot even with a mask on. It isn't the fear of being identified that prevents it.

No respectable conservative would dare think of, much less mention, the real reason why drivers down here, white or black, are so often unmolested.

But you and I know why no sane person would drag a person out of a car in the middle of a Southern riot: he is likely to get his head blown off.

A lot of us "carry heat" down here, and if there is a dangerous situation, even more of us will put the answer to it in our glove compartments.

You will only read it here: if a few Northerners had had guns in their cars, no one would have been dragged out and beaten in Northern riots, then or now.

MODERN SLAVERY

The slave ship fiasco in Africa brought the modern slavery situation into focus.

The International Labor Organization estimates that there are 250 million children between the ages of five and fourteen in slave labor around the world -- predominantly in Asia and Africa.

Two points about this need to be made.

First, This slavery involves few if any whites.

Second, these slave traders bought their slaves from Africans and Asians, usually the children's parents.

Liberals want to talk about slavery in 1860, not about who is guilty today. No way that liberals will OK the discussion of the color of today's slave traders. But I thought that respectable conservatives might dare talk about it anyway.

'Fraid not. Even I constantly underestimate the pure intellectual cowardice it takes to be respectable.

So let's look at the rest of what these ideological Bobsey Twins are not going to bring up.

The liberal line today (and therefore the respectable conservative line) is that Southerners were responsible for the slave trade because they BOUGHT slaves two centuries ago.

It's a funny thing, but few if any whites were going to buy today's slaves, and nobody wants to discuss that.

Slavery was often brutal, but even the Confederacy HANGED people who engaged in the slave trade. Half the blacks were expected to die in misery on a slave ship.

It is New England fortunes, not Southern fortunes, that were founded on that famous Triangle Trade.

One John Brown, for whom Brown University in Rhode Island is named, amassed a slave trade fortune. Most of the other such fortunes were in Massachusetts.

But modern history has to lie even about those bestial slave traders in order to be Politically Correct. So the History Channel tells us that "whites kidnapped blacks in Africa."

The networks produced the movie "Roots" in which whites -- with a couple of black helpers -- were shown capturing Kunte Kinte. In that movie, it was only a few black "allies of the white man" who were mentioned as helping kidnap blacks for the Triangle Trade .

After he was Born Again, an actual eighteenth century slave trader confessed the horrors he had perpetrated in that trade. But even he said that the one thing they were not guilty of was chasing down and enslaving blacks.

No white slave trader ever did what the History Channel constantly says they did and what the networks said they did. It was not that they were too good to kidnap Africans. It is just that, in real history, they would never have found any reason to do it.

Yesterday, as today, slaves are too cheap in Africa to be worth chasing down oneself. Exactly like today's slavers, all the old slave traders bought their ENTIRE cargo from black Africans.

It was and is cheap and easy to buy slaves from black Africans.

What the Confederacy NEVER ALLOWED is what Africans have ALWAYS engaged in.

That would have ruined the "only whites are evil" theme of "Roots", wouldn't it?

FOOTNOTE: The only people conservatives allow to speak for them about race issues today are "neoconservatives," who were hard-core leftists in the 1960s.

I discussed these "neos" on March 24, 2001 in THE "NEOS" HELPED CAUSE TODAY'S SUPPRESSION OF FREE SPEECH.

Neos like David Horowitz have found some of the points I make here useful in representing the "conservative" side on reparations for slavery.

My problem, once again, is that I have a memory. Today's "neos" were shrieking us down when we made that kind of point in the 1960s. The shouting down of free speech never had more loyal allies, on and off campus, than today's neos when they were liberals.

April 28, 2001 - TODAY'S SUPERPATHETIC SENATE

April 28, 2001 - THE RAGGED KNEE AWARD

TODAY'S SUPERPATHETIC SENATE

Conservatives who are not declared "respectable" by the media are banned from having their say not only in those media but in conservative outlets too.

Respectable conservatives are given or denied that precious "respectable" title by the liberal media. So all respectable conservatives have done some really serious groveling before liberals.

In bowing down before the left, no group of conservatives does a more professional job than those in today's United States Senate. I discussed Orrin Hatch's dubiously heterosexual worship of and sellouts to Teddy Kennedy on July 1, 2000 in ORRIN STILL LOVES TEDDY.

Outside today's Senate, Orrin would be special. But in the Senate, he is only middling. Orrin's worship of Kennedy cannot put him in the same category with the behavior of John McCain. I described that on March 31, 2001 in FIFTH COLUMN CONSERVATISM.

But even in the Senate sinkhole of wimpishness, Trent Lott deserves special mention because he is a SOUTHERN perversion. The old Southern senator combined gentility with a steel-hard devotion to principle.

Lott has perverted gentlemanliness into pure squishiness.

In his landmark book on the Senate, "The Citadel," published in 1951, William White discussed the Senate as the World's Most Exclusive Club.

White discussed the fact that there was the whole Senate as a club and then an even more exclusive Inner Club that was closed to most of the Senate itself. He said that every one of those old Southerners was an automatic member of the Inner Club.

Old style Southerners fulfilled two requirements to be members of the Inner Club. First, they fought like lions for the South and for their own constituents. Secondly, they remained gentlemen while doing it.

Lott and his followers have totally dropped the first characteristic. When Teddy Kennedy and his buddies are handing out that "respectable" label, nobody is more ready to sell his people out than the Modern Southern Conservative. And they do it while perverting the concept of a Southern Gentleman.

A real Southern senator was first of all a MAN. He was known for his willingness to fight ferociously for what he believed in. Trent Lott has twisted that into a pure perversion, where "gentleman" means a simpering, grinning, absolutely wimpish weak grin as a substitute for principle.

Lott loudly denounces liberal media bias when he's talking to conservative groups. But when he faces them, he simpers about how fair they are.

The Old Southerner had his feet rooted in Senate Tradition, and he used it as a weapon. Lott's idea of Tradition is described on March 31, 2001 in REAL HISTORY IS STILL NEWS TO SENATE WIMPS.

THE RAGGED KNEE AWARD

Lott, McCain, Hatch, what a monster gallery of wimps and sell-outs!

But it gets even better. The Senate is a center of superpathetic respectability, but they have produced one man who has recently come to stand out ahead of the rest.

Dick Morris, Clinton's longtime chief political advisor, has no doubt about Clinton's misdeeds. He said that the last real chance to find out the real scoop on the Chinese campaign contributions scandal was the Indonesian moneyman, John Ryadi.

Ryadi was the man who arranged the gifts of money to the Democrats and he, as Morris put it, "knew where all the bodies were buried." Pressure on Ryadi was our last chance to find it all out.

Janet Reno had arranged a nice little plea bargain to let Ryadi off the hook with some public service. A conservative legal group had managed to get a court to discuss reconsidering that bargain.

Then our new Attorney General John Ashcroft told the court that the Reno deal was all right with him.

Morris was devastated. He said that that gave up the only chance to really get to the bottom of the campaign finance scandal. Morris could not understand how Ashcroft could let that obvious Reno cover-up go forward. He said that Ashcroft must have lost his nerve in his confirmation hearings.

Remember Ashcroft? He was the Great Hero of the Right Bush appointed as Attorney General.

It's easy to forget that this Ashcroft was the one the whole left went crazy about, and the whole right fought for. Until this year he was a United States Senator. But, incredible as it seems, in the midst of such competition, Ashcroft even stands out among the Senate's wimps and sellouts.

I discussed Ashcroft's falling down at Kennedy's feet on February 3, 2001 - THE ASHCROFT GROVEL. His worship of Kennedy matches poor little Orrin's.

In FIFTH COLUMN CONSERVATISM I discussed how McCain has devoted himself entirely to taking on issues liberals would otherwise have to spend time on, but which don't sound specifically liberal, like gun show checks for gun control or the pro-liberal campaign finance "reform." That is exactly what Ashcroft is doing with the Department of Justice.

Ashcroft is out to prove racial profiling, so liberals can use it. Actually, as I discussed on July 17, 1999 in RACIAL PROFILING IS THE FAULT OF BLACK CRIMINALS; a conservative would be defending law enforcement from these charges.

Likewise, Ashcroft has increased the effort to prove racial discrimination in voting by a twenty percent increase in funding.

As with McCain, these offensives are not specifically liberal, but they go after the sort of thing that liberals want to prove.

He is in there fighting for "reverse" discrimination in court.

Meanwhile, Ashcroft made sure that the Reno deal with Ryadi went through.

These are some of the things he has done for liberals in a matter of a couple of months. Meanwhile, he has done nothing whatsoever for us. He gave the Clinton-appointee in Chicago the go-ahead to investigate the pardons, but even Reno would have had to do that.

So, even in the competition to fall at Kennedy's feet in the United States Senate, Ashcroft has fallen down so fast and so hard that he leaves even other Modern Conservative Senators trailing behind him.

When a man hits his knees that fast and that hard there should be a special recognition. I hereby award John Ashcroft the First Whitaker Online Ragged Knee Award.

May 5, 2001 - A MAN WITH A MEMORY LOOKS AT INTEGRATION

May 5, 2001 - LIBERALISM IS NOT AN "ALTERNATIVE VIEW," IT IS INSANITY THAT WE MUST GROW OUT OF

May 5, 2001 - TO BE RESPECTABLE, YOU MUST MAINTAIN LIBERAL DENIAL

May 5, 2001 - FOOTNOTE ON CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

A MAN WITH A MEMORY LOOKS AT INTEGRATION

Mississippi has just signed a civil rights lawsuit settlement that requires it to spend more money on its black colleges and universities. This demonstrates a landmark liberal failure, but YOU WILL ONLY READ IT HERE.

All those who are allowed to speak, meaning liberals and respectable conservatives, are required to have no memory. But I remember that one goal of the civil rights movement was the abolition of overwhelmingly black education on every level.

Integration, as only some black leaders now admit, was supposed to bring on the millennium in education. Races were supposed to be the same in everything but skin color, so the only thing preventing equal education was separate schools.

Southerners who actually cared about blacks said black problems could best be dealt with in black schools.

If I had told an integrationist in 1960 that the NAACP would be fighting for better funding for overwhelmingly black higher education in 2001, he would have laughed at me. It turns out that having a black higher education system is indispensable in dealing with many black problems.

In 1960, as today, liberals laughed at the common-sense solution to any problem. Back then I insisted that punishment, not "rehabilitation," would reduce crime. That was very unfashionable in 1960.

It is generally conceded today that the more repeat criminals that are locked up, the lower the crime rate will be. Only the truly hypnotic left still believes that criminals are merely "victims of society." For example, the New York Times said last year that, "Crime is on the decrease, EVEN THOUGH PRISON POPULATIONS HAVE INCREASED."

As usual, what is a contradiction to a liberal is common sense to a sane person

Today's young folks have an answer to that kind of totally warped inability to face reality. They say, "Well, DUHH!"

LIBERALISM IS NOT AN "ALTERNATIVE VIEW," IT IS INSANITY THAT WE MUST GROW OUT OF

Sane social policy can only be reached after we have gone through a horrible, costly, disastrous period of taking liberal policy seriously. So it was with crime and so it must be with black education.

Until we look at the old, insane leftist arguments as what they really are and reject them, we cannot return to sanity.

Most people now know how insane the old liberal policy on crime was. Criminals are not just victims of an evil society, as every liberal said in 1960. They must be punished for crime to be prevented.

On race policy, liberals still require conservatives to forget how insane their original justifications were. Policy in that area will remain a disaster as long as that denial persists.

Nothing liberals advocate ever WORKS. So liberals have to deal with constant failure, and they are used to it. They have several established ways of doing this.

First and foremost, liberals use respectable conservatives to make sure their repeated failures are never mentioned. In 1960, integration was supposed to get rid of what were then considered the incredibly high black rates of illegitimacy, drug use and crime. Now those 1960 black statistics are the average WHITE rates, and blacks are much, much worse off.

Blacks are better off now in some ways, such as pay. But their RATE of improvement in these areas was just as fast before integration and affirmative action policies were established.

So liberal policies are a disaster, as usual. But no conservative who does not want to be shrieked at and then ignored ever mentions such a thing.

The reason liberalism always fails is because it always violates common sense. One old common-sense saying was "one rotten apple spoils the barrel." Naturally, liberals sought to deal with those terrible black statistics by dumping the black students in wholesale with white students. The only result, as the old wisdom would have predicted, was that whites went down to black levels.

TO BE RESPECTABLE, YOU MUST MAINTAIN LIBERAL DENIAL

No one remembers today that almost every "intellectual" in the 50s and 60s said that the only way to economic EFFICIENCY was to have all industry owned and run directly by the government. Back then, "socialism," which represented the Inevitable Future of Social Progress, was defined as "government ownership of the means of production."

This idea is so stupid it is hilarious, so no conservative is allowed to remind anyone of what was once Inevitable and Efficient. You will never see that anywhere but here.

Likewise, the fact that integration was supposed to lead to improvements in the statistics on illegitimacy, drug use, crime, and so forth has been flushed down the Memory Hole of every respectable conservative.

O'Reilly on the Fox Cable News Network gives the justification for busing that is popular today. The purpose of busing, liberals say, is to take hostages: If you have white students forced into ghetto schools, their parents will be forced to vote for more ghetto school money.

Liberals never put it this way, of course. But their ORIGINAL argument for busing was that it improved education, and nobody will dare remind them of THAT nonsense!

The other argument liberals NOW use for integration is Holy Diversity.

The 1960s justification for integration was the exact OPPOSITE of Diversity. With integration, "Negroes" would be just like whites, "except for the color of the skin."

On one program, O'Reilly was discussing home schooling with William Bennett. Bennett said that home schooling worked great, but he guiltily admitted that it does not provide Holy Diversity.

Bennett is one of our leading respectable conservatives. To be a good one of those, you have to be genuinely too stupid to see reality. So Bennett is honestly puzzled that Holy Diversity doesn't seem to be necessary to a good education.

It would never occur to Bennett or Jack Kemp or other respectables that the exact opposite is always the case.

So when Bennett said this, O'Reilly dutifully jumped in and said, "That is what I like about public education. Diversity is good." But he did not stop there. His next sentence, without a break, was, "I CAN'T UNDERSTAND WHY WE KEEP PUMPING MORE MONEY INTO PUBLIC EDUCATION AND IT KEEPS GETTING WORSE."

Well, DUHH!

A routine respectable conservative could say that and believe it, but O'Reilly is no fool. Surely he can see that his second sentence answered the first!

FOOTNOTE ON CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

All New York liberals oppose minimum mandatory sentences for all crimes BUT ONE. They say that rapists and drug dealers should not be subjected to minimum sentencing

But anyone caught with a gun in his home in New York -- for the first offense -- gets a one year minimum prison sentence.

When liberals are serious about something, the first thing they do is dump the liberal approach to it.

May 12, 2001 - ABORTION BAD, GENOCIDE GOOD?

May 12, 2001 - TWENTIETH-FIRST CENTURY AMISH

May 12, 2001 - FRANCE - THE BOY IN THE BUBBLE

ABORTION BAD, GENOCIDE GOOD?

Let me say it up front: A lot of us on the right don't trust the pro-life movement.

Too often pro-lifers want others on the right to fight for their issue, and then they sell us out on principles that really matter to us.

Hundreds of thousands of people seem to be interested in marching against abortion, but the fact that the white race is being purposely done away means nothing to them (See February 20, 1999 - THE FINAL SOLUTION).

I have met too many white pro-lifers who love to tell me that they WANT to get rid of whites and Southerners and everything I care about. They get a warm, fuzzy feeling by being on the same side as the leftists.

The pro-lifers imply that the last bad Supreme Court decision was the Dred Scott Decision in 1857 (See July 1, 2000 - WE CANNOT CRITICIZE FEDERAL COURTS ANY MORE).

Many pro-lifers are good allies against the leftists, and I have worked with them for decades. BUT ONLY WHEN THEY WORK WITH ME.

In the meantime, I am not all that fascinated by the abortion issue because I have to fight for my principles alone.

Pro-lifers say all abortion is evil. I say all genocide is evil (And PLEASE read THE FINAL SOLUTION, February 20, 1999).

I believe that whites have the right to exist, which is supposed to make me anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews. Some pro-lifers scream that at me loudest of all.

What is more, I think the white race has special characteristics that make it vital to the human race in general (See February 26, 2000, MISCEGENATION DOESN'T WORK EITHER).

I point out in that article that the liberals who push miscegenation are the same people who have been wrong about everything else. But most pro-lifers quote them as if they were Gospel.

The unique products of the white race have already saved BILLIONS of babies.

In fact, MOST OF THE HUMAN RACE OWES ITS EXISTENCE TO WHITE TECHNOLOGY AND MEDICINE.

In this case, pro-life is pro-white, and the official pro-lifers are anti-white.

So you have to watch people who call themselves pro-lifers. They'll sell you -- and life itself -- out in a heartbeat, and glory in doing it.

TWENTIETH-FIRST CENTURY AMISH

The actual commandment pulls no punches: "Thou shalt not kill."

That little dot at the end is a period.

Historically, most Christians have felt that the defense of everything dear to us requires that we do some killing.

According to most Quakers any killing is like murder. If they had prevailed in America, there would be a ruling Communist regime and no Quakers.

Christianity has survived because most Christians look at the commandment as not meaning exactly what it says. But in the new century, this sort of decision is going to get MUCH harder.

In the twenty-first century, the big revolution will be biological. It will force us to make many very hard choices that before were left to God.

The Amish refuse to use technology that is not in the Bible. The Amish genuinely believe that all Christians should behave this way and leave everything to God.

Another wholly sincere group, the Christian Scientists, feel that all medical questions and cures should be left to God. I cannot do this. I cannot deny a person medical care.

The Amish or Christian Science approach would protect me from having to make hard moral decisions in the coming medical revolution.

I could be one of them and just ignore the incredible medical power mankind is accumulating.

But I am not Amish, a Quaker, or a Christian Scientist, so I must face these life-and-death questions myself.

FRANCE - THE BOY IN THE BUBBLE

A few years ago, there was a little boy in a bubble in France. As everybody is probably aware, a "boy in a bubble" is a child who is born without any immunity to germs. His body cannot fight bacteria, so he is put in a sterile environment, a "bubble" of plastic, for life.

A boy in a bubble cannot live as long as other people. He is imprisoned for his entire very short lifetime.

Scientists did find a way to get this child out of that bubble. But it involved using fetal tissues.

France had a law against using fetal tissues for medical purposes. So it was a question of using fetal tissues to save the life of a child whom everybody could see and sympathize with, or just throwing the tissues away as the law required.

The only alternative was to let the child die as a matter of principle. This choice was real, and it had to be made.

In the real world, how many people are going to side with the fetal tissues against the little boy? So the child is now alive and free.

According to strict pro-life doctrine, the boy's life has to be expendable. In this view, the destruction of a sixteen-cell fetus is exactly the same as partial birth abortion, where a live child is painfully killed.

It is cruel for humans to have to make make this kind of choice. Possibly such power should not be in human hands. But it is, and it will grow.

In the next century the moral choices we will be faced with will be much, much worse. We must either go Amish or find a way to deal with them.

Most people have no problem when the fetal tissue to be used would be thrown away anyway. But what if the little boy's life depended on PRODUCING a fetus to use to save the child's life?

This is indeed a slippery slope. Once you abandon the absolute pro-life position, you are in very deep water.

As for me, I could never tell the boy's parents that their son would have to die for my principles.

I can only balance the life of a real, CONSCIOUS person (unborn children are conscious) against the life of another real, conscious person. This is called the Golden Rule, and it came from the mouth of Christ.

It is one thing to talk about an abortion for the mother's convenience. But here the pro-life movement wants to prohibit the only way to save a living child's life. THAT IS NOT PRO-LIFE.

And let me return to the big point here:

TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY CHOICES WILL BE MUCH, MUCH HARDER THAN THIS.

And let me be absolutely frank. The extreme pro-lifers are perfectly right about one thing: This IS a slippery slope.

Only by adopting the extreme pro-life position can you insist that God protects you from having to make any life-and death, twenty-first century choices.

What I want to know is how other people like me, who must answer to their personal consciences, are going to approach the new century.

Could you say no?

Be sure, because soon you may have to.

May 19, 2001 NOTHING

May 25, 2001 - A MAN WITH A MEMORY LOOKS AT THE JEFFORDS DEFECTION

May 25, 2001 - A MAN WITH A CONSCIENCE LOOKS AT THE JEFFORDS DEFECTION

A MAN WITH A MEMORY LOOKS AT THE JEFFORDS DEFECTION

On March 31, 2001, in REAL HISTORY IS STILL NEWS TO SENATE WIMPS, I pointed out that an evenly split Senate was not a new thing.

I have been pointing out for months now that the same situation existed in 1953, with a 48-48 Democrat-Republican split in the Senate. In 1953, as in 2001, the Republican Vice President gave the Republicans the Senate majority with his right to break a tie vote in that body.

In 1953, the Republicans took over the full powers of the majority party. By forgetting this precedent, Republican Senate wimps were able to "share power" with the Democrats in 2001.

Liberal media did not mention it because it gave Republican Senate wimps an excuse to give the Democrats extra power. But no conservative has mentioned it either!

Now that moderate Senator Jeffords of Vermont is going to give the Democrats a majority by voting with them, this piece of history begins to shout for recognition, BECAUSE EXACTLY THE SAME THING HAPPENED TO THE 1953 REPUBLICAN MAJORITY!

In 1955, as in 1953, 48 Democrats and 48 Republicans had been elected to the Senate. But liberal Republican Wayne Morse gave the Democrats the Senate majority in 1955 by voting with them, just as Jeffords is doing today.

Republicans don't like discussing this because it makes an obvious point. Republicans are always saying that they have to cater to liberals in order to form a majority coalition. But in the real world, after all the weakening of principles has been done to get a few liberal Republicans, they leave you when it counts.

I covered the same ground, dealing with a similar subject, on October 14, 2000, in ONCE AGAIN - REPUBLICANS NEVER WIN WITH MINORITY VOTES.

A MAN WITH A CONSCIENCE LOOKS AT THE JEFFORDS DEFECTION

Unlike conservatives, Jeffords is more interested in principles than in the Republican label. Wayne Morse, who made the same switch in 1955, also valued his liberal principles over the party label.

This fact leads us directly into another fact of history that liberals never mention, and that conservatives - ALL CONSERVATIVES BUT ME - have kept hidden: That fact is that Republican conservatives have NEVER valued principles over party.

No conservative Republican has ever considered the future of America more important than the Grand Old Party of Abraham Lincoln (Please see December 16, 2000, THE THING THAT WOULDN'T DIE).

In 1932, 1934 and 1936 the Republican Party almost ceased to exist outside of New England. Liberals took over the national Democratic Party, but conservatives stayed with the Democrats because they had enormous power in Congress because of their seniority. By 1936, less than a FIFTH of the House of Representatives was Republican and many of them were liberal Republicans.

In 1936, conservative Republicans had no power anywhere. If they had had any interest in conservative principles, they would have left the Party of Lincoln to its handful of liberals and voted for conservative Democrats. There is no record of any conservative Republican ever considering such a move.

So what did conservative Republicans do after the 1936 rout? They could have chosen to join their fellow conservatives in the Democratic Party and rule the country. At that time and for a generation to come, the American electorate contained a solid majority of Southern and ethnic conservatives, especially Northern Irish, and conservative Republicans in the Northeast and Midwest and West.

But putting principle before party never even occurred to Northern conservative Republicans. They simply gave their national party to their liberal-moderate minority. After 1936, to save the party label, Republicans began to nominate one moderate after another for the presidency.

From 1940 until very recently, conservative Southerners, Westerners, Midwesterners, and socially conservative Northeastern ethnics made up a solid majority of American voters. But liberals ran our national politics.

Because party labels meant more to conservatives than did principles, they were fatally split. The base of the Democratic Party was made up of Southern and ethnic conservatives. The base of the Republican Party was Midwestern and Western conservatives.

The South voted for anybody with a Democratic label. The Midwest voted for anybody with a Republican label. Conservatives would vote for anybody with the right party label, no matter what they stood for.

So liberals held the balance of power.

In plain English, the party label was more important to conservatives in both parties than the fate of their country or their principles.

It was conservative Democrats who finally put principle above party.

Finally, beginning in the 1950s, we conservative Democrats began to support the Goldwater-Reagan wing of the Republican Party. Ronald Reagan was one of those who left the Democratic Party to pursue their conservative beliefs.

We had a hard fight. Most Republican conservatives remained loyal to the moderate and liberal Party leaders. They backed Nixon. They backed Ford, Bush, and Dole. If there hadn't been so many Republican conservatives who backed them the party would have stayed conservative after 1960.

Lincoln Republicans are still at it. NATIONAL REVIEW, the magazine that represents respectable conservatism, is now conducting a vicious campaign against the Confederate flag. It demands that all conservatives unite behind the principles of Abraham Lincoln.

So Jeffords is not the real traitor. He is working for his leftist principles. Anyone with a conscience would rather have a Jeffords on their side than NATIONAL REVIEW and its kind of "conservatives."

June 2, 2001 - AN ENVIRONMENTALISM THAT WOULD WORK

June 2, 2001 - LIBERAL-MODERATE CODE WORDS: "A BALANCED APPROACH TO ENERGY"

June 2, 2001 - THE "BALANCED APPROACH" IN EDUCATION

AN ENVIRONMENTALISM THAT WOULD WORK

Every so often a news reports comes in that, after years of litigation, a huge corporation has been convicted of doing major damage to the environment. They are then fined a few million bucks.

This is a joke. Those few millions wouldn't pay for the paper clips used by that corporation over those same years. The fine means nothing. If people are committing a purposeful crime, which you must prove in cases like this, you should JAIL those responsible, no matter how rich they are.

But liberals and self-styled environmentalists, who claim to be tough on corporate greed, never propose such a thing. No corporation will be deterred by a threat of such a fine, and we all know it. Corporate fines don't work, and liberals support them.

If rich people purposely commit crimes, you must jail them for it, or stop playing games.

An environmental policy that would work is like any policy that would work. Regulations that work produce few rules, but every single rule is ruthlessly enforced.

If you rigorously enforce the rules, that assures that the rules will be few. People are careful about passing restrictions if they know they have to obey them.

My approach to the environment or to education or to crime would work, because it is intended to work. I want a clean world, I want crime down, I want better education. So, my policies would be designed to produce these things.

Liberals are not primarily interested in a clean world or less crime or better education. Liberal proposals are made to push liberal causes.

The left is not interested in reducing crime. Its real aim is to take guns out of private hands.

Good education does not really concern them. What they want is to RE-EDUCATE children into leftist ideas.

And in the case of the environment, it is not accidental that all the people who used to push outright socialism are now calling themselves "environmentalists." What they want is not clean air but government control.

As you can see, real liberal goals have nothing to do with a policy that WORKS. In fact, a policy that actually SOLVED problems would get in the way.

LIBERAL-MODERATE CODE WORDS: "A BALANCED APPROACH TO ENERGY"

Nothing liberals advocate ever WORKS. The left keeps advocating that government billions be spent on solar power, geothermal and wind power. But if any of these started to WORK, the left would turn on them the way they did on nuclear power when it threatened to solve the energy crisis.

This is a very simple and obvious conclusion if you know anything about political strategy.

Everybody on the left wants to deal with the energy crisis by "conservation," while the right wants to deal with it by "production." The left wants to have bureaucrats dominate American life in the name of "conservation." They want price controls, rationing, and large government-run searches for unworkable "alternative sources of energy."

Liberals cannot say, EVEN TO THEMSELVES, that what they really want is for government to ration and control the price of every source of energy FOREVER. So they tell themselves, and everybody else, that they want bureaucrats to rule our energy use until an "alternative" is found.

In other words, liberals tell us -- and probably think they believe -- that total government control of energy will only last until they find an abundant "alternative" energy source. In the meantime, the total government control they dream of will be a "temporary solution."

It is generally known that there is nothing as eternal as a "temporary government program." Liberals always demand government control of situations UNTIL GOVERNMENT FINDS A SOLUTION. And liberal "solutions" NEVER work.

So what the liberal code words, "a balanced solution," really means is increased government power in the name of conservation and price controls, and government programs for long-term solutions that will never work.

So, as soon as any "solution" looks promising, liberals no longer like the sound of it, and turn against it.

THE "BALANCED APPROACH" IN EDUCATION

Only about seven percent of America's total public educational expenditures are Federal expenditures. But with that small part, the Feds have developed a titanic educational bureaucracy and are in control of every major phase of public teaching in this country.

The collapse of public educational standards has gone hand in hand with the expansion of the Federal role in education. Nothing else corresponds as perfectly with the decline of American education as does the imposition of Federal "solutions."

In the interest of getting through a "bipartisan" education bill this year, the Bush Administration surrendered all the conservative proposals, from school choice to consistent, nationwide testing.

So the Bush Administration agreed to an educational initiative which is the very picture of what liberals call "a balanced approach." It consists of 1) increases in bureaucratic control over education and 2) more money for the present Federal education programs.

So in education, the short-term fix is more bureaucrats and more government expenditures. The long-term liberal educational fix is liberal multibillion-dollar programs like Head Start.

It is not a conspiracy that makes leftists oppose anything that might work to end a crisis. What makes them fight any real solution is their secret desire for continued bureaucratic control in the name of the crisis.

For example, liberals fight the phonic method of teaching children reading with every weapon in their arsenal. They fight phonics, not in spite of the fact that it works, but BECAUSE it works.

We see "Hooked On Phonics" offering your money back if your child does not get a full grade improvement in his grades. We all know that no liberal is ever going to make that kind of guarantee for any liberal program.

The bottom line here is that there is a reason why nothing liberals advocate ever works.

June 9, 2001 - MIDDLE OF THE ROAD STRATEGY DOESN'T WORK BECAUSE HALF SANE IS NOT SANE

June 9, 2001 - THIS IS CRITICAL, PLEASE READ IT: THE MEDIA "MIDDLE OF THE ROAD" IS THE OPPOSITE OF THE REAL MIDDLE

MIDDLE OF THE ROAD STRATEGY DOESN'T WORK BECAUSE HALF SANE IS NOT SANE

One of the constant dangers that psychiatrists have to be warned about is the natural tendency to enter into the delusions of their patients. That way lies madness - literally.

In other words, if a patient comes into a doctor's office claiming that a giant purple mosquito is sitting on his shoulder, the doctor does not seek a compromise. He does not offer to say, for example, that they can agree that it is a SMALL mosquito and it is GRAY mosquito. The patient would never get well, and the doctor would be institutionalized.

That is why it so critical, so vital, that we keep repeating this mantra: NOTHING THAT LIBERALS PROPOSE EVER WORKS (all of Whitaker Online Archives, passim).

Liberals take the very conservative idea of keeping the air clean and turn it into a demand that bureaucrats take over every aspect of American life. This despite the fact that the most bureaucratically controlled countries in history, the USSR and China and Communist Eastern Europe, are absolute environmental disasters.

Liberals take constitutional due process and turn it into complete sentiment with criminals over victims. They all used to say that the most efficient economy is one owned and run by the government.

Not to put too fine a point on it, liberals are nutcases.

These are the sort of issues that media commentators keep telling us that Republicans should compromise on.

Meanwhile, back in the real world, these are the very issues that have discredited the word "liberal" to the point where even old-line liberals call themselves "moderate" or "progressive." This was accomplished by attacking liberals as traitorous and insane, not by entering into liberal delusions with them.

Liberals want us to stop doing that.

When the right goes after the left tooth and tongue, and shows how ridiculous leftists are, they win. Republicans did this with Reagan in 1980 and 1984. They did it under Gingrich in 1994. They won as "extremists" and they lost when they bumbled back repeatedly into the "middle of the road" nonsense.

Liberalism is Blame America First, it is anti-white, it is pro-criminal, and its only consistent demand is for more bureaucratic control and more government. In the long run, you can only win by attacking all that frontally.

Moderation -- the "middle of the road" -- means that you enter into all the liberal illusions with them, and act as if leftist silliness is good solid logic that you need to listen to and compromise with.

CNN's Bill Schneider will keep demanding that Republicans go "middle of the road." Jerry Ford and all the other Republican halfwits will chant "middle of the road" till they croak.

And the Dumb Old Party will keep trying it and losing.

THIS IS CRITICAL, PLEASE READ IT: THE MEDIA "MIDDLE OF THE ROAD" IS THE OPPOSITE OF THE REAL MIDDLE

If you know real electoral history, you know that the "middle of the road" theory doesn't WORK.

Look at Congress. If "middle of the road" worked in real elections, most people actually elected to Congress would be middle of the roaders. But in the real world, in both houses of Congress, the overwhelming majority of people actually elected are solidly liberal or solidly conservative.

In real world presidential elections, as the last article pointed out, when Republicans go middle of the road, they don't just get beat, they get stomped.

But the "middle of the road" theory sounds so logical it seems like common sense. We picture the political spectrum as two-dimensional: liberals are on the left and conservatives are on the right. If you look at the world that way, most voters must be moderates.

In a left-right view of politics, the "middle of the road" strategy seems obvious. It always convinces Republican pinheads.

Ladies and gentlemen, if what seems obvious from your picture of the world doesn't ever WORK, then there is something wrong with your picture of the world.

My first book was dedicated to showing that real American politics is not just between conservatives and liberals. As I explained in some 60,000 words, there are two more political positions: 3) that of the moderates and 4) that of the people. The moderates and the people are as opposite as are liberals and conservatives.

Liberals accuse professional conservatives of representing big business and big military expenditures, the "military-industrial complex." They are perfectly correct about that.

But in my first book, I explained in detail how liberals represent an even bigger establishment, an even bigger power group than the military-industrial complex. This is what I call the education-welfare complex.

The education-welfare establishment is bigger by far than the military-industrial complex. What is more important in political terms is that every dime the education-welfare establishment spends, every

iota of power it has, is the direct result of political decisions. Its power and almost all of its money depends directly on political leftism.

For the above reason, the education-welfare establishment is more politically ruthless than is the military-industrial complex. There are some liberal generals and leftist businessmen. But on college campuses, ALL opposition is crushed and silenced. No matter which way politics goes there will be a military and businessmen will make a profit. But the government's education-welfare establishment is completely dependent on government programs that don't WORK.

The education-welfare establishment lives almost entirely on liberal politics.

So liberals say conservatives just represent the military-industrial complex. Conservatives say liberals don't care about the people, they just care about bureaucrats and liberal theories.

My first book stated that THEY ARE BOTH PERFECTLY CORRECT.

The title of that book was A PLAGUE ON BOTH YOUR HOUSES.

This shows that the two-dimensional theory of politics, with only the left and the right, is dead wrong. There are

- 1) liberals, who represent the education-welfare establishment and,
- 2) conservatives, who represent the military-industrial complex.

BUT THERE ARE TWO MORE POLES:

- 3) moderates, who represent a compromise between those two establishments, and there are
- 4) the true populists, whose primary concern is "We, the People of the United States of America" They feel that "The People" should dedicate themselves to the interests of "Ourselves and OUR Posterity."

In other words, the true populist position is a direct quote from the Preamble to the United States Constitution.

Most of the positions of group 4) have been declared unconstitutional.

If you want a perfect illustration of four poles, look at immigration: 1) liberals want open borders because it brings in blindly obedient leftist voters from the third world. They will vote for things that sound good but don't work. THAT IS THE MAIN REASON THEIR PART OF THE WORLD IS SO POOR ITS PEOPLE HAVE TO LEAVE.

On the other hand, a massive influx of cheap labor is great for short-term profits, which is what 2) big business, is concerned with.

In the long run, massive third world immigration will make America a third-world country, and 4), the people, don't want that.

But no one is more fanatically pro-immigration than 3), a "middle of the roader."

Moderates and the courts have declared that any discrimination between "We the People" or "Ourselves and Our Posterity" on the one hand, and illegal aliens on the other is directly contrary to the United States Constitution.

Why? Because the moderate represents a THIRD POSITION. The moderate is halfway between the military-industrial complex and the education-welfare establishment. On immigration, both establishments want open borders, so moderates want open borders.

In other words, the moderate is the exact opposite of the interests of the people. That is why both conservatives and liberals love them and court them. That is also why the people don't vote for "middle of the roaders."

The big example of a "shift in the middle of the road" right now is Jeffords leaving the Republicans. But, if Senator Jeffords of Vermont is the middle of the true American road, why doesn't Jeffords represent a big, representative electorate?

Vermont is so tiny that it only has one representative. Vermont's only congressman is also the only outright socialist in the Congress of the United States. Like Jeffords, he calls himself an Independent and votes with the Democrats.

Vermont is supposed to represent the true American "middle of the road," but it is actually a tiny, isolated stronghold of New England Yuppie Yankee leftism. So how in heaven's name does the media get away with calling Vermont the typical American electorate?

Yankee leftism sounds like the middle of the road to conservatives and liberals because they have a two-dimensional view of the electorate. That doesn't just make them wrong. That makes their whole political outlook insane.

June 16, 2001 - ONLY RIGHT- WING MCCARTHYISM IS EVIL

June 16, 2001 - LEFTIST MCCARTHYISM IS ALIVE AND WELL AND LOVED BY ALL

**June 16, 2001 - THE SOUTHERN PARTISAN TRIES TO DEAL WITH LEFTIST
MCCARTHYITE ATTACKS**

June 16, 2001 - THE LESSON THE PARTISAN CANNOT LEARN

ONLY RIGHT- WING MCCARTHYISM IS EVIL

In the period between 1945 and 1950, Russia under Stalin took control of half of Europe. Also in the late 1940s, Communists seized control of China, which contained an additional fifth of the world's population.

And Communists were not just winning OUTSIDE the United States in the 1940s. In that same period Stalin's spies stole the secrets of the atomic bomb for the USSR.

Another bombshell hit in the late 1940s: the case of Alger Hiss. Alger Hiss was a mainstay of America's ruling Yankee elite. He was head of the Carnegie Foundation and one of the American founders of the United Nations.

Hiss was caught spying for Stalin and went to prison. There was panic about American security. It turns out that it was fully justified. Recently released KGB files show that Communist agents had penetrated every level of the American Government back then.

Finally, in 1950, America began actual combat against the Communists in Korea.

Right after all these disasters, Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin took over the search for Communists in the early 1950s.

Exactly like today's conservatives, Senator McCarthy took a genuine concern, a winning issue, and totally fouled it up. He made charges he couldn't back up. As so often happens, the Dumb Rightist saved the leftists.

So now all a Communist has to do to avoid being called a Communist is to shout "McCarthyism!" To be respectable today you aren't allowed to call anybody a Communist. That includes people who ARE open supporters of Castro, Red China, or North Vietnam.

In fact, "McCarthyism" is applied especially to people who call ACTUAL Communists "Communist."

Today's Politically Correct attitude was expressed in Woody Allen's movie "The Front." Allen played a writer in the early 1950s who was helping out all those accused by McCarthy of being Communists. One of the writers he was helping made it very clear that he WAS a Communist, a solid Stalinist. Woody Allen's character supported him against exposure just as he did the non-Communists.

LEFTIST MCCARTHYISM IS ALIVE AND WELL AND LOVED BY ALL

What the Evil Senator McCarthy did was called "guilt by association." He would ask witnesses if they were or ever had been members of the Communist Party. This question brings out gasps of horror today.

McCarthy would quote people's many pro-Communist statements. He would list their Communist associates who were Party members. He would point out their memberships in Communist Front organizations.

This sort of "guilt by association" is now condemned, BUT ONLY IF IT IS USED BY THE RIGHT AGAINST COMMUNISTS.

On the other hand, it is always open season on anybody who ever said anything Politically Incorrect.

Nixon nominee Judge Haynesworth was denied Supreme Court confirmation in the early 1970s. His crime was that he had made a segregationist speech thirty years before in his native Florida.

Actually, a lot of the senators who voted against him had made the same kind of speech in the late 1940's. But, like all conservatives, they were more anxious to lynch Haynesworth than the liberals were.

We are all familiar with leftist McCarthyism today.

Anything Politically Incorrect you did fifty years ago years is the latest news. In the case of Thomas Jefferson, the passage of two centuries is no excuse.

And nobody supports leftist McCarthyism more fanatically than do respectable conservatives. Anything leftists declare "racist" brings out the respectable lynch mob.

And each year, the term "extremist" is applied to people who are less and less far right. If you oppose open borders today, both "neoconservatives" and liberals join together to call you a racist. That label is now applied to opponents of affirmative action and busing. It applies to English Only advocates.

What is happening is exactly what any person who knows political strategy would expect. The respectable right has given the "extremist" weapon to the left, and the left is using it more every day.

Today the term "extremist" is applied to Bush's Federal Court nominees. They never uttered a Politically Incorrect word in their whole careers, but the label now sticks.

THE SOUTHERN PARTISAN TRIES TO DEAL WITH LEFTIST MCCARTHYITE ATTACKS

In the battle to prevent John Ashcroft from becoming Attorney General, leftist McCarthyites were in full cry.

One thing they come up with was that Ashcroft had given an interview to the Southern Partisan. In that interview he had said some nice things about Confederate soldiers.

So an all-out leftist McCarthyite attack was launched on the Partisan. Newsweek magazine, the New Republic, and other members of the usual PC Chorus read through every issue of the Partisan over the last two decades for Political Incorrectness.

Of course they quoted me. I am not Politically Correct, I have never been PC, and I'm proud of it. But they also quoted other Partisan writers who, I can testify, were among the most desperately Politically Correct respectable conservatives I have ever met.

This is important, because it shows that if you go along with the leftist McCarthyites, no amount of care will save you from them in the end.

The statement I made that shamed the Partisan was that I was proud to be white and I hoped my descendants would be. This statement was in a 1985 issue of the Partisan. (That article was reproduced in its entirety on September 19, 1998 as "WHY I WILL NOT DENOUNCE SOUTHERN RACISM OR AMERICAN IMPERIALISM").

Because I was so open about it, the Partisan's defense for publishing me CONSISTED ENTIRELY OF FULL QUOTES FROM MY 1985 ARTICLE.

This gives you another demonstration of why the left demands that people like me, who attack them frontally, must be silenced completely. Unlike respectables, we make sense because we are consistent.

I knew how Politically Correct the other Partisan writers were, so I had been watching the Partisan like a hawk for the time when one of those desperately Politically Correct respectables would attack Southerners for being Evil Racists. That finally happened in 1985.

In 1985, a Partisan article did indeed make a gratuitous attack on the South as racist. The Partisan now handsomely admits they should never have published that article.

I answered the author of that article. In fact, came down on his statement -- not him personally -- like a ton of bricks.

The Partisan didn't want to print my article.

So why did they print my article anyway?

They're Southerners. It was a matter of honor. They owed me for years of free help when they were starting up, including an article in every issue since its beginning, when they needed it.

Both in 1985 and in their recent fight to defend their respectability, the Partisan was very fair to me.

I had been a Senior Editor at the Partisan since the beginning, and they had been able to use my name on the masthead when they really needed it. It is traditional for a senior editor to be allowed to take exception to an editorial opinion he strongly disagrees with.

THE LESSON THE PARTISAN CANNOT LEARN

But what makes the position of the Southern Partisan hopeless in the long run is not publishing Politically Incorrect people like me. The statements and affiliations of their most desperately Politically Correct writers were used even more effectively against them.

The lesson is that once you start letting the leftist McCarthyites dictate to you, it is only a matter of time before they get around to calling YOU the "extremist," the naziwho want to kill six million jews.

No one tried more desperately to be respectable than the Southern Partisan did. But now that the leftist McCarthyites have condemned them as "extremists," not one single respectable conservative group or publication has come to their defense.

Is anyone surprised?

June 23, 2001 - WHEN EUROPE IS MOST SELF-RIGHTEOUS, IT IS TRYING TO SELL SOMETHING THAT DOESN'T WORK

June 23, 2001 - WHY DOES LEFTIST NONSENSE HAVE TO BECOME A DISASTER BEFORE WE ABANDON IT?

June 23, 2001 - WHY DOES EUROPE BUY THIS NONSENSE?

WHEN EUROPE IS MOST SELF-RIGHTEOUS, IT IS TRYING TO SELL SOMETHING THAT DOESN'T WORK

Europe is very upset that President Bush refuses to adopt their present "center-left" economic policy. Meanwhile, in the period since Europe adopted that policy, European per capita income has dropped twenty percent relative to the United States.

During that same period, Europe has had a permanent recession, while America has had the greatest boom in its history.

Another thing Europe is preaching at Bush about is America's policy on crime. They say our imprisoning more and more repeat felons is evil. Meanwhile, as you may have guessed, the American crime rate has been going down, while that in Europe, once very low, has skyrocketed.

Then there's the idea of a missile defense system. Most Americans are totally unaware that we have no defense whatsoever if any country sends a missile our way. Europe doesn't even want us even to think about having one.

Meanwhile, back in the real world, I am the only person who remembers that this so-called "Star Wars" was the final nail in the coffin of the Soviet Union. Every leftist and every European "ally" BEGGED Reagan to drop his Strategic Defense Initiative. He refused.

Finally, the Soviet Union admitted that "Star Wars" was the final straw that broke its back in the Cold War. They admitted that they could not match the unmatched technological edge of the United States in space, even with the help of a spy penetration that would have made McCarthy blanch.

That was the reason the USSR threw in the towel on the Cold War.

"Star Wars" worked once, while Europe fought it as frantically as did the USSR. So Europe is once again preaching against it.

WHY DOES LEFTIST NONSENSE HAVE TO BECOME A DISASTER BEFORE WE ABANDON IT?

No, Virginia, it isn't the Communist Plot or Secret Evil Geniuses that who invent and push the leftist nonsense. The Soviet Union is gone, and the disastrous nonsense keeps coming.

Most of today's horrible ideas begin with professors on campuses in the West. Ideas that the left likes are invented or at least developed among social science professors. From time to time, one of those professors floats an idea that sells like hotcakes on campus.

It spreads from there.

For example, American academics and the media and yuppies and Europeans used to sell socialism as the Wave of the Future.

Socialism said that the government had to take over the entire economy and turn it over to the bureaucrats who were trained by professors. The "intellectuals" would rule in the Inevitable Socialist Future.

But different forms of socialism killed at least a hundred million people in the twentieth century. Socialist failure in the Third World and in Communist countries kept most of the world in poverty. See September 30, 2000, THE KEY TO PROSPERITY: DON'T BE A DUMBASS and OUR IMMIGRATION POLICY SAYS THAT MONEY IS MADE BY MAGIC. And June 17, 2000 -- KINKY SEX, AGAIN.

Real socialism has been discredited at incredible cost, over and over, until even Communists now admit it's silly.

That was a disaster for the left. Intellectuals and radical students and the media and yuppies used to say that bureaucrats must run American life because Socialism was the Wave of the Future. It was also Accepted European Opinion.

Now another idea was needed to make an argument for bureaucratic rule.

Soon it became a popular idea on campus that bureaucrats should run all aspects of American life, not for socialism, but in the name of Saving the Environment. This was not a plot, it was a natural development.

Social science professors on Western campuses run what amounts to a Liberal Seminary. They teach leftism, and they try to formulate leftist ideas that will sell. After Socialism As the Wave of the Future died, they tried many new excuses for bureaucratic (aka Intellectual) rule.

Finally, the Environment excuse sold like wildfire among students. So Environmentalism as an excuse for Intellectual Rule went out by the usual leftist route: It was first tried out on 1) leftist students. When it sold there, it naturally it spread 2) to the media. The media sold it 3) to leftist Yuppies.

Europeans bought Bureaucrats Must Rule To Save The Environment from what they considered the American Intelligentsia. Only then did it become Accepted European Opinion.

The idea that led to the Kyoto Treaty started on American campuses, spread by the routine leftist route, and is now Idealism, Intellectualism, and Accepted European Opinion.

Other policy disasters became Accepted European Opinion by the same route.

The idea that Criminals Are Just Victims Who Need Lots of Social Programs To Save Them followed exactly the same route. It sold on campus, so it sold to the media, so it sold to yuppies, so Europe swallowed it whole.

Academics changed clean air from a legitimate concern to an overboard leftist excuse for bureaucratic rule. They changed the idea that even criminals have rights to a giant leftist world view that was a disaster. They changed education to leftist indoctrination. None of this is accidental.

Academia tells us openly that it is dedicated to the leftist agenda. They openly suppress all real dissent from that agenda.

And we pay them to do it.

WHY DOES EUROPE BUY THIS NONSENSE?

Of course ALL Europe doesn't buy this leftist nonsense. For example, I have heard of a number of polls that show Europeans in general support the death penalty. But over here we get the impression that "Europeans" oppose it unanimously.

What OUR media call Accepted American Opinion is exactly what THEIR media call Accepted American Opinion: leftism.

As Eric Hoffer pointed out repeatedly back in the 1960s, Western "intellectuals" simply have no new ideas. What academia calls a new idea is actually just different packaging on old leftist propaganda.

Many academics still praise Marxism because it says that Intellectuals must rule.

Academia, after all, is just one more self-sustaining bureaucracy. Academics of today pick the new academics. Any interference in this bureaucracy violates "academic freedom," which is now just another phrase used by a rotten, self-contained bureaucracy to justify its privileges.

But outdated ideas and institutions are what European Accepted Opinion is used to following. The European right still takes monarchy seriously, and the European left will not support any idea that does not have a bunch of Intellectuals pushing it.

To the European media the only American opinions that have Authority come from our Eastern media and American social science professors.

What's hilarious is that those Europeans think they're Modern and Progressive. They really do!

Why? Because the inbred, leftist, self-contained academic bureaucracy over here has sold its ideology in the name of Social Progress and Modern Thought. Those ideas are actually so outdated and so rotten that a real American can smell it.

But for Europe's Accepted Opinion, if a PhD says it's a Modern Idea, then it must be true.

June 30, 2001 - A MAN WITH A MEMORY LOOKS AT ARCHIE BUNKER

June 30, 2001 - ARCHIE BUNKER AND GEORGE WALLACE

A MAN WITH A MEMORY LOOKS AT ARCHIE BUNKER

The media were full of the news that Carrol O'Connor, star of the 1970s sitcom, "All In the Family," had died. Everybody talked about how popular his character on that show, Archie Bunker, had been. Not one single person dared mention WHY Archie Bunker was so popular.

Nice people would NEVER mention how Archie Bunker got his huge appeal.

Which is why you've got me.

In fact, my sister made mention of this very connection just a few days back. She said I am the Archie Bunker of the Internet. This was a compliment. The producers of the show certainly didn't mean it to be.

Norman Lear, who adopted "All In the Family" from a British sitcom, certainly did not mean "Archie Bunker" to be a compliment. Like Jane Fonda and other Hollywood leftists, he hated working class

white people and he had never met any. That is why it was so easy for him to believe that white working people hated black people and had never met any.

So Archie Bunker was totally bigoted, loud, ignorant, and mentally retarded, the very picture of white working people in Hollywood eyes.

The last thing Lear expected was that Archie Bunker would become an instant hero to America. Bumper stickers blossomed out all over the country, "Archie Bunker for President." One of the most popular books of the time was "The Wit and Wisdom of Archie Bunker."

Everybody instantly discounted the fact that Archie was retarded, loud and ignorant. All non-liberals on television back then were loud, ignorant and retarded. There were only three networks, and all three were hard left. There was Public Television which, like everything the public finances, was far to the left of mere liberalism.

In those days, a "fair and balanced" discussion on television had liberal Republicans on one side and liberal Democrats on the other. Liberals, being totally out of contact, didn't realize that everyone had long since taken that for granted. Anybody who said anything that Americans were dying to say to the Hollywood Left would be characterized as a dolt, a hater, and an ignoramus on television.

But in this standard guise, they actually let Archie speak. He was the only person on television who ever spoke to the liberals on his program the way a lot of us had been aching to speak to people who mouthed the media line.

We loved Archie, and being compared to him is a compliment I hope I can live up to.

ARCHIE BUNKER AND GEORGE WALLACE

"All In the Family" premiered in 1971, right in the middle of the George Wallace phenomenon.

The reason that Lear was so upset with working class white people in 1971 was because liberals had completely tamed the Republican Party, but they were terrified of Governor George Wallace of Alabama. Wallace got ten million votes for president in the 1968 election, and he very nearly took the Democratic nomination for president in 1972.

The year after "All In the Family" premiered in 1971, Wallace won the MICHIGAN Democratic presidential primary with a solid majority. He was far ahead, and leading in the Maryland primary. If he had not been shot, there would have been no left wing McGovern candidacy in 1972.

Republicans were happy in 1971 because the military was enormous and Nixon was defending the interests of business, and those are the only two things Republicans really care about. Working people's kids were being bused and ethnic neighborhoods were being broken up, but that didn't matter any more to Republicans than it did to Norman Lear.

The only people who were upset at liberal policy were Southerners and Northern ethnics. Lear had always hated white Southerners, but a Northern white person who deserted the liberal Democrats was even more Evil in media eyes. The Archie Bunkers had been obedient little leftists under union supervision, but now that the unions were betraying them, they were leaving the Democrats and going to Wallace.

And their names were not like "Archie Bunker."

I met hundreds of them, and they were Sullivans and Kowalskis and everything else that was white but not Anglo-Saxon. They actually represented diversity. Lear had to rewrite that, so he had Archie hating Poles and Italians and all the other groups he actually represented. No liberal can ever allow reality to intrude too much.

For example, Archie as always hating "pollacks."

A man represented as a Polish-American leader was talking to him and spoke of "We Polish people."

In 1968, I lived in a campaign headquarters in the Polish steelworker section of Chicago. Almost everybody voted for Wallace. Not once in all those months did I hear a single person there refer to himself as a "Polish person." They were Pollacks and proud of it.

No, they did not tremble at the idea that someone was calling them "Micks" or "Wops" or "Pollacks." What they were afraid of were things like this:

- 1) that soon there would be hardened minority quotas in hiring that would exclude white working people from jobs,
- 2) that, as a matter of public policy, the government would enforce the breakup of white ethnic communities,
- 3) that busing white working people's children into ghettos would become routine nationwide and no one would seriously object but the parents.
- 4) they knew a lot more was coming, but they couldn't have guessed, as one example, that anyone who objected to giving welfare benefits to known illegal aliens would be portrayed as anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews by the media in the future.

In fact, the only people who really saw the future in 1971 were those who were fans of Archie Bunker.

July 7, 2001 - SURPRISE, **INDIANS KILLED THE NATIVE AMERICANS! YES, WHAT WE CALL **NATIVE AMERICANS** KILLED THE REAL NATIVE AMERICANS**

July 7, 2001 - THE WHEEL IS NOT A PRIMITIVE INVENTION

July 7, 2001 - WE ARE WINNING A LOT OF BATTLES MOST RIGHTISTS ARE UNAWARE OF

July 7, 2001 - THE REFORM OF OUR ESTABLISHED RELIGION OF LEFTISM IS A REPLAY OF HISTORY

SURPRISE, **INDIANS KILLED THE NATIVE AMERICANS! YES, WHAT WE CALL **NATIVE AMERICANS** KILLED THE REAL NATIVE AMERICANS**

The Discovery Channel is showing a documentary about the real Native Americans ("Ancient Voices: The Hunt for the First Americans, "). They were here fifty thousand years ago. They were similar to the

Australian aborigines. They disappeared at the same time that what we call our Noble Native Americans got here twelve or fifteen thousand years ago.

Those REAL native Americans left pictographs of what seems to be their slaughter by OUR Noble Natives.

THIS IS NOT A THEORY. Researchers now have the skulls and radiocarbon dating that show these people in America from at least fifty thousand years up to about fourteen thousand years ago.

They have rebuilt faces on the skeletons.

There is no relation between these people and what WE call "Native Americans."

The latter are ALL of the Mongoloid racial stock that came across the land bridge from Asia about fifteen thousand years ago.

Real Native Americans, who were wiped out by our "Native" Americans, were of a race very similar to the Australian aborigines and without a trace of Mongoloid.

The only difference between how the Indians dealt with the native Americans they met and the way we dealt with OUR so-called "Native Americans" was that we provided reservations for the group we displaced. The death of real Native Americans didn't bother the Indians at all.

THE WHEEL IS NOT A PRIMITIVE INVENTION

Most of us have heard of the Nordic --not just white, but blond and redheaded -- mummies that were discovered in CHINA. They were so well preserved that one of them, the one that was pictured in the "Reader's Digest" feature on these mummies, looks like he just went to sleep.

In fact, the mummies are so outstandingly Northern European looking that one historian thought his colleagues who brought the news to him were pulling a joke on him.

This gentleman was a linguist who had theorized that many early Chinese technological advances were adopted from Indo-European "barbarians," many of whom were blond and red-headed (See August 19, 2000 - WHEN THE WAGONS FIRST ROLLED WEST).

This linguist was also an expert on ancient Chinese language and literature. He noted the similarity between many ancient Chinese legends and those of ancient Greece and Iran. He also made a long list of otherwise inexplicable ancient Chinese words that were Indo-European in origin. One of these words was "wheel."

So when his colleagues told him that mummies had been found in China that were not only white but also blond and red-headed Indo-European stock, he thought they were joking with him. When he saw the mummies, even with his foreknowledge, he was still shocked.

The word "wheel" in ancient Chinese was especially revealing because almost nobody today thinks of the wheel as something a civilization would ADOPT from another culture. We assume that every civilization had the wheel all the way back to cavemen.

Cartoons normally show cavemen inventing the first wheel. This shows how accepted the idea is that the wheel is a very, very primitive invention.

In the real world, the ONLY early "civilization" where we had thought the wheel existed before Indo-European invasions was -- by a strange coincidence -- China.

Indo-Europeans, or "Scythians," brought the wheel to Egypt within recorded history, and history tells us they were the opposite of a "civilization." These, OUR ancestors, are officially "barbarians" in the history we pay professors to teach our children.

Apparently China, just like Egypt and Mesopotamia, got the wheel from our "barbarian" ancestors. Please be sure to read August 19, 2000 - WHEN THE WAGONS FIRST ROLLED WEST.

I get a bit of amusement from the standard line about how wildly advanced the builders of the pyramids were, both in Egypt and in pre-Columbian America. NONE OF THESE WILDLY ADVANCED PYRAMID BUILDERS HAD THE WHEEL!

WE ARE WINNING A LOT OF BATTLES MOST RIGHTISTS ARE UNAWARE OF

To see clearly what I am about to say, you need to understand the two articles above.

All of these wildly advanced civilizations got the wheel from what historians are paid to call "barbarians." This is the way they refer to people like the Scythians and the Spaniards who crushed the Indian civilizations.

As you will note above, the innocent sweet faultless little Native Americans whom the Spanish conquered never hesitated to do at least as bad to the people they conquered. Human sacrifice on an almost unbelievable scale was an integral part of the Aztec's Great Civilization.

But, according to the history we pay to have taught to our children, any amount of slaughter is all right if you are of a non-white race. It is only evil if white people do bad things, according to Accepted History.

We are just touching the surface of the depths of absurdity of the Accepted History we pay to have taught to our children.

There are many other examples of absurdities in Accepted History we all have immediate access to, like our insane picture of Classical Civilization.

But with carbon dating and the information age, the advance of science is crushing the established religion of our Liberal Seminaries, AKA, universities. Technology is steadily destroying the most fundamental assumptions that our Liberal Seminaries run on.

It is only a question of time before reality and new communications exposes the left, not as a Conspiracy by Geniuses, as rightists look at it, but just painfully obvious babbling by a half-educated and rotten bureaucracy that calls itself Intellectual.

THE REFORM OF OUR ESTABLISHED RELIGION OF LEFTISM IS A REPLAY OF HISTORY

In the sixteenth century, there were two huge reform movements in Western Christianity. One was the Protestant Reformation and the other was the Catholic Counter Reformation. One created new churches, the other reformed the old.

For a thousand years, good Christians had been protesting extreme abuses in the old church, but they only multiplied. Finally the Reformation and the Counter Reformation took them on frontally.

Why did this happen? It happened because of the invention of the printing press.

With the invention of printing, the Bible and real history became accessible to the population at large. As a result, the ancient and crying church abuses like Indulgences being sold on the street became intolerable to the Roman Church itself.

Good Catholics like Saint Thomas More had been denouncing these extreme abuses, such as pope's children being given the rank of cardinal, for ages.

In exactly the same way, good and intelligent people -- including honest liberals -- have denounced the silliness of our Liberal Seminaries for generations.

Before the scream "anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews" became the battle cry of our Liberal Seminaries, socialists and almost all of the intellectual left recognized the achievements of our Indo-European ancestors.

Much of the seventeenth century reform came from Catholics after the Reformation made the grassroots revolt too great for their Scholastics to ignore. By the same token, today's anti-liberal Reformation and Counter Reformation will partially be achieved by honest people with liberal attitudes.

The obvious blathering absurdities of today's academic bureaucracy are being exposed by our new technology and information.

In time even honest but left-leaning people will admit that today's liberal orthodoxy is nonsense, just as truly devout Catholics were happy to repudiate the excesses of the Medieval Church.

July 14, 2001 - THE FOUNDING FATHERS' PATRIOTISM IS MCAIN'S TREASON

July 14, 2001 - NO LOYALTY TO THE AMERICAN *PEOPLE*** WAS WHAT LINCOLN DEMANDED IN THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS**

July 14, 2001 - ACCORDING TO ALL OF TODAY'S CONSERVATIVE SPOKESMEN, MCAIN IS RIGHT -- LOYALTY TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE IS TREASON TO TRUE AMERICANISM

THE FOUNDING FATHERS' PATRIOTISM IS MCAIN'S TREASON

At a meeting in Arizona, Bill O'Reilly of Fox Cable News was talking to Senator John McCain. O'Reilly made the statement that "American immigration policy should be made for the benefit of AMERICANS."

What O'Reilly said seems fairly obvious to my old-fashioned mind.

After all, the purpose of the United States Constitution is declared in the Constitution's Preamble:

"WE THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty TO OURSELVES AND OUR POSTERITY, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

America was set up by the AMERICAN people for the AMERICAN people.

So who could disagree with O'Reilly's statement that American immigration policy should be made in the interests of Americans?

The Senator from Arizona, John McCain, could disagree.

And McCain DID disagree, in no uncertain terms. McCain explained that Americans with a Mexican heritage owe their loyalty to "their Hispanic culture." He indicated that even if they were born in the United States, they should side with potential Hispanic immigrants.

The Arizona audience booed McCain and cheered O'Reilly.

If I had said the same words McCain said a generation ago, I would have been accused of being an enemy of all Mexican-Americans.

Back then what McCain said was an argument AGAINST immigration.

Anti-immigrants used to argue that foreigners who take American citizenship are still foreigners. They said exactly what McCain said, that immigrants are not loyal to the American people.

So if I had said what McCain said a generation ago, I would have been labeled an anti-immigration BIGOT.

NO LOYALTY TO THE AMERICAN *PEOPLE*** WAS WHAT LINCOLN DEMANDED IN THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS**

In what Republicans consider the greatest statement of Americanism ever made, Abraham Lincoln made only one point:

That the Preamble to the United States Constitution was no longer valid.

The ONLY thing Lincoln said in the Gettysburg Address was that the Preamble to the United States Constitution, which dedicated our government to "Ourselves and Our Posterity," was no longer valid.

The ONLY thing the Gettysburg Address said was that the old Preamble to the Constitution had been superseded by the Preamble to the Declaration of Independence. Lincoln said that America is dedicated to the principle that all men are created equal, not to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

The whole point of the Civil War, said Lincoln, was to repudiate the old Preamble and to dedicate America to "...all men are created equal," which is the Preamble to the Declaration of Independence.

Go over the Holy Gettysburg Address in your mind -- we all memorized it -- and see if it says one word about anything else. To Lincoln, the term "people" had no specific reference to anything but a general principle.

"Government for and by the people shall not perish from the earth" refers to a principle of government for all men, not a specific people. For Lincoln, "the people" is a universal term. It is identical with "all humanity," not "We the people of the United States of America."

When the Gettysburg Address was delivered, America had unrestricted immigration.

When Lincoln ran for the presidency in 1860, the American Party wanted to impose immigration restrictions. Lincoln declared them to be un-American. He specifically said that they were violating the basic principle of America, as stated in the Declaration of Independence, that all men are created equal, not just Americans.

That is what Lincoln said America was all about. This is what Lincoln said that the Union was all about. Nothing else.

When the Gettysburg Address is mentioned, conservatives always say, "That is True Americanism. I love it."

If you agree with Lincoln, how can American immigration policy be based on the interests of Americans?

ACCORDING TO ALL OF TODAY'S CONSERVATIVE SPOKESMEN, MCAIN IS RIGHT -- LOYALTY TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE IS TREASON TO TRUE AMERICANISM

Pro-immigration people always equate resistance to open borders with racism. They say that there is no room in America for whites who worry about white people. The natural corollary to this is that there is no room here for Americans who worry about Americans.

According to Lincoln and McCain, Americans have no more right to be here than anybody else. This is a nation of immigrants. So good whites are not loyal to whites, good Americans are not loyal to Americans. Both must only be concerned with all races and all nationalities.

ON THE OTHER HAND, liberals and conservatives agree that non-whites are naturally concerned about the well-being and the fate of their own kind. It is logical that the same principle would apply to good Americans.

To be a non-racist, you can't be pro-white. To be a good American, you cannot be especially concerned about Americans.

But if your loyalty is to something which is either non-white or non-American, other rules apply. For example, "Hispanic" refers to an official minority. It requires fealty to a culture based outside the United States.

It follows, as McCain said, that American Hispanics should be loyal only to their own race and culture.

This is no contradiction if the required definition of a non-racist white person is correct.

This is the inevitable logic of the Gettysburg Address. Liberals and conservatives have repeatedly agreed that America is a Melting Pot united only by paper. They agree that this the basis of Holy Diversity. This, they tell us, is True Americanism.

So McCain says that an American of Hispanic origin should be loyal to the people of his real race and his real culture, not to the American people.

Unless we change our present definitions of racism and Americanism, he is perfectly correct.

July 21, 2001 - I WAS WRONG AND I HOPE TO BE WRONGER

July 21, 2001 - STEM CELL RESEARCH AND MEDICAL HISTORY

I WAS WRONG AND I HOPE TO BE WRONGER

Bush's tax cut program was considered radical and impossible during the 2000 campaign. Now a version of it has passed.

What caused this turnaround was the economic downturn.

But the point is that George W. Bush, son of the wimpiest kind of wimp Republican, stuck by his guns until history turned his way. He learned something from his father's mistakes.

As an expert on real world politics, I honestly believed that no moderate Republican could ever learn anything. They blindly make the same mistakes over and over.

My pessimism was well-grounded. For decades I have watched moderate Republicans lose election after election. Every time they said the middle of the road was the way to win, and they blamed their failures on a vast right-wing conspiracy.

Bush Senior and Robert Dole blamed their crushing defeats on Pat Buchanan. Back in 1976, Ford blamed his defeat on Ronald Reagan. Those were long and horribly frustrating years for people like me.

After Bush Senior won the Gulf War, his popularity hit 91%. There was a skit on "Saturday Night Live" where Democrats got up and insulted themselves so they would not be matched against the unbeatable Bush in 1992.

How could even a moderate Republican find a way to lose after hitting 91%?

Bush Senior did what moderates do: he just wanted to keep that high popularity, so he did not take any political advantage of it. He proposed nothing, hoping to keep everybody happy. Bush Senior used his popularity as an excuse not to lead, and he lost overwhelmingly in 1992.

As always, a moderate Republican snatched defeat from the very jaws of victory. That's routine.

I am astonished to hear from insiders that the younger Bush understood what actually happened in 1992. He learned that he had to lead, and that is why he stuck by his tax cut.

This is wonderful. This is unique.

Naturally Bush is still making the same old mushy-mouth mistakes. The Democrats said they would pass the tax cut to help economic recovery.

But then they said it didn't go far enough, and that all the tax relief doesn't kick in until years from now.

Reagan would have said, "You want more tax cuts NOW? All RIGHT, let's go with it."

Instead, Bush wanted to go slow to please the liberals in his party who were frightened by the tax cut.

But he did learn SOMETHING. And that is an unspeakable relief.

If this happens when I'm wrong, I want to be wrong a lot more.

STEM CELL RESEARCH AND MEDICAL HISTORY

As a boy I was fascinated with the study of the history of medicine. I saw that every step in medical progress was held back by the Medical Authorities. Every time a researcher found a treatment that WORKED, the medical faculties in the old days would fight him every inch of the way.

So when I got to the university and ran into exactly the same situation with social science professors today, I was ready for it.

Other constant villains of medical history were priests and preachers. Every time a researcher found a way to save lives or end suffering, the churches denounced him from the pulpit. And every time, the human cost was stupendous.

Lady Mary W. Montague was an early eighteenth century Englishwoman. She was beautiful until she contracted smallpox, which destroyed her looks by scarring, as it routinely did.

On a visit to Turkey, Lady Montague encountered a primitive but effective form of what we now call vaccination against smallpox. She brought this anti-smallpox treatment back to England with her. It was highly effective and saved the looks and lives of thousands of people.

But Lady Mary ended up being sorry she did all that good. The pulpit viciously attacked her. Preachers quoted the Bible about how putting germs in the human body was playing God and desecrating something built by God, and so forth.

We all know how medical progress was held back by the churches' campaign against dissection.

The churches said that doctors were playing God by presuming to dishonor dead bodies, which were "the temple of the soul". Once again they managed to hold back medical progress and ended up being the villains of the piece.

As a boy, I saw all this as Good versus Evil. To me the preachers and professors were Evil and the medical pioneers were the heroes. But as one matures one can see that a person can be terribly wrong without being evil.

On May 12, 2001, in FRANCE -- THE BOY IN THE BUBBLE, I showed how a little French boy's life was saved by using human embryos. I pointed out that French law prohibited the use of those cells to save him, but when France was faced with a real choice between a living boy and the theoretical humanity of cells, the law collapsed instantly.

Something similar happened in another case. Twelve years ago an only child was dying, and had to have a transplant from a sibling to survive. So the parents had another child to save the first one. The operation did the second child little harm, both children are fine, and fifteen years later the parents' courage is universally praised.

When they decided to have the new child, the parents were attacked for "playing God." A lot of people who claimed they were pro-life made threats on the parents' lives. There were demonstrations and denunciations. Like the case against dissection, that seems very strange today.

Right now the theological battle against using human stem cells for helping people is much the same. Stem cells have no feelings, but using them seems a violation of scripture to Bible literalists and to the pope. But if those cells can actually help real, living and feeling people, and the only argument against it is that it shouldn't be done because it is playing God, we are in another battle that the theological side must lose.

In every battle like this in medical history, the theological side has managed to block progress and destroy millions of lives. Those theologians are all villains of history, right along with the old medical Authorities. Once again the fight will do untold damage to serious Christianity.

St. Paul warned us that "the word kills." In this case it is literally true.

If stem cells are used to bring Alzheimer's and stroke patients back to life and crippled people back on their feet, serious religion is going to get hurt again. Many people who suffered in the meantime will point to the precious time wasted in the predictable and tragic battle with religious people on this issue.

As in the case of dissection, smallpox vaccination and hundreds of other examples, churches will admit eventually their side was wrong -- again.

History will say, once again, that the Bible was used to block medical progress as long as possible. Once again, because of this routine roadblock, lives were lost and suffering was vastly increased.

This does not make the theological people evil. But it makes them look ignorant and blind. It hurts people and it hurts religion.

That is how the battle against stem cell research is almost certain to turn out. I hope that a large number of conservatives do what we do best, and take a lesson from history.

July 28, 2001 - A MAN WITH A MEMORY LOOKS AT FROZEN EMBRYOS

July 28, 2001 - LEFTIST YOKELS AND YAHOOOS

A MAN WITH A MEMORY LOOKS AT FROZEN EMBRYOS

The embryos that researchers want to use for stem cell research are frozen fetuses. They were stored by desperate couples who wanted to be sure that they could bring them to term if they could not have natural children.

Some of these couples were later able to carry their own children to term due to medical treatments. These couples have no use for the embryos they stored, so scientists want to use them for research that could make the crippled walk and cure other invalids.

The extreme branch of the pro-life movement wants the embryos simply destroyed.

Last week, a group of witnesses came to Congress to argue for this extreme pro-life position. They were couples who could not have children themselves, so they had ADOPTED some of those frozen embryos and brought them to term. They had the babies in their arms before the committee to show that, if the fetuses were brought to term, they became real babies.

Everybody already knew that, of course, but they showed their babies to counter the potent argument in favor of stem cell research.

Crippled, dying and desperate people who want embryonic stem cell research to save them go in front of the committee. They argue in person that they are more important than some abstract rights of frozen embryos.

To counter this, the only thing those against embryonic stem cell research could do was bring in these babies developed from frozen embryos.

But I remember when the same kind of people who now oppose stem cell research WERE TRYING TO GET THE FREEZING OF EMBRYOS OUTLAWED. They said that, since some of the embryos would have to be destroyed, they shouldn't be created in the first place.

So if their side had won back then, THE PEOPLE SITTING IN FRONT OF THE COMMITTEE WITH HEALTHY BABIES TO ARGUE THEIR SIDE WOULD NOT HAVE THOSE BABIES!!!

But now, as always, those who have a religious knee-jerk against medical advances are claiming, in effect, that they were always for the right of people to freeze embryos in case they could not have natural children. As always, they ignore the position they originally took.

They did the same thing after they opposed dissection, smallpox vaccination, blood transfusions, and practically every other advance in medical history.

LEFTIST YOKELS AND YAHOOOS

Senator William Proxmire of Wisconsin was a liberal Democrat. But his big sales pitch was what he called The Golden Fleece Award. Each time, he would give an award to government agencies or grant recipients who had fleeced the public out of a lot of money.

At first The Golden Fleece Award was really good. But it took a lot of work to find out the details of something stupid in one of the Federal agencies every week. So soon Proxmire's staff found a way to get out of all that work. They found a cheap shot that required no effort.

Instead of digging for a real scandal, they looked at the list of National Science Foundation grants that came out each week. They just found a title that sounded absurd. They gave the Golden Fleece to one of those grantees.

Soon they just picked any title that was hard to understand and called that research project a waste of money.

This was easy, and this was evil. To a true yahoo, a real ignoramus, ALL scientific research sounds useless. Someone getting a million dollars to study ocean floor life seems, if you just say it that way, to be a true waste of money. But some of that research is now promising an advance in cancer research.

The result was that Proxmire attacked some of the most productive scientific research that has ever been done. All real scientists despised him, and for excellent reason.

What if Proxmire had been a conservative Republican instead of a liberal Democrat? Liberals would have exposed this gambit instantly. They would have ridiculed the "hayseed" who attacked great research because the yahoo voters who elected him couldn't understand the titles.

I explained this to a yuppie liberal the other day, and he simply could not take it in. To somebody in the media or a fashionable yuppie liberal or a respectable conservative, a liberal simply cannot be an ignorant yahoo. A liberal Democrat like Proxmire can "make mistakes" or be "too idealistic," but he cannot just be an ignorant, blind rube the way a right-winger can.

So my liberal buddy honestly could not take this in, really! That is what I call hypnotic leftism.

Once during the Cold War, I crossed the Hungarian border on a bus that had some hippies on it. The Hungarian border, like all the borders of the Democratic Peace-Loving People's Republics, had guards standing at the border with automatic weapons to kill anybody who tried to escape from their Workers' Paradise.

On the Hungarian People's Republic side of the border there was a broad dirt ditch cut out. It had signs with the skull and crossbones that are the universal sign for land mines on it.

I knew that the hippies were always saying that the West was at least as bad as the Communists. To them, the Communists were the good guys. I could not imagine how someone could go over a murderous border like that, a prison wall around a country, and imagine the Reds were the good guys. So I watched the hippies to see how they would react to the ditch and guns and land mines and the skull and cross bones.

Their reaction as we got to the Hungarian border was amazing. They simply looked straight ahead. THEY DIDN'T SEE THE MINE WARNINGS OR GUARDS OR THE MURDEROUS DITCH THEY

WERE CROSSING OVER! It was as if they went into a trance and came to after we crossed the border.

Hypnotic leftism really is a form of hypnosis. To a hypnotic leftist, a rightist like Hitler or Franco is a dictator. Leftists may make "idealistic errors," but no leftist is ever called a yahoo or a tyrant or an ignoramus.

We must start calling them that and backing it up..

August 4, 2001 - WHY THE LEFT HATES TECHNOLOGY

August 4, 2001 - THE FUTURE

WHY THE LEFT HATES TECHNOLOGY

In 1968, George Wallace's American Party had a huge "Science and Technology" platform. The very party that leftists called "reactionaries" and "yahoos" was fanatically in favor of more space exploration, more basic research.

Meanwhile, the project for a moon landing was going forward. Just before the moon shot began, a liberal demonstration protested it. They said that all that money wasted on science should go to the poor.

Norman Mailer spoke for other fashionable liberals in denouncing the whole space program as "Faustian."

Once again, nobody remembers that but me.

All that "wasted" space research founded Silicon Valley, led to the heart pacemaker and hundreds of other lifesaving devices, and yielded many, many times its costs in benefits. So liberals say they were always all for it.

In the present energy crunch, liberals want all the solutions to be government regulation and government rationing and government alternative energy research which goes nowhere. It is anti-liberals who look to technology to solve problems. Leftists want those problems to continue. They want to use them to expand government power.

The last thing leftists want is for technology to solve the crises they want to use.

The leftists are against new technology because they have gained absolute power over the old technology.

THE FUTURE

Most rightists today are depressed.

It appears to them that leftists have gotten a stranglehold on every source of power. Daily the voting power of minorities grows, and they are a slavish leftist power base. In the media, NBC, ABC and CBS remain solidly leftist.

The traditional family is being undermined, illegitimacy has reached proportions among whites which they once reached only among minorities. Among minorities these rates have long since gone ballistic.

"Taking back America," the conservative battle cry, seems hopeless.

Leftists have sewed up all the old power bases. But that will not determine the future.

If one knows American history, the old ruling class has always controlled the established power bases. It was the rise of new kinds of power that overthrew them.

America's first contest for power was the expansion westward, and the South won that contest hands down. We not only settled new Southern and border states at a frantic rate, but we populated a large portion of the Midwest as well.

Seeing the South dominating the westward expansion, New England despaired of ever gaining power in America. New England held secession conventions in 1814.

New England fought every expansion westward because the South led westward expansion completely. The Northeast had lost the old contest for power.

When the slave states wanted to introduce Mississippi, Alabama and Missouri into the Union, the free states could only get a matching free state by splitting the east coast into tinier and tinier fragments.

The South had won the old contest for the old power base. But a new one rose. When the westward expansion was at its height, American industry was made up of a lot of tiny factories. The real power back then lay in settling new lands.

But in the nineteenth century, the new industrial technology steadily became dominant.

New England got its power when they took over the new industrial technology. Their power came from the new rules technology made, not from "taking back" under the old rules.

By 1900, New England and its industrialists had transformed the rest of America and especially the South into economic and political colonies.

Then these capitalists lost power to a new group, the liberals and social planners.

Once again, this was not the result of "taking back" the old power sources. Until they had won overwhelmingly, the old industrialists remained solidly anti-liberal. Liberals did not win power by "taking back" industry.

What liberals took over was a new power source. In the first part of the twentieth century the educational establishment was tiny. It survived on the generosity of industrialists and other big money.

Just as New England and its industry reduced the South to colonial status, leftism has turned big money into its servant. Liberals did that by dominating the new power, the growing education complex and the growing power of government brought on by a more and more interdependent economy and new communications.

In each case, the new rulers USED a new political ideology, but that ideology was just the tactic of a new power group.

In the name of fighting the Old South's slavery, New England built a coalition with Midwestern farmers. But beneath all this, as Calhoun so clearly saw, was the rising NEW FORCE of industry.

America got rid of the old slavocracy when it was taken over by Eastern big money.

Likewise, in fighting the old New England capitalist power, liberals got the South and the Midwest on their side. Liberal rulers got their total dominance today by crushing "wage slavery" and replacing it with tax slavery and rule by regulation.

Now, in its turn, leftism is rotten and out of date. That is its weakness. But it will not be defeated by taking back the old power sources. It will be supplanted by new sources of power, the kind we are seeing exploding out all over the place.

Once again, the ruling group controls the old power sources, like the media and the universities and public education. But once again a new power is rising.

A biological revolution is under way. A communications revolution is under way. They will produce new power sources and new political approaches to get rid of the present rule by social science planners that we call leftism.

I am optimistic because the left is doomed. It will be unseated and replaced, maybe by something even more dangerous. But I know that the PRESENT gloom of the right is absurd.

The old power that is based in universities is being challenged by new powers which were produced by the same process that allowed capitalists to replace the slavocracy, and the same process that allowed social planners to take over from the capitalists.

The real future has absolutely nothing to do with the processes that today's conservatives consider so modern and inevitable. The real future will blindside our present rulers. Like the rise of industry which so few recognized, like the growth of planner power, it will completely upset the processes we are used to.

Gloom comes from the fact that today's anti-liberals are looking at the future the way liberals want them to.

There is great promise and there is great danger in the real future. But today's conservatives don't see either. They are looking the wrong way.

The left rules, for example, by its rule over education and the media. But new communications are rising, and the education complex today is rigid and exists only because of things like rules of accreditation.

The left is doomed. What the future will look like has nothing to do with what present political thinkers think it does.

August 11, 2001 - DEFINING RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES: THEY'RE JUST BUREAUCRATS

August 11, 2001 - RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES KILL THEIR WOUNDED

DEFINING RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES: THEY'RE JUST BUREAUCRATS

I have been asked to define respectable conservatism.

It is very important to understand that a more correct term would be "conservative respectable," because "conservative" is the modifier here. The first real aim of respectable conservatives is respectability inside the present liberal-conservative political system. If he must choose between conservatism and respectability, a respectable conservative never hesitates to choose respectability.

The commentators you see on television and read in the syndicated columns are selected by a bureaucracy. Bureaucracies always choose people who "fit in."

Liberals run the media bureaucracy, and they only want to talk to conservatives they feel comfortable with.

This is the problem with conspiracy theories. Routine bureaucracy ACTS like a conspiracy, but it is nothing of the sort. A conspiracy is run by the head. You can remove the head men of the media bureaucracy and the body will act exactly the same.

Also, do not think of the "bureaucracy" here in the terms one would usually picture it. I am not using it to refer to a single organization of bureaucrats run from top to bottom.

The "media bureaucracy" simply means those who produce our media commentary. They all answer to each other, argue with each other, and select each other, so they constitute what amounts to a single bureaucracy.

For example, William Buckley became a champion media bureaucrat, though he never worked directly under anyone else.

Buckley was selected for his role because he "fit" into the media bureaucracy. He became the perfect respectable conservative who would show just the right combination of criticism and respect for liberals.

The obvious question here is, who is NOT part of the media bureaucracy?

Well, to start with, Matt Drudge is not a media bureaucrat. He selected himself, and the media bureaucracy hates him bitterly for it. As long as he succeeds by going directly to the market the way he does, he will not be declared "respectable." Any right-winger who has not gotten this "respectable" title from liberals is blocked from the mainline media.

If you are not a right-wing Uncle Tom, you are not allowed to open your mouth. Meanwhile, the Uncle Toms themselves are going to make sure those who refuse to be Uncle Toms are kept in their place. As you would expect, nobody is more fanatical in shouting down "right wing extremists" than respectable conservatives themselves. You can count on Jack Kemp or Orrin Hatch or John Inglis to jump right in on the attack on anyone the media call "racist." The Bushes and the Doles are at the head of any liberal lynch mob.

Bless his soul, Jeffrey Hart reviewed my book, *A Plague On Both Your Houses*, in 1976 in *National Review*, under the title, "Read This One!" In this review, he freely admitted that even people like him had to make truly bad concessions to respectability in order to get their case to the public through the media.

But Jeffrey Hart never became a full-fledged respectable conservative. He is allowed media access, but he will never be "one of the boys" like Bob Novak or Pat Buchanan or William Buckley.

A conservative respectable will not hang onto real world truths that are uncomfortable for liberals, and they can be sidetracked very easily. You can count on Novak to be an economic theologian, and, in the end, you can count on Buchanan to end up as a harmless religious nut.

While rewriting this, I was watching MSNBC. A conservative laughed at a liberal who was giving the same old routine spin. The liberal was terribly upset. I have noticed this many times - when he is going through his routine silliness and a rightist LAUGHS, the liberal commentator gets terribly upset. Watch and you will notice this, too. In the end it will be LAUGHTER that will RID US OF THE LEFT.

The left will only be destroyed when people start calling their nonsense nonsense, and denounce the morons who keep repeating this bilge as the morons they are. As long as there are conservative respectables who will look stern and serious as "progressives" recite their nonsense, the left is safe. As long as conservative respectables say what True Intellectuals and Honest Patriots leftists are, liberals will survive and dominate our national dialogue. Conservative respectables live to oblige this leftist need. What is important to a respectable conservative is to maintain his respectability.

Any point he was making takes a distant fourth. Clinton's recent use of frivolous court privileges is very much like the routine liberal use of frivolous labels to throw conservatives off. When the heat was on, he used what liberals always use, fast footwork to get attention off of the hot problem. Few people have noticed the fact that it worked -- again. In January, almost everybody, from Moynihan to Ginsberg, agreed that if Clinton had had sex with an intern in the White House, he should go. No more!

As always, not one conservative respectable confronted these people with their earlier statement about demanding Clinton's impeachment for using his office to have sex with an intern in the Oval Office.

Novak was busy trying to be trendy and Buchanan went back into his moralist groove. The basic point was utterly forgotten by the respectables.

That is, after all, what they are there for.

If a respectable conservative starts making a point that bothers liberals, the "progressives" simply throw frivolous labels at him like "racist" or anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews. By the time he has saved his

respectability, he has completely forgotten the point he was making. It never really mattered to him anyway.

This is not a conspiracy to select kooks and lightweights. It is simply that, if you had someone there who would not let liberals get away with silly stuff, the debate would collapse.

A man who worked with me on the House Education and Labor Committee appeared once, just once, on a national television debate. The debate concerned increasing federal aid to education. My friend would not get off the point that, the more federal aid there is, the more student scores fall. The two liberals were furious. They accused him of saying that giving money could actually HARM education - which was exactly what he WAS saying - and they were shouting that this was impossible.

They said education money HAD to help. My friend was pointing out that Federal money goes with federal regulation, and federal bureaucrats are ruining education.

There was a respectable conservative on the program. He was supposed to be on the same side as my friend. But this conservative respectable knew better than to join in this exposition of liberal silliness. The liberals were furious about it, and he had to satisfy them first.

He did so, and took their side against my buddy.

My buddy was, not surprisingly, never invited for another national debate anywhere. You will see that conservative respectable on national television a lot.

The right will fail as long as it selects its spokesmen this way.

RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES KILL THEIR WOUNDED

Linda Tripp has had it! Liberals are going after her, which means respectable conservatives are after her. She is helpless now, and libs hate her, so respectable conservatives will earn their "respectable" label by cutting her throat.

This is what respectable conservatism is all about. As M. Stanton Evans pointed out, "Conservatives always leave their wounded."

Actually, if you want to be a really respectable conservative like Kemp or Hatch or Buckley, you have to do more than that. You have to cut the throats of your wounded.

The word "respectable" is absolutely essential if one is to make good money as a right winger. You don't get on national television without it, and you don't get a national column that is generally published without it. Unless liberals declare you to be a "respectable" rightist, you become a fascist, you become "anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews," and nobody will touch you.

This wonderful term "respectable" comes at a price. That price is exacted by the liberals who control our national dialogue.

Even Pat Buchanan, who is as far right as he is allowed to be, always chooses respectability first, no matter how ridiculous he has to be to do it. If he must choose between conservatism and respectability, a respectable conservative never hesitates to choose respectability.

Look at the craziness even Buchanan has indulged in to keep his "respectable" label:

An outright racist appeared on Crossfire way back when Buchanan and Bradley were on it, and Buchanan joined the liberal commentator Bradley absolutely. Buchanan was in danger of being called anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews, so he had to jump through every hoop Bradley wanted him to.

In his desperation to prove to Bradley that he was respectable, Buchanan agreed to the most incredible proposition. Buchanan insisted that American soldiers fought in World War II to allow massive nonwhite immigration into Europe!

Bradley told the racist what all liberals always say about World War II. He said that American soldiers fought and died so that Europe would accept massive third world immigration and integrate.

The racist said, reasonably enough, that had American soldiers thought that was what they were fighting for, they would have refused to fight.

Buchanan had to prove he was not an Evil Racist, so he backed Bradley all the way. He insisted again and again that American soldiers went to Europe to fight and die for massive third world immigration and integration!

I could not believe Buchanan had done that. But he said the same thing again. Then he INSISTED on it again.

The segregated United States Army, said Buchanan, fought to make Europe brown!

He agreed to everything else Bradley said. In this debate, any deviation from the liberal line would have threatened his status as a respectable conservative, so all bets were off.

I don't think I have ever been so disappointed in anybody in politics as I was in Buchanan on that program. He absolutely CRAWLED!

The left NEVER deserts its wounded. When the USSR fell, Phil Donahue immediately teamed up with one of the Communist Party's Russian defenders in a joint program. Nobody attacks Communists without catching it from liberals.

And if you call a liberal a Communist, he'll look you straight in the eye and tell you where to go. He won't let you call any other liberal a Commie, either.

But if you want to scare off a respectable conservative, say "NAZIHOWANTSTOKILLSIXMILLIONJEWS" loudly and he will panic and give you anything you ask for.

And if a liberal calls anybody anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews, every respectable conservative demands the right to join the lynch mob.

If liberals give you the label "respectable," you got it made. You become a Jack Kemp or an Orrin Hatch or a William Buckley. A respectable conservative becomes half of the political dialogue. Jesse Jackson allows him to come on "Both Sides."

Remember that it was not Orrin Hatch or William Buckley who was out there defending Paula Jones when she was alone against Clinton. It was the "fever swamp" (AKA, not respectable) right that stood by her.

Linda Tripp has ceased to be of use to Starr, and the liberals want her bad. So she has had it, and only the "fever swamp" right will fail to declare her Evil.

August 18, 2001 - TODAY, ONLY A NATIONALIST UNDERSTANDS NATIONALITY PROBLEMS

August 18, 2001 - THE UN-RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

TODAY, ONLY A NATIONALIST UNDERSTANDS NATIONALITY PROBLEMS

A Southern nationalist is not a person who wants to create a Southern Nation. A Southern Nationalist is one who wants independence for the already existing Southern Nation. No one can create a nation.

I am now in Russia, and all I know about the place comes from books. I doubt I will know anything much about it when I leave. But the simple sentences above make it possible for me to understand a lot of what Russians say about Russia.

In Eastern Europe, "nationality problems" are common. But to official Western opinion, a "nationality problem" just means a dispute over territory. In today's parlance, a nation is just a politically united piece of territory, not a living entity made up of a particular people.

In the real world, very few of the serious nationality problems are disputes over a piece of ground.

To understand what the conflicts and attitudes in Russia are, you have to be able to empathize with what a Russian means when he uses that word. To him, there are many non-Russians in Russia, and relations between Russians and non-Russians in Russia is an important part of life.

But what they call non-Russians speak Russian, have Russian citizenship papers, and reside inside the political unit designated on the map as "Russia." To a Western "intellectual," they are all equally "Russian."

If anyone disagrees, they pull out the big gun. They point out that anyone who says a particular culture and racial group constitutes a nation is anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews. This protects them from having any idea of what is really going on.

To many Americans, the Soviet Union was synonomous with "Russia." Our self-styled "intellectuals" made fun of this confusion.

But the "intellectual" point of view is the one I just discussed, where "nation" just means a piece of ground. That is at least as provincial as the one they make fun of. What is more, the "intellectual" approach is far more hopeless because professors cannot imagine that THEY could be provincial.

These self-styled intellectuals are a perfect illustration of Oliver Hardy's point that, "Nobody is as dumb as a dumb man who thinks he's smart." And nobody is as hopeless as a bunch of inbred academic bureaucrats who think they represent True Intellectualism.

THE UN-RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

History books tell us that there were two Russian Revolutions in 1917. There was the February Revolution which overthrew the Czar. Then there was the October Revolution which imposed Communist rule.

But the fact is that almost no Russians were leaders in the October Revolution. The second Revolution in 1917, the Communist one, was not Russian.

Communism is based on hate. The October Revolution was led by those who, often for good reason, hated Russians. Stalin was a Georgian, which even an intellectual would understand is not a Russian. In terms of what a Russian would see as a cultural or national Russian, only a tiny handful of the founders of the Soviet Union -- and I mean a TINY handful -- were of Russian NATIONALITY.

This is not surprising. Communism is an expression of violent hatred of everything traditional and basic to a nation. China's Cultural Revolution attempted to kill and demolish anything that seemed Chinese. As in America, where leftists hate America and white people, the largest driving force behind the Bolshevik movement was a hatred of Russia.

Today's Russian Communist Party wants a second chance because, they say, they are "real Russians," not the old Communists. Westerners are not allowed to understand what they are talking about.

Leon Trotsky's first criminal offense, for example, was destroying Christian symbols when he was a boy. Russian Jews, both at home and abroad, saw the Bolshevik Revolution as a chance to revenge all the historical crimes Russians had committed against them, whether they realized it or not.

This mutual hatred of Russia bound Lenin, who was no Slav, to Stalin, who had hatred of Russia in his Georgian blood. It is no accident that the man who understood the Soviet Revolution best, the man who took it over, was Lenin's Official Expert on Nationalities, Joseph Stalin.

Trotsky sublimated his hatred of the Russian nation so well that he actually believed all he cared about was Marxist ideology. Stalin knew better. He saw clearly that Bolshevism was a vehicle for group enmity.

He won by using those resentments as only one who saw the real picture clearly could use them. Stalin understood the game, so he played Jews and other nationalities against each other and took power.

Stalin beat the far more brilliant Trotsky because he saw Communism for what it is. Communism, like all modern leftism, is a vehicle for the enemies of the nation in which it exists.

To today's required ideology, just to see the world as a Russian sees it makes one
anazihowntstokillsixmillionjews.

August 25, 2001 - HOW NOT TO SLEEP WITH A BEAUTIFUL WOMAN

August 25, 2001 - RUSSIAN CARS

August 25, 2001 - ECONOMIC THEOLOGY

August 25, 2001 - THE EURO IS THE DOLLAR'S SALVATION

HOW NOT TO SLEEP WITH A BEAUTIFUL WOMAN

I spent one of the worst nights of my life sleeping with a beautiful woman.

Get your tongue back in your head. These days it never occurs to anybody that "sleeping with a woman" can mean exactly that.

She was not only beautiful, she was rich. Her family's house was next door to the lieutenant governor's (this was not in South Carolina, and it was long ago).

The obvious question is what somebody rich and beautiful was doing with me. So let me tell you this: I am a wise man who comments in learned style on world issues. That same wisdom prevents me from ever trying to figure out why women do things. That way lies madness.

Anyway, she was showing off the new, luxury car her father had given her that particular year -- I think he did it every year. We left my cheap but reliable little Volkswagen and she drove me around in her brand new luxmobile.

She drove out into an area where there were only dirt roads (HINT, HINT, BOB!). I was doing what I have spent almost all my time with women doing: Trying to figure out what to do next.

So naturally the luxmobile broke down. Naturally we had no idea where we were. Naturally it was a bitter cold night and the heater went out with the engine.

We spent a night at around thirty degrees with no coats, etc. She was in my arms, sleeping warmly. She looked so comfy there that I, frozen solid, wanted to strangle her.

RUSSIAN CARS

Every time I ride in a Russian car here I think of that horrible night I spent with a beauty.

I thought of it yesterday when we were traveling in a fine Russian van that costs only six thousand dollars brand new.

It was a fine van except for one thing: We spent about four hours traveling and two hours fixing it.

The good Russian who was driving me around had given me great hospitality in his genuine old Russian house out in a village. So please do not think I am complaining here at all.

He kept telling me that it was an excellent van, as it seemed to be, but it kept breaking down.

During that hellacious freezing night with my red-haired beauty, all I could think about was my cheap but RELIABLE little Volkswagen and how warm I would be if I'd taken it. It would not break down.

The most wildly successful cars in history have been the Model T Ford and the Volkswagen. They were indeed cheap. But they were cheap AND RELIABLE. Therein lies the whole tale.

If you can fix farm machinery and cars the way my Russian buddy and the others I was riding with can, breaking down is just a bother. For the rest of us, it is a fatal flaw.

My friends, I have just revealed unto you a Great Mystery. If I spent a thousand pages making it obscure and using lots of economicese, the sentences I just wrote could really impress people the way real Economic Theorists do.

ECONOMIC THEOLOGY

Communists have slaughtered far more than a hundred million people trying to impose the economic theology of Marx, Lenin, and the rest.

But in a way, the democratic socialist Intellectuals were worse than the Communist ones. Their economic nonsense kept the entire Third World in stagnation and abject misery for generations. That was worse than death.

All those years, planners trained at Harvard and the London School of Economics went back to their native lands and tried to plan their countries out of poverty.

All the universities were proud that they had trained economists from all the poor countries.

Every single country these Intellectuals took over got worse and worse.

The planners themselves, however, did what they wanted to do: they had a slave population, jobs, and power. So academics and other wordsmiths still love socialism.

There are still statues of Lenin here in Russia, and no social science department in the West is anything but a rabid fan of Economic Planning.

When some people look at Lenin, they think of a Great Idealist. Others think of the horrors he caused or some World Conspiracy idea they have going.

What I see when I look at Lenin is something that only a battered but all-too-honest old political expert from South Carolina would see.

To me, Lenin is a guy who was a Hero of the Working Class who never did an hour's labor in his entire life.

This is equally true of Marx. This is equally true of Trotsky. Likewise practically everybody else who ever championed the Worker as an intellectual hero. None of them ever produced anything but misery.

Libertarians today, who think they are the ultimate anti-Communists, continue this tradition of making economics into a theology. The one thing they insist on is free markets, with the same religious intensity Communists and socialists devoted to their recipes.

Libertarians say the free market is the solution for everything.

Including border problems. Since differences among peoples mean nothing, and the free market will take care of them, libertarians insist that the Third World population should pour into America and Western Europe.

Just crossing that border, say the libertarians, will make billions of third worlders prosperous First World Citizens in no time.

The Wall Street journal demands a constitutional amendment that says: "There shall be no borders."

In other words, their economic theology will take care of everything.

I think we've had enough of that nonsense.

THE EURO IS THE DOLLAR'S SALVATION

Some Russians have asked me what I think of the new European currency, the Euro. They also talked about a plan to do the same sort of thing in Asia.

This is what I told them:

"As a professional economist, I consider the Euro and a general Asian currency as the best things that could happen to the American dollar."

"A GERMAN Mark or a SWISS franc is real competition for the dollar, because people have confidence in the Germans and in the Swiss. These currencies are being replaced by a Greek, Italian, Spanish, French and German 'Euro,' in which no one will have any confidence."

"Exactly the same thing is true of the JAPANESE yen. If it is replaced by a currency whose worth is dependent on a group of Asian countries working together, no one can have any confidence in it."

"The real long-term threat to the dollar is the change in the US population, in the AMERICA that stands behind the dollar."

September 1, 2001 - Poisoned Fruit (originally ran October 24, 1998)

September 1, 2001 - Liberal Spores (originally ran October 24, 1998)

Poisoned Fruit

It is established law in this country that, if a man tortures and kills children, he is set free if any of the evidence that convicts him is collected in violation of any rules set up by a judge. So if he is searched incorrectly, or Miranda rights are not read, the policeman who did it wrong suffers no penalty, and the criminal is set free.

All evidence collected as a result of a violation of judicial rules is called "poisoned fruit." So, if an informant's name is found before Miranda rights are read, and that informant leads the police to the children's bodies and other evidence, that evidence is not admissible.

Liberals go all the way for their clients.

A few thousand kids may get molested and a few hundred killed, but that's the price you have to pay if liberal lawyers are to have their form of justice. All liberals agree that it's a bit tough on the kids, but justice is not perfect.

Unless, of course, that injustice comes from a nonliberal source. Liberals oppose the death penalty, so the possibility of one innocent person being executed worries them to death.

So liberals talk endlessly about the possibility that the death penalty may be imposed on an innocent person. They never spend one second worrying about the innocent children their policies kill.

So, when debating the death penalty, no respectable conservative ever brings up the innocent children liberals kill with their policies. By the same token, no Southern Crawler ever brings it up. You become a good respectable conservative and a respectable Southerner - a Southern Crawler - by following liberal rules.

If you are to be a good Southern Crawler, you never question the "poisoned fruit" of integration laws. The Fourteenth Amendment was adopted unconstitutionally, and the Federal court decisions outlawing antiscegenation laws in the 1960's absolutely reject all traces of constitutional intent. The states which adopted the Bill of Rights and the Fourteenth Amendment had and enforced antiscegenation laws. Not even the carpetbagger administrations in the South objected to them.

But the courts decided all that didn't matter. The courts didn't want miscegenation laws, so out they went. Naturally, no respectable conservative and not one Southern Creep objected to this.

Years later, in the 1970's, the Federal courts decided they didn't want states to have restrictions on abortion, either. So they declared the constitution did not allow states to have restrictions on abortion. Every Catholic bishop had cheered the court decision doing away with antiscegenation laws. But when the court did exactly the same thing to antiabortion laws, the bishops started shouting about "original intent." Since bishops had objected, respectable conservatives felt they could object. Since Northern conservatives had objected, Southern Crawlers decided they could object to the abortion decision, too.

But all this fake courage came far too late.

Because respectable conservatives and Southern Creeps only objected when fashionable opinion allowed them to, unborn children got murdered, and other children get murdered and molested every day.

People who only object when fashionable opinion allows them to are going to betray you every single time when it counts. If you select Southern Creeps and respectable conservatives as your leaders, you get precisely what you deserve.

Liberal Spores

We have to get out of the Union, because the only discussion inside the Union is between liberals and their pets, the respectable conservatives. In the present so-called discussion, the right can only delay the inevitable expansion of leftist authority.

As recent incidents are demonstrating once again, leftism will not stop until its power is absolute. Respectable conservatives and Southern Crawlers provide a false and temporary illusion of opposition.

Many infections use spores to preserve themselves. A disease germ infests an area, but then the area dries out, so the disease germs form individual, hard shells, and wait for the rain to come back. In the meantime, it looks like the disease has been beaten.

Leftism uses the same method.

Southern Crawlers insist that, now that the libs have won on all the old civil rights fronts, they will quit. How happy we all are now, with JUST ENOUGH anti-white laws. So, by giving liberals those laws, we have inoculated ourselves against any further outbreaks of this disease. We need no longer worry about limitless Federal expansion in the name of civil rights, right?

Wrong. The disease did not go into remission. Like all liberal programs short of total bureaucratic control of everything, it merely spored.

But the spores are always just waiting for their water. And for Federal power extension in the name of diversity, the "water" is a hate crime. Give them one hate crime, and the disease is back in action.

Now a homosexual got murdered, and, surprise, surprise, liberals want more Federal "Hate" laws. In the name of the melting pot, we need another extension of Federal authority.

Crawly Southerners (I call them Southern Creeps) agree with liberals that they were wrong to object to such extension last time.

But the respectable conservatives and Southern Creeps say, "THIS time, you really are going too far." Quite reasonably, liberals say, "Just let us enforce it a few years and you'll LOVE it, just like you did everything else we enforced."

Experience everywhere shows us that leftists often look like they've been tamed for the moment. But in the long run, they never stop demanding more. And conservatives never stop giving them more.

Back in 1959, when I first went to England, Hyde Park in London was the world center of free speech. It was a point of pride with Britons: in Hyde Park you could say dirty words or defend dope addiction or anything else. It was a tourist draw because it was unique in the world.

Then, in the 1960s, Britain passed laws against any bad remarks about any minority group. This was a Labour Party move, and bothered a lot of people. But then something happened that made the left look like it had been tamed: a person who was convicted under the law proved that every remark he had made was a simple recitation of statistics. The judge acquitted him with a historic remark:

"You cannot imprison an Englishman for telling the truth."

All the world thought freedom of speech was saved in Britain!

It wasn't.

The left was tamed for the moment, but the left always gets what it wants in the long run. It is essential to the left that all dialogue about minorities be subject to law.

In 1986, the British courts gave the leftists all they wanted. Even the blasé British were shocked. In *Crown vs. Joseph Pierce*, 1986, the judge gave Pierce a year for inciting racial hatred, and the judge said:

"The truth is no defense."

By the way, in 1986 the United Kingdom was under respectable conservative rule.

As usual, the left seemed to be under control, but, with the connivance of respectable conservatives, it has resumed its march toward absolute control over free speech in Britain.

We all know there is now a major offensive to expand Federal authority under new "Hate" laws.

Meanwhile the left is opening up this offensive on new fronts. There is a new cable movie starring Beau Bridges. It is called "Defending the First." The movie argues that anyone who publicly disagrees with the liberal line on race is criminally responsible for hate crimes.

But this incitement is only to be blamed on the political right. Leftists can incite all the hate crimes they want to. A year or two ago, a black man got on a subway in New York City and started shooting white people. He said he hated whites.

A couple of years ago, the New York State School Board actually approved a textbook which stated flatly that all white people were racists! It was pulled at the very last minute.

So, who got blamed for the black man's murder of a lot of white people? New Yorkers unanimously blamed the gun for it! A wife of one of the victims got elected to congress saying it was the gun's fault!

Did you hear any respectable conservative blaming any of this on leftists?

Me neither.

How about Southerner Crawlers?

Me neither.

The bottom line is this: in politics, you are either going forward or you are going back. We must either destroy the left and discredit it, or it will consume us. Respectable conservatives and Southern Creeps say that liberalism so far is not just OK, it is great.

We must either discredit liberalism totally, or we must secede.

We must stop trying to get liberals to approve of us and turn to driving them out. If the Union continues, if leftist respectability continues, your future belongs to the left.

September 8, 2001 - WHEN PEOPLE TALK ABOUT OTHERS, THEY TELL YOU ALL ABOUT THEMSELVES

September 8, 2001 - COMMENTS ON THE CHANDRA LEVY CASE TELL YOU ABOUT THE COMMENTATORS

September 8, 2001 - CORRUPTION THRIVES AMONG THOSE FAVORED BY THE MEDIA

WHEN PEOPLE TALK ABOUT OTHERS, THEY TELL YOU ALL ABOUT THEMSELVES

The primary weapon of any interrogator is not torture, but time. If you want to know all about somebody, just let them talk.

A psychiatrist friend of mine read my first book and said, "Bob, I wish my patients would all write a whole book like yours, about how they view the world."

Like any good psychiatrist or any good interrogator, his specialty was finding out what he wanted to know by letting me talk about what I choose to talk about. After he read my book, I had few secrets from him.

Letting people talk and concentrating on what you want to find out is critical. It was absolutely essential to me in my career in politics. For example, one thing I learned early on was one way to spot a liar.

I found that a person who uses the word "liar" all the time is invariably a liar himself.

To those who take truth seriously, "lie" is a very big word. To them a lie is a DELIBERATE falsehood, not just a mistake in facts.

Some people respond that this is just a quibble. They see anything incorrect as the same thing as a falsehood.

If someone thinks the difference between deliberate falsehood and accidental misinformation is trivial, don't believe what they tell you. They do not take lying to be a serious offense, and that means they do not mind lying themselves.

This information has been enormously valuable to me and those I worked for. It came from my observations as I listened to people talk freely.

COMMENTS ON THE CHANDRA LEVY CASE TELL YOU ABOUT THE COMMENTATORS

I spent a lot of time on Capitol Hill, but my picture of it is entirely different from the picture drawn by the media commentators.

The media talk about Congress as a place where everybody is on the take and where there is little interest in working for what is right.

Everybody in Congress, according to the media, is in on having sex with interns and every other sleazy activity. They say that if sleeping with interns was a disqualification, ninety percent of congressmen would be out.

That's not the Capitol Hill I saw.

In all my years on the Hill and in the Administration I saw almost nothing but dedicated workaholics. I was there at night, I did a lot more than just earn my salary. When I was there late, I saw lots of other offices occupied by people just like me.

As to corruption, nobody would dare try to try to bribe a real fanatic like me.

Of course, the Capitol Hill I saw was the one I spent my time in. I didn't see others bedding down young girls, because I was in my office or writing at home. Naturally the people I associated with were doing the same thing.

So if you ask me about congressmen and their staffs, my experience is with honest ideological nut-cases like myself. The people I worked with were those like my boss John Ashbrook and Jesse Helms.

They scared the media precisely because they are so unbendingly dedicated to what they see as right.

So when someone with Hill experience says everybody they know is corrupt and sex mad, what are they telling you about themselves?

Capitol Hill is a huge place, and everybody really knows only his corner of it. What he sees will not tell you the objective truth about the Hill, but it tells you all about the commentator and the people he is used to dealing with.

CORRUPTION THRIVES AMONG THOSE FAVORED BY THE MEDIA

Homosexual Congressman Studds of Massachusetts got reelected after seducing male interns. He survived the scandal, but conservative Representative Crane of Illinois, who seduced a female intern the same year, was defeated in the next election.

What a public servant gets away with depends entirely on his constituents.

The media hated those of us who were on the right.

If they got anything on us, they would not downplay it the way they did the Studds affair. We all know that if Teddy Kennedy had been a conservative, Chappaquidick would have destroyed him.

So the right had to follow the old rule, "Don't write down anything you are not willing to see on the front page of the Washington Post tomorrow." As a result, the press did a bang-up job of riding herd on us and exposing corruption on our side.

That, after all, is the function a free press is supposed to serve: keeping public servants honest.

By the same token, this also means that the media does not do its job when it comes to the left.

So one of the things Congressman Condit says is true. He is indeed getting meaner treatment from the media than Clinton did.

This is because Clinton was needed by the political left, so he got full backing from the press for anything he did, no matter how sleazy.

Condit is not leftist enough or important enough to earn the same free pass Clinton had.

If Condit finds this surprising, he must have been living under a rock.

A totally corrupt person can survive in politics if the press and his constituents give him a free pass. We all know that the left, constituents and media, will quite literally let their servants get away with murder.

So when we hear big-time paid commentators tell us that everybody they know about in politics is immoral and corrupt, they are telling you all about themselves.

September 15, 2001 - FOR HEAVEN'S SAKE, AMERICA, SPREAD OUT!

September 14, 2001 - WOULD THE CONFEDERACY HAVE BACKED THE UNITED STATES IN THIS WAR?

September 14, 2001 - BUREAUCRATS VERSUS ZEALOTS

September 14, 2001 - ALL OUR "ALLIES " LOVE US - -FOR THE MOMENT

September 13, 2001 - A MAN WITH A MEMORY LOOKS AT THE "AMERICA FIRST" MOVEMENT

September 13, 2001 - MY ARAB SYMPATHIES

September 12, 2001 - WHAT MAY HAPPEN

September 11, 2001 - AMERICA'S BUREAUCRACIES GET DEADLIER EVERY DAY

September 11, 2001 - UNTIL WE FACE THE SIMPLE CAUSE, THE SITUATION WILL GET WORSE

September 11, 2001 - SUPERTERRORISM (originally published November 21, 1998)

September 11, 2001 - LEFTISTS SHOW US HOW NOT TO DEAL WITH TOMORROW'S TERRORISM (originally published April 1, 2000)

FOR HEAVEN'S SAKE, AMERICA, SPREAD OUT!

Those who look at Whitaker Online once a week will not know that we have been doing daily updates since the terrorist attacks. These articles are all below, the latest ones first.

To round off the week I want to return to the bottom two article here, SUPERTERRORISM, November 21, 1998, and LEFTISTS SHOW US HOW NOT TO DEAL WITH TOMORROW'S TERRORISM, April 1, 2000.

Those were the two reprints our webmaster Virgil Huston decided to put on in the wake of the attack. His editorial judgment was right on target as usual.

Recently I saw two TV discussion shows talking about whether the World Trade Towers should be rebuilt. As liberals and good respectable conservatives always do, each panel ended up with everybody

agreeing. But one group unanimously agreed they should be rebuilt to spite the terrorists and the other unanimously agreed that they shouldn't.

Another newscast mentioned that the stock market will open Monday, but 20% of its communications were in the World Trade Center. So they said that this will slow trading JUST AS IT DID AFTER THE LAST ATTACK ON THE WORLD TRADE CENTER.

A lot of people want us to build those targets again, so the next attack will hobble our financial institutions again.

The theme of the two last articles here has been a WOL theme since the outset:

We now have the means to spread out. We no longer need to huddle our communications, our industry, and our population -- in other words, our terrorist targets -- together in big cities.

But our ruling planners are all in cities. I am afraid this will not occur to them until a true "super terrorist" attack finally occurs.

WOULD THE CONFEDERACY HAVE BACKED THE UNITED STATES IN THIS WAR?

Yesterday I said that the Confederacy would have joined the United States "unreservedly" in retaliating for the New York bombings (A MAN WITH A MEMORY LOOKS AT THE "AMERICA FIRST" MOVEMENT, below). A reader disagrees, with considerable heat.

She says the Confederacy would not have backed the American Empire, which brought this on itself. She may be right.

She is right to be upset if I am wrong, because I have so little excuse. Whitaker Online warned that if America continued to ignore history, if it kept trying to straighten out the Middle East and the Balkans, it was asking for disaster.

My excuse is that I simply cannot tolerate the idea of foreigners attacking American soil and getting away with it. But my own worries about where this may lead, expressed in September 12's WHAT MAY HAPPEN (below) and in the two articles that follow this one, show that my head might disagree with my heart on this.

BUREAUCRATS VERSUS ZEALOTS

We are all rooting for America in this war. But most of us feel a very deep pessimism about our chances. I think I have found the reason for that deep dread.

That fear is because, down in our bones, something is remembering recent history.

Our giant military bureaucracy operates fine against other military bureaucracies. It conducted a ground campaign against organized Iraqi forces perfectly. It did mass bombings perfectly. It did fine in World War II in an organized campaign against other organized forces.

Our problem now is that we have old established military and intelligence bureaucracies trying to deal with small, fanatical groups of terrorists.

These terrorists are operating from the midst of their own ethnic kin. They are Arab Moslems based in Arab Moslem country.

This war looks very much like the first war the United States Government ever lost, the one in Vietnam.

In Vietnam we faced an enemy organized into small groups operating almost independently. They faded back into the Vietnamese community and struck when they chose, like terrorists today.

We tried to fight in Vietnam with our giant military bureaucracy and we lost. We used mass bombings and body counts, things that a titanic, centrally organized force could do. But they controlled the ground by night, as terrorists do, and in the end our nerve and our national patience couldn't hold.

If we don't attack the bureaucracy problem, we are in deep, deep trouble (See September 11, 2001 - AMERICA'S BUREAUCRACIES GET DEADLIER EVERY DAY and September 11, 2001 - UNTIL WE FACE THE SIMPLE CAUSE, THE SITUATION WILL GET WORSE).

ALL OUR "ALLIES " LOVE US - -FOR THE MOMENT

In Vietnam, our European "allies" -- the ones declaring their undying love for us right now -- turned against us as soon as the first excitement died down (See April 14, 2001 - THE "ALLIES" GAMBIT).

Today we are grateful to the Europeans for their sympathy for American dead in New York and Washington.

We think that sympathy means lasting European support. We are not remembering the last time we actually staged reprisals against an Arab country for its support of terrorists.

You have to go back to Reagan's bombing of Libya to find an example of a military action we took entirely as a response to terrorist acts. We proved that Libya had sponsored bombings that took American lives in Western Europe -- on the very soil of our "allies." So Reagan ordered that country bombed.

Nobody in continental Europe would let our British-based bombers fly in "allied" air space to attack Libya. They had to fly west of Portugal over open ocean and it probably cost American lives.

Europe is a lot like Clinton. When it's just a matter of sympathy, they feel our pain. But they will cheer us on as we get in, and they will desert us as soon as the novelty wears off.

A MAN WITH A MEMORY LOOKS AT THE "AMERICA FIRST" MOVEMENT

This is VERY serious business.

It is essential for you to read July 29, 2000 - ANOTHER WRITER IS PROUD TO HAVE NO FEELING FOR HIS HOMELAND OR HIS PEOPLE and the following article, MY ARAB SYMPATHIES, before you comment on this article.

If I were a good Wordist (WORDISM, May 15, 1999), I would have a lot of sympathy with those who have attacked America. I have been a good friend to the Arabs for over forty years, and I have sympathized with the evil that has been done to them.

But I am NOT a Wordist. I am a nationalist, and an attack on America is an attack on me, no matter how many grudges I hold against New York and Washington.

The South is my nation, but America is the country I am a part of. A Southern Confederacy would be on the side of the United States without reservation.

Osama Bin Ladin and his like have chosen to declare war on my land, and that, not his philosophy, makes him my enemy.

They could have spent all that money and dedication on telling their side of the story. People like me would have helped them with all our heart. But they chose war.

Many are comparing the attacks on the United States a couple of days ago to Pearl Harbor. Many Americans back then wanted no part of a European war. Roosevelt had promised them he would not get us into that war.

Even after Pearl Harbor, Roosevelt tried to get the US to declare war on Germany and Italy. But the Congress declared war only on Japan.

Then, on December 11, 1941, Hitler declared war on US.

So the America Firsters who had previously resisted getting into the war against Germany SINCERELY declared their total support for the war against Germany.

These people included William F. Buckley, SENIOR, a Southerner.

Ever since, liberals and respectable conservatives have denounced America Firsters as traitors and isolationists because they did not WANT to go to war against Hitler. Only those who were for allying us with Stalin before Pearl Harbor are now considered true patriots.

This insane idea runs this way: Everybody insists that we fought Hitler, not because he declared war on our country, but to rid the earth of white people. Even PAT BUCHANAN once said that!!!! See RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES KILL THEIR WOUNDED, Sept 26, 1999, reprinted August 11, 2001). So everybody here should have wanted war from the first.

No, America Firsters did not want to rid the earth of white people, and if that makes one a traitor, then count me in.

America Firsters joined in the war with all their heart because Hitler had declared war on their country. Maybe Wordists like Buchanan cannot understand this. But it is the essence of real non-Wordist patriotism that makes me an enemy of anyone who declares war on my homeland, no matter what beliefs they profess.

BUT THIS POINT IS CRUCIAL: As you will see in the next article, I am fully aware of which Arabs are our enemies and which are not. I would no more advocate bombing the innocent now than I would have supported bombing the German-speaking Swiss in 1944.

ANOTHER CRITICAL POINT: TO ME, ISREAL IS JUST ONE MORE FOREIGN COUNTRY. I see anyone who wants to shed my nation's blood for some crackpot Bible theory as blasphemous (See October 21, 2000 - THE HINDUS IN ROMAN PALESTINE).

To a non-Wordist, American loyalty to Israel is as treasonous as any other loyalty to a foreign power. Such foreign loyalty is specifically forbidden in the oath every naturalized citizen must take, and it goes for the native born as well.

MY ARAB SYMPATHIES

When I entered the University of South Carolina in 1957, the media hated two groups of people to the extent that they were not considered human. Those two groups were Southerners and Arabs.

I knew a lot of Palestinian refugees who had been treated worse by Israel, literally, than American law would let you treat a dog.

In fact, Arab students led the charge to get me elected to the Student Senate. You could say I was the only conservative in history to WIN an election because of the support of an ethnic minority (See November 28, 1998 - YOU NEVER WIN WITH THE BLACK VOTE).

I was even considered by some Arabs at USC to be a spokesman for their side. I have always deeply appreciated that kind of trust from any group.

In 1959, one my best buddies in Germany was the German representative of the Arab League.

I have mentioned the Bobby Kennedy episode (that I alone seem to remember) in Whitaker Online before, and I will repeat it here:

A Palestinian refugee living in the United States shot Robert Kennedy. Earlier that same night, as part of his campaign for the Democratic presidential nomination, Kennedy debated his opponent Eugene McCarthy in California. The debate was carried on national TV.

As a Southerner and a friend of Palestinian refugees, I was used to vicious insults and bloodthirsty threats against those I sympathized with. But what Kennedy and McCarthy said they planned to do to Arabs that night froze even MY blood.

Remember that both of these men were PEACENIKS in Vietnam. But they were also competing for the Jewish votes and money in the Democratic primary in California. I have never heard more cold-blooded threats against Arabs than I heard from those two peaceniks that night!

For this reason, I doubt that that debate will ever be rerun on television or even reproduced where it is easy to find.

As I listened, I thought how I would feel if I were a Palestinian. Obviously I don't condone murder, but I understood what had happened to Sirhan Sirhan.

Liberal environmentalists are allowed to understand the Unibomber without condoning his actions. But I am not allowed to understand Sirhan Sirhan without advocating murder, or to side with the America Firsters without being a traitor.

Nonsense.

For once, George W Bush got it right. The attack on America was not murder or terrorism, it was an act of war.

I have been one of those who has understood and spoken for Arab grievances all my life. I am the last person on earth to blame all Arabs for these massacres of Americans. I know the difference, and I know it very well indeed.

But I am not a Wordist. If you attack America, you are my enemy, and no one is more of an enemy of those who have chosen to make war than this old redneck.

WHAT MAY HAPPEN

- 1) Because of the attack on America, the United States has a chance to really move into the Middle on the side of Israel.
- 2) We now have the combination of the Israel lobby and a state of war.
- 3) With support from everybody, the US goes into the Middle East big time.
- 4) The US, pushed by the Israeli lobby, fundamentalist "Christians" and Israel-hawk liberals, goes absolutely nuts in the Middle East.
- 5) As in Vietnam, our "allies" desert us sometime next year.
- 6) The US goes it alone, getting in deeper and deeper.
- 7) As the ruin mounts up from loss of oil and -- less important, the deaths of Americans -- an anti-semitic reaction grows.
- 8) In the 1960s, the media and anti-war advocates became more and more openly pro-Communist. As our economic collapse grows and real anti-semitism grows in the US, swastikas begin to go on the streets.
- 9) People like me begin to scream "nazihowantstokillsixmillionjews," because by now it's a real threat. But leftists have screamed that "wolf" too often in the past.
- 10) a new Holocaust begins

AMERICA'S BUREAUCRACIES GET DEADLIER EVERY DAY

The CIA ands FBI failed to give any indication that the World Trade Center attack was being planned. So Congress wants to increase the CIA and FBI budgets.

That is our response to everything, and it never works. More money will not improve bad performance.

American security agencies are run by entrenched bureaucrats. It is the nature of that bureaucracy that is the problem.

But nobody dares face the problem with our security bureaucracy because it is the same problem we have with others who run the country. If we faced it in intelligence, we might see other things clearly as well.

If we faced the truth about the CIA and the FBI, our other failing bureaucracies would be in serious trouble. Instead of pumping more and more money into Government tuition grants, we might have to realize that our universities are just entrenched bureaucracies, where academic bureaucrats hold all the teaching and administrative jobs. No intellectual need apply.

Our welfare bureaucracy, in fact our entire titanic education-welfare establishment, would be under attack.

And bureaucrats with stars on their shoulders in the Pentagon might lose some of their blind conservative worshippers.

Those who run our political bureaucracy might be questioned.

Worst of all, media bureaucrats might even be questioned.

But bureaucrats needn't panic. Nobody is going to let any of that happen until things get truly desperate.

UNTIL WE FACE THE SIMPLE CAUSE, THE SITUATION WILL GET WORSE

When the KGB briefly opened its files right after the fall of the Soviet Union, those who looked at them were shocked to discover the enormous extent of Soviet penetration into the US Government since the 1930s. It was worse than even McCarthy had thought!

Naturally the liberal media bureaucracy minimized this news. Respectable conservatives, who are chosen by the same bureaucracy, hardly mentioned it either.

Nobody spent many resources looking at those files while they were open. Neither the big media nor the US intelligence community really wanted to open that can of worms. So when the KGB closed its files, it was clear that only a tiny percentage of their American operations had been uncovered.

For the KGB and other enemy agencies, a static bureaucracy like that in America's CIA and FBI is a sitting target. Over a period of seventy years, it took little talent to penetrate it wherever one wanted to. They got one Communist sympathizer in, and he got others in.

Any entrenched bureaucracy will be as riddled with informers as an unguarded computer is with viruses. These security failures are easily explained. But it is an explanation no paid security expert would dare make public.

So our security bureaucracy is not only inefficient. It also is open to infiltration.

And please take note: these are only two of the MANY obvious realities that those who work for our security bureaucracy must overlook if they want to keep their jobs.

No security professional, in or out of the government, is going to point out this obvious fundamental problem. If he did, he would never get paid to do anything in that area again.

No bureaucracy, be it security or media or education or military, is going to fund a serious critic.

This is not a plot. It's just the obvious result of letting bureaucracy go its own way.

We must stop promoting and listening to people because they have degrees or years in office or the right crowd approves of them. That is why they are allowed, even encouraged, to fail.

Only a complete intellectual revolt against all entrenched bureaucracies, a root-and-branch house cleaning, can deal with the real problems America faces.

Make them give us real solutions or get rid of them. Until we do that, things will get worse.

SUPERTERRORISM

There it hangs, the threat of superterrorism.

You can find out how to make a suitcase-size atomic bomb on the Internet. Russia probably has hundreds of times as much plutonium missing as is needed. Disease and poisoning of water supplies are constantly mentioned as cheaper, less complicated means of superterrorism.

There is no reason liberals or moderates or respectable conservatives would look at this threat. The minute superterrorism appears, the entire, narrow world of liberalism collapses.

As you will see below, the first thing that will disappear as soon as superterrorism appears will be the liberal concept of a society planned on rules set down by social experts.

Liberals don't like to think about superterrorism, so moderates and respectable conservatives ignore it.

Someone once said that facing execution concentrates one's attention wonderfully.

Atomic devices will concentrate our attention wonderfully.

As I mentioned at the Redshirt meeting, the first atomic terrorist explosion will cause instant decentralization. Suddenly, when anybody could carry an atomic device into a community, all this multiracial, multicultural nonsense will evaporate.

Today, liberalism forces us to make heroes of anybody who has a grudge against American society or white people or, in the case of fanatical environmentalism, even mankind itself.

To the liberals, all the other terrorists are just right-wing extremists, but the Unibomber was a semihero. Suddenly, it will no longer be fashionable to treat guilt-sellers as colleagues. The Unibomber will be

the man of this future, though compared to his nuclear successors, this leftist radical was a piker. The guy who got his arms blasted off by the Unibomber got his attention concentrated abruptly.

He wrote a book about it, and in that book he no longer shows the usual businessman's tolerance for environmental radicals.

If political resentment leads people to use atomic terrorism, and you say you feel America really belongs to the Indians, I do not want you within a mile of me.

Literally.

Every liberal and respectable conservative will declare that superterrorism will be end of civilization. Not long ago, that might have been the case. But today, the same thing that makes secession so efficient will preserve civilization after superterrorism, probably without too much of a bump. Industry is no longer concentrated the way it once was. We no longer need the sort of huge cities that superterrorists can threaten as the center of our civilization. We can easily spread out and defend our production facilities.

How will we unite without the United States Army to force all of us to be part of a single Union?

We will do what we should have done in the first place. Communities will make voluntary agreements for trade and mutual protection, as the Confederacy will make with the United States and other countries. Such agreements could easily be more efficient than our present bureaucratic tangle of interstate regulations.

Can civilization survive without the Federal Courts to regulate every facet of our social life? I believe so.

LEFTISTS SHOW US HOW NOT TO DEAL WITH TOMORROW'S TERRORISM

Technology moves very fast. Those of us who are older carry around time capsules in our bodies. Most of us still have some of the old silver fillings in our mouths. And on our arm, all of us from my generation have a piece of yesterday -- a smallpox vaccination scar.

Everybody had to have them. As late as the 1970s, you had to prove you had had a fairly recent smallpox vaccination in order to travel into many countries. Now the only living smallpox viruses left are in a handful of laboratories.

Smallpox does not exist outside of a few laboratories. The World Health Organization has recommended that even those disease stocks be destroyed. Smallpox is probably the only disease that human effort has so far destroyed completely all over the world. But Europe got rid of leprosy almost as completely centuries ago.

You know all those movies you see where evil superstitious Europeans are forcing innocent lepers to live in their own places? This is usually presented as the old fashioned ignorant approach to such diseases.

But in the real world, it worked. Leprosy was made to disappear from Europe by isolating it. The reason WHO says the remaining smallpox virus should be destroyed is because of its potential use in biological warfare.

We are facing a large number of threats of this sort. We are trying to prevent nuclear proliferation, bacteriological warfare, and other types of mass terrorism. The only real answer is to take advantage of our advancing technology to spread the threatened population out. As I explained on March 6, 1999, in "How Tomorrow's Confederacy Will Deal With Tomorrow's Reality" the real solution to this is to use our technology to SPREAD OUT.

The ruling leftist policy is the exact opposite of this rational policy. We are told that the solution to our problem is to force Serbians into living as closely as possible to Albanians, blacks and whites must be mixed together in prescribed percentages for racial balance, and the like.

None of this is necessary for the PROFESSED liberal aims. Through computer technology and simple travel, we will in any case have more CULTURAL INTERACTION between different groups than we have ever had before. We don't have to be jammed together physically to have cultural interaction.

Like everything else liberals propose, forcing groups together won't work. Once again, we must do the opposite of what liberals propose. In a world where a single extremist can destroy a city, we will have to spread out, not integrate.

I have watched liberals for decades, and this is typical. Every day it becomes more possible for terrorists to kill everybody in a confined area. The liberal solution to this is to jam as many potentially hostile groups as closely together as possible.

Can you imagine that leftists would recommend anything else?

September 22, 2001 - FOR PROFESSIONAL CONSERVATIVES, AMERICAN LIVES ARE THE MOST EXPENDABLE

September 22, 2001 - FOR AMERICAN LIBERALS, AMERICAN SOLDIERS ARE THE MOST EXPENDABLE

FOR PROFESSIONAL CONSERVATIVES, AMERICAN LIVES ARE THE MOST EXPENDABLE

In this crisis as in all the others, one government spokesman after another lined up to tell the media that "our allies are behind us" (See April 14, 2001 -- THE "ALLIES" GAMBIT).

In this crisis as in all others, the backpedaling began almost immediately.

President Bush now tells us that, yes, our "allies" love us, but they do it in their own way. Each country will contribute what it wants to. Some will give money. Some will give information.

Americans will do most of the dying, of course.

Am I being cynical, or do I just listen more closely than others?

Listen to conservative spokesmen, and see if they do not seem to tacitly welcome our "allies" reticence. They want this crisis to be used to build up AMERICAN military expenditures. This has always been the case.

Throughout the Cold War American troops and American taxpayers took on the main burden of protecting Europe from Communists. Europe was many times as rich as the Communist countries and Europe had far more people than the United States did. But conservatives never seriously complained.

In fact, it was not until America had been bearing that European burden for a generation that a presidential candidate finally complained about it. That candidate was the most liberal major party candidate in American history, George McGovern.

McGovern wanted less money for military expenditures and more for liberal social engineering. He didn't care about America, he just cared about his liberal agenda.

But at least and at last he said SOMETHING.

If Europe had taken on more of its own defense, then America could have cut back on its Pentagon expenditures. That was the last thing professional conservatives wanted.

By exactly the same token, the more our "allies" come to America's aid, the less our Pentagon will have to do alone, and the lower those precious military outlays will be.

Conservatives will never push our "allies" to do their share.

So when it comes to making our allies do their part, conservatives certainly will not speak for America's interests.

And liberal foreign policy is NEVER concerned with America's national interests.

If we are aware what is driving the professional conservatives in Washington, this routine betrayal of our troops might be stopped this time before it goes too far.

FOR AMERICAN LIBERALS, AMERICAN SOLDIERS ARE THE MOST EXPENDABLE

During the Clinton Administration, all the generals lined up and said, one after another, that America's armed forces were in great shape and ready for war. They said that our great leader President Clinton was doing just fine by our troops.

Yes, Virginia, those were the same generals who lined up as soon as Bush was elected and talked about how the military had been robbed and ruined by the Clinton Administration. Once Bush was elected they told the public -- and the incoming President Bush -- that since the great times of President Bush Senior and the Gulf War, the military had been neglected and crippled.

But back to the Pentagon line during the Clinton Administration.

In 1999, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Colin Powell, took the lead in announcing what fine shape America's armed forces were in.

But when it came to fighting in the Balkans, as liberals wanted, Powell was dovish.

Powell was a great bureaucrat, and mouthed whatever line was in vogue whenever it was in vogue. Nobody in our day gets four stars without that willingness. But he also didn't want those forces out there being tested.

This reluctance on Powell's part infuriated those in the State Department who wanted war in the Balkans.

American policy in the Balkans was to force violently hostile ethnic groups in that area to be in the same country. This has been American policy since Abraham Lincoln, and Federal troops have been used regularly to enforce it inside the United States with racial integration and busing for racial balance.

President Clinton stated the purpose of the war he wanted to conduct in the Balkans: "We must remember the principle we and our allies have been fighting for in the Balkans is the principle of multi-ethnic, tolerant, inclusive democracy. We have been fighting against the idea that statehood must be based entirely on ethnicity."

Another great Pentagon bureaucrat, General Wesley Clark, stated this more specifically: "Let's not forget what the origin of the problem is. There is no place in modern Europe for ethnically pure states. That's a 19th century idea and we are trying to transition into the 21st century, and WE are going to do it with MULTI-ETHNIC STATES."(June 12, 1999 - BUSING BY BOMBER).

If it was good enough for Lincoln it was worth American blood in the Balkans. Liberals were infuriated with Powell's fear about what might happen to American troops if they got into a ground war in the Balkans.

Then Clinton's Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, finally blurted out what liberals were all thinking. In answer to Powell's dovishness, Clinton's Secretary of State said, "What good are these forces if we can't USE them."

In other words: "Why do we have all these people in uniform if we don't put them in harm's way?"

For those of us who value American lives, of course, the best reason for having a powerful military would be to PREVENT its having to be used. It's called a "Defense" Department. If you're strong enough you don't have to defend yourself.

But when we build up a big military, liberals and conservatives use it to get into disastrous places like the Balkans, the Middle East and Vietnam.

September 27, 2001 - HINT 1: WHAT THE MEDIA CALL "RELIGIOUS EXTREMISTS" ARE AMERICA'S HISTORIC ALLIES

September 27, 2001 - HINT 2: THE UNITED MEDIA MESSAGE IS "ALL THIS HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH ISRAEL"

September 27, 2001 - PROPAGANDA IS FOR SUBJECTS, NOT FOR CITIZENS

HINT 1: WHAT THE MEDIA CALL "RELIGIOUS EXTREMISTS" ARE AMERICA'S HISTORIC ALLIES

To liberals, the term "freedom of religion" means that one does not take religion seriously. If a Baptist says something bad about Catholics or vice versa, a liberal says he is against religious freedom.

In actual fact there is no religious freedom if you are prevented from making a PURELY RELIGIOUS STATEMENT, no matter how extreme it may be.

Americas' religious freedom is important precisely because we take our religion so seriously. It is the right of a Bob Jones to say all Catholics are going to Hell. It is the right of an American Catholic to say that there is no salvation outside his One True Church. See September 9, 2000 - THE UN DECIDES TO "USE" RELIGION.

For generations, the most steadfast allies America has had, both at home and abroad, have been the very people our media call "religious extremists." Almost the only people who denounced Joseph Stalin in the 1940s were Protestant fundamentalists and conservative Catholics.

This is also true of non-Christian resistance to our enemies.

After fifty years of armed victory, Soviet armies were finally stopped and almost destroyed in Afghanistan -- by religious extremists. Osama Bin Ladin gave up life as a billionaire businessman in Saudi Arabia. He went to Afghanistan and put his life on the line against those who were invading Moslem territory, which he looked upon as blasphemous. In that country all of the real anti-Communist fighters were "religious extremists."

The Buddhist Dali Lama is the symbol of resistance to Communism in Tibet.

As more than one conservative Jewish writer has pointed out, the media culture takes it for granted that the words "liberal" and "Jewish" are interchangeable. But even among Jews the group which is most deadly serious about its faith, the Hassidim, votes solidly conservative.

So now the line is that Bin Laden and his Islamic fundamentalist followers have no goal but the destruction of America. According to today's media line they want to come over here and destroy us because we are "free and rich and good."

Does that really make sense to anybody?

HINT 2: THE UNITED MEDIA MESSAGE IS "ALL THIS HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH ISRAEL"

For as long as I can remember, which means well over fifty years, when the term "Middle East" has been mentioned in the news it has been followed by the term "Arab-Israeli."

By a curious coincidence, our media are now united in declaring that the one thing that our present terrorist problems in the Middle East have nothing to do with is the term "Arab-Israeli."

The flagship of respectable conservatism, National Review, has a lead article assuring us that fundamentalists in the Arab camp just hate America for what WE are.

The fact that we backed a movement to take away Arab land and helped dispossess Arabs from what Islamic people chose to call THEIR land had nothing to do with it. No, the subject American media have considered almost interchangeable with the term "Middle East" now has absolutely nothing to do with all that hatred that is spewing at us from the Middle East.

So repeat after me: Whatever the cause of Arab hatred of America, it has nothing to do with Israel.

Usually the one thing that Americans agree on is the consistent falseness of the media line. In terms of their believability, the press is in the same category with used car salesman.

So what do we do when the chips are down and it is more important than ever to reject the line that the media -- for obvious reasons -- has chosen to push?

Why, we believe it of course! You'd better if you value your job and maybe even your life.

Guess what happens if you question the media line that Mideast terrorism has nothing to do with Israel? If you mention Israel as a cause of our troubles, you are anti-Semitic. That makes you anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

I have seen that label used thousands of times, and never yet has it been used for any purpose but to prevent someone from saying what we all know to be true.

In America, you can't yet jail somebody for saying something you decide to label "Nazi." You can ruin him professionally, but so far he can't be jailed for political heresy.

But you can actually imprison somebody for it in a country with Hate Laws. In Britain, the American Ambassador was asked if Middle East hatred of America was not due to our founding and support of the State of Israel. This put the American Ambassador in a bad position. If he addressed the subject, he would have to say that a great deal of that enmity has to do with Israel.

But the Ambassador found a way around that.

He stated crying. British officials apologized for letting a member of the audience ask that question, and the person who asked it may be charged under the British Hate Law.

As usual, when a propaganda line is being pushed this hard, we all know it is nonsense. Nobody is ever this desperate to suppress all opposition unless they know very well that everybody knows what they are saying is false.

PROPAGANDA IS FOR SUBJECTS, NOT FOR CITIZENS

Rulers use propaganda in time of war. But these same leaders had better not fall for their own propaganda or their country will be destroyed.

Propaganda is aimed at those whose only function is to obey. Their job is to be enthusiastic. It is not to make a rational decision about who is right and who is wrong, who is good and who is evil. You don't want those whose only job is to blindly obey to understand the enemy they are fighting.

In time of war, the subject whose only job is to follow orders needs no understanding of the enemy. In fact, a realistic view of the enemy is the last thing you want them to have. It is hard to hate anyone blindly if you understand him.

The opposite is true for those who must make decisions about the war. A leader who sees the whole situation can fight an enemy effectively ONLY if understands his foe. The more you have to do with strategy, the more realistic you must be about the other side.

Those who must make the decision should be the least susceptible to propaganda.

Should you and I be realistic about terrorists, or should we see them as purely anti-American, the way the media wants us to?

We have just answered that question. The answer is that, in a democracy where citizens want to be in on the decisions, citizens must be aware of any propaganda line and reject it.

October 5, 2001 - NETANYAHU BEGINS FIGHT FOR ISRAELI AGENDA

October 5, 2001 - BIN LADEN WAS BORN IN THE HOLY LAND

NETANYAHU BEGINS FIGHT FOR ISRAELI AGENDA

Shortly after the September 11 attack, former Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu made the round of American talk shows. He is, of course, an authority on Arab terrorism, but as a patriotic Israeli, he also has his agenda.

Naturally Netanyahu wants to use this crisis to get America even more involved on the side of Israel against the Palestinians. I explained how this agenda would be disastrous for America over the next few years. I also showed how it might be disastrous for Jews in the long run (WHAT MAY HAPPEN, Sept. 12).

Nothing is more critical right now than that we do not fall for the Israel Lobby's attempt to use this crisis for their purposes.

Netanyahu was portrayed on the talk shows not as a loyal Israeli, but purely as an expert on how to deal with terrorism. Instead of saying America should go get the Palestinians, he used code words. He said we must have "zero tolerance for terror" and then talked about how the Palestinians represented only terrorism.

Those who can't see through this are wasting their time reading Whitaker Online. I would suggest something more on their intellectual level, like "Dick and Jane Went To Town" or Mother Goose.

I explained last week that the media line right now is to insist loudly that our stand for Israel has nothing to do with the fact that we are now hated throughout the Arab world.

If you know how propaganda works, you know that this means the major reason Arabs hate America is probably because of Israel. We have been totally on the side of Israel since the founding of that country. In the week since I wrote that article, Arab countries have been telling the United States that our totally

one-sided support for Israel against the Palestinians is the basis of all that Middle Eastern hatred of America.

The old saying still applies, "One convinced against his will is of the same opinion still." Israel, with the American Empire behind it, has taken the ground Arabs called their own. To keep their oil and their international businesses, rich Arabs have generally accepted that, at least publicly. But private antipathy toward Israel and therefore the American Empire is universal over there.

If only some of them could realize that their real enemy is not America but the American Empire!

Even poor Arabs do not want anything from the United States except that we leave them alone. An old Southerner like me can understand that.

BIN LADEN WAS BORN IN THE HOLY LAND

Jerusalem with its Old Testament history is the third most important holy city of the Islamic faith. Mecca is the first, and for Moslems Saudi Arabia is the Holy Land. I have met many leftist Moslems who wanted revolution everywhere else, but opposed revolution in the very homeland of their religion.

It was a violation of his Holy Land that made Bin Laden our enemy.

Bin Laden did a great deal to battle the Communist invasion of Afghanistan. In that war he was America's ally.

The final straw in making Bin Laden our open enemy was when American troops who were not Moslem came into his Holy Land by the thousands. In other words, he believes that the Holy Land should belong to God's Chosen People.

Emma Lazarus, who invented the term "melting pot" as the purpose of America, believed exactly the same thing Bin Laden does. She too wanted a homeland for God's Chosen People. Emma Lazarus was a Zionist who declared that America was for everybody else, but there should be a homeland for Jews only.

The only difference between Emma Lazarus and Bin Laden is that she thought the Jews were God's Chosen people and he thinks Moslems are the Chosen People (October 31, 1998 -- FIVE WORDS AND EMMA LAZARUS).

Emma Lazarus agreed with Bin Laden. Every national fundamentalist spokesman I have heard so far agrees with both of them.

Every national "Christian" leader I have heard from demands that America be a melting pot. They are in the forefront of sponsoring, demanding and pushing interracial international adoptions to further that goal.

These "Christian" leaders also insist that the purpose of our American melting pot is to fight to preserve the State of Israel as the Holy Land for God's Chosen People the Jews.

Now comes the sick part. Unlike Lazarus and Bin Laden, these "leaders" do not believe the Chosen People are their own people or even those who share their faith.

When I state these obvious facts, I am attacked for being both anti-Christian and anti-American.

All that I am saying about fundamentalists is what I say about every other group: their national spokesmen are selling us out. That goes along with Whitaker's Law of National Spokesmen:

- 1) The media choose who will be the "national spokesmen" for any group.
- 2) The media will not give exposure to anyone who seriously challenges the basic media line.
- 3) If you spout the basic media line, you have to sell out America, white people and anything else a decent white gentile should have affection for.
- 4) Everybody's National Spokesmen must therefore sell them out.

I recently got a letter from a fundamentalist who said that religion and integration were the same thing to her. Since I did not agree with that, she accused me of being happy about all the nonwhites who were killed by the terrorists. She said she hoped I would find God.

In other words, if religion and integration were not the same thing to me, I was a bigot who wanted to kill women and children and I was unGodly.

Now for the clincher: This was NOT an angry letter. It was what such people consider a routine statement that they have right to make to me. I get similar ones regularly.

You see, these people have the right to attack my patriotism and my faith, but I have no right to question theirs.

Sorry, I won't play that game.

October 12, 2001 - HOLLYWOOD'S "GODFATHER" LIE: SUICIDE BOMBINGS ARE IDEALISTIC

October 12, 2001 - THE "SOUND OF MUSIC" LIE

October 12, 2001 - WHY THE "SOUND OF MUSIC" LIE IS SO IMPORTANT

NO LINKS

October 20, 2001 - THE BIG SECRET REVEALED: WHITES ARE UNIQUE ONLY IN *GOOD*** WAYS**

October 20, 2001 - "IT'S NOT ISRAEL" MEDIA BLITZ IS PAYING OFF

THE BIG SECRET REVEALED: WHITES ARE UNIQUE ONLY IN *GOOD*** WAYS**

Every race had slavery throughout its entire history.

No white ever captured blacks for the slave trade, as "Roots" says they did. It made no sense. Blacks were happy to sell other blacks into the hell of slave ships, and they did it very cheaply.

But whites did one thing that no other race ever did.

Whites FREED their slaves.

Whites did something ELSE that no other race ever did: they forced others to free THEIR slaves. Britain forced Kunte Kinte's homeland to free its slaves in 1905. If Kinte was as high a person as "Roots" claims, it is likely that his family owned slaves.

When the poor innocent "Native Americans" (the ones we pay reparations to) came to America, they did what every other people did when they came in: They slaughtered the locals and took their land (July 7, 2001 - SURPRISE, ****INDIANS** KILLED THE NATIVE AMERICANS! YES, WHAT WE CALL ****NATIVE AMERICANS**** KILLED THE REAL NATIVE AMERICANS)**)

The only thing whites did to the Indians that was unique was to provide reservations to the natives they were driving out. No other race ever did that.

Every nonwhite race either slaughtered or enslaved the locals when they moved into new land.

In Africa two thousand years ago, the ancestors of today's Hottentots occupied almost all of sub-Saharan Africa. This "Capoid" race occupied the continent all the way through Nigeria. Today Hottentots have been wiped out everywhere but in a tiny area of southern Africa.

Black Africans took Africa from the Hottentot race (the "Capoids") and slaughtered them. In other words, the poor, innocent blacks did the same thing in Africa that the Indians did in America.

These are the people whites are supposed to pay reparations to for colonialism and for slavery.

The only reason there are any Hottentots left today is because of the white Afrikaaners, the Boers. These whites moved into Africa just as the black Zulus were finishing off the Hottentots. This murdered race was being driven to the end of Africa, to be slaughtered as the others had been. But the whites who moved into Africa stopped the advance of the blacks and saved the remnant of this "Capoid" race from them.

Every race has routinely wiped out other races. Only whites ever SAVED one.

"IT'S NOT ISRAEL" MEDIA BLITZ IS PAYING OFF

Islamic fundamentalists are inward looking people. Normally they have no interest at all in people outside the Moslem world. In fact, the only time they show interest in Americans is when we do something that explodes inside the Moslem world.

For two generations, the full weight of American power and prestige has been thrown behind carving out a piece of Moslem land and turning it over to another religious group, the Jews.

It takes a truly moronic mindset to get people to overlook this painfully obvious fact.

Most Americans normally have no more interest in Middle East policy than Middle Easterners normally have in us. Exactly like Moslems in the Middle East relative to America, most Americans had no interest in the Middle East until the results of some Islamic attitudes literally exploded right in our own back yard.

Polls taken right after September 11 showed that most Americans were suddenly demanding that we reconsider our whole approach to Israel.

These polls were reported by Reuters news agency:
<http://www.reuters.co.il/news2000/N2S6IO60.HTM>

These polls were not mentioned in the American press.

After the terrorist acts, a majority of Americans wanted to have a whole new review of our enormous payments to Israel and those who are nice to Israel. That attack threatened to cause them to question our whole established routine. We routinely act as the guardians of Israel's borders while we refuse to police our own (September 9, 2000 - AIR DEFENSE FOR ISRAEL, BUT NOT THE US).

I described the unanimous media push to get everybody saying, "Well, all this is not because of Israel." (September 27, 2001 - HINT 2: THE UNITED MEDIA MESSAGE IS "ALL THIS HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH ISRAEL").

I have heard those words and others like them at least a hundred times on television in the last couple of weeks. All of the discussions talk about everything BUT Israel as the cause of Middle Eastern hatred of America.

Meanwhile, almost every Middle Eastern spokesman says it's mainly about Israel.

Suddenly we are told that Islamic fundamentalists just hate us because we're rich. We've been far richer than they are for centuries. In fact, it is only now that there is a fair number of rich Moslems, too.

But the religious people of Islam ignored America all that time.

Until the creation of Israel.

But it can't be Israel. So the media tell us Moslems just hate us because we are free.

We have always been freer than they were.

So it takes a true moron to drool and repeat, "Oh, it ain't Israel."

And since everybody knows the press lies all the time, a press blitz should have no effect on public opinion, right?

Wrong. The only poll of Americans on the issue -- reported abroad but not here -- showed that, before this "It's not Israel" blitz got underway, 68% of Americans said that the major cause of Middle Eastern hatred of this country was our generations-long one-sided support of Israel. A week later, that had dropped to 58%.

Now that this "It's not Israel" blitz has gone on for weeks, every regular conservative "expert" I talk to gives me that same wise old "Bob, I'm going to say something popular and idiotic" look and then pontificates: "Don't be Simplistic. It's a Complex Matter. It's not Israel. In fact, it's got nothing to do with Israel."

You don't see surveys of American popular opinion on this matter in the America media. That's because the propaganda machine still has a lot of work to do on the "It's not Israel" front.

58% of Americans are still not drooling and repeating "It's not Israel." Until they do the media's job is not done.

We will hear nothing about public opinion on Israel until it is exactly what the establishment wants it to be.

It will be. Soon everybody will be saying, "It's Simplistic to say this has anything to do with Israel. It has nothing to do with Israel."

Until then, you are going to hear nothing about Israel in discussions of the present crisis.

I know all about how you get the public to say what it's supposed to. I've been there WHERE they did it and I've been there WHILE they did it.

October 27, 2001 - A BILLION FOR THE BUREAUCRACY

October 27, 2001 - SELF HATE MAKES FOR A BASS ACKWARDS FOREIGN POLICY

October 27, 2001 - OUR RIGHT TO INTERFERE ABROAD EQUALS OUR INTERESTS ABROAD

A BILLION FOR THE BUREAUCRACY

September 11, 2001, was a critical time in our lives. I tried to make my columns for that day hit to the heart of our national crisis.

With this in mind, let me quote from AMERICA'S BUREAUCRACIES GET DEADLIER EVERY DAY from September 11, 2001:

"The CIA and FBI failed to give any indication that the World Trade Center attack was being planned. So Congress wants to increase the CIA and FBI budgets.

That is our response to everything, and it never works. More money will not improve bad performance."

"American security agencies are run by entrenched bureaucrats. It is the nature of that bureaucracy that is the problem."

So President Bush's answer to the present crisis will be to dump a billion dollars into that CIA-led Federal intelligence bureaucracy, as I predicted.

This is to be expected. Just as surely as liberals will dump money into the education-welfare bureaucracy without demanding any results, conservatives dump money into the defense bureaucracy and the intelligence bureaucracies in a spirit of blind faith and worship.

It is true that Bush has a nonconservative side. But that side includes his father. Papa Bush was one of the leading members of the intelligence bureaucracy.

What I predicted has come to pass.

I made another prediction that day in UNTIL WE FACE THE SIMPLE CAUSE, THE SITUATION WILL GET WORSE:

"For the KGB and other enemy agencies, a static bureaucracy like that in America's CIA and FBI is a sitting target. Over a period of seventy years, it took little talent to penetrate it wherever one wanted to. They got one Communist sympathizer in, and he got others in."

One piece of major news that got buried by the terrorist attacks was the fact that THE TOP DEFENSE DEPARTMENT SECURITY ANALYST ON CUBA IS BEING TRIED AS A COMMUNIST SPY. This man had access to every American secret, including the names of our agents in Cuba!

But things will have to get a lot more desperate before the blind worship of our intelligence bureaucracy comes to an end.

SELF HATE MAKES FOR A BASS ACKWARDS FOREIGN POLICY

Presently there is a lot of discussion of what kind of government we should impose on Afghanistan. Of course, no one uses the word "impose." But anyone who cannot make the connection is simply incapable of thought.

So we delayed air cover to Northern Alliance forces fighting the Taliban because the Northern Alliance is a coalition of Afghani minorities.

But the Northern Alliance is a coalition of AFGHANI minorities. We are foreigners. Why is it up to us to base our military strategy on imposing our ideal government on a foreign country? What gives us the right to do that?

I have no objection to our considering whether the Northern Alliance would best serve our national purposes. If it is not stable enough to be worth backing, that is another matter. But whether they are the PROPER government is, in my opinion, no business of ours.

Unless you are a colonial power, the only right we have to interfere in the affairs of other sovereign countries is where their actions directly affect you. Whether we think it is good or bad or democratic is not ours to dictate.

We are over there because they attacked us. That is our ONLY reason for being there. Unless you stick to your own interests, you become a colonialist.

OUR RIGHT TO INTERFERE ABROAD EQUALS OUR INTERESTS ABROAD

The State Department is notoriously leftist and so is the foreign policy establishment in general. And the basic tenet of American liberalism is American self-hatred. Many conservatives have pointed out the odd fact that American foreign policy is considered legitimate only if it does not serve American interests, but that is the inevitable result of its being based on self-hate.

So "blame America first" is one foundation of American policy planning. "Blame whites" is even more fundamental to the foreign policy of all white majority countries. A statement of morality in our age is incomplete if it doesn't include a condemnation of Americans and whites.

This leads to a truly bizarre idea of what "legitimate concerns" are for America abroad.

In the sane world, you have no right to interfere with what another country is doing unless it affects your own interests.

When the USSR insisted that Communism should be imposed on everybody, for their own good, they were generally considered to be wrong, even by other leftist countries. In fact, for one country to impose what it thinks is best on another has a name. It is called colonialism.

But if your foreign policy and your armed forces are not aimed at forcing them to do what you think is best for them, what must your foreign policy be based on? In other words, what is there in a foreign land that is really my business?

Liberals say my only legitimate business in other countries is doing what they consider best for those countries. The difference between that and outright imperialism is semantics, and tortured semantics at that.

The first thing liberals and respectable conservatives agree on is that our Middle Eastern policy should NEVER concentrate on the oil supply. In fact, the one charge liberals make about Middle East activities by the United States is that "It's all about oil."

As soon as liberals say "It's all about oil" conservatives go into their standard grovel.

But back in the world of sanity, oil is about the only reason we have any right to interfere in Middle Eastern affairs. Their oil is, in every sense of the word, our business. Nothing from that part of the world has the direct effect on us that the supply and price of oil does.

So everybody agrees that our policy there must be imposing what we think is best, not assuring our supply of oil. Yet if I put it in those words, liberals would deny it fiercely. They say that what they want to enforce is not imperialism. It is Goodness.

No imperialists, Communist or colonial, ever said anything else. All colonials and all totalitarians just want what is best for you.

But if you don't want to decide what is best for other countries and enforce it, there is only one other possible guide to go by. This is the same guide free societies use in everyday life. In a free society, as in a free world, your right to interfere is limited to your interests.

I normally have no right to force you to do anything unless what you are doing might harm me. That's the first rule of freedom. But if I hate myself, I cannot apply this rule. That is why people who hate

themselves are so often dangerous. Self-hatred is a mental illness which makes it impossible for people to deal with each other rationally.

The pathology of self-hatred is no healthier in international affairs.

November 3, 2001 - WHO SHOULD SPEAK OUT AGAINST TERRORISM?

November 3, 2001 - WHY SO MANY OLD HIPPIES ARE NOW FOR WAR

November 3, 2001 - TERRORISM BEGINS TO WORK AGAINST THE MELTING POT

WHO SHOULD SPEAK OUT AGAINST TERRORISM?

A popular line right now is that, while it is true that many Moslems do not support terrorism, Moslem leaders should denounce the killing of Americans more loudly.

Does this mean other groups might be asked to denounce THEIR terrorists?

For every white who does violence to a black person, twenty black people do violence to whites. But the only thing black leaders ever denounce is whites who are especially afraid of blacks. Being especially afraid of blacks is called "profiling" and Hate.

Six thousand Americans were killed by terrorists. Nonwhites have killed a lot more whites than that in the last decade.

It will be a long cold day in Hell before blacks denounce blacks who kill whites. Before respectable conservatives or liberals ask them to, there will a blizzard Down There.

WHY SO MANY OLD HIPPIES ARE NOW FOR WAR

All the commentators are glorying in the fact that most of the 1960s leftists who called themselves peaceniks are now for the war in Afghanistan. The guys who marched in the streets against the Vietnam War are now mostly in favor of this war.

Paid commentators and morons in general think this represents a change of attitude.

It does not. All it represents is a change of enemies.

The hippies of the 60s marched with Viet Cong flags and pictures of the Communist Vietnam leader Ho Chi Min. Jane Fonda said, "If you knew what Communism really was, you would fall to your knees and pray for it."

Liberals don't want that remembered now. They want everybody to agree those so-called "peaceniks" were actually for Peace. We are told that the hippies were just too sweet and loving to support a war.

Those sweet hippie types used to call American families and tell them falsely that their sons or husbands had been killed in Vietnam.

Love and Peace, brother!

The Love and Peace Generation routinely called American troops in Vietnam "paid killers". But no liberal wants to remember that so no respectable conservative will say it.

Old hippies are free to be for this war because the enemy is no longer the People's Loving and Democratic Republics to which they were and are loyal. They still love Castro with all their hearts, and if Castro were proved to be sponsoring terrorism, they would be on his side.

TERRORISM BEGINS TO WORK AGAINST THE MELTING POT

Suddenly everybody is starting to realize that open borders are dangerous. You and I have been pointing that out for years. But protecting our borders was considered to be racist, a move supported only by naziswhowanttokillsixmillionjews.

All the respectable conservatives and the liberals kept saying that Hispanic-Americans should be loyal to their fellow Hispanics across the border. They all agreed that Hispanics in California would never forgive white Californians for supporting Proposition 187, which took legal benefits away from illegal aliens.

Senator McCain has stated flatly that Hispanic-Americans should be loyal to Hispanics first:

-July 14, 2001 - THE FOUNDING FATHERS' PATRIOTISM IS MCAIN'S TREASON

-July 14, 2001 - NO LOYALTY TO THE AMERICAN ***PEOPLE*** WAS WHAT LINCOLN DEMANDED IN THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

- July 14, 2001 - ACCORDING TO ALL OF TODAY'S CONSERVATIVE SPOKESMEN, MCAIN IS RIGHT -- LOYALTY TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE IS TREASON TO TRUE AMERICANISM.

But now that foreign terrorists are killing Americans by the thousand those open borders don't look so wonderful.

Not only that, but the idea that non-Anglo-Saxon Americans owe their first loyalty to their native cultures is not so popular. The same people who were saying before September 11 that only anaziwhowanttokillsixmillionjews would ask a Hispanic to worry about the welfare of Americans over foreign Hispanics are now screaming for the blood of Arab-Americans whose loyalty is with the Arabs.

Melting pot advocates have been for open borders and they have denounced anybody who said a non-Anglo-American owed any loyalty to America over his native race and culture. Suddenly, what was absolutely right for Hispanics has become a no-no for Arab-Americans.

WOL and our readers have said from the get-go that both of these things are no-nos. If you were born in America but your loyalty lies in Mexico or Arabia or Israel, then you should be put on the next plane to your real country.

There is third foundation of the melting pot that is getting questioned since September 11. That is the idea that American society should be based on minority grudges.

A few years back a black man got on a New York commuter train with an automatic weapon, screamed anti-white epithets and shot a lot of whites. His leftist lawyers (William Kunstler's last case) tried to get

him off with a new doctrine called "black rage." A black, they argued, had the right to go nuts and kill whites because of his righteous resentments of the treatment of blacks by whites in America.

If they had won -- and in California they might have -- all blacks would have had a license to kill whites! This is slavery reparations carried to its logical extreme!

In "The Godfather" a gangster said, "We're bigger than US Steel." The white guilt industry in this country makes US Steel look puny. As just one example, it was the basis of the War on Poverty. For academics who want big grants and who dream of a world run by college professors, white guilt is a major instrument. In a world of guilt the sociologist would be king.

But since September 11 people with big grudges against society are not looking so attractive. Now the shooting license is being handed out to anyone with a grudge against anybody, not just white gentiles. That makes a society based on grudges a lot less attractive to the media and our rulers in general.

If the situation gets no worse, things will go back to normal on these issues. But if Superterrorism in the form of nuclear or bacteriological or chemical weapons hits, the melting pot may be on its way to ruin, as I predicted in two articles reprinted on September 11:

SUPERTERRORISM (originally published November 21, 1998) and LEFTISTS SHOW US HOW NOT TO DEAL WITH TOMORROW'S TERRORISM (originally published April 1, 2000)

November 10, 2001 - A MAN WITH A MEMORY LOOKS AT THE GULF WAR

November 10, 2001 - A MESSAGE TO RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES: APOLOGY IS NOT OPPOSITION

A MAN WITH A MEMORY LOOKS AT THE GULF WAR

No one has more contempt for the cowardice of Republican spokesmen than I have.

But because conservatives are abject cowards when they face actual liberals, I have often been reduced to what I have to do now: defending the Republicans I despise from obvious leftist hypocrisy. As usual I will do this by making a statement of simple facts that no cowardly respectable conservative would dare make.

Today every Democrat attacks Republicans by asking "Why didn't we take out Saddam Hussein when we had the chance?" They mean why didn't Bush's father, President GHW Bush, fail to go on to Baghdad and remove Saddam Hussein after we had won the Gulf War in 1991.

In 1991, American forces had driven the Iraqi army out of Kuwait and could have destroyed Saddam Hussein's remaining armed forces without much effort. So why didn't Bush Senior "take out Saddam Hussein?"

As the only man in America who has a memory I will tell you a big reason Bush Senior didn't "take out Hussein" in 1991. That reason was the Democrats who are doing all the shouting now.

I am the only American who remembers the weeks before the Gulf War began in 1991. Only I remember that back then the national press had one main topic, like the terrorist attacks are the only main topic now. That topic was, "Should America go to war with Iraq, or should it give nonviolent sanctions more time to work?"

At that time, the then-President GHW Bush said he would go into Iraq with or without congressional approval. But the great debate went on in congress anyway.

Republicans put in a bill to support President Bush's taking military action. The Democratic leadership was solidly against it, Republicans and moderate Democrats were solidly for it. The debate was dramatic and all over the media in the weeks before the Gulf War began.

Guess what the main point that the Democratic opposition made against going into battle against Iraq was? Guess what was the one point they hammered on day after day, headline after headline, with the entire nation watching and talking about it?

Their one big argument was that, if they gave him the power, Bush would not just throw the Iraqis out of occupied Kuwait. They said that Bush would use those powers to go to Baghdad and overthrow Saddam Hussein.

Republicans promised, day in and day out, that they would not under any circumstances use the power congressional sanction would give them to "take out" Saddam Hussein. President GHW Bush assured the Democrats that he had no intention of "taking out" Saddam Hussein.

A quarter of a billion Americans heard that debate in the media and everywhere else, and not one of them remembers a word of it except me.

But today when Democrat after Democrat demands to know why Bush's father didn't "take out" Saddam Hussein the fact that they were fanatically opposed to the idea in 1991 has not been mentioned by a single respectable conservative spokesman.

It still hasn't.

A MESSAGE TO RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES: APOLOGY IS NOT OPPOSITION

Republicans are so pathetic. When liberals attack them they only know how to whine about how that they are not whatever it is the left has decided to call them, which is usually some kind of naziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

After the whine, conservatives say that whatever it is the liberals are for, they are even more for it.

Liberals accuse Republicans of being against changing the population of America by massive immigration. Conservatives respond that they want to change the American population by massive immigration. Conservatives tell liberals that their "conservative" capitalist approach will use greed to bring in and integrate more waves of third worlders than the liberal programs will.

With all their money and media access, Republicans simply cannot truly oppose liberals. Even when liberal criticism is pure hypocrisy, respectable conservatives cannot look liberals in the eye and call them on it.

That is why they are labeled "respectable" by the media. "Respectable" means "harmless to the long-term liberal agenda".

For decades liberals declared that "so-called criminals" were actually just people oppressed by Society. As the 1964 leftist film starring Anthony Perkins put it in the title, "We are All Guilty." Self-hate is the basis of all leftism.

As liberals took over America in the 1960s crime went through the roof. One of the things that caused a nationwide reaction against the left was their love of criminals. Leftists said if you treat felons nicely they won't commit crime.

Coddling criminals was a disaster. No idea that is fashionable with the left ever WORKS.

Even so, Republicans did not want to make a big thing of crime because liberals said that the crime issue was just a front for racism. Everybody knows how high the black crime rate is, so to mention crime was what we now call profiling and they used to call racism. Either way it means anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

In the early 1970s a group of leftist women featuring Bella Abzug called together their pet media and announced that they were the Women's Movement. So everybody left and right said that women's rights were now represented by this solidly leftist "Women's Movement."

One of the main things this Women's Movement was screaming about was the enormous increase in the number of rapes in the 1960s. Every woman standing there was a lifelong liberal. Every woman standing there, until the moment they announced the Women's' Movement, had been a best friend to rapists and other felons.

Until that moment these women had called rapists victims of society, and they had pushed Eldridge Cleaver's book that encouraged blacks to rape white women as a legitimate expression of black rage.

No conservative ever mentioned any of this. They went into their usual fetal position and whined they were not really against women the way the Women's Movement claimed they were. They said they were more for whatever the left was for than the left was.

The fact that until the day they became leaders of the Women's' Movement its leaders had been on the side of the rapists was never mentioned by a single respectable conservative.

It still hasn't.

November 17, 2001 - THE ONLY REAL CHOICE IS BETWEEN NATIONAL SELF-INTEREST AND COLONIALISM

November 17, 2001 - IN LIKE A LION...

November 17, 2001 - THE ONLY REAL CHOICE IS PEACE OR WAR

November 20, 2001 - THE WAR AFTER THAT

November 20, 2001 - HOW ABOUT A RUSSIAN NON-WAR?

THE ONLY REAL CHOICE IS BETWEEN NATIONAL SELF-INTEREST AND COLONIALISM

Too many people insist that American foreign policy should sacrifice our own interests for the interests of others. That sounds too sweet to be wrong.

But there is a murderous Catch-22 that comes in when you decide to forget your own interests and devote your foreign policy to the interests of others.

In order to pursue the interests of other people, you have to decide what their interests really are. When you start deciding what the true interests of a foreign country are, you have switched into an imperialist mentality.

Leftist thinking does not consider this because leftism is always colonial. Leftists talk about self-determination and freedom but they don't mean a word of it. In fact, they don't understand that freedom means that you are free to go one's own way, even if leftists think that way is bad for you.

Besides, the whole basis of American liberalism is self-hatred on the part of Americans and especially of white people. A foreign policy based on national self-interest would be a complete impossibility for our leftist foreign policy establishment even to understand.

In order to allow other nations to exist, you have to be a nationalist yourself. The instant you go beyond your national self-interest in actions abroad, you begin being an imperialist.

IN LIKE A LION...

National self-interest is the only basis of a moral, non-imperialistic foreign policy. It is also the one approach that foreigners can understand and sympathize with.

A foreign policy based on anything but national self-interest is colonialist because you have no right to decide what is in anybody's best interests but your own. Your only legitimate business is literally your own business.

More important, a foreign policy based on anything but self-interest becomes suicidal. That is the real lesson of Vietnam. No one could understand exactly why we were there. So instead of deciding to either fight a war or get out, we fought half a war in Vietnam.

I think one thing we should agree on here is that you can be pro-war or you can be antiwar, but no rational person can support half a war.

The only reason we should be in Afghanistan is because they helped kill six thousand Americans. On that basis we have to decide whether to hit back with everything we have or to stay out.

In other words, America must either forgive and forget or come out like a raging lion. Anything in between leads straight to a Vietnam.

Right after the September 11 attack, the world realized that the only remaining superpower had the right to be a raging lion. A smaller attack at Pearl Harbor had led to our only atomic war.

So how would President George Bush the Younger react? Would he react like Clinton and say American history shows we are just terrorists ourselves?

Would George Bush Junior be an unapologetic pro-American like Reagan?

Or would George W. Bush try to be like his father and say he was "gentler and kinder" than that awful Reagan had been?

He came out like a lion. On September 11 President George W. Bush told the world that you were either with us or you were on the side of the terrorists.

The lion roared and the world went along unanimously. Everybody wanted to get out of the line of fire. Even Iran and Iraq were chilled to the bone at the idea of an America with whom all bets were off.

Everybody understood it when the United States reacted like a wounded lion. Like it or not, everybody knew where we were coming from. We were coming out like a superpower that had had six thousand of its people murdered. There was no self-hatred here.

Then it became business as usual. Bush began to tell others that they could do as much or as little as they chose. We dithered over supporting our enemy's enemies in Afghanistan because they might not form the sort of government that would be good for Afghanistan.

So our new "allies" began to dither.

Finally we dropped the "what's good for Afghanistan" nonsense and helped the Northern Alliance go ahead and defeat our enemy.

The lesson is that you must never go to war at all unless you are ready to be a lion.

THE ONLY REAL CHOICE IS PEACE OR WAR

I think the way my readers do. The mission of Whitaker Online is do the intellectual spadework of digging out, in depth, the basic mistakes that America is making.

To us, our approach is simple sanity, but in our "1984" style world, simple sanity takes a lot of explaining. This is hard and frustrating work.

Our present situation is a good example. You understand where I am coming from, but what I say is very confusing to most people today.

Here I am demanding absolute militancy. Yet no one has expressed more doubts about how we got into this situation or more fear about where it could go than I have.

So I am clearly not with those who consider our total pro-Israeli foreign policy a holy cause. So I don't want an all-out war in the Middle East for Israel. I am called anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews because I refuse to hate all of Israel's enemies blindly

No one has expressed more doubts and fears about this war than I have. So when it comes to the hawks versus the doves, shouldn't I be somewhere between a hawk and a dove? On the contrary, I just wrote an article demanding that Bush be not just a hawk but a lion!

Most of my readers have no problem with this.

Sergeant York, a Christian from Tennessee, had a long struggle with his conscience over whether he should fight in World War I or be a conscientious objector. But when he did decide to fight he became the most decorated American soldier in that war. You and I understand that, but it is very confusing for the people who got us into Vietnam.

To the people who got us into Vietnam, war is a two-dimensional line from dove to hawk. You can be for war, you can be for peace, or you can be somewhere in between. So in Vietnam, America fought a respectable war, a moderate war, a war based on compromise.

This is not the way the world looks in the eyes of sanity. To us war is not a compromise situation and soldier's lives are not chess pieces.

There is hawk and there is dove and then there are TWO positions between hawk and dove. A person who wants to fight half a war is between a hawk and a dove. He is also insane.

But you can have a hard time deciding between peace and war because you understand that being for war means going all the way. It is hard choice not because it is such a clear choice.

The other position is one that sane people understand the way that Sergeant York did. To a sane person the only choice is between no action or a real war.

When you don't face that real choice, you get Vietnams.

THE WAR AFTER THAT

Respectable conservatives love to call people "Nazis" but they are the ones who want a militarized America. When they talk about war, you can almost see them drool. They just love the idea of Americans getting killed.

One conservative commentator after another licks his lips and talks about going after Iraq next.

The theory is that if Saddam Hussein stays in power he will get atomic weapons and other means for Superterrorism. Plenty of people have plenty of opinions on this and I can't add much to what you already know.

What concerns me is the whole idea of an endless war against terror.

Republicans love to call people naziswhowantotkillsixmillionjews, but they keep adopting Hitlerian terminology. Hitler talked about his New Order and Bush Senior talked about his New World Order. Hitler talked about a Thousand Year Reich and now Bush Junior is talking about an unending war against terror.

Huey Long, who knew all about demagoguery, once pointed out that, "Fascism will come to America in the name of anti-Fascism." The best excuse for terror is to say that you are preventing terror.

There is nothing new about this insight. Anybody who knows political history is aware of how one horror is always justified in the name of preventing another horror. When Communists justify their police state, they say they are "stopping the fascists." When fascists round up people it is always in the name of fighting Communism.

After beating Afghanistan and Iraq, Americans would be flushed with victory and looking for the next war.

That war is likely to be against the Palestinians. After two major victories, no one could stop conservative bloodlust and the Israeli lobby from going overboard. It would be like trying to stop a train with your bare hands. A war bandwagon like that would be a sure formula for disaster. Let me repeat here what might happen (originally published September 12, 2001):

WHAT MAY HAPPEN

September 12, 2001

- 1) Because of the attack on America, the United States has a chance to really move into the Middle East on the side of Israel.
- 2) We now have the combination of the Israeli lobby and a state of war.
- 3) With support from everybody, the US goes into the Middle East big time.
- 4) The US, pushed by the Israeli lobby, fundamentalist "Christians" and Israel-hawk liberals, goes absolutely nuts in the Middle East.
- 5) As in Vietnam, our "allies" desert us sometime next year.
- 6) The US goes it alone, getting in deeper and deeper.
- 7) As the ruin mounts up from loss of oil and -- less important, the deaths of Americans -- an anti-Semitic reaction grows.
- 8) In the 1960s, the media and antiwar advocates became more and more openly pro-Communist. As our economic collapse grows and real anti-Semitism grows in the US, swastikas begin to go on the streets.
- 9) People like me begin to scream "nazihowantstokillsixmillionjews," because by now it's a real threat. But leftists have screamed that "wolf" too often in the past.
- 10) a new Holocaust begins.

And don't buy the lie that a multiracial country cannot be violently anti-Semitic. Multicultural countries cannot unite on what they are FOR, but it is easy for different groups to join in a common HATE. September 11 should convince us of that.

HOW ABOUT A RUSSIAN NON-WAR?

All the commentators are trying to out-macho each other by being war heroes by proxy. Conservatives have gone nuts at the prospect of lots of Americans in combat.

Now Geraldo Rivera has become a war correspondent.

Since the Afghan cities fell the big buzz is about how "We are going to go in and get the Taliban" in their mountain caves.

It sounds like a silly question, but I would like to ask it: "Why?"

Our heat-seeking weapons can locate Al Queda troops when they light a fire for warmth. They can be pinned down when they try to move day or night. Their supplies, even if anyone tries to bring them in, will be destroyed.

Just as I am about the only anti-liberal commentator who does not claim to speak for God all the time, I am also the only one who does not claim to be a military expert. But it seems to me we might take a leaf out of the book of the Russians who defeated Napoleon.

As you know, Russia destroyed Napoleon's army after it reached Moscow by doing nothing. They destroyed all his potential supplies and fell back. Time and the Russian winter did the rest.

Can't we isolate and destroy the Taliban remnants just by using the fact that time and air power are on our side?

November 24, 2001 - RACE: DON'T GET OBSESSED WITH IQ

November 24, 2001 - IQ TELLS US LITTLE ABOUT DIFFERENCES IN RACIAL HISTORY

November 24, 2001 - AS A MATTER OF FACT, RACE MAY BE ABOUT SKIN COLOR

November 24, 2001 - TURNING THE OLD THEORIES AROUND

RACE: DON'T GET OBSESSED WITH IQ

By now almost everybody, including many Jews, have been labeled naziswhowanttokillsixmillionjews.

One of the Jews who was labeled anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews was the co-author of The Bell Curve, Harvard professor Richard Herrnstein. The Bell Curve talks about the importance of innate racial IQ differences so liberals said it was just part of an Evil Racist Plot to get money.

This is unlikely in Herrnstein's case.

Herrnstein was at Harvard, where talking about inborn IQ differences between races is pure heresy. All The Bell Curve could get him was fired.

Worse, Herrnstein was dying of cancer while the book was written. A person with a terminal illness is seldom an Evil Opportunist.

So we are left with three choices, 1) Herrnstein was just doing the book to get paid by the right-wing conspiracy, 2) he, a Jew, was anaziwhoantedtokillsixmillionjews or 3) he was an honest man making an honest point.

Liberals insist on 1) or 2).

To deal with The Bell Curve, liberal psychologists are called in to disparage IQ tests and say that they mean nothing when applied to race. This sounds good because everybody knows IQ tests are psychological tests and it makes the psychologists sound like they're being modest.

That's not the point. IQ tests may be as bad as liberal psychologists get paid to say they are. But even a poor dumb psychologist's test can tell whether a person is smart or dull.

IQ tests are not all that good but basic intelligence is too obvious to miss when you are dealing with large numbers of people. It is not demonstrated on the tests because the tests are good but because, if you go into the real details of the test, consistent results are simply undeniable.

That is what Herrnstein used hundreds of pages to demonstrate -- again. It is what his fellow Harvard professor Arthur Jensen has demonstrated repeatedly.

But while liberals have tried to say IQ tests are too rough to be valid, those on the side of Jensen and Herrnstein have gone overboard in the opposite direction. They have erected IQ into something very like a god, a piece of perfection which tells the whole truth.

IQ TELLS US LITTLE ABOUT DIFFERENCES IN RACIAL HISTORY

Japan recently went right up to the economic level reached in the West, and Japan is now stagnating.

Throughout history, Mongoloids have reached a certain level and then stagnated. Japan did it quicker because history moves faster today.

I discussed this point on July 7, 2001 -- THE WHEEL IS NOT A PRIMITIVE INVENTION. My opinion is that without the white race, humanity will stagnate and fall back.

White empires only go down when they turn brown.

Leftists, who never get anything right, assure us all this is naïve, unsophisticated and everything else they say about things that turn out later to be right. They demand that respectable conservatives agree with them or they will not be respectable.

Respectable conservatives agree with liberals on this, as they do on everything liberals insist on.

IQ-obsessed people whom liberals call racists also agree with this. They say that Mongoloids have high IQs so you don't need whites.

I don't agree because that is not the way the world looks to me. In the end, everybody bases his worldview on how things look to him no matter how much time he spends marshaling his facts to prove it.

AS A MATTER OF FACT, RACE MAY BE ABOUT SKIN COLOR

"Third World" is the code word for "colored" and we all know it.

There is a rich white world and a poor colored world. Every year thousands of academics are paid billions of dollars to pour out rivers of ink arguing that this is an accident.

I seriously doubt that deep down they or anybody else really believes this.

Meanwhile back on earth the color line is the line which divides lands that are high in infant mortality, hunger, disease, and poverty from the opposite. People of color all over the world are desperately trying to get into countries which have white-skinned majorities.

The only countries today that are both white and poor are those which until recently were Communist. That is to say that the only countries today that are white and poor were ruled by those same Leftist Intellectuals who now insist the color of the Third World is an accident.

Oddly enough, both liberals and the IQ-obsessed people liberals call racists agree that skin color means nothing. The Jensen-Herrnstein worshippers say that the color of the skin is really something that happens to overlap with IQ. They all agree that skin color is just superficial, and that something Deeper and More Profound is involved.

Meanwhile, I see a world in which reality is divided by skin color.

I suggest that what you see may well be what you get, which is why we have eyes in the first place.

White people do not have black skins and sickle cells in their blood as a defense against malaria as do blacks.

White people do not have the epicanthic eye folds that Mongoloids have. These are the eye folds that make their eyes look "squinted" -- "slant-eyed" -- to outsiders.

What whites do have is decoration. Whites have blond and red hair and different eye colors, which helped them compete with each other for mates. Unlike other races, whites developed less to compete with the environment and more to compete with each other.

I think that a race is white because it takes the climatic high ground. Other races developed to deal with extreme cold (Mongoloid) and extreme heat (the black races).

TURNING THE OLD THEORIES AROUND

Historically, people have tried to explain the accomplishments of white people as being unrelated to skin color. They have tried to explain how the northern climate forced whites to accomplish things.

But in the world before air conditioning, Northern Europe was the most desirable ground on earth. Wave after wave of invasions have tried to take Europe even within the years of written history.

Wave after wave of ever whiter people succeeded in taking and settling Northern Europe.

There are two ways animals and people survive. In the case of Eskimos, they were stopped from moving south into warmer and more desirable lands by the American Indians who were already to the south of them. To survive, they had to adapt to live on the Arctic ice.

There are other groups, like the Indians themselves, who took and held desirable land -- until whites got there.

Some animals, like buzzards, find niches to live in that others have not adapted to. But others like the lion take the ideal places at the top of the food chain.

Like supply and demand and other now-obvious rules of life, the facts of race and history may be so simple that we have overlooked them. Wave after wave of people took the most desirable territory. They therefore look like the people who took the most desirable places.

Finally, the race that conquered the genetic high ground conquered the rest of the world and science and went on instead of stagnating. Looking at history from a distance, this is, like most rules that work, predictable with common sense.

It should be understood that this is not my reason for opposing the idea of letting the entire white world be overrun by the third world. Each race has a moral right to exist. If you say that about any other race it is simple decency, but if you say it about whites you are anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews.

All I am offering here is a possible explanation of why "third world" is a code word for "colored." In the real world "It's all an accident" won't cut it.

December 1, 2001 - WHY ARE GAS PRICES DROPPING?

December 1, 2001 - RUSSIAN OIL - A WORLD-CHANGING FACTOR?

December 1, 2001 - "R-E-S-P-E-C-T!!!"

December 1, 2001 - TURNING THE OLD THEORIES AROUND

WHY ARE GAS PRICES DROPPING?

Despite a war right beside the world source of petroleum, gasoline prices have been dropping. With their usual uncanny ability to miss the point, our ruling "intellectuals" and their commentators tell us it is only because of the business downturn.

That's part of it, but unrest in the Middle East should lead to a situation where you are lucky if oil prices don't skyrocket even in a recession.

It looks like something is pushing the price down. It could be that our beloved "allies" in OPEC want to show their support for the American offensive against terrorists.

Or maybe Bush is being firm for American interests behind the scenes. Maybe they are firm about oil prices. I hope so, but I have my doubts.

It is unusual for the American government to do anything but wobble on American interests IN PUBLIC. So the idea of anything being done privately in that direction is hard for me to credit.

I was in on negotiations by the US Government over the years, and those apparent sellouts you see out in the open are just indicators of how this government acts in private. Nonetheless, I live in hope.

RUSSIAN OIL - A WORLD-CHANGING FACTOR?

The one country outside of OPEC that has huge reserves of oil is Russia. And Russia is not playing ball. It wants all those markets that OPEC countries are cutting off.

The Putin regime represents a whole new day in Russia. Russian oil is now considered a stable resource. Gangsters no longer control everything in Russia, and they are beginning to move.

Russians have a different attitude from that of the OPEC countries. It is a racist attitude.

Liberals and respectable conservatives like to say that there is a racist attitude behind most thinking in our white-non-white world, but they forbid anybody to go into this logic in detail. Only an evil person would talk openly about the attitudes people have on race and where those attitudes lead.

Only a person who does not care how what he says may sound would go into this, a really uncaring, indecent individual.

So I'll do it.

In their true attitudes, non-whites are every bit as white supremacist as whites are. If you tell an NAACP official that blacks will eventually rise to a level equal with whites on their own, he will talk about centuries of oppression, but he is thinking exactly what any other white supremacist is thinking: "No way blacks can do that, ever!"

The OPEC countries do not want to sell their oil and use the capital to build a modern economy because they do not believe their brown people will ever be able to do it. OPEC is dedicated to the idea that that oil is the only resource the OPEC countries will ever have, so it must be maximized while it lasts, not used for a fast capital buildup.

Putin sees Russian oil as something that will even up the odds that generations of rule by Leftist Intellectuals stacked against Eastern Europe. For what he sees for his superior white people he sees a great future if they can get the capital and the beginning of a boom like that in post-World War II Germany.

Because of the racist attitudes that underlie all present-day thinking, OPEC countries consider oil the only resources their people will ever have, while Russia considers its oil as a means to get Russia started after the Leftist Intellectuals destroyed the Russian economic miracle that was under way in 1913.

The resulting drop in oil prices may be so enormous and consistent that even paid commentators will notice it in a decade or so.

"R-E-S-P-E-C-T!!!"

I always used to hear from professional dealers with the USSR that Russia's "leaders" desired acceptance by the West. I have a seasoned distrust of any theory establishment experts come up with.

But then Pat Buchanan and some of my old buddies from DC went to the USSR in the 1970s, and he and my buddies told me exactly the same thing. These are not experts the establishment trusts, and these were not State Department flacks.

The previous article pointed out that the real attitudes of non-white leaders on race are, deep down, exactly the same as that of white leaders. They are all in the same intellectual climate.

When I realized that the Soviets really did want our respect, I saw that their attitude toward themselves was, deep down, much the same as that of Western leaders. They realized that their regime was a bunch of silly nonsense cooked up and pushed by Leftist Intellectuals that could never work. Everybody kept a straight face and obeyed because they had a bunch of gangsters forcing them to.

I got the word "gangsters" from Solzhenitsyn, who lived under the rule of these Leftist Intellectuals in the Peace-Loving People's Republics. And all Communist countries build walls to keep their people in because they knew their system didn't work.

You can sell this bilge on an American campus where a bunch of kids are exposed to Mommy Professor who tells them that college professors should rule the world. But, as Solzhenitsyn pointed out, nobody who was actually there took this nonsense seriously.

Hence the walls.

This included the Soviet rulers. They ached to be seen as something other than what they knew very well that they were -- fifth rate bureaucrats who toed the line.

Today Putin is getting that ever-wish-for Western recognition because he deserves it. He is not a Venezuelan or a Middle Eastern potentate getting rich for the time being before his country loses the oil advantage and slides back into poverty.

We deal with the Venezuelans and oil-rich Arabs. But we despise them and they know it.

But Russians seem to know that Putin is earning them a place in the mainstream of first world society, and his popularity is out of sight.

December 7, 2001 - AS SERIOUS AS...

December 7, 2001 - BUT THERE IS ANOTHER MESSAGE HERE

December 7, 2001 - THE FOUR MOST HIDEOUS WORDS IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

December 7, 2001 - PAIN MATTERS. PAIN MATTERS A LOT

December 7, 2001 - OUR BREEDING POLICY IS EVIL, WHATEVER EXCUSE YOU USE

AS SERIOUS AS...

I had a heart attack this week, but don't worry (or in some cases, don't get your hopes up). I am healthy as a horse and almost as smart.

For over a decade I have done heavy workouts and kept my weight down. Just a few weeks ago I had a complete physical and, as usual, the doctor complimented me on what amazingly good shape I'm in, especially my blood pressure and cholesterol level.

I have family history of heart trouble. But when I got really awful pain in my left arm during my heavy hour-long exercise session, I went right on. I thought it must just be arthritis or something, because it couldn't be my heart, not with my excellent tests and my excellent health regimen.

So first of all there is a personal lesson here. Keep your family medical history in mind. They can't tell whether you are having this inherited blockage that I had without actually putting the catheter into your heart to find out.

By the way, this catheterization procedure is a completely painless procedure with the drugs they give you.

BUT THERE IS ANOTHER MESSAGE HERE

With me the personal message is not ever the whole story. Everything has a lesson for me in terms of my worldview. That's why it's a worldview.

I did what all the authorities and experts told me to do -- exercise, diet and so forth.

But I ignored heredity, so I ended up in an Emergency Services truck with the siren blasting.

I think the world is headed for a ride in that truck, and for much the same reason.

All the education programs, social action, Family Values, Bible Studies, prayers in school and social science programs in the world, everything all the experts advise, cannot make up for the fact that we are BREEDING humanity to be ugly, retarded and mongrelized.

We have a BREEDING POLICY that is as definite as Adolf Hitler's. Pro-lifers and liberals agree that all the children should be born in the slums of Delhi and other third world swamps. White countries should be overrun and sterile.

I am putting this in plain English, which is a definite no-no, but we all know it's true.

Whether you are a pro-lifer or a Liberal Intellectual (AKA academic bureaucrat) you know very well that this is what is going on. It is an evil policy, no matter how many professional moralists embrace it.

THE FOUR MOST HIDEOUS WORDS IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

For centuries Catholics tortured and killed Protestants and Protestants tortured and killed Catholics. Today's terrorism is a continuation of a very old tradition.

To a person who truly believes in Heaven and Hell -- and I see no reason to call oneself a Christian if you don't -- temporary agony in this world is literally nothing compared to the eternal joy of Heaven and the eternal pain of Hell. If you are not very, very, VERY careful it is a very short jump from there to the Inquisition and terrorism.

It is precisely those who believe most sincerely who must always be aware of this threat. If you believe in heaven and hell it is easy to think that you cannot spare the body in saving the soul. That same insanity can be expressed in the four most horrible words that can be uttered, the basis of most real torture and horror in the real world:

Not sparing the body for the sake of the soul is not cruelty. It is Mercy. Inflicting agony and death to save a person's soul is done FOR HIS OWN GOOD.

A person who is not clinically insane has to show some decency unless he uses those four words:

"FOR YOUR OWN GOOD"

There is nothing theoretical about this.

History is full of examples where sane dedicated people did things to others that would make a sadist cringe. In every case they did it under the banner of THOSE FOUR WORDS.

PAIN MATTERS. PAIN MATTERS A LOT

People keep telling me that life IN THIS WORLD is infinitely precious.

I think they're out of their tiny little minds.

They tell me the Bible says that.

I KNOW they're out of their tiny little minds.

There is always a great danger that a person who believes in Heaven and Hell will go into torture and murder FOR YOUR OWN GOOD.

By the same token, one who is fighting abortion easily jumps the tracks in a similar insanity, the idea that a beating heart is everything, and human feelings mean nothing.

The Golden Rule, the one Great Commandment Jesus Christ himself gave us for dealing with others, says the opposite. It does not tell us to keep that heart pumping no matter how much it hurts. Life in this world is definitely not Jesus's focus.

Yet I have argued with a Catholic priest who told me that we must thank God for every moment of agony our loved ones go through on the way to death, because life is God's most precious gift. He told me that is official church doctrine. Pro-life Protestants have told me exactly the same thing, if you clear away all the verbiage they use to cover it.

I think they have let their politics turn them into dangerous nut cases.

As I lay there in agony, I did not fear death. I did not fear death at all. What I did want was an end to the pain.

So while others are quoting obscure parts of the Old Testament to show I should appreciate that pain and pass it on to others, the Golden Rule tells me it is not, to say the very, very least, some kind of BLESSING.

OUR BREEDING POLICY IS EVIL, WHATEVER EXCUSE YOU USE

Filling the world with helpless, ugly mongrels may be good propaganda against the Quality of Life slogans of the abortionists. But the abortionist leftists have the same goal. Today's pro-life breeding policy is the same as the leftist breeding policy.

I would far rather die than be born into the world pro-lifers and liberals are fighting for. The Golden Rule makes me an enemy of that evil policy.

And don't tell me how unreligious all this is. I am ready to face judgment on what I truly believe, and I just came close to doing so.

Are those of you who use the name of Christ or Social Progress to justify our sadistic breeding program really ready to answer for it?

December 14, 2001 - HITLER WROTE THE CONSTITUTION!!!!!!!!!!

December 14, 2001 - SOMETIMES THE WORST POSSIBLE ATTITUDE IS GRATITUDE

HITLER WROTE THE CONSTITUTION!!!!!!!!!!

Those who say that America is a "melting pot" and "a nation of immigrants" have a very special idea of what American Patriotism is. An Op-ed writer recently explained this idea of "patriotism" perfectly: He said:

"My blood is patriotic, not for a place or a people (that's nationalism) , but for a constitutional order that my nation represents."

So for the true advocate of a "nation of immigrants" and a "melting pot," any loyalty or feeling toward a particular land or people is evil because it is nationalism.

I think we have all been warned enough times about people accused of "nationalism." They are really naziswhowanttokillsixmillionjews, and that is what the Op-ed writer is saying here.

I have heard some version of "anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews" stated at least ten thousand times in my lifetime, and you have heard it thousands of times even if you're much younger.

The Op-ed writer is not saying that people who express loyalty to their people or their country are OUTRIGHT Nazis. Quite the opposite. This kind of Nazism is more dangerous than the outright kind.

To "melting potters," American Patriotism means dedication to the proposition that all men are created equal. Treason is preferring the American people over another in any way or saying that Americans are

in any way special. So you can tell someone has a treasonous, Nazi attitude, not by his shouting "Sieg heil!" but by his making statements about how loyal he is to Americans as a people.

In fact, I can show you the exact words this kind of Nazi would use if he were writing an American Constitution. He would not start with "all men are created equal." Instead he would say that "We the people of the United States of America" were writing this Constitution. This Hitlerite would wind up saying that this Constitution was not written for All Mankind, but for "Ourselves and Our Posterity."

If you see any words like that, you know Hitler probably wrote them himself.

SOMETIMES THE WORST POSSIBLE ATTITUDE IS GRATITUDE

"He who would sup with the Devil should carry a long spoon."

Today the establishment is pushing Patriotism big time. That means we have to be very, very careful about what they are trying to get over in the name of "patriotism."

Definitions are usually quibbles used by people who don't have reality on their side. But in this case the definition of the word "establishment" is critical.

The establishment is the group that owns the present system and the means of persuasion and violence (which is another means of persuasion) that enforces it. To you and me, "patriotism" means loyalty to a particular land and people.

To the establishment, patriotism has nothing whatsoever to do with either this land or this people. To the establishment, "patriotism" means loyalty to the system. To them, loyalty equals obedience, and "patriotism" means a willingness to obey.

Please follow me carefully here, for this is critical: To you and me the word "patriotism" means that you and I are being loyal to our own people and to ourselves. That is the absolute opposite of what the word "patriotism" means to the media, the government, and other ruling institutions.

To you and me, patriotism is the principle stated in the only statement of purpose Americans ever adopted, the Preamble to the United States Constitution. America, it says, is "We the people," and its only purpose is to obtain liberty and the pursuit of happiness for ourselves and our posterity.

There could not be a clearer statement of what the establishment says patriotism is NOT than the Preamble to the United States Constitution. To understand this clearly, we need only look at the definition of the "establishment" again.

"The establishment is the group that owns the present system and the means of persuasion and violence (which is another means of persuasion) that enforces it."

The establishment insists that American freedom and prosperity have nothing to do with you and me. American freedom and prosperity exists entirely because of the system we live under, the one that belongs to the establishment.

So America is not a great place to live because of you and me. America is a great place to live because of the SYSTEM you and I live UNDER.

With this firmly in mind, if you listen carefully to the present drumbeat for "patriotism" you will see what I mean.

Today's patriotism means that you and I and the rest of our people are not free and prosperous and the target of massive immigration because you and I and other Americans have, as a people, any special qualities. No one who immigrates needs to be grateful to US. We are NOT blessed because we live in the country that we rule.

Today's "patriotism" directs all loyalty to the System. Today's "patriotism" directs all gratitude to the System. All hail the System! Today's "patriotism" declares that we are a nation of immigrants. This means that any group of people who happen to live under this System would do just as well. All we are is people who are lucky enough to live under their System.

To the establishment, the Constitution has nothing to do with "We the people." In fact, to the establishment the Constitution is the exact opposite of "We the People." If you listen to what they tell you every day, the media says that the Constitution is the means by which judges overrule the people. Under their idea of the Constitution an alien is as good as a citizen, and the only difference is some documents, as in "undocumented aliens."

If you listen closely you will notice that when the establishment uses the word "patriot," it always means the exact opposite of what you and I and the Founding Fathers always took that word to mean.

December 22, 2001 - I CAN'T BELIEVE IT -- FOX ACTUALLY REPORTS *ISRAELI*** EXCESSES!!!!**

December 22, 2001 - GOOD NEWS IS NOT BAD NEWS

I CAN'T BELIEVE IT -- FOX ACTUALLY REPORTS *ISRAELI*** EXCESSES!!!!**

I react with fury against Moslems those who kill Americans for their Middle Eastern Holy Land.

I also reject those who would sell America out in the name of their Holy Land, the modern state of Israel.

The media suppress a lot of information, and it is usually the conservatives we depend on to do at least a little exposing of leftist bias and misinformation. But when it comes to media bias in favor of Israel conservatives are worse than the usual sources of misinformation.

We all know that for anybody in the United State Government to talk about the cover-up of Israeli spying will destroy their careers. But Fox actually quoted sources who said that! I simply could not believe it!

Fox is reporting Israeli firms that are being contracted to take over major functions of American government security. They exposed the fact that an Israeli firm controls all of our phone surveillance. Fox Cable News Network pointed out that this is NOT because the Israeli firm provides the best system. It is in fact a lousy system but somebody insisted on giving the Israeli firm a monopoly on it and no one has dared to object.

This firm works hand in glove with the Israeli government, the same government that sent in Pollard to spy on United States Government secrets, the same Jonathan Pollard who is now serving a life sentence for spying on the country he was born in.

I have read email from one American-born "Christian" conservative after another who told me flatly that his real loyalty is to the State of Israel. I have heard this kind of person join leftists like Derschowitz in saying that Pollard should be let go because he "only spied for Israel." So it is generally agreed that Americans whose first loyalty is to Israel SHOULD spy against America and for their real country.

If you disagree with this statement you are -- guess what? -- anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

According to national Christian conservative spokesmen you are also an Enemy of God.

So I could not believe it when Fox violated this absolute rule. More important, Fox Cable News Network has EXPOSED THIS ABSOLUTE RULE. They quoted a government memo which stated flatly that anyone mentioning Israeli spying was committing career suicide!!!

No respectable conservative would dare ever mention that.

This is very, very good. I know a lot of people will say that Fox Cable News had to mention this just because people like us are raising so much Cain about it on the Internet.

But that is good, too. It means that we are getting through the media blackout even in the most absolute areas.

This is a breakthrough of titanic proportions. It is also a breakthrough no Christian or respectable conservative national spokesman is going to mention. It is entirely up to us to make a big point of it.

Thank you, Fox Cable Network. We need to praise them for this, because I can assure you they are catching hell for it from the rulers of the right wing.

When they talk about "hate," the media is always talking about right-wingers. But believe you me, you have never gotten true hate mail until you say something critical about leftists or about Israel.

GOOD NEWS IS NOT BAD NEWS

As I said, some determined depressives will try to make the Fox exposure of Israeli spying seem like it is nothing. But the fact we are able to get information out despite both a liberal and a conservative blackout is tremendously good news.

This is just one more example of how good people -- including me -- will often work to make a good event seem bad.

We live in such a depressing world that it is a real effort to stop being depressed.

Some years ago it was announced that aspirin could be a major ally in preventing and minimizing heart attacks. Now plain old aspirin is one of the things the doctor makes me take regularly in my recovery.

You are supposed to have it on hand at all times right along with nitroglycerine in case you have an attack.

The finding that aspirin could save so many heart attack victims was revolutionary, a sort of miracle. Right in our medicine cabinets there was a cheap effective pill to take which would cut fatalities from one of America's leading killers by some fifty percent. It was on all the networks.

But what really got to me about all the coverage was how SAD it was!

Not one single newscast announced the discovery of this medical breakthrough as anything but a danger to the public health!

In every case a stone-faced reporter announced the aspirin breakthrough with the same lightheartedness he would have brought to a major assassination.

How, you may ask, can one be sad about a breakthrough that could save lives by the thousands?

In case you ever want to make a happy announcement sound like a state funeral, you will want to know the formula. You present it as something that the public will go crazy with and turn into a disaster. So all the newsmen worried out loud that people would start eating and drinking heavily and ignore all health warnings because they would think aspirin would prevent all heart attacks.

I am not joking. This was the theme of every sad-faced announcement of the breakthrough in dealing with heart attacks.

December 29, 2001 - ISRAEL SPYING STORY SNATCHED OFF OF FOX

December 29, 2001 - JOHN WALKER'S UNFASHIONABLE TREASON

December 29, 2001 - FOR AN ADULT, IT AIN'T THE REASON, IT'S THE TREASON

December 29, 2001 - WITH WALKER, LIBERALS GIVE RESPECTABLES A CHANCE TO PRETEND THEY'RE BRAVE

ISRAEL SPYING STORY SNATCHED OFF OF FOX

Last week I was congratulating Fox Cable News Network for daring to talk about Israeli spying.

It is clear that this phenomenon is no secret, since Israel is presently trying to get Jonathan Pollard released from a life sentence for spying against America for them. But Fox showed great courage in talking about it.

In a sane world, these two statements would seem odd.

Countries usually deny espionage or at least they apologize for it. But Israel openly demands that its American-born spy be released.

While everybody knows that Israeli spying takes place on a huge scale, we also know that no critic of Israel is allowed to talk about it. Israel and Dershowitz demand that their spy be released, but you and I are not allowed to even mention the whole subject.

We all know you can lose your job for mentioning Israeli spying. Anyone who talks about it is -- guess what? -- anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews. So I was astonished when Fox actually quoted an internal Federal memo which stated the rule that if you discussed Israeli spying you would lose your job.

I'm glad I mentioned it last week, because I now hear that Fox has snatched this story off the network and fired Carl Cameron who reported it. I wrote Fox to ask about this, but of course I got no reply.

Someone sent me a Fox URL on the story:

<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,40684,00.html>

It says:

Carl Cameron

Friday, December 21, 2001

"This story no longer exists."

Here is a screen shot taken Thursday:

I doubt that URL will still be there when you read this.

As I say, I cannot confirm this because Fox, which exposes others, will not respond to me.

The whole thing is straight out of "1984", isn't it?

Editor's note: I also attempted to check this story out with Fox News. They aren't talking to me, either. I also wrote to Carl Cameron's foxnews.com email address - no response, which could mean he isn't commenting or is no longer employed there.

JOHN WALKER'S UNFASHIONABLE TREASON

I have the right to call John Walker a traitor. Practically nobody else in America today has that right.

That is because I have consistently denounced traitors. I did not wait to jump on one particular turncoat because it is fashionable to jump on him.

On September 10, 2001, the only white person who was truly moral was a white person who spoke of white people the way Goebbels spoke of Jews.

On September 10, 2001, the only truly moral American was one who blamed America for the world's problems.

On September 10, 2001, a good person was one who hated Christians. Every history lesson told us how good the Aztecs were and how evil the Christians were.

All my life American education taught that a young white American Christian like John Walker was only moral if he hated whites, Americans and Christians.

On September 10, 2001, the word "Idealist" described "The Love Generation," those 1960s hippies who were marching under the same Viet Cong flag that was actively killing Americans at the time. Jane Fonda was an Idealist for going to North Vietnam and pretending to man a gun that was used to shoot at American planes.

"Idealism," on September 10, 2001, was represented in the Woody Allen movie "The Front," where Allen played a 1950s writer protecting outright and outspoken Stalinists who were trying to give America to the Soviet Union.

Now everybody is astonished that John Walker went and fought for the Taliban.

They want him hanged.

But nobody wants any other traitors even criticized, much less prosecuted. Unlike Walker, these others were not traitors, they were merely Idealists who supported the Democratic and Peace-Loving People's Republics.

Respectable conservatives are howling for Walker's hide, but not one of them has the guts to mention all the other traitors.

For pro-Israel "Christians" and leftists, treason is moral if you give the right reason for it.

FOR AN ADULT, IT AIN'T THE REASON, IT'S THE TREASON

Why is it that John Walker is a traitor while Jane Fonda or Jonathan Pollard is a "misguided idealist"?

The gun Jane Fonda posed with in Hanoi actually shot at American planes, and may have killed an American or two. She went to Vietnam while they were actually killing Americans and torturing American POWs.

Walker joined Al Queda long before the fighting started but all the conservative spokesmen want him hanged.

No conservative will ever demand the punishment for Fonda that he demands for Walker because liberals won't let him. It is liberals who allow conservatives to become "spokesmen" in the media, and any conservative who talked about leftist or pro-Israel treason would lose his respectability instantly.

The word "treason" is just fine if liberals say it.

There is nothing wrong with killing Americans if you do it for the Loving and Democratic Peoples' Republics. There is nothing wrong with spying against America if you do it for Israel.

I am told that Israel is the reason Christ died on the cross. Everybody says it's all right to blame pro-Israeli treason on Christ.

But John Walker should be hanged for blaming his treason on Mohammed.

I beg to differ. As someone who tries to be a Christian, I find treason blamed on Christ MORE offensive than Walker's treason in the name of Mohammed.

WITH WALKER, LIBERALS GIVE RESPECTABLES A CHANCE TO PRETEND THEY'RE BRAVE

This business with Walker is one of those times when liberals have given professional conservatives permission to pretend they're fearless.

You can't be professional conservative unless you are a full time professional wimp. You say what liberals allow you to say or the media dump you. That means you are always dodging anything serious

But at some times and on some issues, liberals give professional conservatives permission to beat their little chests and shout. Militant support of Israel is one of these issues. Even George Will once said that liberals want the United States armed forces to be "strong enough to defend Israel."

So conservatives beat their chests and pretend to be war heroes every chance they get. No conservative would be allowed to snub Jane Fonda or to point out the outright treasonous aspects of the Love Generation. But they are allowed to be shouting militants against John Walker.

On the talk shows, liberal commentators let conservatives demand that Walker be lynched.

For one who knows what the real game is, it is pathetic to watch the respectables beat their little chicken chests.

January 5, 2002 - PEOPLE WHO SAW THE REAL HORROR OF CRUCIFIXION DID NOT MAKE THE CROSS A SYMBOL

January 5, 2002 - DISSECTING HUMANS USED TO BE BANNED IN THE NAME OF THE BIBLE

January 5, 2002 - HUMAN CLONING AND STEM CELL RESEARCH -- ARE THE ANSWERS REALLY THAT SIMPLE?

PEOPLE WHO SAW THE REAL HORROR OF CRUCIFIXION DID NOT MAKE THE CROSS A SYMBOL

On the brink of the battle which would make him ruler of the Roman Empire, the Emperor Constantine looked into the sky and saw the Christian symbol. He decided to fight in the name of Christ and won. He then made Christianity the religion of the Roman Empire.

People telling this story today routinely say that Constantine saw the cross in the sky, but he did not. At that time the cross was not the Christian symbol. What Constantine saw was letters representing Christ's name. That was one early Christian symbol. Another, also representing letters, was the sign of the fish.

In fact, the cross only became an accepted Christian symbol in the latter part of the fourth century, after the adoption of Christianity as the official religion of Rome.

Maybe this was not a coincidence. One of the first things a newly Christian Roman Empire would do would be to outlaw crucifixion.

If that is true, then the cross was adopted by the first generation that had not actually SEEN a crucifixion.

It may be that seeing a real crucifixion would keep a person from reminding himself that Christ died that way. It was a hideous, ugly death, nothing like the idealized portraits we see.

DISSECTING HUMANS USED TO BE BANNED IN THE NAME OF THE BIBLE

The creed I was raised on declared my belief in "the resurrection of the body." The Bible refers to the body as the temple of the soul. So for centuries, no matter how desperately medical science might have needed to dissect actual bodies, no one in a Christian country was allowed to do it.

If you look at the depiction of Death in many medieval manuscripts, you will see the results of this ban on dissection. Death was represented as a skeleton, and the skeletons were totally wrong when it came to the hipbones. Neither artists nor doctors had seen real human hipbones, so the picture they had of them were the ones doctors went by.

Can you imagine what effect this crazy idea of the hipbones had on the delivery of babies?

Dissecting human bodies was outlawed throughout most of Christendom until the late nineteenth century. But in the last half of the nineteenth century, all the screaming Bible-thumpers suddenly forgot they had ever opposed human dissection.

The timing was no accident. Medicine made giant leaps forward in the late nineteenth century, and people began to hope that their diseases would be cured by the new science.

Christians began to use the cross as their symbol, but only after they no longer saw that horrible instrument in use. Christians stopped using the Bible to ban dissection when the benefits of medical science became obvious.

In 1800, almost every preacher demanded the outlawing of human dissection. By 1900, almost every preacher advocated human dissection. But the Bible had not changed.

HUMAN CLONING AND STEM CELL RESEARCH -- ARE THE ANSWERS REALLY THAT SIMPLE?

The twenty-first century will be the time when a total revolution in human biology takes place. Babies being born today can probably live as long as they want to live. By the end of the century a person can be as smart and as good-looking as he or she wants to be.

Right now, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, this biological revolution is about where the medical revolution was around 1800. In 1800, practically every preacher wanted human dissection to stay banned. For a faith that preached the resurrection of the body and the body as the temple of the soul, such a ban was obvious.

By 1900, practically every preacher claimed that his church had never wanted to ban dissections.

Today conservatives bang their chests and brag that they are rough and tough on stem cell research. They tell me I am a wimp on the issue.

But when I get these letters, I ask a simple question and I never get an answer. I send them a copy of Whitaker Online for May 12, 2001 -- FRANCE - THE BOY IN THE BUBBLE. France had a law banning the use of fetal tissues, but when a real child's life could only be saved by using them, France dropped that law like a hot rock. This sounds a lot like the churches who dropped their opposition to human dissection by 1900, doesn't it?

So I ask each of these chest-beating people whether they would have told the parents that fetal tissues could not be used and their child would just have to die. I have not gotten one single answer yet. I won't use the term, but O'Reilly says that people who won't face his questions are cowards. Let's just say that all that moral bravery seems to decrease when a question like this comes up.

January 12, 2002 - IN THE NUCLEAR AGE SILLINESS MEANS DISASTER

January 12, 2002 - THE FATHER OF LIES LOVES THE EQUALITY MYTH

January 12, 2002 - IF YOUR SOCIETY IS BASED ON A LIE, ONLY THE FATHER OF LIES CAN BENEFIT

January 12, 2002 - DESPERATION SELLS TRUTH

IN THE NUCLEAR AGE SILLINESS MEANS DISASTER

The media keep referring to the fact that both India and Pakistan have nuclear weapons and they are very close to a shooting war -- again.

Well, gosh, gang, the third world's got nukes and we may be heading for a nuclear war! Who could possibly have guessed that might happen?

The answer, of course, is "any sane person."

But in our times, Political Correctness always takes precedence over sanity.

You see, in order to keep nukes out of the hands of the third world you have to admit that the third world is not equal to the white world.

But if the third world is just as good as the white world, why are so many people so desperate to LEAVE the third world?

Political Correctness does not let you say that if the third world population takes over the first world, it will become the third world, too. So if the first world becomes the third world through immigration, we will be killing the golden goose. But that has been OK with the media until now because it will take decades for immigration to overwhelm the white world.

So we thought we could all talk about how equal everybody is and let it be a disaster for future generations, but not for us. But now that the third world has nukes WE may have to face the consequences of repeating "all men are created equal."

PC says that India and Pakistan should have those nukes because the third world has as much right to them as anybody else.

If you disagree, you're anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

THE FATHER OF LIES LOVES THE EQUALITY MYTH

Satan has had many titles. He has been called "Old Dick" (as in "the Dickens you say!") and he has been called "The Lord of the Flies." But the name we need to look at here is "Father of Lies."

The great Christian writer C.S. Lewis wrote "The Screwtape Letters," which were supposed to be letters from a senior demon in Hell advising his nephew on how to damn souls. Screwtape praised the modern use of the word "equality." He said it was good, first of all, "because it is based on a good, sound resounding lie."

Hell hates the truth.

Every time you cross a border from a nation ruled by white-skinned people to a nation ruled by brown people, the standard of living drops like a rock.

No one knows why this drop takes place, we just know it ALWAYS happens, no matter what the history of the brown-skinned country might be. We all know you have to say that this is all an accident, absolutely and 100% pure accident, or you are anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

The fact is that absolutely nobody believes that all that is just an accident.

We all know this, so why does no one dare say it?

We cannot speak this truth because the ones who argue most ferociously that this is all an accident are the very ones who believe it the least. No black "leader" or white leftist believes his followers can rise without white giveaways and affirmative action.

Leftists know that if debate is allowed, they will lose. So they outlaw or shout down any disagreement. Truth does not need to suppress all opposition.

But why do many so-called "Christians" join them in this shouting against any challenge to Equality?

IF YOUR SOCIETY IS BASED ON A LIE, ONLY THE FATHER OF LIES CAN BENEFIT

Equality is a good example of the Devil as the Father of Lies, and how he can trap those who claim to be his enemies. Those who use the Bible as a political textbook hate the New Testament. The Old Testament has lots of talk about politics, but Jesus made it very clear He did not come about that.

As to equality, when the Disciples argued about who would be first in heaven, He Himself said that even He did not know that.

He also did NOT say that all men are created equal. Jesus Christ is not the Father of Lies, even lies that liberals pat you on the head for repeating.

We are presently destroying our society on the basis of agreed-upon falsehoods that everybody knows are lies. People who pretend to be truthful but are only half-truthful are still sponsoring a lie, and everybody knows it.

DESPERATION SELLS TRUTH

Lake High tells a great joke about a con man who had spent years giving his son advice about how to lie to people. Finally the son asked him, "Dad, is there ever a time when you tell people the TRUTH?"

The father stood there, totally stunned by the question. He thought deeply and replied, "Well, son, in a desperate situation, ANY GIMMICK will do."

This equality nonsense sold very well in the 1960s and in earlier times. But now brown hands are hovering above the nuclear trigger, and we are headed toward a whiteless world.

Not only is the situation desperate, but even the blindest might soon see it for what it is. Everybody knows what the lies are, and the Big Lie of Equality is putting us in an obviously desperate situation.

When people get desperate they also get real.

It might soon be time for the Truth Gimmick.

January 19, 2002 - SHOULD WE REBUILD AFGHANISTAN?

January 19, 2002 - NOTHING WORKS IF YOU REFUSE TO "TELL IT LIKE IT IS"

January 19, 2002 - SKIN COLOR AND FOREIGN AID

January 19, 2002 - REAL ECONOMICS WORKS IN REALITY

January 19, 2002 - SKIN COLOR AND INDEPENDENCE

SHOULD WE REBUILD AFGHANISTAN?

Afghanistan wants \$45 billion in world aid over the next decade rebuild its economy.

Right After World War II America began its first peacetime foreign aid program, the Marshall Plan. We did it to keep a devastated Western Europe from going Communist.

The European countries we aided -- with the exception of socialist Britain -- responded to the Marshall Plan incredibly well. They quickly rebuilt a totally destroyed continent, though some British buildings remained down because planners couldn't agree. Then these countries soared beyond their pre-World War II level per capita income -- except for Britain.

Ever since the Marshall Plan, we have been trying to do for everybody else on earth what we did for Europe. One foreign aid plan after another has been developed by our "intellectuals" and one after another has failed.

The Marshall Plan was the only foreign aid plan that succeeded, first, because it was the only one our "intellectuals" didn't put together. The Marshall Plan was not put together by a bunch of Harvard economists. We were in a desperate situation and desperation makes you get real.

NOTHING WORKS IF YOU REFUSE TO "TELL IT LIKE IT IS"

Foreign aid since the Marshall Plan has been a consistent failure because it has been planned by liberal "intellectuals." All Politically Correct plans fail.

There is nothing mysterious about the repeated failures of Politically Correct foreign aid programs. There is nothing mysterious about the failure of ALL Politically Correct programs in every area of life

But since it is a bunch of PhDs who are doing these disastrous things, we think that what is being done wrong is somehow the result of highly sophisticated, highly intellectual, hard-to-understand failings that require books and mathematical equations to explain.

What academics are doing is not complicated. What they are doing is silly. They are violating some very simple rules of life, rules the rest of us can see clearly.

But as long as we keep treating leftism as if it were something highly sophisticated and intellectual, we will never expose them.

The problem is that anyone who calls the silly stuff "silly," in other words, anyone who tells it like it is, will not be allowed to say it in the media. Showing respect for these ridiculous little eggheads is how conservatives stay "respectable." Until the respectable conservatives are discredited, leftists will keep their power and money.

So on foreign aid, as in the case of each subject before, Whitaker Online will now explain the commonsense rules, the rules real people know, that the so-called "intellectuals" are ignoring.

SKIN COLOR AND FOREIGN AID

The only American foreign aid programs that have been successful were for white countries, and for Japan.

The Marshall Plan after World War II did help Europe and Japan pull themselves out of the devastation and ruin. Naturally, all the successes of those countries were attributed to "The Marshall Plan." You will regularly see quotes like "Europe recovered due to the Marshall Plan."

This is, to put it mildly, a bit overstated.

REAL ECONOMICS WORKS IN REALITY

This is the way economics works in the real world:

- 1) White or Mongoloid countries that use -- in the latter case, copy -- the free market all get rich fast.
- 2) Brown countries are poor.

3) Communist countries of every color are poor.

That's not very complicated is it?

The problem is that all this means that the academics, the people who call themselves "intellectuals," are always wrong. They say skin color is unimportant. They say that if you turn economic planning over to "intellectuals" and bureaucrats, you will get fairness and prosperity.

So we pay professors to spend a major portion of their time persuading people that all three of these universal rules of economics are the result of unfortunate accidents.

Meanwhile back in the real world the success of foreign aid follows the three basic economic rules of economics:

1) economic aid to white countries and to Japan after World War II was a success.

2) economic aid to colored countries is worse than a failure.

3) economic aid to Marxist countries of all colors is a flop.

SKIN COLOR AND INDEPENDENCE

Edward Gibbon, the eighteenth century historian, opposed American independence. Since he turned out to be wrong about that, he changed sides and started pushing Indian independence.

By the same token, those who saw what a success the Marshall Plan was decided that all that BROWN countries needed to get rich was foreign aid money.

When someone goes with the idea that whatever is good for whites is good for brown people they are wrong. This is true at least in economic development, foreign aid and probably on the subject of political independence. See

January 12, 2002 - IN THE NUCLEAR AGE SILLINESS MEANS DISASTER

January 12, 2002 - THE FATHER OF LIES LOVES THE EQUALITY MYTH

January 12, 2002 - IF YOUR SOCIETY IS BASED ON A LIE, ONLY THE FATHER OF LIES CAN BENEFIT

January 12, 2002 - DESPERATION SELLS TRUTH

Political Correctness says that you have to say all this is an accident, and that brown people are just as good at economic development as whites are.

What is funny is that Political Correctness also blames white people for economic development because economic development is unnatural and evil.

To repeat the hippie motto, "The white race is the cancer of history." We are the cancer of history because we have "ruined the world" with industrialization. Whites are evil because they brought economic development.

Brown people are good because they did not develop Evil Industry.

But if you say brown people don't bring on economic development just as naturally as whites do, you are anaziwho want to kill six million jews.

If they had an opposition that had brains, the Political Correctness crowd would be in real trouble spewing self-contradictory drivel like this. But the only anti-liberals who are allowed to speak are those with whom the liberal media feel comfortable. And a kept opposition like that is not going to make the PC crowd keep its lies straight.

January 26, 2002 - WHEN DUMMIES TRY TO BE "SHREWD"

January 26, 2002 - HARDY'S LAW

January 26, 2002 - LAUREL AND HARDY, PROFESSORS AND THE MEDIA

January 26, 2002 - THE IVY LEAGUE THINKS EUROPEANS ARE WISDOM PERSONIFIED

WHEN DUMMIES TRY TO BE "SHREWD"

There was a time when a nickel was a good bit of money. Back then you could buy a hot dog, a coke, or a hamburger with a nickel. You could buy a beer for a nickel and get a free lunch with it.

Back in the days when the nickel was king, there was a small town where Bob Shrewd and Roger Dumb lived. Roger admitted he didn't know a whole lot and Bob said he knew everything.

Bob would often demonstrate how dumb Roger was and how smart he was. He used a nickel to do it.

OLE Bob Shrewd would show Roger Dumb two coins and he would say, "Look here, Roger, you can either have this tiny little dime or this great big shiny nickel."

Poor Dumb Roger always took the big old nickel.

Finally somebody felt sorry for Roger and decided to tell him the truth. "Roger," he said pityingly, "that big old nickel is just worth half as much as that little dime."

Dumb Roger replied, "But if I ever take the dime, Bob Shrewd will stop giving me free nickels."

And that, brothers and sisters, is what a wise old Southerner has in mind when he capitalizes the word Shrewd.

HARDY'S LAW

We all still know about the great 1920s comedy team Laurel and Hardy. Oliver Hardy was the fat one, the boss of the moronic duo.

The real Oliver Hardy was born and raised in Augusta, Georgia. He got his background on how people act while being reared in his mother's boarding house with all the guests and characters there. Hardy was a wise old Southerner at an early age.

It took real art to make the Oliver Hardy character one you could laugh at and actually like. After all, it would have been very easy to play him as just a big, mindless bully pushing little Stan Laurel around.

But Hardy made his character funny instead of boorish. He told a reporter the big secret of why Oliver Hardy was so laughable. You see, Laurel always freely admitted he was dumb and always asked Hardy to be his leader. Hardy actually thought he was smart enough to know what they should do.

So the real Oliver Hardy stated the wisdom that made his character so hilarious. He said,

"NOBODY IS AS FUNNY AS A DUMB MAN WHO THINKS HE'S SMART."

And that is exactly what I mean when I capitalize the word "Shrewd."

LAUREL AND HARDY, PROFESSORS AND THE MEDIA

Professors don't say they're Shrewd. They say they're "sophisticated."

Neither professors nor the media have ever gotten over the fact that after Harvard Think Tanks got us into Vietnam, it was under Ronald Reagan that Communism collapsed.

Now neither the media nor the professors can get used to the idea that Bush can handle foreign policy. That's because he's not "sophisticated," a.k.a., Shrewd.

Anything that confuses the professors totally blitzes the media. The only education media spokesmen have, after all, is the one that made them half-baked products of the professors. That's the only thing they ever had that could be called an "education."

Hardy thought he was smart, so he convinced poor little Laurel that he was smart. Like the media and the professors, Hardy was the only example of "smart" poor dumb Laurel had, and the professors were the only example of "educated" the media ever had.

So exactly like Laurel believed in Hardy, the media BELIEVE in professors.

THE IVY LEAGUE THINKS EUROPEANS ARE WISDOM PERSONIFIED

When the twentieth century began, Americans felt totally inferior to Europeans. Especially European nobility.

A few years back a friend of mine married a real Austrian Countess and it was kind of a joke between them.

But if we felt inferior to Europe in 1900, the rest of the world BELONGED to Europe. Back then the whole world was part of one empire or another. By 1900 Europeans were dividing up China, though it was officially independent.

By 1945, Europe was a blasted-out ruin. Its empires were on the way out and the homelands were destroyed. They had been saved from fascism by the United States and, if they had been left to themselves, they would have become colonies under Stalin.

But American east coasters STILL felt inferior to Europe. Even looking at the total catastrophe European thinking had made of itself, they still worshipped European thinking.

In 1945, East Coast "intellectuals" could not understand why a bunch of "cotton-chopping Southerners" and "corn-fed Midwesterners" were not desperate to copy everything from Europe.

Nothing liberals do ever WORKS. The East Coast and Ivy League worship of Europe was a formula for the same disaster Europe had just created for itself. So naturally post-War liberals thought it was the only way to go.

Professors and the media will never grow up. But some people HAVE to. One of the former Eastern European Communist satellites that has done well economically was trying to find an economic plan to make the transition from Communism to capitalism. Their leader said, "And we don't want something cooked up by East Coast academics."

This leader had observed how East Coast "intellectuals" had dealt with the Communists he knew so well, and he wanted no part of their idiocy.

By 1945, after total destruction and tens of millions of deaths in Europe, Europeans were not so charmed by their "intellectuals," most of whom were Communist by then.

You see, to an East Coast "intellectual" (or a William Buckley), "European" means "foreign," it means "exotic," it means "classy."

But the few European "intellectuals" who didn't fall for socialism did not see themselves as "exotic." To them, Middle Americans were exotic. Today, American tee shirts in Moscow are considered very avant-garde. East Coast intellectuals sort of know this, but they don't have the imagination to UNDERSTAND it.

If there is wisdom in this world, it won't come from the thinking of blasted-out Europe. It will be somewhere in the thoughts of the Reagans and even the Bushes. It is only when they listen to the Voices of Shrewd that they screw up.

February 2, 2002 - RIGHTS FOR THE RIGHT, AND EVEN FOR WHITES

February 2, 2002 - KISSING LIBERAL BACKSIDES IS *SHREWD******

February 2, 2002 - IF THEY DO IT TO THE EXTREMISTS, THEY DO IT TO US

February 2, 2002 - RIGHTS FOR THE RIGHT, AND EVEN FOR WHITES

February 2, 2002 - SO IT HAS TO BE RIGHTS FOR THE RIGHT AND EVEN FOR WHITES

RIGHTS FOR THE RIGHT, AND EVEN FOR WHITES

Pat Buchanan was being interviewed about his new book, "The Death of the West." In "The Death of the West," Pat says that whites are literally being driven off the face of the earth, and not only are whites not allowed to object, they are denounced if they do not approve wholeheartedly.

In the middle of this interview someone asked Pat about the Bush economic stimulus package.

Pat replied:

"The Visigoths are across the Alps and in the Roman Senate they are debating a stimulus package."

I have said this many times before, and I will say it many times again:

Until WHITES are allowed to worry openly about race, the left can beat us to death with the shriek "ANAZIHOWANTSTOKILLSIXMILLIONJEWS!!!!"

This means we will have to get out there and defend even the rights of people we do not approve of.

KISSING LIBERAL BACKSIDES IS *SHREWD*****

About every two weeks, another Shrewd (Please see January 26, 2002 - WHEN DUMMIES TRY TO BE "SHREWD") rightist sends me the same idea, and every one of them thinks he came up with it.

He says, we don't have to get the liberals mad at us by defending the rights of right-wing extremists. He says, "Let's be Shrewd."

He continues, "Nazis and other extremists are really left wingers, they are really socialists, so we just need to say that and nobody will connect us with them."

Then they tell us the really Shrewd Part: This way we on the right can lead the lynch mob against right wing extremists, and leftists would pat us on the head for it.

When a rightist decides to Get Shrewd he always has the same punch lines: 1) everybody will go along with it, and 2) liberals will pat us on the head for it.

The disastrous "Let's get the black vote" nonsense is exactly the same. It lets us denounce everybody liberals hate and do what they approve of.

Meanwhile, back in the real world, this "far rightists are actually leftist" gambit is as moronic as every other attempt by a rightist to be Shrewd.

No matter what we do, liberals are going to use the nazihowantstokillsixmillionjews shriek against us forever.

Further, real people out in the real world see the familiar left-right continuum, and only a moron thinks he is going to change that, even if WE controlled the media. And we don't.

So any precedent we help leftists establish against the extreme right will eventually be used against us.

IF THEY DO IT TO THE EXTREMISTS, THEY DO IT TO US

In the real world, the right uses "Communist" as a way to scare leftists, and the left uses "anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews!" to scare rightists. The right uses the Communist label as an excuse to deny liberals their rights and leftists use "racist" and "Nazi!" to shout down all opposition in exactly the same way.

The difference is that the left defends the rights of the extreme left and the right wants to lead the liberal lynch mob against extremists on the right.

This is one reason the leftists are winning. They know that the right would like them to spend all their time denying that they're Communists. Rightists would love it if leftists agreed that all Communists are fair game and that the far left has no rights.

They would love it because we all know that if the extreme left has no rights, you can cripple the rest of the left by saying they are extremists. If that happened, leftists would spend all their time the way rightists do, groveling whenever the other side calls them extremists.

But the left is winning because it isn't made up of the kind of moral cowards and morons who lead the right.

And the right is losing because it is stupid and cowardly.

If you are going to have any rights, you will have to defend the rights of people you don't approve of. It's risky, it's costly, and it's scary, especially when the other side controls the media and can spin it their own way. But the left did it when the right controlled the media, and the liberals' rights are more than safe today because they did.

RIGHTS FOR THE RIGHT, AND EVEN FOR WHITES

So let's laugh at Shrewd - again - and talk turkey about the real world. The simple fact is that the left has a regular nazihowantstokillsixmillionjews tactic they use all the time. It is routine and only today's gutless and brainless right would fall for it.

PLEASE, PLEASE, ***PLEASE*** READ:

June 16, 2001 LEFTIST MCCARTHYISM IS ALIVE AND WELL AND LOVED BY ALL.

This describes the regular leftist routine of kicking the far right and later using the precedents set that way to kick the "respectable" right.

SO IT HAS TO BE RIGHTS FOR THE RIGHT AND EVEN FOR WHITES

Before his presidential run, Pat Buchanan was the highest-paid columnist in America. You would think he would be using all that notoriety to get the big money back.

Pat used to be the leading respectable conservative. Now, instead of trying to get that title and all the money back, Pat Buchanan is sticking his neck out, WAY out.

WAY WAY out.

Pat actually dares defend the right of the white race to exist. But most conservatives still support the leftist ban on any such discussion.

We need to form a deadly serious organization aimed at protecting the rights of the right in general and especially those who dare talk about race. We can testify before state legislatures and congress. THERE

IS NO EXCUSE FOR PUBLIC MONEY TO BE USED AGAINST THE RIGHT AND AGAINST WHITES TO INDOCTRINATE YOUTH. CAMPUSES SHOULD BE ABLE TO PROTECT ALL SPEAKERS, INCLUDING RIGHTISTS, OR THEY SHOULD LOSE THEIR TAX MONEY.

This sort of issue would raise its own funds. Granted, a lot of conservatives would attack us to get patted on the head by liberals. They could say they are more anti-extremist than the liberals are. There will always be people like that, and the media will favor them.

But there are enough people who see reality to support an organization and, if we have the guts and the brains, we will generate our own publicity without destroying ourselves.

But it will take guts and brains, and that let's the whole Shrewd Right out. Paul Weyrich pointed out in "The New Right Papers," in 1982, that the greatest weapon the right uses AGAINST ITSELF is, "We tried that once. It didn't work."

"The National Association for the Advancement of White People" and some outright racist organizations have tried to do what I am talking about here. But their political agenda is seen to take precedence over protecting real rights.

The NAAWP was set up at the wrong time and by the wrong people.

But I am talking about something deadly serious. Even the blindest -- with the exception of respectable conservatives and liberal Southerners, of course -- can now see that the program is that whites must lose every country and that whites must be chased down and made to disappear, no matter what the cost.

We can leave the Buchanans out there swinging gently in the wind with a respectable conservative lynch mob howling under the tree, or we can get SERIOUS about the rights of the right, and even the rights of whites.

But if you're not in this fight, don't fool yourself into thinking you have the right to say anything liberals don't approve of.

February 9, 2002 - WHY I AM VERY OPTIMISTIC

February 9, 2002 - PROPHETS OF DOOM THINK THEY ARE PROPHETS. THEY'RE NOT

February 9, 2002 - WHY WE DON'T WANT TO DISCUSS THE REAL FUTURE

WHY I AM VERY OPTIMISTIC

We all remember the disaster that was going to happen at midnight, January 1, 2000. Every single computer in the world had been programmed so that it couldn't tell the difference between January 1, 1900 and January 1, 2000. And computers ran the whole highly technical and tightly interconnected modern world.

All the professors were paid to meet and discuss the inevitable catastrophe. All the talk shows and commentators talked about it.

I was in a science conference out west, and even there the young geniuses were talking about how we should prepare for a catastrophe. I didn't take commentators and a bunch of silly professors seriously. But when I saw that the young geniuses were scared it worried me a lot.

Do you remember what happened on January 1, 2000?

Nothing happened. And that's the point.

In the 1990s, all the professors and commentators were trying to come up with what kind of government program should deal with the coming catastrophe. If you notice, when professors are brought in as experts to discuss a crisis, they always decide that the answer is to let professors and bureaucrats take everything over.

So while the professors and liberal commentators had the usual meetings and came to the same conclusions they always come to, somebody quietly made sure the catastrophe didn't take place.

While there were all sorts of wild warnings and media events, somebody in the background was actually dealing with the problem. The same thing happened with the energy crisis around 1980, the inevitable permanent meat shortage everybody has long since forgotten about, and every other crisis that made so much media noise.

While the media concentrate on noise, real problems are dealt with behind the scenes. Nothing the professors and the media propose ever makes any difference.

In other words, we are always fixated on where the noise is coming from while the real future is coming from an entirely different direction.

PROPHETS OF DOOM THINK THEY ARE PROPHETS. THEY'RE NOT

On November 21, 1998 I began an article, SUPERTERRORISM, with the following sentence, "There it hangs, the threat of Superterrorism." It seemed like a pretty harebrained thing to be talking about at the time. It had absolutely nothing to do with the headlines of 1998.

Almost exactly three years later to the day, our entire national attention became riveted on Homeland Defense. Every threat I talked about in that article is now front-page news.

The same people who moan or cheer over what is in the media right now don't even remember which news items obsessed them in 1998.

What is really going on in the world has a lot to do with the crisis that did not happen on January 1, 2000. What is really going on in the world has nothing to do with a bunch of predictable, silly professors and commentators huddled together coming to the same conclusions they always come to.

So if you are a leftist who thinks those professors are prophets and the world of the future is theirs, you're being ridiculous.

And if you are a rightist who takes everything we see around us at this moment very, very seriously and think we are all doomed, you are being ridiculous.

What is really going has nothing to do with the headlines or what we now think we know about the future. Everybody will nod when I say that. But then they will go back to being hypnotically entranced by whatever the headlines are this week. I have not met more than three or four people who get the full import of what I am saying.

And until you do get the picture I am trying to convey, anything you say about the future is simply nonsense.

Which is good, because the future you would predict right now looks very grim indeed.

WHY WE DON'T WANT TO DISCUSS THE REAL FUTURE

Scientists in Japan have recently crossed pigs with spinach.

For the first time vegetable genes have been inserted into an animal embryo. The very idea of crossing a plant with an animal makes me a little queasy.

Most of the advances now being made in biology are repugnant to our deepest feelings. And that, ladies and gentlemen, is precisely the reason the real future has nothing to do with what is in the media today.

Somebody is going to have to deal with the problems of population and genetics, but conservatives don't want to talk about population and liberals don't want to talk about genetics. So our media ignore the whole thing.

Superterrorism was another example of something that everybody had agreed to overlook. In 1998 I talked about this critical subject and other people ignored it. This is not because I am a prophet, but because I am not making my living in the news media. Superterrorism was a tremendous threat, but nobody wanted to talk about it.

In the article on Superterrorism, I explained why liberals and respectable conservatives don't want to hear about Superterrorism. It is threat to the melting pot. Having angry minorities in your community is less popular when they might have a weapon of mass destruction on them.

Already an awfully lot of people support discrimination on the airlines.

They spend a lot of time trying to explain that profiling is not discrimination. The difference is very, very hard to explain because it doesn't exist. Out of the blue, Superterrorism is suddenly making discrimination popular, which is what I predicted in 1998.

The Inevitable Melting Pot is becoming evitable.

In real history most "Inevitables" don't happen, and most people who think they are prophets, including the Prophets of Doom, turn out to be fools.

February 16, 2002 - JAPANESE STAGNATION IS A GROWING PROBLEM
February 16, 2002 - CONNECTIONS AND THE WEST

JAPANESE STAGNATION IS A GROWING PROBLEM

Japan is a major problem today. Japanese per capita income actually rose above the American, and then Japan stagnated. Asia has been doing that for thousands of years.

China has repeatedly invented and stagnated.

This could be a coincidence. No book on the subject can be published if it does not explain how this is an accident. In Europe, anyone who says it is not an accident goes to PRISON.

Unlike Politically Correct people, I do not have a ready explanation of this recurrent phenomenon.

But everybody is admitting that this time Asiatic stagnation is serious for the West. Japanese stagnation could bring on an economic crisis for the whole world.

But is a mere world economic crisis any excuse for considering that there may be a flaw in Political Correctness?

Historians readily admit that the reasons for things happening to people are a combination of heredity and environment. But they then insist that anyone who mentions heredity is anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

But if human action is result of both genes and experience, a history that leaves out genes must be nonsense.

By the same token, if human action is the result of both heredity and environment, then economic theories that leave out genes are absurd.

But as one leading anthropologist pointed out recently, HITLER said that there was a connection between genetics and a society's advancement, so anyone who mentions this is someone who loves Nazi Death Camps.

CONNECTIONS AND THE WEST

I would guess that about every Whitaker Online reader has seen every episode of the television series "Connections." It is the sort of thing we would enjoy.

Last week, I talked about how everybody always has to tell you, again and again and again, that the Chinese invented paper, gunpowder, and printing before it appeared in the West. I also pointed out that the population of China has consistently, for millennia, been equal to or greater than the total white population of the earth, so the idea that at one time or another they came up with things does not shock me out of my seat.

In other words, this constant parroting of a very limited list of Chinese inventions, which is considered the height of anti-racism here, could not be more patronizing to what anti-racists clearly consider to be the poor little yellow people.

But I believe that "Connections" had the most patronizing moment for the poor little yellow people that I have ever seen -- and that's saying a LOT.

James Burke had just breathlessly informed us, for the hundredth time I'd heard it that year, that the Chinese invented printing before the West did.

He then got that constipated look on his face, the look of Sincerity and Seriousness all Brits get when they are about to intone something from the Gospel of Political Correctness.

Burke then went into the fact that, while China came up with a lot of stuff, what happened next was the very opposite of "Connections." In the East, things got invented and then died out. In China, printing was invented and forgotten. In the West it made revolution after revolution. In China, gunpowder was, so to speak, a flash in the pan, but again it uprooted the old order in Europe. The mechanical clock was invented in China long before it appeared in the West, but it disappeared, too.

I was astonished he brought this up, as it is the basis of the assumption, by both racists and anti-racists in the West, of Oriental inferiority.

So Burke, the expert on "Connections" which makes the West so revolutionary, got that Politically Correct constipated look on his face and explained the entire history of the Far East from a PC point of view.

Burke took an old Chinese stamp, which represented -- guess what? -- the invention of printing by the Chinese before the West had it. By the way, did you know the Chinese had printing before we did?

Anyway, Burke took this stamp which showed the Chinese invention of printing, and stamped a single word, "Tao."

He explained that the only reason the entire Orient had stagnated, including Korea, Japan, Mongolia and all the rest, was because one Chinese philosopher had written one book. This book, Burke announced with that constipated frown, told Chinese that they must forever follow Nature. Tao means "the way," Burke explained, and that one book totally got rid of the whole idea of connections in the East and caused the stagnation of everybody who has epicanthic eyefolds and lives in Asia.

As far as I can tell, I am the only person who was completely shocked by the fact that a grown man would say that.

February 23, 2002 - WHAT HAPPENS WHEN CHURCHES APPEAL TO A HIGHER MORAL AUTHORITY

February 23, 2002 - WHAT IF WE HAD A GREAT NORTHERN NEIGHBOR LIKE MEXICO DOES?

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN CHURCHES APPEAL TO A HIGHER MORAL AUTHORITY

THIS should be FRONT and CENTER in the discussion of priests molesting children in the Catholic Church:

Again and again, Catholic Church officials are saying that they let priests molest children and get away with it because they appealed to a higher moral authority.

Who were these Moral Authorities?

The "intellectuals," of course.

You see, moan the bishops and cardinals, all the psychologists and psychiatrists told them that they should concentrate on rehabilitation, not punishment. They themselves knew what the Bible said about sin, but they didn't want to be old-fashioned rednecks.

They were only following orders.

This is not just important, this is an absolute crime. All the mainline churches today are appealing to liberal opinion as a higher moral authority on almost every issue. More important, they also let the "intellectuals" decide what the moral issue ARE.

Today, all the preachers and priests agree that human action is a result of heredity and environment. But they also say that God says heredity means nothing. That is what all the professors, the psychologists and psychiatrists tell them so it must be true.

Genocide against whites is not genocide. All Modern Opinion agrees. So the mainline preachers and priests say that this is all right with God. None of them has ever considered what it will be like on Judgment Day to tell God that to His Face.

"Lord," they will tell Him, "You worry a lot about kids getting the right education, but you don't care whether they are born smart or dumb. So smart people should not have children and they should spend all their time and money supporting huge welfare families. God, you said that."

You had better be right when you tell Him that!

The churches are shot through with leftist ideas, all courtesy of their desperate desire not to sound like a bunch of judgmental rednecks. That is the single greatest lesson we should all learn from this child molestation scandal. But nobody even mentions it.

Why not? Because nobody wants to sound like a bunch of judgmental rednecks. When it comes to morals, they want to be in on the Latest Thing.

If you are a bishop and you don't want to make moral judgments, take off the suit. If you are a mainline Protestant minister and you follow the Intellectuals, you had better take another look where you are following them to.

WHAT IF WE HAD A GREAT NORTHERN NEIGHBOR LIKE MEXICO DOES?

Now that terror has made tightening our border more popular, we will face another tide of pity for the Mexicans who are stuck in Mexico.

Please look at the sentence I just wrote. It describes the exact truth, but when I write it that way it sounds hideously, screamingly racist, doesn't it? Yet shouting one's pity for the poor Mexicans stuck in Mexico demonstrates that a person is anti-racist.

Anti-racists spend most of their time slobbering and crying over how bad America is for Mexico.

"How would you feel," they shout at us, "If you had a huge, powerful, rich country on your northern border like they do?"

OK, let's look at that question. If we were like Mexico in this respect, we would have a titanic country on our northern border which had a per capita income ten times as high as ours. Every day enormous medical advances would be pouring out of that huge country at a hundred times the rate we produce them.

And, yes, they would tower over us. If we went to their country to work and we lived there exactly like we do here, they would say we were "migrant workers," and that our conditions were unbearable. They would cry and shout that no human being should have to live the way we are used to living.

Above all, they would shout that no one should have to live the way we normally live in THEIR country! And they would feel GUILTY about it!

Now let's list a few of the other things they would feel guilty about.

1) They would beat their chests about the fact that we only make thirty or forty thousand dollars a year instead of three hundred thousands dollars a year like they do. They would pour money down to us in aid.

2) Our Great Northern Neighbor would kick himself because we die at the early age of seventy or eighty. They would pour medical care down here to get our average life span up above a hundred years like theirs is.

3) Millions of us every year would be allowed in to work at ten times our present wages and send them back here. We would complain that ALL of us weren't allowed to go up there and make hundreds of thousands of dollars a year working in conditions vastly better than we ones we work under here.

4) The Monroe Doctrine of our Great Northern Neighbor would make it unnecessary for us to defend ourselves from foreign enemies.

5) Our Great Northern Neighbor would have already made all the technical and economic advances needed to show us how we can also attain levels of riches and health and power we had not imagined were possible.

If you think about it, there are a lot more things like this we would see in our Great Northern Neighbor. Mexico spends most of its time whining and pushing American guilt. If we had a Great Northern Neighbor maybe we would spend more time learning what it has to teach us.

March 2, 2002 - BEING RIGHT, DOES IT MATTER?

March 2, 2002 - BROWN SOCIETIES AND BROWN INDIVIDUALS

March 2, 2002 - CREATION AND COPYING ARE NOT THE SAME THING

March 2, 2002 - JAPAN DISAPPOINTED ME

BEING RIGHT, DOES IT MATTER?

In earlier centuries, book publishing was instant communication. It might take you a year or more to go from manuscript to a printed book, but the world changed very little in a year.

In our day it still takes the publishing bureaucracy a year to get a book out and these days an awful lot happens in a year.

The year before the first sheep was cloned a scientist submitted his final manuscript for a book to come out the following year. One of the things he proved conclusively was that scientists would never be able to clone an animal. The first cloned sheep and the book came out the same month.

This made this particular scientist the best known man in his field. All the media mentioned him, which, for a hard science man, is a lot of publicity. His career is going very nicely, thank you.

Being wrong HELPED his career. This is not unusual.

Very few people I know ever go back and read old conservative writings. So everyone who finally does actually read old conservative writings thinks he has made a unique discovery. It turns out that the person he reads was psychic!

Predictions about the future from the Old South are uncannily accurate. Segregationist writings about what would happen with integration are dead accurate. Conservative predictions about the results of liberal programs are right on target, and nothing liberals say ever works out.

In 1985, not one single paid Soviet expert had the slightest inkling about the collapse of the USSR. Every single paid Russian expert today is either one of those who were paid in 1985 or they were given their credentials by people who were paid Soviet experts in 1985. Being wrong meant less than nothing.

Futurology is defined as an attempt to predict the future. It is nothing of the sort. Futurologists are people who are PAID to predict the future and are PUBLISHED when they write about the future. Here is the important point: Nobody will ever go back over what the futurologists predicted and say who was right and who was wrong.

To the futurologist, predicting the future is totally irrelevant. What he must do is GET PAID to write about the future and get his predictions on the future PUBLISHED. Being paid and published NOW is all that matters for a professional futurologist.

If a futurologist predicts anything Politically Incorrect, he will lose his job as a futurologist and no one will publish his predictions. No futurologist ever predicts anything that offends today's publishers or media managers.

Like today's history, today's futurology is a Just-So Story in which everything past and present fits in perfectly with the picture Politically Correct people want. Any future that doesn't fit will get you fired, and any past that doesn't fit will mean you never get published again.

BROWN SOCIETIES AND BROWN INDIVIDUALS

"The Visigoths have crossed the Alps into Italy, and the Roman Senate is debating an economic stimulus package."

- Pat Buchanan

I am appealing the death sentence that Political Correctness has pronounced on the white race.

It is true that INDIVIDUAL blacks, Asians, Indians and Chinese and Japanese do very, very well IN A WHITE SOCIETY.

Everybody does better in a white society.

Libertarians and liberals want all the presently white majority countries to mix into a uniformly brown group. My problem is that everywhere that has happened, people are stagnant and poor. Liberals and libertarians say that that will not happen if white majority countries all mix into a uniform brown this time.

They prove it by arresting or ruining anyone who disagrees.

Brown people do very well in a society built by whites. Everybody does better in a society built by whites.

THIS IS USED AS AN ARGUMENT AGAINST THE EXISTENCE OF WHITE SOCIETIES!

People insist that if non-whites do well in a white society, a society made up of brown people will lead the world just as well as a white society does. So, they say, whites need to disappear into a melting pot.

And with our present mode of thought, no one but me would notice that this is total self-contradiction. That scares me.

CREATION AND COPYING ARE NOT THE SAME THING

I did well in advanced calculus at school. This does not mean that if there were no calculus, Robert Whitaker would just go ahead and invent it.

I keep getting letters from people who insist that since Asians do well in Silicon Valley, Asian society would have invented computer technology if we hadn't. I have actually been told that since black professional baseball players get paid far more than scientists, a black society would be just as productive as a white one if it weren't for White Evil.

Do not ask whether these people are serious. They are deadly serious. In fact, if you say anything else, you will never get paid or published.

Recently I pointed out that it was the Japanese who recently combined animal and plant genes for the first time. Does that mean that, if white people had never existed, the Japanese would be combining animal and plant genes anyway? If you insist on anything else, you will be professionally ruined in America and you will actually go to prison in Europe.

Please, please PLEASE read February 23, 2002 - THANK GOD FOR READERS WHO CAN READ AND THINK.

JAPAN DISAPPOINTED ME

According to Politically Correct history, white people just copied what the Middle East had done before the Middle Ages and then built Western Civilization, complete with the Moon shot. If you want to get hired or published, you have to insist that any people, brown or black or yellow or white, not only could have done the same thing, they WOULD have done the same thing.

So once Japan caught up with the United States technologically, Asia would make new FUNDAMENTAL advances, as far ahead of the Apollo Mission as the moon shot was ahead of a camel train in the ancient Middle East.

I wish Asians were able to forge ahead of us. I would be happy if there were people who pushed ahead of us in technology and gave us all the benefits this would produce. I wish Asia would forge ahead and I wish that we, like Mexico, had a Great Northern Neighbor to feel sorry for us and send us money. Please see February 23, 2002 - WHAT IF WE HAD A GREAT NORTHERN NEIGHBOR LIKE MEXICO DOES?

So far, Asia has done what it always does. It reached a new level and then stagnated. It just happened faster this time than it has in past history. Everything happens faster these days.

All the paid experts say that Asia will push ahead of the West the way the West left the Middle East in the dust. If they don't say that, they don't get paid or published.

But as the fellow says, "I, I am skeptical."

I think whites should be preserved. The present world program is immigration and integration into ALL white majority countries and ONLY into white majority countries.

Nobody is insisting that Japan accept massive third world immigration, but they are insisting that the more crowded Netherlands be immigrated and integrated to brownness. Anyone in the Netherlands who disagrees goes to PRISON.

I am arguing that this death sentence on the white race should be appealed.

March 9, 2002 - ISLAM AND TOLERANCE OF OTHER RELIGIONS

March 9, 2002 - EACH FAITH HAS A FATAL DISEASE

March 9, 2002 - WHAT IS THE DEGENERATE FORM OF JUDAISM?

ISLAM AND TOLERANCE OF OTHER RELIGIONS

The Koran says the infidel must be crushed. At the same time we are constantly told that Islam is a tolerant religion.

I hate to interrupt a perfectly good shouting match with information, but as usual there is a lot to what both sides are saying.

Moslems often refer to all non-Moslem faiths as "infidels." Sunni Moslems refer to Shiite Moslems as "heathens" and Shiite Moslems refer to Sunni Moslems as "infidels." Like most insults, these labels are not strictly accurate.

When the Koran uses the word "infidel," it is referring to faiths which are not derived from the Old Testament. Judaism, Christianity and Islam all recognize the Old Testament. Moslem countries allowed Jews and Christians to practice their own faith. In Moslem countries, Christians and Jews were discriminated against, but they were not killed.

Pagans, true infidels, were killed by Islam. So those who worshipped the old Greek gods or the old Arab tribal deities were slaughtered outright. Followers of all the old religions of Northern Europe were burned alive.

This is exactly the same approach medieval Christians used in relation to Jews. Jews were permitted to practice their religion in Catholic countries, in Eastern Orthodox countries, and in Protestant countries, but a "pagan" was burned alive.

A Jew who practiced his Old Religion was tolerated in every Christian land. But any of my ancestors who practiced his Old Religion was burned alive. Jews are the only ones we hear complaining about discrimination because they are the only ones who are still alive to do so.

No one complains about the burning of "heathens" by Christians because our old religions were wiped out by pure intolerance. The only people still around to complain are Jews, so the significance of the fact that they were allowed to live and practice their faith under Christians and Moslems is totally ignored.

So what we call the tolerance of Islam, slaughtering infidels but not Jews, was practiced by Christians.

When Jews were persecuted they went to Moslem lands or to other Christian lands. This sort of "Tolerance" is a very relative term.

According to the Old Testament, today's Israel was taken from its native inhabitants complete with blood, fire and genocide. Islam was spread with the sword just as Old Testament Judaism was. So the Crusaders, about whom Christians feel so guilty because they took the Holy Land by fire and sword, were simply the third of three faiths which took the same land the same way.

The forceful taking of Israel by the Jews in our age is a repetition of a very old process.

No faith based on the Old Testament is likely to be tolerant.

Pagans were almost always tolerant. Which may be why I must refer to them in the past tense.

EACH FAITH HAS A FATAL DISEASE

As I said, no one today makes the distinction between Jews who were allowed to practice their faith and members of every other non-Christian faith who were burned alive.

No Christian ever expresses any real guilt about the latter, and every Christian has to moan constantly about our treatment of Jews if he is not to be labeled anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

So we refer to Islam as tolerant because it allowed Jews to live but discriminated against them, but Christian Guilt requires us to denounce Christians as Evil because of the same policy.

To the person being burned alive, this distinction was very important. But to a Christian whose life is built on Guilt, it means nothing. The person who calls himself a Christian but whose true religion is nothing but a giant guilt Complex has not the vaguest idea of what real history is about.

Islam does indeed degenerate into a pure terrorist warlike fanaticism. Christianity does indeed tend to degenerate into pure Guilt and total self-hatred.

Jesus said "love others as you love yourself." Christian self-hatred leads straight to a hatred of others.

WHAT IS THE DEGENERATE FORM OF JUDAISM?

The logic I am using here, like all logical thought, leads me into a piece of pure heresy against Political Correctness. If Christianity has a degenerate form because Christians are human beings, and if Islam has a degenerate form because Moslems are just human beings, is it possible that Jews are human, too?

If Jews are human, then Judaism has a degenerate form, too. But in America today, all the major Christian denominations and all the Jewish denominations agree that any gentile who utters any criticism of anything Jewish is at best an agent of Hitler and at worst an agent of Satan Himself. Which is just another way of saying that today's accepted Christianity and today's accepted Judaism have gone all the way to their degenerate form.

The degenerate form of Islam is terrorism and the degenerate form of Christianity is Guilt carried to the extreme of pure self-hatred. The degenerate form of Judaism is total self-pity. Self-pity leads to a desire for revenge. That leads straight to hatred.

The definition of degenerate Judaism is carried in the endlessly repeated words, "Five thousand years of Suffering." Degenerate Christianity has the same motto about Jews, who exist to Suffer. These two pitiful creatures agree that only Jews can Suffer and the only feeling a Christian should be capable of is Guilt and self-hate for Jewish Suffering.

Some of the serious Jews say that the Holocaust has completely replaced real religion in the minds of many Jews. I know for a fact that the worship of Israel and self-hatred has replaced Christ in the mainline Christian denominations of our day.

In the Koran there is enough about Holy War to allow mere humans to turn it into a religion of Terror. In the Old Testament, there is plenty about being Chosen and Unique Suffering to allow Jews to turn Judaism into pure self-pity and revenge. There is plenty in the words of St. Paul and in the New Testament in general to allow a Christian who tends that way to hate his own existence and to hate himself.

March 16, 2002 - IF YOU WANT A PROMOTION, CAUSE A CATASTROPHE
March 16, 2002 - I TOLD YOU SO!

March 16, 2002 - AMERICA'S BUREAUCRACIES GET DEADLIER EVERY DAY September 11, 2001

March 16, 2002 - UNTIL WE FACE THE SIMPLE CAUSE, THE SITUATION WILL GET WORSE September 11, 2001

IF YOU WANT A PROMOTION, CAUSE A CATASTROPHE

We have all heard that the Immigration and Naturalization Service has just approved visas for the two dead terrorists who piloted the planes that hit the towers in New York on September 11. So what are we going to do about it?

In the last half of the nineteenth century, the death rate in American railroad accidents was horrendous. A much higher percentage of Americans were killed in trains smashing into each other than are killed today in cars. And that was in an age when most people never traveled at all.

Over a hundred and thirty years ago, Mark Twain noticed that while America took train crashes for granted, they almost never happened in France. He quickly found the reason. In America, he said, nobody was ever to blame. In France, if there was an accident, somebody high up got fired and probably prosecuted. To repeat, the result was that France almost never had a train wreck.

To repeat, we have known this for over one hundred and thirty years.

So on September 11, 2001, three thousand people were killed in an attack of which there was not the slightest hint from our numerous and expensive security agencies.

Our response to September 11 has been to make huge increases in security agency budgets. Many of the people in charge were promoted.

By the way, one little bit of news was missed in the rush of reports on the September 11 disaster. It would have been front-page news if the attack had not occurred.

The week of September 11, THE TOP CUBA ANALYST FOR THE DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY WAS ARRESTED AS A SPY FOR CASTRO!!!

To my astonishment, they actually stopped the actual spy's paycheck. Guess how many other people were punished for this security catastrophe?

Nada, senor.

I TOLD YOU SO!

No diplomatic person would just say, "I told you so." No decent person would say that.

It's the sort of thing you depend on me to do.

So not only will I say it, I will rub it in by reprinting what I wrote on September 11. Please note that the above article, written six months later, is exactly what I said would happen.

If you want the CIA to work, clean it out. If you want the DIA to work, clean it out. If you want the INS to work, clean it out. If you want programs that work, clean out the universities where all the policy disasters originate.

That is ALL we should be telling everybody in charge.

AMERICA'S BUREAUCRACIES GET DEADLIER EVERY DAY September 11, 2001

The CIA and FBI failed to give any indication that the World Trade Center attack was being planned. So Congress wants to increase the CIA and FBI budgets.

That is our response to everything, and it never works. More money will not improve bad performance.

Entrenched bureaucrats run American security agencies. It is the nature of that bureaucracy that is the problem.

But nobody dares face the problem with our security bureaucracy because it is the same problem we have with others who run the country.

If we faced it in intelligence, we might see other things clearly as well. If we faced the truth about the CIA and the FBI, our other failing bureaucracies would be in serious trouble. Instead of pumping more and more money into Government tuition grants, we might have to realize that our universities are just entrenched bureaucracies, where academic bureaucrats hold all the teaching and administrative jobs. No intellectual need apply.

Our welfare bureaucracy, in fact our entire titanic education-welfare establishment, would be under attack. And bureaucrats with stars on their shoulders in the Pentagon might lose some of their blind conservative worshippers.

Those who run our political bureaucracy might be questioned.

Worst of all, media bureaucrats might even be questioned.

But bureaucrats needn't panic. Nobody is going to let any of that happen until things get truly desperate.

UNTIL WE FACE THE SIMPLE CAUSE, THE SITUATION WILL GET WORSE September 11, 2001

When the KGB briefly opened its files right after the fall of the Soviet Union, those who looked at them were shocked to discover the enormous extent of Soviet penetration into the US Government since the 1930s. It was worse than even McCarthy had thought!

Naturally, the liberal media bureaucracy minimized this news. Respectable conservatives, who are chosen by the same bureaucracy, hardly mentioned it either.

Nobody spent many resources looking at those files while they were open. Neither the big media nor the US intelligence community really wanted to open that can of worms. So when the KGB closed its files, it was clear that only a tiny percentage of their American operations had been uncovered.

For the KGB and other enemy agencies, a static bureaucracy like that in America's CIA and FBI is a sitting target. Over a period of seventy years, it took little talent to penetrate it wherever one wanted to. They got one Communist sympathizer in, and he got others in. Any entrenched bureaucracy will be as riddled with informers as an unguarded computer is with viruses. These security failures are easily explained. But it is an explanation no paid security expert would dare make public.

So our security bureaucracy is not only inefficient. It also is open to infiltration.

And please take note: these are only two of the MANY obvious realities that those who work for our security bureaucracy must overlook if they want to keep their jobs.

No security professional, in or out of the government, is going to point out this obvious fundamental problem. If he did, he would never get paid to do anything in that area again.

No bureaucracy, be it security or media or education or military, is going to fund a serious critic.

This is not a plot. It's just the obvious result of letting bureaucracy go its own way.

We must stop promoting and listening to people because they have degrees or years in office or the right crowd approves of them. That is why they are allowed, even encouraged, to fail.

Only a complete intellectual revolt against all entrenched bureaucracies, a root-and-branch house cleaning, can deal with the real problems America faces.

Make them give us real solutions or get rid of them. Until we do that, things will get worse.

March 23, 2002 - IN A CRISIS SITUATION, CAN YOU AFFORD TO LIVE IN TWO WORLDS?

March 23, 2002 - WHAT REALLY HAPPENED

March 23, 2002 - WHAT HAPPENED IN THE POLITICALLY CORRECT TWILIGHT ZONE

March 23, 2002 - HOW DO WE SQUARE OUR AMERICAN IDEALS WITH REALITY?

IN A CRISIS SITUATION, CAN YOU AFFORD TO LIVE IN TWO WORLDS?

Fox Cable tested a courthouse which has "beefed up" security with lots of new machines and lots more workers since September 11. Fox sent people through its checkpoints with weapons to see if all that new security would catch them.

All that security did not one bit of good.

Fox videotaped while hammers, knives and other weapons were brought through five different checkpoints. Not one single person that Fox sent through was stopped.

So they decided to show the videotape of all this to the security chief in the courthouse. Then they decided instead to bring the weapons into his office. So in they came with a huge bag of deadly weapons.

WHAT REALLY HAPPENED

What happened in the above incident was this:

Fox sent through well-dressed American white people with those suitcases full of weapons. The guards, almost every one of whom was black, did not bother to check them.

Jesse Jackson said, "I hate to admit it, but when I hear footsteps behind me on a dark street, I am relieved if I turn around and see it's a white man."

And that, ladies and gentlemen, is how the real world works. Well-dressed white people who look all right do not get checked nearly as much. That is not Evil. That is simply good sense.

The fact is that in the real world, you use your eyes and your experience. In other words, out here in reality, prejudice rules. It keeps us alive.

WHAT HAPPENED IN THE POLITICALLY CORRECT TWILIGHT ZONE

Years ago there was a television show instructing people on how to avoid being a crime victim. Most of it was common sense advice, like having your keys in your hand when you approach your car alone, walking where there is light, and so forth.

In other words, it was all simple, real-world stuff.

Then came the Twilight Zone of Political Correctness. They asked if you should get on an elevator at night that is full of "minorities."

No problem, said the film. People of every race and color and creed commit crimes, so you are just as safe in an elevator full of black folks or Puerto Ricans as with well-dressed white Americans.

No one who was that stupid would survive in the real world. But that is the logic on which our whole society is built. The world of liberalism and Political Correctness is never real, it never works, but we try to build a society on it.

So in the Politically Correct Bizarro World, those well-dressed whites from Fox who looked like they belonged should have been checked just as closely as any red-eyed Arab.

We all know that will never happen in a sane world. But we also insist that Our Great Principle of Equality says you have to strip-search grandma. See WOL Worldview for December 29, 2001 - YOU'VE EITHER GOT TO DISCRIMINATE OR STRIP-SEARCH GRANDMA.

HOW DO WE SQUARE OUR AMERICAN IDEALS WITH REALITY?

We don't.

If you have adopted some dumbass insanity and called it an "ideal," you dump it.

But when somebody says "Race doesn't matter" or "All men are created equal," you are supposed to say, "Yes, Master" and lynch anybody who objects. These are "ideals" to which reality and even survival must yield.

Maybe real crises will finally make us face the fact that this is insane. If it doesn't, there is no limit to how much we will have to pay for this insanity.

If our so-called Ideals prohibit rational discrimination, it is time to toss them out.

For in the real world, as Robert Heinlein pointed out:

"The penalty for stupidity has always been death."

March 30, 2002 - CONSERVATIVES GET READY FOR A SELLOUT "TO SAVE THE CHILDREN"

March 30, 2002 - ANOTHER WHITAKER HERESY

March 30, 2002 - SILK PANTS ARISTOCRACY

March 30, 2002 - THE LAST ARISTOCRATS

March 30, 2002 - SOUTHERN ARISTOCRATS VERSUS PSEUDO-ARISTOCRATS

CONSERVATIVES GET READY FOR A SELLOUT "TO SAVE THE CHILDREN"

Conservatives want new laws against child pornography. Liberals want Hate Laws so that they can put right-wing political heretics in prison the way they do in Europe. See March 16, 2002 - GOING TO PRISON FOR HATE IN EUROPE.

Here is how liberals are going to get their Hate Laws. Conservatives will pass special censorship laws for the Internet, and liberals will add on Hate provisions. To prove they are as much against Hate as liberals are, conservatives will support them.

Law enforcement doesn't enforce the child pornography laws we have. Today, the law is too busy putting the criminals back into the prison that Social Progress keeps letting them out of.

Conservatives talk about the wonderful past, when child pornography and drugs were not in the schools. But they have not the slightest idea how that was accomplished. You can't be a modern conservative if you know any real history.

The reason we did not have child pornography and drugs in the schools in the old days was not because we passed more laws. We had a very direct and effective way of dealing with such "hideously complex, intricate, and almost insoluble problems."

It had nothing to do with passing laws.

When I was in school. if a Dentsville School parent heard of a child predator going after his children, he would kill the bastard. The sheriff and the local prosecutor would look the other way or pat him on the back.

In other words, the people did what every respectable conservative and every liberal condemns more loudly than any exploitation of children:

We took the law into our hands.

You see, it was OUR country. They were OUR children. We were responsible for them.

This is heresy to both liberals and conservatives today. "America" to them is an abstract set of principles, not a group of people. Least of all is America US. America is Freedom or Equality or the Statue of Liberty, not a collection of mere human beings (See May 15, 1999 - WORDISM).

Today's mantra is "Leave it to the Authorities." You pass a law and your job is over. The result is that we get lots and lots of new laws that are enforced ONLY if they do what the liberal bureaucrats want done.

So the conservatives will push through new child porno laws. In return, conservatives will help liberals pass Hate Laws.

Guess which laws will be enforced?

ANOTHER WHITAKER HERESY

In American society today nothing is purer heresy than saying people should "take the law into their own hands."

We have a Constitution whose only claim to authority is "We the People of the United States of America..." But liberals and conservatives agree that the only real purpose of that document is to allow judges to overrule the people's will.

For the people's own good, of course.

And here I am demanding that the people take the law back into their own hands.

I'll never be an Intellectual.

SILK PANTS ARISTOCRACY

Conservatives always talk about Tradition but they know nothing about real history.

The National Review conservative, for example, thinks French and aristocracy go together. If you know any history, this is hilarious.

French (the Franks were Germans) became the international language in imitation of Louis XIV and Versailles. Louis' purpose in building Versailles was to destroy the French aristocracy. He succeeded.

When Louis XIV was a boy, the French aristocracy became so powerful Louis' home was invaded by rebellious aristocrats and he was displayed to them. He hated them, and he determined to build a total despotism in France. As part of this, he built Versailles.

The Versailles Palace was so huge almost the entire French aristocracy moved there. All preferment under Louis XIV was on the basis of whom he saw at Versailles. His most damning remark was, "He is a man I do not see."

As a result, the entire French "aristocracy" spent all its time playing personal servants to the Sun King. In order to stay where Louis XIV was they had to cut all their roots with their people in the countryside. They gave up all real power and put on silk pants and the latest fashions and said witty things while packed together at the Palace.

All the smaller kingdoms tried to imitate Versailles. French and the latest French fashions in every area became the rage with those who wanted to ape aristocracy.

But the real aristocrats in England and Germany and other places stayed with their power-bases. The real aristocrats stayed with their own people in the countryside.

The pretend aristocrats today are as pitiful as the ones they imitate under Louis XIV.

The ones today tell each other how sophisticated they are and they use untranslated French phrases and look down on the "masses." They think that makes them upper class.

THE LAST ARISTOCRATS

In a book called "Who Killed Society?," Cleveland Amory wanted to see if there were any aristocrats left in America. Amory, who was a Northern liberal, found that all the old Northern "upper crusts" no longer had any clout or even much self-respect.

Looking at today's sham aristocrats, Amory laughed at the series of books called "The Four Hundred." The "Four Hundred" series had started in New York and listed the top four hundred families there. Soon there was a "Four Hundred" book in every major Northern city.

So the "Four Hundred" publisher sent a representative to Charleston. He called on an old lady on the Battery. He told her about his project, to list the top four hundred families in Charleston.

"Why?" She asked.

"So people will know who they are," he replied.

She looked surprised and answered, "We already know who they are."

With this and numerous other examples, Amory said that the only aristocracy left in America was in Charleston.

National Review and the Four Hundred types identify with Europe and with "sophistication." Charleston's aristocrats are very much Charlestonians. Unlike Northern Four Hundreds who try to keep their views "hip," our real aristocrats look at the world as other South Carolinians do.

Unlike the pitiful French "aristocracy" under Louis XIV, the best of the Charleston upper crust maintained its ties with, and therefore the respect of, the people of their own land.

SOUTHERN ARISTOCRATS VERSUS PSEUDO-ARISTOCRATS

After Dale Earnhardt's death, a writer for National Review made fun of the people who mourned him so openly. She used her column to show how they didn't know the high-class music she knew and how that made her a true aristocrat.

Pretty standard silk pants aristocracy stuff, fitting perfectly with modern conservatism.

Can you imagine Southern working people following that sort of person into the Yankee guns the way they followed the Southern generals in the Civil War?

As Lake High points out, the first thing a Yankee asks you is what you do. The first thing a Southerner asks you is where you're from.

The Southern aristocracy is my model. I am not from Paris, I am from Pontiac, South Carolina.

The first rule with the real aristocracy was that it was FROM somewhere. The silk pants types keep spouting French, but they never notice that words like the French "de" or the German "von" meant FROM, as in the Marquee OF Salisbury.

The poor clowns don't even really understand basic French.

When I formed the Populist Forum, National Review types thought I was putting on some kind of hillbilly act (to New Yorkers, everybody in the South is a "hillbilly"). They simply could not believe that we had genuine respect for the people we were helping out.

We were in Kentucky, the West Virginia coal mines, South Boston, and riding with the striking independent truckers. But we were there as people with the education and experience these people, OUR people, needed.

That's what real aristocrats do.

One of my proudest moments was when a leader of the textbook protest in West Virginia said, "Whitaker speaks for us and he's not even a hick."

We did their writing and put on their press conferences, but every word was checked with them, and THEY were at the press conferences, not some self-styled "intellectuals".

Not surprisingly, respectable conservatives like National Review and the Marxists have very similar ideas of "aristocracy." Marxists call it "the dictatorship OF the proletariat." It means that the self-styled "intellectuals" like Marx and Trotsky and Lenin have absolute power and say they are kicking the masses around for their own good.

The reason working Americans trusted us was because they were right to do so. Even in Boston, they could sense the ideal of the Southern aristocracy.

April 6, 2002 - REMEMBER WHEN ISRAEL HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH AMERICA'S MIDDLE EAST PROBLEMS?

April 6, 2002 - DAN RATHER HAS A REVELATION

April 6, 2002 - A BIRTHRIGHT IS NOT A RIGHT OF RETURN

April 6, 2002 - WHO ARE THE RELIGIOUS FANATICS WHEN IT COMES TO BIRTHRIGHTS?

April 6, 2002 - WHY YOU ARE A DOCUMENTED ALIEN

REMEMBER WHEN ISRAEL HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH AMERICA'S MIDDLE EAST PROBLEMS?

Of course you don't. It's been six months.

In the month after the Twin Towers attack, every single discussion of that attack had to include the following statement:

"A lot of people think the Arabs are mad at us about Israel. It has nothing to do with Israel. They just hate America because we got money and we let women vote."

I summed it up on October 20, 2001 with "IT'S NOT ISRAEL" MEDIA BLITZ IS PAYING OFF. In the first survey after the Twin Towers attack, the portion of Americans who thought that attack was related to American support of Israel was 67%. A month later, the "It's not Israel" campaign had pushed it down to 57%.

Nobody is repeating that "It's Not Israel" line now.

You only hear yesterday's spin from me. Everybody else forgets it instantly and listens to whatever this week's media line is. It never occurs to anybody, especially conservatives, not to believe them.

DAN RATHER HAS A REVELATION

One of the top Keepers of the Spin everybody listens to is Dan Rather. He is in Israel and he said, "Gosh, Israel can't control suicide bombers with a few explosives. What if they started carrying suitcase atomic bombs or biological weapons?"

Please read November 21, 1998 – SUPERTERRORISM.

A BIRTHRIGHT IS NOT A RIGHT OF RETURN

Israel and the United States have a theological concept called "right of return," based on the official United States doctrine that God personally gave Palestine to the Jews.

Britain and almost every country that was once in its Empire has a concept called "birthright." Anyone born in England, no matter what his citizenship, has a right to go back to the United Kingdom and live there.

Even though every respectable American agrees that God personally says any Jew has the right to throw out anyone born in Palestine, we could at least get the words right.

Arabs have been arguing that Palestinians who were actually born inside what is now Israel should be allowed to go back there and settle. Both Christian and Moslem Arabs have asked for this birthright.

When they discuss this demand the media call it "a right of return." It is not a right of return, and the difference is so profound that the media are not even allowed to mention it.

The "right of return" means that any Jew anywhere on earth can "return" to Israel to live. The right of return means that any Jew whose family has lived anywhere for centuries has the right to Palestinian land.

WHO ARE THE RELIGIOUS FANATICS WHEN IT COMES TO BIRTHRIGHTS?

Regardless of which side you support, what is undeniable is that Palestinians are asking for the traditional birthright of a human being. The Right of Return is a totally different and unique concept.

According to official United States doctrine, Right of Return was given to all in the religious sect we call Jews (Please see · October 21, 2000 - THE HINDUS IN ROMAN PALESTINE). The Right of Return was given directly to all Jews by the hand of the Almighty, according to the United States Government.

A birthright is NOT a right of return. The reason the media confuses the two words is because, if they used the words correctly, they would be admitting who the religious fanatics are on this issue.

In 1935, Hitler promulgated the Nuremberg Laws which took German citizenship away from Jews who had been born in Germany. The world is still screaming bloody murder about that. The fourteenth amendment did not give blacks the right to vote, but it did give them something more basic, a birthright in the United States.

As stated before, the birthright still exists in countries of the former British Empire, even after you renounce your citizenship. Birthright is recognized everywhere.

Except Israel.

WHY YOU ARE A DOCUMENTED ALIEN

I have exactly the same problem the Palestinians do. According to official United States Government and "Christian conservative" doctrine, America is a nation of immigrants. Everybody on earth has just as much right to be here as people like me who were born here.

Since we have the sense not to overpopulate our land, these self-styled "Christians" demand that we adopt the overflow babies from other lands. This is in addition to the fact that, according to the "melting pot" doctrine, all foreign adults have more right to be in America than we do. Everybody on earth has a Right of Return to this "nation of immigrants."

I would be a lot less pro-Palestinian if the same media who mix up the Right of Return with the birthright there did not agree that I live in "a nation of immigrants." My family had been living here for

over two hundred and fifty years when Israel Zangwill declared that America has nothing to do with us. He declared that America was just a "melting pot" where everybody on earth had a Right of Return.

Emma Lazarus was a Zionist who invited the whole world to come to America. She wrote the inscription on the Statue of Liberty. Emma Lazarus declared that America was for anybody who wanted to come here. She also demanded a Jewish state that would be strictly for Jews.

Please read October 31, 1998 - FIVE WORDS AND EMMA LAZARUS.

The only reason every Mexican who wants to come here has a problem is because he is "undocumented." It's not a question of right. You have no birthright here. It's just a matter of papers.

Native born Americans are documented aliens in this nation of immigrants.

Remember those so-called "Christians" who are always talking about Patriotism and Family Values?

You know, the ones who are going to Save America for you?

They're with Israel Zangwill and Emma Lazarus both here and in the Middle East.

April 13, 2002 - THE INTELLIGENT SOUTHERNER'S DESPAIR IN THE 1950'S

April 13, 2002 - COULD I HAVE BEEN A SUICIDE BOMBER?

April 13, 2002 - THE YOUNG BOB WHITAKER'S REAL HATE

THE INTELLIGENT SOUTHERNER'S DESPAIR IN THE 1950'S

In The Death of the West, Pat Buchanan says that the whole white world is dying and being crowded and immigrated and integrated out of existence. He says Western Civilization, which is the only place where the average person ever lived above animal level, will die with it.

I saw all that when I was fighting integration in the mid-1950s. I watched conservatives swing over to the integrationists and respectability. Twenty years after that, by the 1970s, pretty well every respectable conservative, including Pat Buchanan, regarded the end of the white race as the single greatest goal of Western Civilization.

Back then, Pat argued on "Crossfire" that all those Americans fought and died in World War II specifically to open Europe up to third world immigration. "Open borders" was the battle cry of every conservative who said that the free market, and nothing else, was What America Is All About.

All this was called "race mixing," but it was obvious to everybody that Asia was for the Asians and Africa was for the Africans. This so-called race mixing would occur only in white majority countries. In the "progressive" science fiction stories of the time there are often blacks and Asians in the future, but no whites.

COULD I HAVE BEEN A SUICIDE BOMBER?

Many segregationists reacted in a knee-jerk way against integration. Only some of us understood what the battle was and what the stakes were. More than one observer noted that loud segregationists fell into two strange groups. One was the knee-jerk segregationists, and the other was made up of some of the most literate people they had ever met.

Most of the knee-jerk segregationists have since become knee-jerk integrationists.

I watched while we were steadily betrayed by conservatives who could not (or with the right incentives would not) see the big picture. Like so many other literate segregationists, I predicted exactly what we have today in every area of our lives.

It was horrible, and no one was striking back. Our hideous, treasonous, blasphemous traitors prospered. That must be the way teenage Palestinians see Israel today.

I felt terribly alone because I WAS terribly alone. Other "normal" teenagers were worrying about what kind of pomade Sal Mineo greased his hair with.

I was told by one "practical" person after another to worry about education funding or other "practical" issues.

If, on top of all the rest, my family was in financial trouble back then, and with my helplessness and hopelessness, it might have been fairly easy to get me to sign on to the suicide crowd if it had my enemies terrified.

What if someone had given me a real incentive back in the 1950's to become part of a movement of suicide bombers? In a world controlled by a sick and evil drive to destroy my people I can see that I might have taken the opportunity to get out of the nightmare once and for all and take some real enemies with me. But they would have been the worst kind of enemies, not random women and children.

As to my having been a potential suicide bomber, I have never been afraid of dying. Even as a teenager I did not regard life in this world as glorious and wonderful and of infinite value. In arguing with liberals, pro-lifers have given themselves to a Big Lie which nobody believes. It is a good example of how one becomes like one's enemy.

The Palestinians who are doing the suicide bombings are not Karl Marx's dispossessed poverty-stricken proletariat. They are educated young Palestinians who feel alone and see a bleak future for their people.

I like to think I could never be persuaded to go after innocent targets. I could never be among women and children and know I was about to kill them.

THE YOUNG BOB WHITAKER'S REAL HATE

People still like to mention the fact that the worst part of Dante's Hell was not fire, but ice. What they have to skirt around today is exactly who was in that worst part of Hell.

Today, if you are an American who hates America, you are a Moral Idealist. Today, if you are a white who hates whites, you are a Moral Idealist. Today, if you are a gentile who hates gentiles, you are a Moral Idealist. Today, if you are a Southerner who hates Southerners, you are a Moral Idealist.

So no one today likes to mention that Dante left the worst part of Hell for traitors. The most horrible part of Hell was reserved for the kind of people we now call Moral Idealists.

I have pointed out how "anti-racist" propaganda today regards non-whites as less than human. See February 9, 2002 - WHITE ANTIRACISM IS REALLY VERY RACIST. Colored inferiority is their real attitude and it underlies everyone's view of race, especially that of minority "leaders."

In the 1915 movie, "Birth of a Nation," the blacks who supported Reconstruction were said to be corrupted by Yankees. The white supremacists who wrote that movie in 1915 could not regard blacks as guilty of anything, any more than a squirrel could be. Exactly the same thing is true of today's anti-racists.

When today's liberal says, "It may seem cruel to us, but it is nature's way," you never know whether he is talking about what animals are doing or what aboriginal peoples are doing.

Like today's anti-racist, I have always tended to secretly believe that only whites are capable of real evil.

So I didn't hate blacks for being dumb blunt objects to be used by liberals. I detested anti-white whites, though. For my entire life, some form of self-hatred has been regarded as The Only True Morality among white gentiles, and especially American white gentiles.

If a movement with all the inducements of helping my family had recruited this depressed teenager in the 1950s, I would have gone after the people I, like Dante, hated most in the world, the traitors. Those Southerners like Ralph McGill or Tom Wicker would have been spread all over the sidewalk with me in a grotesque but ultimate form of integration.

So I am not writing this for the sake of the Palestinians. I am writing it to others from the 1950s who were young people going through that long night of knowing what was coming and watching the traitors thrive.

I write it for all of us who, despite all the attacks and the incentives to become traitors, remembered what the battle was all about.

April 20, 2002 - BLACK OR HISTORY?

April 20, 2002 - TO KNOW WHERE WE ARE, THE FIRST QUESTION IS: WHO ARE "WE?"

April 20, 2002 - WHAT ARE OUR SPECIAL REQUIRED FALSEHOODS?

April 20, 2002 - WHEN YOU READ, DON'T JUST *SEE***, ***OBSERVE*****

April 20, 2002 - A FINAL OBSERVATION

BLACK OR HISTORY?

In his book, "Might of the West," Lawrence Brown summed up a thousand years of Chinese history in two paragraphs. Obviously a lot more incidents occurred in that period than two paragraphs worth, but only two paragraphs of HISTORY occurred in that period in the Far East.

If we knew every incident that ever occurred in sub-Saharan Africa in the past ten thousand years, we would not have much more HISTORY than we have now.

In the real world, Black History is an oxymoron. Black History doesn't go anywhere and the purpose of history is to show where we are and why.

TO KNOW WHERE WE ARE, THE FIRST QUESTION IS: WHO ARE "WE?"

In order to understand real history in time, we must first face real history in space. When all the Politically Correct horsehockey has been put to bed and the talk gets serious, all mention of the Democratic Republic of the Congo disappears like mist and we begin to discuss real places.

Even when serious discussions go into the possible effect of the non-white world on real history, the analysis is of non-human factors. The third world may be important because of "ITS numbers." The Moslem world may be important because its population happens to be sitting on top of oil. When we get serious about Rwanda, its human population and history are less relevant to us than that of the handful of gorillas who live there.

In other words, when you stop talking horsehockey and your time gets valuable, you get down to priorities. And as we all know, real world priorities can be enormously insulting. Truth is seldom kind and reality is NEVER Politically Correct.

WHAT ARE OUR SPECIAL REQUIRED FALSEHOODS?

Nobody can seriously question the statements I have just made. But everybody is amazed that I made them. That tells us something very important about where we are in real history today.

Obviously we are in a period of history where no one is allowed to speak out unless he lies a lot.

In the real world, the most important factor by far is skin color. If you want proof of how important skin color is, look at the rivers of ink and billions of dollars we spend every month trying to prove it isn't important. At least twice a month, another book is awarded a long list of academic awards for trying, once again, to prove that what we all see is not really there.

If you look at the world the way I do, this can get hilarious.

The "It's all an accident" book that picked up a Pulitzer Prize recently is called "Guns, Germs and Steel." In its second sentence, it informs us that it is going to explain why history unfolded differently on different continents.

The next sentence would knock a sane person's eye out:

"IN CASE THIS QUESTION IMMEDIATELY MAKES YOU SHUDDER AT THE THOUGHT THAT YOU ARE ABOUT TO READ A RACIST TREATISE, YOU SHOULDN'T."

As I say, you simply cannot write a book for the public unless you routinely lie and lie wildly. Even in the long and crowded history of outright lies, this one would be hard to top. No sane reader would think this was a racist book.

If there is one fact we all know today, it is that nobody is going to write a racist book for a mainline publisher. He would be ruined academically and professionally in America and put in prison in the "Western Democracies" of Europe (WOL Worldview · March 16, 2002 - GOING TO PRISON FOR HATE IN EUROPE).

So why on earth would anybody imagine for an instant that a book that got the Pulitzer Prize might be racist?

Try to imagine a future historian looking at this sentence, a historian who is perfectly aware of today's Inquisition on racial discussion. He would be in the position of a specialist in Medieval History reading a book put out by the Spanish Inquisition, complete with the doctrinal Imprimatur, which starts off, "You probably think this is a Lutheran book."

For someone who just got the umpteenth Major Award for writing the umpteenth book proving the doctrine of today's Inquisition for the umpteenth time to say the reader might think it may be a racist book surprises nobody. The fact is that you don't get a public forum in our age unless you start out with a "good, sound, resounding lie."

WHEN YOU READ, DON'T JUST *SEE***, ***OBSERVE*****

We all remember what Sherlock Holmes used tell his dumb-but-loyal assistant and biographer:

"You SEE, Watson, but you do not OBSERVE."

Let us OBSERVE what this sentence that millions have SEEN tells us:

"IN CASE THIS QUESTION IMMEDIATELY MAKES YOU SHUDDER AT THE THOUGHT THAT YOU ARE ABOUT TO READ A RACIST TREATISE, YOU SHOULDN'T."

This wonderful sentence tells an OBSERVER another fundamental truth about our age. And it needs stating clearly because it is an important OBSERVATION:

Despite the fact that thousands of books are written and given awards to prove that the historical importance of skin color is an accident, absolutely nobody believes it.

Nobody really believes that race does not exist or that that the inherited characteristics of race are not important. What the author is here admitting up front is that any serious discussion of why some continents are part of history and others are not would be a racist book.

A FINAL OBSERVATION

People seem constitutionally incapable of talking about history without getting silly.

For example, there is a Great Historical Mystery that asks why all the Great Civilizations built pyramids. Maybe it was Ancient astronauts who showed them how.

Hundreds of books have told us that these Great Civilizations were nonwhite and built pyramids and that shows everybody's equal.

Let me give you another Great Historical Mystery:

A pyramid is a building where the base is wide and it goes to a peak. So why did absolutely none of the Great Civilizations build buildings where the base was in the air and the point was the only thing touching the ground? Did Ancient Astronauts tell them NOT to build pyramids that were upside-down?

By the way, both white and nonwhite Great Civilizations did NOT build upside-down pyramids. That proves everybody is equal. You could get a Major Award out of writing a book about that.

April 27, 2002 - ANOTHER PC SPIN

April 27, 2002 - OUR PERMANENT SNOOZE BUTTON

April 27, 2002 - REMEMBER THE RAGGED KNEE AWARD?

April 27, 2002 - LAST YEAR'S RAGGED KNEE AWARD

April 27, 2002 - THE NOT-SO-NEO RATS

April 27, 2002 - NEO WORSHIP

April 27, 2002 - THE RAGGED KNEE AWARD FOR 2002

ANOTHER PC SPIN

I know leftists are having a field day attacking religion because of the Catholic scandal about child molestation. I hate that, but it is no excuse.

"Only a percent or two of priests are accused." How many populations outside of ex-cons have one or two percent of their numbers accused of a single felony? In any case, this too is an excuse for absolutely nothing.

The overwhelming majority of those molested were teenaged boys.

But homosexuals are an Officially Protected Minority, so we cannot blame homosexual priests. So someone has come up with a word for someone who goes after teenage boys. They say those perverts are something different from homosexuals, you see.

This is the kind of Politically Correct crap that got the Church into this mess in the first place. See February 23, 2002 - WHAT HAPPENS WHEN CHURCHES APPEAL TO A HIGHER MORAL AUTHORITY.

OUR PERMANENT SNOOZE BUTTON

Cardinal Law of Boston has been exposed for covering for child molesting priests for a generation. He was so bad that the only thing standing between him and a prison cell is his red hat.

Cardinal Law's job, his ONLY job, is Christian morality. So Cardinal Law just announced that the fact that he has been exposed is a "wakeup call." He says that this should wake him up to start paying some attention to Christian morality.

See February 23, 2002 - WHAT HAPPENS WHEN CHURCHES APPEAL TO A HIGHER MORAL AUTHORITY.

The only job of the INS is to enforce American immigration law. They just got two wild scandals which they called "wake up calls" to enforce the American immigration law.

The ONLY job of the giant security apparatus of the United States is to gather information critical to American security. The death of three thousand Americans on September 11, 2001, has been repeatedly referred to as "a wakeup call" to make America's security agencies start gathering information critical to American security.

For the first three years of Whitaker Online, I kept groaning and shouting about the fact that nobody is required to do anything that WORKS (see WhitakerOnline archives 1998-2001, passim). All you need to be a big man in security or the INS or any large church is the right degrees and approval from the other bureaucrats.

There is no substitute for making people do their jobs. Nothing is a substitute for getting rid of people with paper credentials if they do NOT do their jobs. There is no room for any compromise on this.

Until we build a complete revolution on the basis of this uncompromising position, all the death and agony we are getting is exactly what we ask for.

REMEMBER THE RAGGED KNEE AWARD?

It is always important to remind ourselves where respectable conservatives come from.

For over half a century liberals have been in absolute control of every form of national media.

In 1950, there were four television networks. There were CBS, NBC and ABC, which were solidly liberal, and there was PBS which was extreme left and was paid for by our tax dollars. Back then, a balanced debate consisted of two liberal Republicans and three liberal Democrats. There simply were no conservative spokesmen in the national media.

Over the ensuing decades a handful of carefully selected conservatives were allowed some air time. Naturally, they were those that liberals felt comfortable and safe with, like William F. Buckley.

This was the exact opposite of a plot. It was the most natural development in the world. Liberals would try out conservatives for spokesmen jobs - I was on PBS a couple of times - and the ones who made liberals feel uncomfortable were not asked back.

When a group gets to select the opposition it feels comfortable with, it is not going to pick the best and the brightest. In this process, morons and cowards will come out ahead.

Above all, liberals did not ask conservatives back who hit them on issues that really hurt. Once again, it was the exact opposite. They liked the rightist spokesmen who would help them avoid really hurtful discussions. So what happened was very natural:

We ended up with conservative spokesmen who, if someone talked about something that could really hurt liberals, would lead a lynch mob against them. When a liberal says "extremist" or "nazihowantstokillsixmillionjews" it is respectable conservatives who scream for the blood of the heretic.

When liberals condemn, respectable conservatives either scream for blood or grovel. If their boss liberal calls some other right winger a name, respectable conservatives scream for his blood. But if a liberal finds that his pet conservative has himself said something heretical, the conservative goes to his knees and begs forgiveness.

So if anyone says something about whites being wiped off the map, the respectable conservative screams for his blood. If the respectable conservative himself says something nice about whites and his liberal notices it, he grovels and apologizes.

At the top of the heap among respectable conservatives are the Grovelers Extraordinaire, the ones who hit their knees instantly and hard at any hint of heresy. Their physical knees get bloody, their pants knees get ragged.

Once a year, I give the Ragged Knee Award to the champion respectable conservative grovelers.

Remember that we are dealing here with people who have made a career of being such cowardly morons they were actually selected for it by the liberals. So the competition for the best of all these professional grovelers is fierce.

LAST YEAR'S RAGGED KNEE AWARD

The average conservative has the memory of a fly on LSD. So last year's Ragged Knee recipient will astonish this year's conservative community.

No one fought for the leftist agenda with less regard for human decency than did Clinton's Attorney General Janet Reno. Bill was a flagrant sociopath, but Reno put on airs of having a conscience. She stopped every investigation of Clinton after he reappointed her for his second term.

So Bush appointed John Ashcroft to succeed Reno, and he did every bit as good a job as she did for the political left. The right threw away all its power to get him confirmed and he paid them back in wonderful respectable conservative style. He condemned everything liberals condemned and stopped everything that worried Clinton at least as well as Reno had ever done.

See April 28, 2001 - THE RAGGED KNEE AWARD. So last year's Ragged Knee Award was earned by Attorney General John Ashcroft.

As always, last year's biggest turncoat is this year's conservative hero.

THE NOT-SO-NEO RATS

Neoconservatives are the liberals who, around 1970, suddenly realized that the left was turning public opinion against them and therefore switched sides.

In 1950, the word "liberal" was a compliment. By 1970, no one wanted to be called a liberal, even in New York politics. The real rats among the liberals could feel the water coming up around their necks. So they jumped ship by dropping the liberal label and calling themselves "neoconservatives."

As one neoconservative put it, "I was a social democrat and I am a social democrat."

In the 1950s and 1960s conservatives had told all the liberals that liberalism would lead to treason and policy disasters. Neoconservatives say that nothing liberals did before 1970 was wrong.

Neoconservatives say that one day about January 1, 1970, liberalism switched from absolute rightness to disaster. At that moment they became neoconservatives, so they were right before that to be liberals and they were right after that to sell liberals out.

NEO WORSHIP

Nothing is more natural than that respectable conservatives would worship neoconservatives.

Respectable conservatives were thrilled that these neoconservatives who had been in the media and in the government as liberals were now willing to have lunch with them. Respectable conservatives went nuts when neoconservatives started to write for them.

Respectable conservatives could not believe that these Great Men who had previously only associated with the media moguls among their fellow liberals now talked to THEM!

As the hard-core liberal ship went down, conservatives not only welcomed the rats aboard the conservative ship, they gave them the helm.

As William Buckley keeps saying, "People talk about rats deserting the ship. Well, why shouldn't they?"

After all, some of those rats are his best friends.

David Horowitz, who screamed anaziwhowsantstokillsixmillionjews to prevent any opposition on racial issues on campus when he was a leftist, is now in charge of the conservative civil rights debate.

You see, says Horowitz, he did help crush all opposition to integration on campus by calling anyone who did not lie about race anaziwhowantedtokillsixmillionjews. Now he demands to know why there is not free speech on racial issues on college campuses.

According to neoconservatives, shrieking down all serious discussion of race before January 1, 1970, was the act of an Idealist, but on January 1, 1970, for no reason, it got ugly.

THE RAGGED KNEE AWARD FOR 2002

Conservatives have given their movement to the neos. They condemn anything that challenges liberal policies prior to January 1, 1970, especially those aimed at getting rid of white people.

So when David Horowitz holds up a photo of Martin Luther King to respectable conservatives, they fall on their stomachs so hard that their knees are actually the highest points on their bodies.

Respectable conservatives were always good at groveling to liberals, but I never realized how incredibly good they were at groveling until the neoconservatives started speaking to them.

So the Ragged Knee Award this year goes to the conservative worshippers of David Horowitz. They have earned it and they will earn it more as the days go by.

May 4, 2002 - AMERICA, GET A LIFE!

May 4, 2002 - WHEN THINGS GET SERIOUS, LEFTIST MYTHOLOGY GETS EXPOSED

May 4, 2002 - GUNS FOR ISRAELIS BUT NOT FOR NEW YORKERS

May 4, 2002 - WHEN TERROR BOMBING WAS COOL

AMERICA, GET A LIFE!

We all know that the South is America's only natural nation. We have a set of attitudes and a deep-rooted culture that makes a nation. This shows that the term "Southern nationalist" needs to be used carefully. We already ARE a nation. What we want is to make our nation, which already exists, independent.

It is important to us to know that we are the only real nation over here. But it also has enormous implications for non-Southerners. It means that the rest of the United States does not have a real identity of its own.

When I cross the border into Canada, I feel that I am in a land that is still an integral part of Europe. All Canadian political attitudes are purely European. Even the upper house of their legislature is appointed for life!

In Canada, if you have a gun you go to prison. If you say anything Politically Incorrect, you can go to jail.

So what does the rest of the United States use as a substitute for nationality? The founder and first editor of the New Yorker Magazine in the 1920s had a sign on his desk that said, in bold letters, "HATE SOUTHERNERS" (James Thurber, "My Years With Ross").

If you had asked someone in the 1920s what America was all about, he would say something like "Mom and apple pie." But now that is unicultural. The only thing you are allowed to say that America is now is the Constitution. When we sit through a list of people on television telling us "I am an American" it is a parade of people who have nothing in common.

So the United States outside the South is a "nation" of people who have nothing in common.

So today, America is stating flatly what that sign on the editor's desk said eighty years ago: the only identity the North has is hating the Southern nation. When they get together in what they call a patriotic rally, their theme is "The Battle Hymn of the Republic," which we know as "John Brown's Body."

The only basis for American nationhood today is cultural nonexistence and hate. For all their talk about the Constitution, a United States without the South would have exactly the same laws that Canada has today, Hate Laws and all.

The United States hates the Southern nation and it hates white gentiles. That is its only basis.

That's not a basis for a Union. The North needs to get a life.

WHEN THINGS GET SERIOUS, LEFTIST MYTHOLOGY GETS EXPOSED

The Ohio Supreme Court has just struck down a state law banning concealed weapons. Finally, the courts are doing something for US!

Now that terrorism is in the air, a completely helpless public is not as popular as it used to be. Even some courts are beginning to understand this.

Open borders was the real American policy until September 11, 2001. Now Congress demands that the INS be abolished!

Every day hundreds of thousands of Americans who were all for a color-blind society are being searched so that people who look like terrorists won't be singled out for airline checks. They are really upset that they, regular Americans, are being frisked right along with the grubbiest foreigner.

It was all right when white school children were bussed into dangerous areas for the theory of nondiscrimination, but when it hits voters on airplanes, it's suddenly gone too far.

GUNS FOR ISRAELIS BUT NOT FOR NEW YORKERS

I saw a picture in Time Magazine of an Israeli woman showing the weapon she carries all the time. Have you heard any calls for gun control in Israel? New York's Jewish population solidly backs that state's gun ban but not a one of those folks wants the same law in Israel.

Is New York safe? Of course not. But if minorities threaten New Yorkers, the New Yorker gets a minimum sentence of one year in prison if he carries a weapon for self-protection. After all, Jews in New York look upon themselves as a minority group in sympathy with the oppressed minority groups.

But in Israel, the oppressed minority is the Palestinians, so that's a completely different matter.

WHEN TERROR BOMBING WAS COOL

"The Godfather, Part II" had a plot which ended up concentrating on a single incident. The Evil Capitalists and their fellow criminals, the Mafia, were dividing up Cuba with the evil ruler Battista. Meanwhile, the intellectual Marxist hero Fidel Castro was trying to drive Battista out of power.

The Godfather himself was riding through Havana at this time and he saw a man yell "Viva Fidel!" and blow himself up with a policeman. He told the Evil Capitalists that Castro would win. "Nobody paid that guy to kill himself," he said, "They might just win."

Fidel, you see, is a hero of the left. The movie industry was explaining to us that suicide bombing for Castro was a good idea. Terror against civilians has always been a routine Communist tactic. Those bombs were used in restaurants and other civilian targets back then the same way they are used by Palestinians today in Israel. But Cuba is not Israel.

May 11, 2002 - A THIRTEEN-WORD RULE OF LIFE

May 11, 2002 - HOW DID YOUR MIND SURVIVE?

May 11, 2002 - WHY YOU AND I ARE "SIMPLISTIC"

May 11, 2002 – EXAMPLES

A THIRTEEN-WORD RULE OF LIFE

Never trust anyone who does not pronounce the "w" in the word "dog."

HOW DID YOUR MIND SURVIVE?

Every fan of WhitakerOnline.org is a miracle. Almost every European and Canadian is a knee-jerk liberal, but Americans like you laugh at leftist silliness.

The most important three hundred and twenty-six (326) words I have ever written are in the present (April 6, 2002) WhitakerOnline.org World View, titled "WAREHOUSING THE YOUNG."

If anyone from another age looked at our time, the first thing he would notice is that every child who reaches the age of fourteen delays his adulthood and spends eight years being told how to think every day by a self-perpetuating bureaucracy that calls itself "teachers."

Nobody but me even notices this titanic fact of life.

You and every "educated" European go through eight years of concentrated drilling in how stupid everybody else is and how smart professors are. They call it leftism, but it really is just the idea that professors are the only unselfish and smart people on earth.

The difference is that, with you, all that training didn't take.

Almost every European I know quotes a PhD like he is a god. In Europe, academic opinions from abolishing the death penalty to how Communists are just as good as we are are popular beliefs that everyone votes for at every election. They are being overrun by third world immigrants, but every election shows Europeans would rather throw away their countries than have the "intellectuals" call them racists.

It is not surprising that almost all Europeans and Canadians worship professors. You are the miracle because you went through eight years of this and it didn't take. So, to me, every one of you is an incredible example of mental survival.

Europeans would not have any idea what I am talking about. It could never occur to them that they have been propagandized. Like Europeans, Canadians honestly believe that every point of view was given a fair hearing in their schools.

And their professors warned them day after day about "simplistic people" and "anti-intellectuals" like you and me.

WHY YOU AND I ARE "SIMPLISTIC"

In his huge book, 1984, George Orwell sums up his entire message this way:

"Freedom is the right to say that 2 plus 2 equals 4."

The reason Orwell's statement is so wise is because propagandists always try to tell us that things are not as they appear.

Your professor told you that all the things he said are really very, very complex. But what one learns from a lifetime of experience is that people's real motivations, no matter how many degrees they have, are very simple.

Any human being who is hired to talk daily for years to a captive audience will do what any human being does when he talks: he tries to look good.

All humans, left to their own devices, say whatever they think makes them look good. No matter how hard I try, WhitakerOnline is going to contain lots of references to my background and my experience, and not all of them are going to be for your benefit.

Benjamin Franklin's short autobiography is great because he starts off by admitting that the main reason he wrote about himself was his own ego.

But almost every European or Canadian will look you straight in the eye and tell you that his teachers and professors did not push political leftism and socialism because political leftism and socialism makes professors look good.

This simple fact has never occurred to anybody, though if you think about it just a moment you will realize it is one of the most important facts in the world today.

Like supply and demand, once you actually look at professor's natural human bias, it changes your whole view of the world. What is terribly hard is to get people to see how important this simple fact is.

No matter how "complex and unsimplistic" you get, you can't know anything about real world economics until you have done a lot of thinking about supply and demand.

By the same token, you are simply not IN this world until you have done some serious thinking about the UNAVOIDABLE human biases of the people who ruled your life for at least eight years.

To repeat:

It is not surprising that almost all Europeans and Canadians worship professors. You are the miracle because you went through eight years of this and it didn't take.

EXAMPLES

What if every child were required to spend eight years in military school? What if those same kids ended up being militarists and fascists? The connection would seem a bit obvious, right?

So our teachers, who call themselves "Intellectuals," tell us how a Truly Just Society is to be run. Here are some predictable things they say:

Businessmen are Evil. What we need to do is to turn economics over to the Planners and the professors. This never works, but kids keep marching for it, especially at European universities. Has it ever occurred to anybody that for a university student to be a socialist is as inevitable as it would be for an entire generation sent to military school to be militarists?

So we have younger generations that have the terminal sillies. They insist that criminals are really nice people who have been perverted by Society. What we need, they say, is huge Rehabilitation programs planned by Criminologists. And the Europeans are still on the street demanding this as their crime rate climbs out of sight.

Once you start thinking in these terms, it is as revealing as suddenly finding out about supply and demand. Everything we call "leftist" is simply what college professors would professionally prefer.

And notice that every school child knows all about the biases of military men, businessmen, doctors, and every other profession. But never once does anybody point out that teachers -- and your teachers' professors -- have just as many biases that are just as natural.

Have you ever heard anybody even MENTION this possibility?

May 18, 2002 - WHY ISRAEL MOVED RIGHT

May 18, 2002 - A POINT RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES CANNOT UNDERSTAND: OUT IS NOT IN

May 18, 2002 - SEGREGATION TODAY, SEGREGATION TOMORROW, SEGREGATION FOREVER!

May 18, 2002 - WHY THE GENERALLY ACCEPTED POSITION (GAP) ON ISRAEL IS INSANE

May 18, 2002 - ON ISRAEL, ONLY THE "FANATICS" CAN MAKE SENSE

WHY ISRAEL MOVED RIGHT

When the first Israeli Parliament met shortly after World War II, "the Right" was still identified with Hitler and Mussolini. This led to an immediate practical problem. No one in the new Israeli Parliament would sit on the political right.

Today the Likkud Party rules Israel and it is a party of the right. If you think about it a minute, you will understand why that is the case, and why it is important to see the reason for this.

Meanwhile, Jews in New York are still solidly leftist, as are Jews everywhere else. So what's so special about Jews in Israel?

Jews in Israel are the first Jews in over two thousands years who are the ruling majority. All that time, Jewish politics has been based on hate. Jews have been hated and, contrary to the Politically Correct orthodoxy, they have hated in return.

But in Israel, Jews must not just hate, they must govern. They cannot afford to dedicate themselves to hating the ruling majority in Israel because they ARE the ruling majority in Israel.

What Israelis do in New York is aimed at punishing the white gentile majority. They go for integration and busing, they take the side of criminals in solidarity against the law-abiding majority. They demand open borders so that they can be on the side of outsiders against the ruling white gentile majority.

Every political stance backed by the Jewish voting bloc outside Israel is aimed at hurting the ruling majority in that country. The last thing that bloc votes for is something that WORKS.

That's the way Israel started, too. But they discovered that leftism is national suicide.

National suicide may be fine for everybody else, but not for the Jewish homeland.

A POINT RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES CANNOT UNDERSTAND: OUT IS NOT IN

The Likud Party just voted that it will never ever accept a separate sovereign Palestinian state under any conditions whatsoever. It did that despite the vehement opposition of its own ruling Prime Minister Sharon, who is not exactly a noted moderate himself.

Netanyahu is likely to be the next Prime Minister of Israel, and he is attacking the rightist Sharon from Sharon's RIGHT. Netanyahu proposes to build a wall to keep Palestinians OUT of Israel.

First let me explain that that word OUT is in caps for a very good reason. A wall to keep people OUT is a right-wing solution. Walls to keep people IN are a leftist solution. Libertarians and respectable conservatives are too dumb to know the difference, so let me explain it again very briefly.

Our kind of rightist policy WORKS. It produces a place that everybody wants to GET INTO, like the United States. Leftist countries are run on policies that never WORK, so everybody wants OUT.

Communist countries always have walls to kill people for trying to get OUT. The United States has a Border Patrol and walls on its southern border to keep Mexicans from getting IN. Libertarians state loudly that there is no difference keeping people OUT and keeping people IN.

Prison walls keep prisoners IN and non-felons OUT. Guards keep the cons INSIDE, but they will also keep you from going IN. Nonetheless, there is a difference between being IN prison and OUT OF prison.

Please note I have to belabor this difference, which no child would have any trouble with, because libertarians STILL cannot understand it.

SEGREGATION TODAY, SEGREGATION TOMORROW, SEGREGATION FOREVER!

Now to the awful truth: what Netanyahu is proposing is a permanent state of segregation between Jews and Arabs.

Us old segregationists used to wear a white button with five letters on it written in blue: NEVER. Everything we said would happen with integration is exactly what happened with integration. I leave it to all the other self-styled Southern Spokemen to beg forgiveness for having opposed integration and saying it wasn't a wonderful idea.

It was NEVER a good idea, so there is no reason for me to join the Southern Crawl (THE SOUTHERN CRAWL DOESN'T WORK--September 23, 2000).

So when the Likkud Party said "Never!," it touched a chord.

On the other hand, I have made it very, very clear that I have strong and lifelong Arab sympathies (September 13, 2001 - MY ARAB SYMPATHIES).

I can understand militant Arabs and I can understand militant Israelis. It is the Generally Accepted Position (GAP) which all the respectable people accept that is utterly ridiculous.

WHY THE GENERALLY ACCEPTED POSITION (GAP) ON ISRAEL IS INSANE

In some cases, moderation is insane. One of these cases is Israel.

You see, the GAP on Israel says that the Arabs are the only religious fanatics. The rest of us are moderates.

But you cannot say that God Almighty has taken a homeland away from one religious group and God Almighty has given that homeland to another religious group unless you are a religious fanatic. But if neither religious group involved is YOUR religious group, you are not only a religious nutcase; you are a UNIQUE religious nutcase in a world history that is crammed full of religious fanatics.

To support Israel, self-styled "Christians" have to insist that God Almighty took their homeland away from Moslems because of their religion and God Almighty gave that country to Jews. That is not only religious fanaticism, but it is a fanaticism so extreme that it is unique in history.

And these so-called "Christians" insist that theirs is a MODERATE position!

The GAP says that religious fanaticism is moderation. You can say that ten thousand times - and they have said it ten thousand times - but it is still absurd.

ON ISRAEL, ONLY THE "FANATICS" CAN MAKE SENSE

So the Likkud says they are not going to go halvies with the Palestinians. God gave it all to them and they took the whole thing and they're going to keep the whole thing. That kind of thinking I can understand and respect. Do I agree with them? Frankly, my dear, the Likkud doesn't give a damn.

May 25, 2002 - WHAT AMERICA IS ALL ABOUT

May 25, 2002 - ONE-WAY UNITY

May 25, 2002 - SOUTH HATING AND WHITE HATING ARE THE ONLY BASES OF AMERICAN UNITY

May 25, 2002 - WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO ME

WHAT AMERICA IS ALL ABOUT

Most of us have seen the ad where dozens of nonwhites tell us, in heavy accents, "I am Mellican!" (It means American). An American is a person who has certain documents.

There are "undocumented workers," who are just as American as we are but who happen not to have the papers they need. These are the folks you only call "illegal aliens" if you are anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews.

That ad was put out by the Ad Council, but it didn't make the whole point they wanted to make. So there's a new one that has the same type of "I Mellican" plus Harry Bellafonte and one critical addition that no American Patriot could do without.

This ad has a very dark Asian guy and a very white blue-eyed girl wrapped up together in an American flag. It is shown twice in fifteen seconds, so you don't miss the point. All you can see is their eyes and their complexions. The rest is the American flag they are wrapped in.

If you are not anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews, this illustrates What America Is All About. Anyone who is not anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews has one aim above all: the end of "racism."

Ending racism has to do with only one race. It means the mixing of whites with other races. Those who fight "racism" only want nonwhites to immigrate and be integrated into white countries. Nobody pushes Japan, which is less crowded than the Netherlands, to bring in non-Japanese immigrants, but any criticism of nonwhite immigration in the Netherlands is Evil.

So this ad, where only the American flag is draped around a colored guy and a white girl, takes up where the old "I Mellican" ad left off. Both are products of the Ad Council.

I have not seen this latter one repeated. Is this one too blatant for even the dumbass white gentiles to swallow?

ONE-WAY UNITY

For many years, we tried to get Republicans to go after the George Wallace vote. They finally did in 1980, and the "Wallace vote" was suddenly renamed "Reagan Democrats." National Review, the organ of respectable conservatism, now tells us they wouldn't go for that Wallace vote until it cleansed itself of Racist Evil.

For National Review, conservative victory is nice, but insulting white working people and Southerners is nicer.

Actually, a person with a memory - which means only me - remembers that National Review used to reject that Wallace vote for an entirely different reason.

I remember that all those years before 1980, the Republicans said something entirely different. For decades they said there were just very few Wallace votes, and what they wanted was those black voters who were now ready to vote Republican in 1960, 1962, 1964, 1966, 1968, 1970, 1972, 1974, 1976, and 1978.

I have been told that blacks were ready to vote for Reagan in 1980, but the Evil Wallace, I mean Reagan Democrat, Strategy drove them off.

In 1980, when Republicans finally went for the Wal--, sorry, I mean Reagan Democrat, vote, they won the presidency from a sitting president and they gained control of a House of Congress for the first time since 1952.

But National Review now tells us they were not being stupid all those years before 1980, they were just being Shrewd " - January 26, 2002 - WHEN DUMMIES TRY TO BE "SHREWD".

SOUTH HATING AND WHITE HATING ARE THE ONLY BASES OF AMERICAN UNITY

I wrote a column on September 11 saying that if they attack America, they attack me. But let us all understand that this is true ONLY of a spokesman for white Southerners like me. NO NATIONAL SPOKESMAN, in the United States, RIGHT OR LEFT, thinks like this.

Senator John McCain, hero of the Southern Partisan, told it exactly like it is. McCain said that those of us who are white gentiles born in the United States owe our loyalty to this country, i.e., to getting rid of whites and so forth. But, he added, Hispanics in the United States owe their first loyalty to foreign Hispanics (January 26, 2002 - WHEN DUMMIES TRY TO BE "SHREWD".

Arizona eats that kind of Americanism up.

National Review is American only if America maintains its dedication to getting rid of whites. National Review is anti-Southern and pro-Lincoln first and foremost, and it never spares any effort to make that clear. It demands that all Confederate flags come down and there is no "South" in National Review." There is only a "south."

National Review now makes a major point of never capitalizing South or Southern. That is their idea of National Unity.

As always, any white gentile American and especially any Southerner who gets all excited about American Unity is being a sucker.

The south is not the South.

Actually, saying "southern states" is not even geographically accurate if you are referring to the states of the American South.

The most "southern" state in the Union is Hawaii, which conservatives do NOT include in the term "southern states." California borders on Mexico, but it is not considered a "Southern State" although it is undeniably a southern state.

If William Buckley had his way, the most southern state would be Puerto Rico.

When they say "southern states," it is clear that respectable conservatives are referring to the "Southern" states, the Old Confederacy. But insulting the South is more important than accuracy.

WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO ME

This is not some sort of secret conspiracy. They could not be more blatant and open about the fact that hating white gentiles in general and white Southerners in particular is What America Is All About.

We have national TV ads and Senator McCain saying this as clearly as any human being can POSSIBLY say it. There is nothing subtle here.

The Ad Council said it loud and clear and on national television. Senator McCain said it, also on national TV. National Review, which is always talking about the importance of words, spends a lot of effort making it clear that hating the South trumps verbal accuracy.

"John Brown's Body" is our real national anthem.

National Review makes it very clear that Reagan's victory was nowhere near as important to them as rejecting George Wallace's many millions of supporters.

They hate you, and I don't know how they could possibly make this any clearer.

And that, dear Virginia, is What America Means To Me.

June 1, 2002 - WORSHIPPING EXPERTS

June 1, 2002 - WHERE WERE ALL THOSE INTELLIGENCE SERVICE HEROES WHEN US "EXTREMISTS" WERE CRITICIZING THE LIBERALS?

June 1, 2002 - IS IT RIGHT TO ASK SECURITY AGENCIES TO DO THEIR JOBS?

June 1, 2002 - ASK AND IT WILL BE GRANTED TO YOU, AND VICE-VERSA

June 1, 2002 - WHILE EXCUSING ALL THE FAILURES, WHOM DO WE REWARD?

June 1, 2002 - A NOTE ON HINDSIGHT

WORSHIPPING EXPERTS

As you know, I have a hard time doing what respectable conservatives do best. What respectables do best is to worship anybody in a uniform or anybody in Intelligence.

Liberals do exactly the same job of falling on their tummies when they worship liberal idols. So when the teachers' unions report another major failure, they just get that "I'm a Professional" look on their face and liberals demand that we give them more money to waste.

When experts are talking about how they have failed -- AGAIN -- exactly the same thing happens with liberals and conservatives. The experts they worship will differ, but the scenario is an exact repeat.

So when a group of conservatives asks why the intelligence services have failed - AGAIN - to come through - the Security Hero gets a pained expression on his face and explains to these poor, silly amateurs that all this is very complicated stuff and he is out there in the field and he is the big expert and what in the hell are they doing criticizing all those Heroic Experts.

And when a group of liberals asks why social services have failed - AGAIN -- the Professor or teacher's union rep gets a pained expression on his face and explains to these poor, silly amateurs that

all this is very complicated stuff and he is out there in the field and he is the big expert and what in the hell are they doing criticizing all those Heroic Experts.

Whenever any security expert is interviewed about the total failures of our intelligence, he gets that self-righteous, pained look on his face. The Tough Guy Expert explains that the only reason we expect intelligence to come up with anything is because we are not Great Professionals like he is.

We are all civilian wimps while this guy is a Big Pro. He may not be able to warn us about anything we need to know about, but he is a Brave, Tough, Big Man, and we are a bunch of ignoramuses.

WHERE WERE ALL THOSE INTELLIGENCE SERVICE HEROES WHEN US "EXTREMISTS" WERE CRITICIZING THE LIBERALS?

All those Military Experts and Security Experts we are paying may look like Tough Guy Heroes when they are making conservatives crawl. But when they face real criticism, they have a torrent of excuses.

For instance, security experts are always whining about how liberals like Senator Torricelli crippled their work. But not a one of them said a single word about Torricelli or any other liberal back when we needed those Tough Guy Heroes to say something.

If anybody in Intelligence had complained about liberals crippling their work when we needed them to, their superiors would have ruined them, and we all know it. None of the Tough Guy Heroes is Tough and Heroic out in public when it counts.

When those of us who dared complain when it counted did complain, the Intelligence Experts would testify about how patriotic the wonderful liberals like Senators Church and Torricelli were.

IS IT RIGHT TO ASK SECURITY AGENCIES TO DO THEIR JOBS?

When I was in public service, I was always aware that I was drawing a salary and exercising power, and I had to justify it EVERY DAY. When I see some guy in the security services talking on television, I get the impression that he feels that we owe him his supper.

One of the most famous quotes from Ronald Reagan was, "Mr. Gorbaczev, tear down this wall." And I think we all know how many people tried to get him to take that out of his speech in West Berlin. Time after time the final draft came back to him with those lines quietly taken out. He quietly kept putting them back.

He stood in front of the Berlin Wall, which all the liberal apologists for Communism had been ignoring, and demanded RESULTS.

If I had been Reagan, I would have been as demanding of my staff as I was with Gorbaczev. If I kept putting "Tear down this Wall" in my speech and my staff had removed something AGAIN that I had put back in my speech AGAIN, they would have been looking for new jobs.

Someday we may have congressmen who say to security chest-beaters, "Stop the enemy or get out." Someday, some conservative may actually object to the repeated failures who are Official Experts daring to show up with two generations of uninterrupted failure.

ASK AND IT WILL BE GRANTED TO YOU, AND VICE-VERSA

When education specialists or sociologists or psychologists show up in front of congressional committees, nobody asks them if their programs WORK. Since we started hiring thousands of Criminology graduates to be our experts on crime, the rate has shot up out of sight.

The more money we hand over to our educational experts, the worse every measurable result gets.

By now, in any rational world, it should take incredible gall for a social "expert" to show up in front of a congressional committee. But in the real world, that never even occurs to anybody.

The fact is that we respect failure and we are happy to pay for failure if you show up with the right degree or the right uniform. It never seriously occurs to liberals or conservatives that we have a right to demand any results from anybody who draws public money.

The Bible says "Seek and ye shall find." No matter how hard you seek, the fact is that you may not find. But if you don't even ASK for results, you certainly won't get them.

WHILE EXCUSING ALL THE FAILURES, WHOM DO WE REWARD?

There has recently been a big to-do over one memo where a security man predicted that the Arabs training at flight schools in the United States might grab planes and use them to attack targets in the USA.

Everybody is arguing about whether that one memo of the thousands going up the security chain should have been recognized for its importance. Let me ask an entirely different question.

Do you think that the guy who wrote that memo will take the place of any of the higher ups who slept through reading it?

Nobody else is going to ask that.

All these security chest-beaters have said the Senator Torrecellis have ruined American security. Did you hear a single one of those people going on news shows and talking about this before September 11?

Of course not. They are big heroic patriots, but not patriotic enough to get out there and expose themselves that way.

I can personally testify to something you already know: There is nothing less rewarding in public service than being right when it counts. And as long as that is the case, I do wish people would stop blubbering over the deaths and injuries we are going to sustain, and the destruction of our children in schools.

A NOTE ON HINDSIGHT

When you threaten to take away some bureaucrat's pay and privileges because he is not doing his job, his excuse is always, "Well, you're just using hindsight, and hindsight is always perfect."

This neatly bypasses the basic reality, which is that he is getting PAID. If his foresight is no better than mine, he shouldn't be getting PAID.

In other words, if you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen.

Let me illustrate this point:

- 1) I am typing this on a computer. I do not know who made this computer, but I am sure they are nice people,
- 2) If this computer doesn't work, I will fire the nice people who made it. That is, I will send it back and buy someone else's computer.
- 3) They could say that if they had known about the defect in this computer, they would have corrected it ahead of time. So I'm just using hindsight, and I am being unfair.
- 4) Tough. They get my money if they do their job. Excuses don't cut it.
- 5) The bottom line is this: If you keep people on because they are nice or their colleagues like them or because they are big tough pros and you are a wimp civilian, you are a fool. This is true even when the problem is just a few glitches on a cheap computer.
- 6) So if you keep paying somebody who fails at saving lives, you are an idiot.

June 8, 2002 - THEY GOT SKAKEL, NOW HOW ABOUT CHAPPAQUIDDICK?

June 8, 2002 - EUROPEAN THIRD PARTIES WIN A HISTORIC VICTORY

June 8, 2002 - RESHUFFLING FAILURE

June 8, 2002 - BROWN HANDS ON NUKES

June 8, 2002 - MERCY IS A PREJUDICE

June 8, 2002 - NO PREJUDICE MEANS NO MORALITY

June 8, 2002 - HOMOSEXUAL AND INTERRACIAL

THEY GOT SKAKEL, NOW HOW ABOUT CHAPPAQUIDDICK?

Editor's note: The title says it all. There is no article.

EUROPEAN THIRD PARTIES WIN A HISTORIC VICTORY

This is the only place you will see news of one of history's great political victories. Every country in Europe is now moving to tighten down on immigration. Every country in Europe is using one excuse.

They are all saying that they are not tightening immigration for their countries' benefit. All European leaders are saying they are doing this to stop the growth of right wing anti-immigration parties.

What you will never read anywhere else is what this means in plain English:

It means that the third parties have won a victory that they were created to win. If Le Pen's National Front or the other parties had done like American conservatives and voted with libertarian rightists who want open borders, the flow of third worlders in Europe would have kept expanding.

It is only the first step, but it is a REAL first step that is taking place in Europe.

Here we didn't even get to step one. Our votes go to conservatives no matter what they do in the real world. So we get no action on immigration.

What's the point of "conservative" victories if your country becomes third world? Our "conservative" President Bush is avoiding any real decisions by creating a new department. But leftist European governments are tightening their borders because of voters who were not afraid of being branded Evil Racists.

If you don't demand better, you don't get better.

Period.

RESHUFFLING FAILURE

The problem with our borders is that George Bush wants open borders.

The problem with the FBI and CIA is that a bunch of failures without any moral courage never lose anything when they fail - AGAIN. They are all getting promoted.

So no one is going to do anything about the real problems. So what ARE they going to do in Washington?

They are going to do what they always do in Washington when the will is not there to change policy. They are going to create a new governmental department.

The problem with education since the 1950s has been education policy. Education scores kept dropping and no one wanted to take on the National Education Association.

So the Carter Administration created a new Department of Education. Have you noticed how education has improved since the Department of Education was created?

Me neither.

Creating new departments to deal with failure is an admission of defeat. That is all that the creation of Bush's new Department of Homeland Defense means.

BROWN HANDS ON NUKES

We had the fun, now we pay for it.

There is a chasmic difference between a country ruled by whites with blacks living there and a country where the actual bloodline makes everybody brownish. Compare blood-mixed Brazil and white and black America, for instance.

But nobody can be allowed to say that. It's more fun to say everybody's equal and to proclaim our triumph at the independence of Africa and Pakistan and India from Evil Whites.

"All men are created equal," you know. The third world has as much right to sovereignty and a-bombs as whites do, you know.

We have been enjoying all that crowing about equality for over half a century. Pakistan and India are just as good as we are. We were so proud and the liberals told us we were so smart to say that.

So now they got the bombs. All that fun has to be paid for.

So stop whining.

MERCY IS A PREJUDICE

Many good and kind people were involved in the Inquisition. Some of the priests who had devoted their lives to their faith and to kindness to other human beings were leaders in torturing and burning people alive.

From their point of view, torturing others was their ultimate sacrifice for the Good Cause. They honestly believed that to be kind to heretics would be the worst kind of cruelty to them.

After all, by slowly torturing these people to death they were giving them a chance to repent and avoid an eternity in Hell. And they were taking action against other people being damned to eternal torture in Hell by digging out the heretics.

In fact, this argument is irrefutable. If an Inquisitor had shown simple mercy, he would have been favoring his own personal prejudice in favor of not hurting somebody to the much greater cause of stamping out heresy.

This is usually true when mercy is shown. If there is no reason to hurt somebody most sane people will avoid it. The only time you need to appeal to mercy is when there IS an excuse for hurting people. In war, the choice is often between the Cause and mercy, and mercy is often interpreted as treason.

But the fact is that throughout most of history most Great Causes have been wrong or not as important as people like the Inquisitors thought they were. If people were always right, there would be no need for mercy.

But in real history, people feel the need for "mercy" when they truly believe it is just a weakness, a prejudice which they should ignore. So in real history, human beings should have listened to that voice of prejudice rather than to whatever cause called them to brutality.

NO PREJUDICE MEANS NO MORALITY

Recently conservatives were screaming because homosexual kissing was being shown on network TV. Yet these same conservatives will kill to make sure that interracial kissing and coupling is shown on network TV without objection. They will lynch people like me who openly say they don't like it.

For leftism, the whole "War on Racism" has been the key to victory. They have one set of conservatives demanding the end of the "prejudices" of another group of conservatives.

That means you can destroy any vestige of morality, because you can denounce everybody else's morality as "prejudice." Once you force everybody to agree that criticizing blacks and blondes kissing in public is Nazism, then you can force them to agree that men slobbering men in public is OK with everybody but Nazis.

The same scream of "prejudice" that liberals use against me is used by NAMBLA to justify boy-man sex. They tell us that the Ancient Greeks had man-boy sex all the time so our dislike of it is just a prejudice.

And HITLER was against man-boy sex!!

The battle against prejudice is called a "War Against Racism" but it is actually a campaign against whites. It is only aimed at immigration and integration of all white majority countries. What they call "race mixing" is actually only aimed against one race.

So the War Against Prejudice is both a genocidal campaign and a campaign against morality.

And in both of these battles, against whites and against Western Morality, leftists have no more dedicated allies than the respectable conservatives.

HOMOSEXUAL AND INTERRACIAL

During the presidential campaign, Alan Keyes declared that, since he is a black man married to an Indian woman, the Federal Government should condemn Bob Jones University for any ban on interracial dating. And that is ALL he said about it.

Every respectable conservative is ready to die for the right of blondes and blacks to fondle each other in public. Then they get terribly upset when homosexual kisses and other activities are shown on television.

Every single state that adopted the Constitution banned interracial marriage. But conservatives now agree that anyone who says a state should have the right to do that should be vetoed from serving anywhere in the American Judiciary.

Then those same conservatives get upset that, for some reason, everybody laughs at them when they talk about Strict Construction of the Constitution.

Hating whites comes first. Hating Southerners comes first. As long as that is the case, conservatives are laughed at because they SHOULD be laughed at.

Meanwhile, if I have to watch blondes and blacks slobber on each other, others should have to watch two guys slobber over each other in public. I call my preference morality, liberals call it prejudice. As long as you agree with them on fighting my moral stands, why should you have any right to object to the same people violating yours?

June 15, 2002 - CHILD MOLESTING - "ONLY ONE PERCENT"?

June 15, 2002 - IS HIS NAME JOSE PADILLA OR ABDULLAH AL MUHUJIR?

June 15, 2002 - PATRIOT MCCAIN SAYS STOP DEMANDING LOYALTY FROM MINORITY GROUPS!

June 15, 2002 - HOLD ME BACK! - AGAIN

CHILD MOLESTING - "ONLY ONE PERCENT"?

We have been told that things are fine because only a tiny part of the Catholic clergy has actually molested children. If "only" a percent or two of any church's clergy had committed armed robbery and the church had covered for them, would that "only" apply there, too?

Another point you will only see here. The excuse the bishops used for delaying their dealing with perverts is that each diocese makes its own rules. But the universal rule until now has been "cover up and sic the perverts on more children." Funny how it never took a special enclave of bishops to announce that rule.

IS HIS NAME JOSE PADILLA OR ABDULLAH AL MUHUJIR?

The "American" caught planning a dirty bomb attack on the United States was born Jose Padilla in New York City. He changed his name when he converted to Islam.

So what is his real name? The media says his real name is Jose Padilla when they want to say that profiling by race and religion is evil. As Jose Padilla he is a Hispanic, so airports should continue to search white grandmothers just as carefully as they do Middle Easterners.

On the other hand, when it comes to immigration, his name is Abdullah al Muhajir. Liberals and respectable conservatives have been arguing that our open border with Mexico is no problem, because it is only Arab immigrants, not people of Hispanic origin, who are hostile to the United States.

PATRIOT MCCAIN SAYS STOP DEMANDING LOYALTY FROM MINORITY GROUPS!

Al Sharpton has stated flatly that blacks owe no loyalty to the United States. He says that the only obligation here is that the United States owes reparations to blacks.

Senator John McCain stated flatly on The O'Reilly Factor that Mexicans born in the United States owe their first loyalty to "their Hispanic culture" (July 14, 2001 - THE FOUNDING FATHERS' PATRIOTISM IS MCCAIN'S TREASON). This was what he told O'Reilly when O'Reilly said that American immigration policy should be in the interests of Americans. McCain began this statement with the flat word, "No."

In California, everyone agrees that what destroyed the Republican Party's future chances was its campaign to deny American taxpayer-financed benefits to illegal aliens. Again, the Hispanic voter's first loyalty, regardless of his accidental birthplace, is to Mexicans.

In "Roots," the faith of the colored man in his battle against whites was Islam. A starving Kunte Kinte refused the pork he was offered and addressed his fellow rebellious slave in Arabic with the traditional Moslem greeting, "Salaam."

You will never read this anywhere but in Whitaker Online. Anything that is inconvenient for liberals is instantly forgotten by conservatives. But just as Hollywood praised terror bombing in Godfather II (May 4, 2002 - WHEN TERROR BOMBING WAS COOL), it has urged the McCain idea that all minorities are common enemies of whites and that Islam is a legitimate vehicle for that hate.

HOLD ME BACK! - AGAIN

So when they are discussing Jose Padilla (if they are talking about profiling) or Abdullah al Muhajir (if they are talking about immigration), conservatives demand that he be punished for disloyalty.

"Lynch the traitor!," they scream.

Exactly what world have they been living in for the last four decades? Certainly not this one.

McCain has made it clear that Jose Padilla owes no loyalty to the United States. He is Hispanic. California Mexicans, wherever they were born, are fully justified (by George Bush, among others) for having their first and only loyalty to illegal immigrants.

Meanwhile, the disgusting little conservatives who denounce NONE of this are now screaming, "Lynch him!," about someone the liberals allow them to be mad at.

The entire '60's generation was called Idealist if they hated America and white people. Terror bombing was cool in Godfather II and anti-white Islam was cool in "Roots" and racial loyalty is the right loyalty for Hispanics born in America according to McCain. All that's forgotten.

So the cowards who don't dare denounce a McCain or hippies or anyone else with power are shrieking for the death of John Walker Lindh (March 30, 2002 - HOLD ME BACK! HOLD ME BACK!) and Jose Padilla (profiling) or Abdullah al Muhajir (if you are talking about immigration).

These conservative cowards make my skin crawl. What a bunch of groveling creeps!

June 22, 2002 - SUPREME COURT SAYS THAT IQ IS A LIFE AND DEATH MATTER

June 22, 2002 - DOES IT MATTER IF SOMEONE IS ANTI-WHITE IF THEY AREN'T ANTI-SEMITIC?

June 22, 2002 - UNPREJUDICED PEOPLE

SUPREME COURT SAYS THAT IQ IS A LIFE AND DEATH MATTER

The Supreme Court has ruled that no retarded person may be executed.

The term "retarded" has only one definition:

A person who is "retarded" has an Intelligence Quotient (IQ) below 70.

Until this decision, liberals insisted that tested IQ meant nothing. This is because, as "The Bell Curve" points out, black IQ is far below white IQ, and this difference is INBORN. So anybody who believes in IQ has, for two generations, been officially labeled anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

But now IQ is being used for a purpose which is favored by the political LEFT: the end of capital punishment. Suddenly the only people who would dare discount IQ tests would be naziswhowanttokillsixmillionjews. After all, HITLER was for capital punishment.

DOES IT MATTER IF SOMEONE IS ANTI-WHITE IF THEY AREN'T ANTI-SEMITIC?

Well, it turns out that Arabic terrorists are bad because "They're anti-American and anti-Semitic." Farrakhan and other black separatists were denounced because they were "anti-white and anti-Semitic."

I cannot remember ever hearing anyone denounced for being anti-American or anti-white unless they were also anti-Semitic.

With one exception: For months after the September 11 attack, over two-thirds of the public connected that attack with American support for Israel. So every single commentator assured us that the attack had absolutely nothing to do with Israel (April 6, 2002 - REMEMBER WHEN ISRAEL HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH AMERICA'S MIDDLE EAST PROBLEMS?).

That was the only time I ever saw "anti-American" denounced when it wasn't combined with "and anti-Semitic."

But the establishment line, the line which liberals and respectable conservatives and ALL media commentators follow, is that there is nothing wrong with being anti-white or anti-American as long as you are not against any official minority group.

After all, ALL respectable commentators, right or left, are routinely both anti-American and anti-white.

ALL respectable commentators demand that every white majority, and ONLY white majority countries, be open to third world immigration and to internal integration. This is what "anti-racism" actually means. It never applies to non-white countries. "Anti-racism" is a code word for getting rid of whites.

By the same token, McCain says flatly and all respectable conservatives say implicitly that all minorities should demand open borders for America and that their loyalty should be to other minorities, not to Americans July 14, 2001 - THE FOUNDING FATHERS' PATRIOTISM IS MCAIN'S TREASON).

So you simply do not hear anyone denouncing someone for simply being anti-white or anti-American. They have to be anti-white AND anti-semitic or anti-American AND anti-Semitic.

UNPREJUDICED PEOPLE

In the 1950s and 1960s, every "progressive" Southerner worshipped New York City.

As usual, I could see back then what was coming, and as always I regarded these Southern liberals with absolute puzzlement. I could not imagine how grownups who could read could possibly be such

obvious fools. I saw that New York was about to come apart, yet Southern turncoats regarded them with an open-mouthed, drooling adoration.

In the 1960s, when a girl was slowly stabbed to death in New York while hundreds of New Yorkers stayed in their apartments and didn't even call the police, this astonished all the New York worshippers.

What amazed me was why this incident should have surprised anybody.

New Yorkers were unprejudiced people. Unprejudiced people don't like to get involved.

As unprejudiced people, New Yorkers only got excited about issues liberals allowed them to get excited about. They have learned not to be concerned about anything liberals do not get excited about. It may bother you to see a mixed couple, but you have been trained that you have no right to an opinion on that.

So you don't get involved. This would strike earlier Americans as odd, but they were a bunch of bigots anyway.

Another place which was admired by liberals in the 1960s was the unprejudiced, brown land called Brazil. I knew that Brazil was a smelly hole where dogs and abandoned children roamed the streets starving. But in the 1950s, liberals worshipped the place because there was no racial prejudice there.

Even as a child I could not imagine how any literate adult could regard BRAZIL with the drooling adoration every Southern turncoat expressed as loudly as possible.

Brazilians are unprejudiced people. They don't want to get involved.

Look at the Catholic bishops. For decades, they never gave a damn about raped little boys. But they were out there fighting for racial busing and against capital punishment. They were concerned about what they were told to be concerned with, and they were otherwise perfect sociopaths. That's how they got to be bishops.

You can't become a general or a politician or a bishop of any church today if you are not a sociopath. You can't have the gut feelings your masters denounce, and to have no gut feelings except the ones you are allowed requires a sociopath.

Once you allow someone to tell you which of your feelings is a prejudice and which is a preference, you make that someone your master.

June 29, 2002 - JEWS ARE JUST PEOPLE

June 29, 2002 - JEWS HATE CHRISTIANS BECAUSE CHRISTIANS DISCRIMINATED IN FAVOR OF JEWS

June 28, 2002 - THE HIDEOUS IRONY OF JEWS AND TODAY'S TERRORIST METHODS

June 28, 2002 - GUESS WHO THE NAZIS ARE NOW?

JEWS ARE JUST PEOPLE

When I was in college one of my drinking buddies was a Jew who, as a child, had been in a Nazi concentration camp. When we got drunk together he told me more than once, "There can't be too few white gentiles in the world."

He came from a Caribbean island where, he announced with joy, the LAST WHITE FAMILY had married into a mulatto family. That was the kind of thing he LOVED and kept up with.

I understood how someone who had been where he was could feel that way. He might even have had a right to one or two sick attitudes.

But unlike other white gentiles today, I do NOT feel that every Jew has the right to that attitude.

And the reason that leftism has been able to do so much harm to the world is precisely because Christians do not call Jews down on hate the way they would any other human being.

JEWS HATE CHRISTIANS BECAUSE CHRISTIANS DISCRIMINATED IN FAVOR OF JEWS

For two generations the left has been led and financed overwhelmingly by Jews. As even Buckley pointed out, "Jews in America live like country club Episcopalians and vote like Puerto Ricans."

The left is dedicated to a hatred of white gentiles. For two thousand years the very existence of the Jewish community in the West has been based on a rejection of Western Christianity.

As I have pointed out, though, the anti-Christian feelings of Jews have resulted from the fact that Christians discriminated IN FAVOR OF Jews. Only Jews were allowed to reject Protestantism in Protestant areas or Catholicism in Catholic areas. Any European who was a Catholic in Protestant territory or vice-versa was burned alive. Only Jews were allowed to reject the prevalent Christian denomination and live at all in Medieval Europe.

By the same token, a Celtic European who held to his Old Religion or a German who held to his Old Religion of Odinism was burned alive. Only Jews were allowed to reject Christ and live, which Christ specifically said didn't make any sense (see October 21, 2000 - THE HINDUS IN ROMAN PALESTINE).

So Christians have hated Jews and, a fact which Political Correctness will not allow anybody to say, Jews have naturally hated them back. So the hatred of white gentiles, which is the basis of modern leftism, results from the special exceptions to total INTolerance which Christians made for Jews.

So the "Christian" right, which thinks Jews will love them for their praise of Israel, is as silly as the respectable right is in every other area. Jerry Falwell keeps trying to lovey dove it with Alan Dershowitz, and Dershowitz - who freely compares America to Nazi Germany - openly despises Falwell.

THE HIDEOUS IRONY OF JEWS AND TODAY'S TERRORIST METHODS

You know all those "charities" that Arab terrorists set up to finance their operations in America and in Israel? This tactic was developed by leftists, largely leftist Jews who hated white gentiles. We all know

about the publically financed National Public Radio's use of public and tax-deductible money for leftist propaganda.

Practically all tax deductible organizations spend a lot of their money on leftists and leftist causes. As soon as one major charity got money raised for the victims of September 11, it put it into leftist "anti-hate" projects. Today, just as "anti-racist" means anti-white, anti-hate means the same thing.

The World Council of Churches regularly financed leftist terrorists - paid for their "humanitarian needs" - while the leftist terrorists were left free to spend all of their money on weapons. The WCC learned that tactic from their fellow leftists.

But all this was developed originally to allow charity groups - all the way back to the famous "Communist fronts" - to raise funds from Americans to finance hate-America causes.

A very wise man - a man whom today's professional "Christians" disavow - once pointed out that those who live by the sword die by the sword. The New Testament also continually points out how hate turns on itself.

So today's professional Christian prefers the Old Testament.

Every tactic pro-Israelis are now screaming about as unfair was developed by leftist Jews like Dershowitz in their campaign of hatred against white gentiles.

Once again, Hate comes back to bite the haters.

GUESS WHO THE NAZIS ARE NOW?

So now Palestinians are waving swastikas in the Israelis' faces and calling them Nazis. Guess who developed THAT tactic?

Richard Herrnstein was a Jewish psychology professor at Harvard who co-wrote "The Bell Curve." "The Bell Curve" discussed the importance of HEREDITY to intelligence in general and specifically the huge gap between the INNATE (inborn) intelligence of whites and blacks.

Herrnstein was promptly accused by the left of being a Nazi. The fact that he was a Jew did not cause them one moment's hesitation. HITLER believed intelligence was inherited, so anyone who says intelligence is inherited is instantly anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews (but see June 22, 2002 - SUPREME COURT SAYS THAT IQ IS A LIFE AND DEATH MATTER).

One guy told me Herrnstein was just writing about heredity to get in good with the rightists. Why a Harvard professor would want right wing credentials is beyond me. I once protested Herrnstein's treatment at Harvard in a book, and he wrote me to quiet down.

Another minor point: when Herrnstein coauthored "The Bell Curve," he was dying of cancer and he knew it. So I doubt he was trying to get in good with anybody.

So everybody has been free to use Hitler's anti-Semitism for anything from gay rights to women's lib or anything else that might reduce the number and power of the white gentile-dominated right.

But now -- surprise surprise! -- that same "Nazi" label is the rallying cry of anti-Israelis around the world!

Which is exactly what Christ warned the Jews about two thousand years ago.

July 5, 2002 - WERE SOUTH CAROLINIANS STARVING CHILDREN?

July 5, 2002 - IN AFRICA, WHITE RULE IS OUT AND STARVATION IS BACK

July 5, 2002 - DIET REVERSES ITSELF IN MODERN RICH LANDS

July 5, 2002 - WHY WHITES NEED BLACK RULE

WERE SOUTH CAROLINIANS STARVING CHILDREN?

Jane Fonda told the world several years ago that "children are starving in upper South Carolina."

To her, it sounded perfectly reasonable. According to liberals, people are starving everywhere because of evil whites.

The fact is that, for the first time in history, starvation is NOT occurring in every society on earth. This, like other uniquely GOOD situations, is the product of white societies, and only of white societies (see October 20, 2001 - THE BIG SECRET REVEALED: WHITES ARE UNIQUE ONLY IN ***GOOD*** WAYS).

Malnutrition is not starvation. You can be malnourished and be rich. Every single Pharaoh of ancient Egypt had worms in his stomach and was desperately lacking in certain vitamins and minerals.

Every Pharaoh was malnourished and not one Pharaoh was poor.

I doubt there is anybody who could not, by a detailed examination, be found to be short of something in his diet, health nuts included.

There are degrees of malnutrition. There are only two degrees of starvation: dying and dead.

IN AFRICA, WHITE RULE IS OUT AND STARVATION IS BACK

I have been reading news reports about the fact that people are starving in Zimbabwe. When I was there, that African country was called Rhodesia, and it was ruled by whites. It was one of those "white minority governments." Back then, the idea that people might starve in Zimbabwe would have been funny.

What I called "Rhodesia" was called Southern Rhodesia when it was a British colony. The area that was called Northern Rhodesia had become a black-ruled land called Zambia. Despite the fact that Zambia-based Communist guerillas attacked Rhodesia, Rhodesia let food supplies for those starving Zambians go across its territory on its railroads.

I said Rhodesia should cut them off. They said that wouldn't be nice. I said you had to be ruthless to survive. They said it wouldn't be nice.

There is no more Rhodesia. I am not sure what good they think being nice did them.

So the world finally forced black rule on Rhodesia, too. It became Zimbabwe, its third name in a few decades. Now blacks are starving there.

Under white rule it was a farming country which exported huge amounts of food. Certainly we would not want what the black Africans there ate. Their main food was grits, but they managed to make it inedible for me. It was called mealie-meal and it was smashed down into such tiny bits that it tasted like water.

So they didn't eat what I would want to eat, but they ate. So in order to spread hatred for the white man, it is necessary to forget how important and unusual the lack of starvation is in human history.

DIET REVERSES ITSELF IN MODERN RICH LANDS

One of the people who works at the heart center told me that gout is a disease that is still prevalent. But it prevails in America mostly among poor people.

Gout used to be the disease of the rich. The foot would swell up enormously and painfully among rich people because they had diets that were rich in protein and fat. Anyone who has seen Oliver Twist saw the pure vegetarian diet of the very poor, gruel, while the upper classes ate turkey and dressing with lots of gravy.

Now vegetarianism is the fad of the rich. Even those who eat meat have all the fat cut off of it.

When yuppies do decide to have something that tastes good, it is wine, cheese and bread. Wine, cheese and bread was the lunch a farmer's wife in Europe used to take out to her working class husband for lunch.

In Charles Dickens' day, the rich were the fat ones. Back then, American Presidents like Cleveland and Taft were enormous. The term "fat and happy" comes from those days.

Today there are far more fat people among the poor. Poor people today eat lots of fat and lots of protein in all the fast-food places.

Poor people may be fat, but they are far less careful to get the right foods. So they are fat and malnourished. Jane Fonda would say they are starving.

WHY WHITES NEED BLACK RULE

So how are limousine liberals going to deal with what, in their more hysterical moments, they might call the "starvation" of America's working class?

Limousine liberals have one solution to every problem. They call it regulation. We call it telling people what to do. In order to win elections for their "regulation" agenda, liberals "get out the minority vote." This means that they spend much of their money getting people with dark skins to the polls on the assumption, an assumption where they are putting their cash, that those dark skins will be solidly liberal.

They never lose that bet.

So in Africa every time blacks take over they starve. And I mean STARVE --horribly, women and children-- and I mean to DEATH. But it never occurred to any liberal that this means that black self-rule could be a bad idea for the blacks in Africa.

On the other hand, the fact that white American working people don't eat healthy enough diets is plenty of reason to "regulate" their lives in detail.

It never occurs to liberals that white self-rule is a right WE have earned. We have the right to self-rule, not because somehow every human being is entitled to it, but because we build successful countries with our votes.

July 13, 2002 - THIEVES BELONG IN PRISON

July 13, 2002 - OUR RELATIONS WITH OTHER HERETICS

THIEVES BELONG IN PRISON

The WorldCom and Corporate scams are bringing forth the usual knee-jerk reactions. Republicans want them to be a "wake up call" for corporations; Democrats want them to be a "wake up call" for legislators.

I explained in my first book, "A Plague on Both Your Houses," 1976, Republicans are the property of the military-industrial establishment and Democrats are the property of the education-welfare establishment. The American people are not represented because they do not demand to be represented.

So every crisis automatically becomes a chance to push the agenda of one establishment or the other. Democrats want more power and spending for the education-welfare establishment, which means expanding government. The ideal situation for liberals is a world in which their professors rule the planet.

Conservatives want corporations to make money, period. When I worked for the Civil Aeronautics Board under the Nixon Administration, the chairman told us, "Our goal is twelve percent return on airline investment, and that is our ONLY goal."

For Democrats, every crisis is an opportunity to expand government power and expenditures. Not long ago, the shooting spree in Colorado was celebrated over and over again by the media. That was when it was to be used to get national gun control. But when they began to find out it was largely the fault of local authorities ignoring CRIMINAL activities by the two boys, the liberal media lost interest in it.

What is going on is very simple. Regulators were set up and they were soon captured by the corporate heads, exactly the same way that the Civil Aeronautics Board quickly became the property of the airlines. Liberals get more government and corporations neutralize it routinely.

What we need is people who are against all this. We need people who send thieves, no matter how rich, to prison. That would stop the corporate fraud. More laws have nothing to do with it. More laws will

produce more lawyers - the liberals favorite animal - and corporations will use those laws to make themselves even more invulnerable.

Exactly the same thing happens with regulators as with lawyers. Liberals get their shiny new agencies and corporations buy them up.

If you want to be in government, you must either be a worshipper of uniforms and corporations, in which case you go conservative, or you must see every crisis as an opportunity for more government and more government expenditures. I had to join the right because the left was worse.

OUR RELATIONS WITH OTHER HERETICS

I freely allow those who are labeled extremists to reprint my material. I am not worried if Ronald Reagan got the endorsement of some Klan groups and liberal candidates get the endorsement of some Communist groups. As long as THEY reprint what ****I**** say, I welcome the help.

In George Orwell's book "1984," it turns out that the whole hideous totalitarianism that crushed the hero is based on ending one simple, useless-sounding freedom: "Freedom," it says, "is the right to say that 1 plus 1 equals 2."

It is obvious to me that for a black buck to have a blond girl and produce more ugly brown children is wrong. But liberals and respectable conservatives agree that to say this makes me a NAZI! It also made Harry Truman and Douglas MacArthur NAZIS, according to today's respectable conservatives.

It is time to take on the "NAZI!" tactic without compromise.

What makes respectable conservatives harmless is that liberals pick the people THEY want to call "respectable." The liberal media allow the harmless ones, harmless because they are dumb and cowardly, to get media exposure. Liberals are not going to allow those anti-liberals on their media who make liberals feel threatened.

That's how the real world works.

For many decades I have been yelled at by respectable conservatives and liberals, screaming, "If you are a heretic on race, you are a NAZI!!!"

For anyone with ANY male hormones, there is a hurting wish to scream, "OK, damn you, I'm a Nazi!!!" Many of us have yielded to that natural tendency. But the simple fact remains that I am NOT a Nazi. Truman was not a Nazi. MacArthur was not a Nazi.

When you let them make you react that way, you are yielding to their Orwellian tactic.

If there were a real dictatorship in America, I would bet anything that most of the "extremists" would be in the life-and-death resistance to it. I know for sure that the best COLLABORATORS would be RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES.

Collaboration is how you get the "respectable" label in the first place.

What Orwell concluded, "Freedom is the right to say 1 plus 1 is 2," is very American. European "democracies" send people to PRISON for heresy on the race issue. They call that Freedom, a capitalized virtue. But Americans are interested in freedom, which is simply the right to say what you damn well please, and a willingness to fight for that right, a battle which no respectable conservative will wage.

As long as "respectable" means "coward," a lot of good people will go with the leftist's Orwellian "Nazi" tactic. I want the good people who have fallen for the enemy tactic to come back. I want them to join those of us who fight for freedom and who care about our race.

If everybody on the right refuses to care about the very survival of our race, we are going to lose everybody with courage to the swastika or the Klan. People are going to find leaders, even if they have to be called Nazis to do it.

There are a lot of really evil people in extremist groups. But what counts is those who have been driven to those groups by the Orwellian left AND by despair with respectable conservatism. It is not necessary to drive good people to that extreme.

July 20, 2002 - GOVERNOR HODGES "GITS SHREWD"

July 20, 2002 - IS THERE ANY WAY TO DISCREDIT THOSE WHO ARE ALWAYS WRONG?

July 20, 2002 - ME AND TED WILLIAMS

July 20, 2002 - I HATE NATURE!

July 20, 2002 - HATING RAW NATURE IS THE AMERICAN WAY

July 20, 2002 - THERE IS NOTHING CONSERVATIVE ABOUT MY CONSERVATISM

GOVERNOR HODGES "GITS SHREWD"

"You can't believe anything these government bureaucrats tell you. So I won't allow plutonium shipments into South Carolina until they PROMISE me..."

--Governor Hodges

If you can't trust them, it means their promises are worthless. So Governor Hodges demands that they promise him not to break their promises.

Unfortunately, Hodges is not the only person who makes that mistake.

Liberal professors discredit themselves over and over and over and over, yet the media always go straight to them when they come up with a new program. No matter how often they are wrong and no matter how wrong they are, we all listen to them.

IS THERE ANY WAY TO DISCREDIT THOSE WHO ARE ALWAYS WRONG?

No policy social science professors come up with ever works. Busing, rehabilitation of those innocent victims of Society we call "criminals," getting rid of phonetics in schools, all were disastrous failures recommended almost unanimously by the professors.

Hundreds of other professor-recommended social policies, like experiments in education and the old welfare policy, were all WORSE than failures. Every one of them was a human disaster.

But every time a new professor's policy comes up, people take it seriously. And guess who every network, including Fox, goes to ask about it?

The professors, of course.

For two thousand years, if a patient went to a highly educated physician with pneumonia, what the Learned Doctor did was to BLEED him. That's how George Washington died. But the people still kept coming and they still kept dying because the guy had a title and the guy had a degree.

Until we learn to stop going to people who are always wrong because they got a degree, we will continue to let them destroy us.

ME AND TED WILLIAMS

According to his executor, who was his friend, Ted Williams wanted to be frozen after his death.

Me too.

I am signed up to be frozen myself. Ted's loving daughter wants to cremate him.

My question is "WHY?"

The argument against cryonics (human freezing) is that in the future they will never find a way to bring people back from that state. You will just stay dead.

So what? If they burn you or stick you down with the worms, I absolutely guarantee you will not be revived.

So what does Ted Williams' daughter get out of burning the old man?

The other anti-freezing argument is that, when you come out of freezing, you won't know anybody and the world will be a completely new place to you.

I don't know about you, but that's how I came into THIS world.

I HATE NATURE!

So arguing you won't be brought back or that the world you are brought back in will be strange -- opponents make both arguments at the same time -- makes no sense at all.

Actually, neither of those arguments has anything to do with the real opposition to the whole idea of human freezing.

Many, if not most, of the directors of the cryonics group I belong to are Doctors of Medicine. Yet the only "experts" the media interviews are university professors who are against freezing. I have never seen one of our MD's asked a single question in the media.

The professor "experts" talk about water damage from freezing. We've solved that problem, but no one will ever know it.

The real reason people oppose freezing is because it's "agin' nachur." Rotting away and being eaten by worms, that's what nature intended. That's the healthy way to go.

Being agin' nachur is not only all right with me, it is the only way I ever want to go. As Eric Hoffer pointed out decades ago, "It is no accident that people who say they love nature mostly come from a manicured little island in the North Sea."

It is easy to love nature if you're in England, because there's no nature in England. There is not a hundred square miles of English countryside today which has not been shaped by men down through the ages.

Hoffer, who spent much of his life working in the West, had the same contempt and dislike of Nature that I do.

I was raised working at a brick plant in the sandhills of South Carolina. Beloved Nature to me is red ants, black ants, and, if you sit on a pine log, you may not stand up with all the skin you sat down with. I watched frogs swallow other frogs that were doing their equivalent of a scream. I have seen other things I simply won't mention here, but I bet a lot of my readers have more examples than I do.

I have had more than enough outhouses for my lifetime.

I did a LOT of VERY hard work, and you know what I learned from it? I learned that modern machinery is wonderful. I learned that human beings shouldn't have to get out in a South Carolina summer and push something that a machine can push ten of.

You can butcher that pig if the idea charms you. It doesn't charm me. I get it in a store, preferably microwavable.

All those anti-hunting people say it is cruel for animals to die that way. Not one of them has ever seen how animals usually die in nature. Usually, they are in such pain and hopelessness that they lie down and die.

HATING RAW NATURE IS THE AMERICAN WAY

No European lives with real nature. There isn't any nature in Europe. Americans live with real nature and no people ever took to machines and anything else that helped them battle that Sweet Mama more than Americans did.

Life in nature, as people before Hobbes pointed out, is "nasty, brutish, and short."

In real terms, the political left is anti-technology. This is because they want problems solved by bureaucratic rationing and professors controlling and planning every aspect of our society. Now that socialism has been laughed out of existence as an efficient and fair system, "saving the environment" is the ticket to turning everything over to the planners.

Nothing leftists propose ever WORKS and the last thing the left wants is solutions that DO work. Today it is liberal "ethicists" who scream when anything is "agin' nachur."

THERE IS NOTHING CONSERVATIVE ABOUT MY CONSERVATISM

I am conservative only about things that have proven that they work. If something is working, you have to meet a hellacious burden of proof before I will change society to fix it.

Our society calls that conservative. A sane society would call that common sense.

It is no accident that lefties and the nut right always end up pointing to Oriental Wisdom as the way to go. Like Napoleon, today's leftist loves the Orient's willingness to follow its "intellectuals" blindly.

In the West, we follow Davy Crockett's very conservative advice, "Be sure you're right, then go ahead." The Orient wants man to remain an animal, tied to the earth and Nature. The Western mind will settle for nothing less than the stars.

To go to the stars, you have to have a solid basis on earth, and that basis has to WORK. That is as conservative as I get.

July 27, 2002 - WORLD WAR II CONSERVATISM

July 27, 2002 - OUR BELOVED ALLY JOSEPH STALIN

July 27, 2002 - THE RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES' FAVORITE WAR

July 27, 2002 - IF MODERN CONSERVATIVES AND LIBERALS LOVE IT, SOMETHING MUST BE WRONG WITH IT

July 27, 2002 - A PATRIOT LOOKS AT WORLD WAR II

WORLD WAR II CONSERVATISM

In The wake of September 11, conservatives are wildly praising World War II.

I get desperately tired of hearing conservatives bless and praise WW2. A lot of good people died in that war.

For conservatives, the fact that a lot of good people died in it makes WW2 The Good War. But to me, the very fact that so many good Americans died in a war that ended up being nothing but a victory for the political left makes it worse, not better.

There are lessons to be learned from World War II. The main one is that conservatives should not let their lust for uniforms and flag-waving blind them to what the struggle is all about.

OUR BELOVED ALLY JOSEPH STALIN

Charles Lindbergh was America's premier hero after he became the first man to fly across the Atlantic Ocean in 1927. But he became America's premier villain because of his friendliness to Hitler before World War II.

As a matter of fact, Lindbergh was far less friendly to Hitler than every liberal was to Stalin, but modern conservatives agreed to make him a special villain.

In the late 1930's, Lindbergh wrote the article for which he was infamous for the rest of his life. He wanted all the Western powers to unite and destroy Joseph Stalin's Communist regime in Russia. He even wanted Hitler's Luftwaffe to be part of the coalition to destroy Stalin!

Joseph Stalin, the leader of the Peace-Loving Democratic Republics! Stalin, our Great Ally and the Hero whose ideology later took Eastern Europe from Hitler and China from Chang-Kai Chek and Vietnam from France! Joseph Stalin, Champion of Democracy!

From the time he wrote that article, Lindbergh became the man the left was out to get.

After World War II, every respectable conservative agreed with liberals that that article was the height of outright treason. The idea of allying with Hitler to destroy Stalin was Pure Evil.

This is because the only true American patriotism was uniting with Stalin to get rid of Hitler. Liberals wanted to get rid of the extreme right and praise the extreme left.

And if that's what liberals insisted on, that's what today's conservatives want.

THE RESPECTABLE CONSERVATIVES' FAVORITE WAR

It is hard to say which war is most the popular with today's conservatives. They keep bragging on the Civil War, in which more Americans were killed than any other. Conservatives try to get liberals to like them by bragging about their love for Lincoln.

But the favorite conservative conflict is still The Big One, The Last Good War, WW2. For today's conservatives it was perfect.

First of all, during World War II practically everybody was in uniform, which is the dream society for today's right.

On its first cover after September 11, National Review showed a scene from World War II. It showed thousands of Americans parachuting, many to their deaths. Happy days were here again!

What thrills conservatives most about WW2 is the fact that the left was all for it. Especially after Hitler attacked the Peace-Loving Democratic Republic of Joseph Stalin in 1941, liberals united in favor of American entry into the fight.

So from 1941 America was waving flags, keeping its young men in uniforms, and liberals were all for it. It was a total war, the kind conservatives live for, and nobody protested against it and liberals told conservatives how smart they were for being such wonderful patriots. For that short period, liberals praised patriotism and conservatives were in Paradise.

After World War II, when America was fighting the Democratic Peace-Loving Peoples' Republics, i.e., Communists, the left has been for Peace, Non-Violence and Brotherhood. The conservative obsession for getting guys in uniforms no longer drew leftist praise.

No wonder World War II is still remembered as the conservatives' Dream Time.

IF MODERN CONSERVATIVES AND LIBERALS LOVE IT, SOMETHING MUST BE WRONG WITH IT

So after we destroyed Germany and Japan in the name of Freedom, how did Freedom come out of World War II?

Before World War II Germany, Japan, Italy and -- my apologies to leftists for saying it -- the Soviet Union, were absolute tyrannies. But the first three constituted the Anti-Comintern Axis. Three of the world's absolute ideological tyrannies were enemies of the fourth.

As a result of World War II, a third of the world ended up under the absolute tyranny of Communism, a third of the world was free, and a third was neutral and stagnating under third-world socialism.

And, unlike the situation before World War II, the tyrannies were all on one side.

This is the result that conservatives brag on when they glory over World War II.

Why do conservatives glory in this? Because liberals glory in this result, and in order to be respectable, conservatives have to approve of history that liberals like.

World War II not only saved Stalin, it made him an American Hero. Liberals and conservatives now agree that the war was not fought for Freedom, but against Racism and Rightism.

Before America's entry into WW2, conservatives opposed America's entry into it, and Roosevelt told Churchill that, if they found out what he had done to get the United States into the war, he would have gone to jail. But now Roosevelt is a conservative hero for wanting Americans to fight against the Axis -- and FOR the world's left.

A PATRIOT LOOKS AT WORLD WAR II

Patriotic Americans before Pearl Harbor took one of two positions on the war. What they wanted most was for the United States to stay out of it, especially after Churchill allied himself with Stalin so enthusiastically.

Another possibility some conservatives considered was joining a REAL fight for freedom. That would have been a war against Hitler, but it would also have been an alliance against the Peace Loving Democratic Peoples' Republics under America's Hero, Joseph Stalin.

My father wanted to stop aid to Britain and Russia. If we didn't stop aid, he wanted to use it against both our enemies.

My father said we should aid Stalin until his forces entered Germany and then aid Hitler until his forces came within easy range of Moscow, and then to back Stalin and so on until both were exhausted. Chris Matthews or a modern conservative would call that idea treason.

It was called treason after the United States got into the war. My father was told that if he didn't shut up, they would close his plant down. He told them, "You can shut me down but you can't shut me up."

Back then America was still a free country

August 3, 2002 - WHAT COAL MINERS SHOULD TEACH US

August 3, 2002 - THOSE MINERS AND FLIGHT 93

August 3, 2002 - LIBERALS ALWAYS PORTRAY AVERAGE AMERICANS AS PANICKY COWARDS

August 3, 2002 - AMERICA'S PROBLEM IS NOT ***PHYSICAL*** COWARDICE**

WHAT COAL MINERS SHOULD TEACH US

Coal miners have a special meaning to me. Unlike leftist Heroes of the Working Class in Hollywood, I actually know a lot of working people.

As I have mentioned in whitakeronline, about the proudest I have ever been was when a West Virginia coal miner said, "Whitaker speaks for us, and he's not even a hick."

I AM a hick -- from Pontiac, SC -- but as their Official Spokesman I had to cover that up with a coat and tie.

That miner's remark was made at a joint press conference and march I had arranged in Washington, DC, for West Virginia parents fighting filthy textbooks and Boston anti-busers.

I was also an official Honorary Boston Southie.

Coal miners and Boston Southies are not people who are noted for giving their trust freely and easily. I earned it.

Those nine coal miners who just survived are typical of the breed I am proud to have been trusted by.

Jane Fonda keeps saying that nuclear energy is dangerous and implies that other energy production isn't. She doesn't know anybody who's worked on an oil rig or in a coal mine.

Nobody but a bunch of coal miners would have been cool enough to find a place to survive down there. The very idea gives me the cold crawlies.

Damn, they're good!

THOSE MINERS AND FLIGHT 93

Flight 93 was the plane that the hijackers seized for an attack on the Pentagon on September 11. The passengers fought back and the plane crashed in Pennsylvania. Before they fought back, many of the passengers called their families on cell phones and said goodbye.

A mother of one of the passengers got to hear the recordings and she was so proud of her son's heroism on that day her glowing pride showed over her grief. Those in authority do not want us to hear that, but

we did get the words of one of the passengers who, getting up to go after the hijackers, spoke his last words. "Let's roll."

That's cool heroism.

We will probably never hear the full tapes, because many police officials and other agents of Authority do not like for Americans to look at themselves as heroic.

We are supposed to be helpless cowards. We are supposed to cower under a bed and let the Authorities take charge.

So if someone robs you, you are told never, never, never, never to be armed. You are told to submit and give a robber anything he wants. Invite him home to rape your daughter.

The officials who tell us that would have told the Flight 93 passengers to submit quietly. Don't make trouble.

But, like their ancestors, those Americans, despite all the brainwashing, went right out and made trouble. In doing so, they died saving countless others that airplane would have been used against.

LIBERALS ALWAYS PORTRAY AVERAGE AMERICANS AS PANICKY COWARDS

As good liberals, history professors are always trying to prove that there were no heroes at the Alamo. Liberals always try to prove that Americans are evil exploiters and cowards, especially those who fought for Politically Incorrect causes like taking Texas from Mexico.

In academia and on the East Coast the doctrine is that people should never "take the law into their own hands." All guns should be in the hands of the police. They say that any American who has a gun will use it for crime and that Americans are too cowardly to defend themselves, so the police have to do it.

Some time ago, the media were all reporting that if a home had a gun in it, a burglar was exactly FORTY-THREE TIMES more likely to take it away from the cowardly, panic-stricken householder and use it AGAINST HIM than the householder was to protect himself with it.

This "fact" reigned supreme for months. Then career police officers began to write newspapers saying that, in twenty-five year careers on the police force, they had never seen this happen once, and they had seen a lot of robberies and burglaries thwarted by armed citizens.

Like all gun control "facts," this one was discredited and everybody agreed to forget it had ever been said, especially respectable conservatives. But the next time the media come up with another "fact" like this, everybody will report it respectfully.

I heard National Public Radio announce that since Kennesaw, Georgia, began to require every citizen to be armed, the crime rate has shot up. Actually, it turns out that from the time Kennesaw started that requirement to the time NPR made that report, not one single crime had been committed there!

Probably no crime has been committed there since. So NPR was as wrong as you can get.

NPR made no correction and no conservative ever asked for one.

AMERICA'S PROBLEM IS NOT **PHYSICAL*** COWARDICE**

I would arm every honest American. Let's try the Kennesaw approach, at least on a pilot basis, and see if our crime rate doesn't drop like a rock. Let's at least stop telling everyone to grovel at the criminals' feet. Let's at least MENTION the alternative.

Liberals want us to believe that physical courage only comes in a government-issue uniform.

Meanwhile, back here in the real world, the gun-hating Englishmen have a crime rate far higher than ours. You are six times as likely to be mugged in London as you are in NEW YORK CITY!!

In England, almost half of the burglars don't even bother to wait until the family leaves the house. They just go right in and take what they want and terrorize the family and show the children how helpless their father is.

The Brits call that "civilized." It is the sort of perfect helplessness and obedience liberals would LOVE to see here.

During World War 2, when the Authorities needed the Brits to be brave to fight the right-wing Axis Powers, the Brits were brave. But in defending their own homes against thugs, they are the kind of abject, crawling cowards liberals consider ideal.

In other words, the Brits' problem is that they can only be brave when their rulers TELL them to be. They will stand up for Equality, but not for themselves or their families.

The Brits have no MORAL courage at all.

Americans have a similar problem, though we are not as hopelessly far gone as the poor little Brits. Over ninety percent of our burglars at least wait until the family is gone. And it's not out of courtesy.

But if we don't show some MORAL courage, our physical bravery will eventually end up the way it did in Britain -- gone.

August 10, 2002 - MAURICE BESSINGER AND THE HOLLYWOOD TEN
August 10, 2002 - LIKE ANY OTHER ESTABLISHED RELIGION, POLITICAL
CORRECTNESS CANNOT ADMIT IT HAS EVER BEEN WRONG
August 10, 2002 - THE PC TITHE

MAURICE BESSINGER AND THE HOLLYWOOD TEN

The State newspaper and the NAACP and all the other voices of Love and Brotherhood state loudly that they want Maurice Bessinger ruined for his political heresy. His life's work and his means of living should be destroyed because he is an outspoken rightist and flies a Confederate flag.

Which makes a column by Anna Quindlen in the July 15 issue of Newsweek especially interesting. She was talking about the McCarthy era, when Evil People ruled: "It was the height of the Red Scare in

America, when the lives of those aligned with or merely flirting with the Communist Party were destroyed by paranoia, a twisted strain of uber-patriotism and machinations of Sen. Joseph McCarthy, after whom an entire vein of baseless persecution is now named."

Nobody else noticed, but she is admitting that everybody McCarthy went after was either an outright supporter of Stalin's Communist USSR or was flirting with it!

So destroying the careers and livelihoods of people who were "aligned with the Communist Party" was "baseless persecution." We are talking here about people who wanted STALIN to take over America. The "McCarthy Era" was when the Communists had just taken over a third of the world. They had stolen the A-Bomb and were stealing the H-Bomb.

Everything Hitler ever did he learned from Stalin, who did it better. Hitler killed millions in wartime. Stalin killed tens of millions in peacetime.

The official doctrine is that Bessinger, an American who fought for America in Korea during the McCarthy period, should be destroyed for his rightist political views.

The official view is that we should kick ourselves over how we treated those poor sweeties who "aligned with or merely flirted with Stalin's Communist Party."

This is exactly the kind of thing respectable conservatives get paid NOT to talk about.

LIKE ANY OTHER ESTABLISHED RELIGION, POLITICAL CORRECTNESS CANNOT ADMIT IT HAS EVER BEEN WRONG

It took the Catholic Church centuries to admit that it had been wrong to persecute Galileo. He had said that the earth was not the center of the universe so the Church shut him up. Within a century every Catholic university was teaching Galileo's doctrine, but the Church refused to admit that it was wrong to persecute him until the 1800s.

Exactly the same thing is true of today's established religion, Political Correctness (PC). Its official doctrine has been that the McCarthyite era was a "witch hunt." It was called a witch hunt because witches don't exist.

The official PC doctrine was that none of the people McCarthy went after were actually Communists.

But, when the Soviet Union failed, the KGB files were opened and guess who fell out?

Now that we are finding the KGB dossiers of one after another of these people, liberals have begun to admit, very softly, that they actually were Communists. They don't use the term "witch hunt" as much today, because somebody might remember that they used it when they said the Alger Hisses were NOT Communists.

They needn't worry about that. Respectable conservatives are paid not to have a memory.

What leaps out at me in the Quindlen column quoted above is a giant change in the PC line. A few years ago if she had described McCarthy's victims as "aligned or merely flirting with the Communist Party" she would have been denounced as a McCarthyite herself.

With the help of respectable conservatives, liberals have a media in which nobody but me even notices this enormous switch. No PC will ever have to admit that his side was just plain wrong.

So destroying Bessinger for rightist heresy is good, hurting anybody who actively supports a foreign enemy is evil. And all respectable conservatives agree. You will not see this fact pointed to anywhere but here.

THE PC TITHE

Like all established religions, Political Correctness cannot be accused of changing its doctrine. If a conservative points out that PC doctrine was wrong he will cease to be respectable and the media will ruin him.

Also, like any other established religion, Political Correctness has a tithe everybody must pay. So when the Red Cross and the United Way got money for the victims of September 11 they started financing PC programs with it. The one I remember was an anti-hate workshop put on by professional "anti-haters," i.e., priests of Political Correctness (who are among the world's best real haters when it comes to people like Maurice).

When the entertainment industry pays its tithe to the left it is called a "social message." You have to give a certain proportion of any movie to racial balance, interracial sex, making fun of Christians, and showing how cowardly white gentiles are.

O'Reilly did attack the charities for not giving money to the victims of 9-11. But if he had mentioned that it was routine for them to give at least a tithe of contributors' money to liberal causes, he would have been a real hero.

But, once again, you will only see that mentioned here.

August 17, 2002 - HARD TO BELIEVE

August 17, 2002 - CHILD KIDNAPPINGS

**August 17, 2002 - THE TIME HAS PASSED WHEN LISTENING TO SOCIAL SCIENCE
"EXPERTS" WAS AN INNOCENT MISTAKE**

August 17, 2002 - YOUR GUN HELPS ME

**August 17, 2002 - TRENDY OPINION SAYS CRIMINALS ARE BRAVE AND HIGHLY
INTELLIGENT**

HARD TO BELIEVE

A Mexican came to the United States and killed an American law enforcement officer. So we're executing him.

Not only is President Vincente Fox of Mexico not apologizing to the officer's family, he is refusing to meet with President Bush as a protest against the execution.

A French citizen, Moussaoui, was in on the killing of three thousand American citizens. Does France apologize? No way. France is protesting our treatment of him.

Only a country ruled by respectable conservatives could do all the groveling to the Mexicans and the French that we are doing over these incidents.

CHILD KIDNAPPINGS

One thing about the rash of child kidnappings and murders needs to be mentioned. In every case, the man accused was in the hands of the authorities and was released. Isn't our System wonderful?

We are being assured by the media that the number of kidnap-murders of this kind has actually gone down in recent years. There seem to be more because recently the media have given such kidnappings enormous coverage.

There is lot of media comment on the fact that these cases have recently received so much attention while child grabs of this kind did not get this kind of media coverage before. The reason is not far to seek.

There used to be no conservative television outlets at all and liberals don't like to talk about real crimes, especially crimes against children.

If you will listen to what liberals say, their official doctrine is that only leftists care about children. Liberal politicians say conservatives are out -- and I am not exaggerating this -- to starve children and ignore anything done to them.

See July 5, 2002 - WERE SOUTH CAROLINIANS STARVING CHILDREN?

If the media had discussed child kidnappings they would have also ended up pointing out that it is the criminals whom liberals acquit or let back out on the street who commit those crimes. It is the law and order conservatives who care about THOSE children.

So child kidnappings were not given much publicity when liberals had a television monopoly.

The media did not talk about specific incidents of crimes against children because each such crime is traceable back to a felon liberals want sympathy for. They only discussed general things like crime RATES and EXPENDITURES on government programs for children.

And, of course, the liberal media demanded more expenditures for the rehabilitation of those nice child molesters.

Besides, any discussion of real crimes opens up a can for worms for the political left.

If liberals talked about specific incidents, they would have to recount cases where people defended their family and property with evil private weapons.

This was not a conspiracy. It was simply that liberal commentators were uncomfortable discussing crime, so they didn't. Now they have to.

Reality is always the leftists' biggest enemy.

THE TIME HAS PASSED WHEN LISTENING TO SOCIAL SCIENCE "EXPERTS" WAS AN INNOCENT MISTAKE

Catholic Church authorities have been whining that they are innocent of all those rapes of little boys that priests committed. Their excuse is that back when most of that happened they were just following orders.

The Catholic authorities openly insist that, back when they ignored child molesters, every single social expert from the universities told them that these people could be rehabilitated.

The Church is right about one thing: that rehabilitation line is what every trendy university professor recommended. But then, as now, nothing they say ever WORKS.

If you listen to them, you become a criminal, too. The time when listening to social "experts" was an honest mistake is long, long past.

See July 20, 2002 - IS THERE ANY WAY TO DISCREDIT THOSE WHO ARE ALWAYS WRONG?

No respectable conservative ever points out that the social "experts" are always wrong. And that makes them part of the criminal outlook, too, because tomorrow's crimes will be the result of people listening to those social science professors AGAIN.

YOUR GUN HELPS ME

A relative of mine was very anti-gun. She lives in an upscale area.

Of course it is a very anti-gun community. Wealthy communities in South Carolina tend to associate weapon-owning with the peasants.

I have worked in a prison. Prisoners know areas where there might be guns the way a farmer knows what the weather forecast is. They discuss where the guns are the way a stock trader talks about market trends.

So criminals knew about the lack of guns in my relative's community.

So one night a couple of thugs came right in my relative's front door -- the way they do in gunless Britain. They beat my relative and her husband up and took what they wanted.

She has a gun now.

My relative probably got attacked at least in part because it was well known that her community was gunless. People in that community bragged that they were too classy to have a gun ("like the trailer trash" being the implication).

I want to live in an area that is known less for its trendy attitudes and more for bristling with deadly weapons.

TRENDY OPINION SAYS CRIMINALS ARE BRAVE AND HIGHLY INTELLIGENT

According to established opinion, people should not have guns because the criminals are too brave to be bothered by them. According to anti-gun propaganda, the person with a gun in his home is a terrified wreck but the thug coming into the house and facing the gun is cool, calm, collected and professional.

It used to be the official doctrine of this "criminals are heroes" theory that a person in the home was FORTY-THREE TIMES more likely to have the gun taken away by the cool, heroic, professional criminal than he was to use it to defend himself. They won't even admit they ever said that nonsense now.

But the media said it and the media BELIEVED it. They honestly believe that all Americans are cowards and all criminals are calm and smart, so only a person with a government-issue badge is capable of defending himself with a weapon.

See August 3, 2002 - AMERICA'S PROBLEM IS NOT *****PHYSICAL*** COWARDICE .

August 24, 2002 - The Only Moral Justification For War Today Is Oil

August 24, 2002 - If Both sides Are Wrong, Their Compromises Are No Better

August 24, 2002 - Liberals Are Bad, Respectable Conservatives Are Bad, But Their Compromises Are Worse

August 24, 2002 - Republican Moderation Is The Ultimate Compromise

August 24, 2002 - Moderates Are Total Champions of the Military-Industrial Complex

The Only Moral Justification For War Today Is Oil

America is in the Middle East for two major reasons. The main one is to defend Israel's theocratic right to Arab land. The second is to protect Europe and Japan from an oil shortage.

We get a lot of oil from the Middle East, too, of course, and that is our only moral excuse to be in the Middle East at all. As I said on November 17, 2001, in THE ONLY REAL CHOICE IS BETWEEN NATIONAL SELF-INTEREST AND COLONIALISM, a country's only MORAL right to interfere in the affairs of other countries is when its OWN national interest is involved.

I am no pacifist. If we went into any OPEC country to destroy OPEC, I might just be for it.

Liberals are for using American force for other peoples' benefit. Conservatives are for using American force for another set of reasons, but they also insist that it be used always and only for the benefit of others.

So the one thing any "foreign policy compromise" between conservatives and liberals is going to start with is that that policy will not benefit, "We the People of the United States of America."

For me, the only time Middle Eastern force sounds worthwhile is when it might break OPEC's hold over the US.

According to liberals and conservatives, Americans have no right to our own country, but oil sheiks have "Sovereign Rights" to the oil they happened to be sitting on when we found a use for it.

Liberals and conservatives agree we must share our high living standard, which is a result of our political wisdom, with floods of immigrants. But we should fight to the death for the high living standard of oil potentates and Europeans.

So when it comes to TAKING enough oil to break OPEC's power OVER THE UNITED STATES -- not over Europe -- I might support that.

That is the one thing liberals and conservatives agree would be morally Evil. Which makes me all the more certain that it's right.

If Both sides Are Wrong, Their Compromises Are No Better

In 1939, Communist fanatics ruled the Soviet Union. In 1939, Anti-Communist extremists ruled in Germany, Italy and Japan. Fanatics on one extreme ruled one side, fanatics on the other extreme ruled the other.

So they compromised. In late August of 1939, these two totalitarian states signed the Nazi-Soviet Pact. That Pact divided Poland between Germany and Russia.

The problem was that both fascists and Communists were extremists. By definition, a compromise between those extremists should lead to truth and peace, right?

But the Nazi-Soviet agreement led right into World War II.

So when people say that a compromise is the solution to problems between extremists, it just ain't so.

Liberals Are Bad, Respectable Conservatives Are Bad, But Their Compromises Are Worse

President Bush needed a billion dollar appropriation. So he asked Congress for it.

Bush had to veto the spending bill that came back to him. It amounted to FIVE billion dollars.

This vetoed spending package included huge programs added to please liberals, especially AIDS expenditures. It also included more money for Homeland Security and the military to please conservatives.

It was a compromise.

Ah, that magic word! It conjures up the idea that reasonable men with wide ideological differences are finally coming together for the public good. This five billion dollar boondoggle shows that in the real world, a compromise between liberals and conservatives produces the worst of both worlds.

'Twas ever thus.

People who use that word "compromise" as a magic incantation get lost in the idea that it represents a position between two extremes. They completely ignore the fact that the two extremes represented are BOTH bad. As a result, compromise is the worst of both worlds.

A perfect example of this kind of moderation is moderate Republicanism. The Republican Party establishment represents big business and a big military. Liberals represent the idea that all the money in the country should be turned over to college professors and other "intellectuals." These "intellectuals" will then divvy out all the money and impose whatever rules they think society should obey.

So when they compromise, these two groups come up with a half cut for each side. Conservatives get lots of money for their military contractors and Democrats get the new regulations and the higher expenditures their social experts demand.

Take a look in your mind at what "compromise" looks like in a real Congress. Do you really believe one side represents a bunch of evil ideologues and the other stands for truth? They are all there to get what their sponsors want.

A "compromise" is the middle of the road because it gives away everything each group of lobbyists want.

This split between Republican power-brokers and liberal power-brokers is what we call moderate Republicanism.

Republican Moderation Is The Ultimate Compromise

The Republican Party exists to obtain 1) benefits for large corporations and 2) mucho, mucho military expenditure. In hard core, real-world politics, the rumors are true. In return for more bombers and a macho foreign policy, Republicans are happy to let liberals have their racial quotas, their busing, and anything else they want on the social policy side.

So the real meaning of "middle of the road" in America is that both the military-industrial establishment and the education-welfare establishment get what they really insist on. There is no room in this compromise for the people to get anything.

Washington, DC, took over America to an unimagined extent in the period between 1953 and 1977. During two-thirds of that critical period moderate Republicans held the White House. That period began with Eisenhower creating the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and ended with Reagan being defeated by Ford at the Republican Convention Of 1976.

Liberals sponsored most of the Washington power grabs between 1953 and 1977.

But it was moderate Republicans who prevented any real opposition from forming against them.

Moderates Are Total Champions of the Military-Industrial Complex

"The military-industrial complex" is a term coined by President Eisenhower. It is pointed to today as the phrase a great moderate used to warn against the right.

As you might suspect, the military-industrial complex never had a better all-out champion than Dwight David Eisenhower.

Europe came out of World War II in ruins and the United States had to provide for its defense against the Soviet Union. But by 1959 Europe was back on its feet. There were far more people in Western Europe than in the Soviet bloc and they were far, far richer than the USSR and Eastern Europe.

So by 1959 it was time for Europe to take on a fair share of its own defense and give American taxpayers, not to mention young American draftees, a break.

But if American military expenditures went down, that meant the American military-industrial complex Republicans were devoted to would be cut.

So in 1959, Europe said it didn't want to do all that drafting and spending. It wanted the US to do all the drafting and spending and defending while Europe remained a military welfare case.

Eisenhower went to Europe personally and guaranteed them that this boondoggle would not only continue, it would increase. To this day, the idea that Europe should have to protect itself is considered the height of Evil American Provincialism.

But it wasn't liberals or conservatives who made the decision to put Europe on a permanent military dole. It was that denouncer of the "military-industrial complex," the moderate Republican Dwight Eisenhower.

August 31, 2002 - Nothing Liberals Do Ever Works - Johannesburg Chapter

August 31, 2002 - The Yellow Cloud

August 31, 2002 - No European Bill of Rights

August 31, 2002 - European Intellectuals Love the Third World

Nothing Liberals Do Ever Works - Johannesburg Chapter

There will be a world conference on global warming in Johannesburg, South Africa. It will represent that same brilliant thinking that made southern Africa what it is today. South Africa has gotten rid of white rule and now has the world's highest crime rate and a near majority of its black population has AIDS and is dying. In the rest of Africa, where this anti-white "wisdom" rules, there is starvation. Few if any African blacks today have the rights in their black-ruled lands that South African blacks had under the apartheid regime.

But worst of all, there is no prospect for improvement. In black-ruled Africa, there is less for everybody every day. Countries that exported food under white regimes are starving now. That was never true in white-ruled Africa.

Every day, more of Africa enters the starvation phase of progressive economic policy.

So what are these geniuses meeting to lecture the world on this time?

The Yellow Cloud

This particular leftist conference of European and Third World Wisdom is going to tell America how to handle the environment. A large part of the delegations are coming to South Africa from under the "yellow cloud" that is forming over India and southeast Asia.

This yellow cloud is something unprecedented, but it is perfectly predictable by anybody who does not represent World Environmental Wisdom.

As any reasonably intelligent person knows, a primitive industrial economy produces far, far, far more pollution than a more advanced one. If America had produced a tenth of this Asian "yellow cloud" of pure choking pollution, it would have made world headlines.

Long before Chernobyl, Communist countries always produced a lot more pollution and environmental destruction than the more advanced and productive western economies, but World Opinion never breathed a word about it.

But this particular yellow cloud is not coming from Red China. This one is coming from the leftists' pet, that Wise and Wonderful Third World in lower Asia.

Those Third World Idealist geniuses who are going to tell us how to run America's environmental policy are leaving their own lands at a good time. For a while they won't choke on the results of their own environmental policy.

This yellow cloud has already spread around Asia, and we are going to probably see signs of it over here before long.

No European Bill of Rights

Recently there was another scene straight out of the Inquisition in Europe. A European graduate student was trying to stay out of prison for research he had been doing. In France and Germany you get an automatic one-year prison sentence if you question any aspect of the Holocaust.

As in the United Kingdom, when it comes to Hate Law, "the truth is no excuse" (The Crown Versus Joseph Pierce, 1986). So a French grad student had found some information that questioned the holocaust and he was trying to stay out of prison. He sat there at his university, that Citadel of Free Inquiry, and insisted that he hadn't spoken Heresy. His professors were mostly Inquisitors.

In Germany, a person was accused under the Holocaust law and he could not have witnesses, because the witnesses would have gone to prison for testifying on his side.

Can you imagine the shriek that would go up around the world if an American witness for a terrorist were threatened with prison for testifying in the terrorists' favor?

But, of course, when it comes to violating Political Correctness, one has no rights.

Listening to Europeans, you get the impression that their court system must be perfect. They have none of our exposures of police misconduct or convicting of the innocent.

In Europe, they have these little guys in round hats or wigs or some other uniform who pronounce what, if you listen to the silence, must be perfect justice. Our system is messy.

Anything human is messy. So why is European justice, like so much else in Europe, so perfect?

Well, first of all, we all know that these countries are largely white. Nobody is allowed to say it, but that helps a LOT. But lately, even that hasn't overcome the sheer dumbness of leftist policy.

The European crime rate, under policies of the kind being developed in Johannesburg for the environment, has gone from astonishingly low to unbearably high.

But in Europe, the people are obedient. They apparently don't mind the crime rate. You don't have the kind of hell-raising you do here.

Europe is the leftists' dreamland. The people there obey and believe. The fashion right now is to take guns away every time a nut misuses one. Europeans rush to obey the fashion. Australians and Canadians, good little colonials, do the same thing. Since gun confiscation, crime has shot up in Australia, but once you get a leftist law in a European colony, it is forever.

The American east coast and the Ivy League LOVE Europe.

European Intellectuals Love the Third World

For American leftists, Europe is good but the Third World is GREAT. Communists countries were, of course, perfect, but sometimes leftism is too dumb to survive at all.

Leftists worship Karl Marx in their universities still, but they can't talk about that outside their captive classrooms without getting laughed at.

But our east coasters still have that Johannesburg meeting to salivate over.

There, the old condemnation of America for being rich is gravely accepted by everybody. We may not have that world-threatening yellow cloud spreading out from us, but we are guilty of using a quarter of the world's energy to produce a quarter of the world's goods.

And by the way, the people at the Johannesburg conference want us to give THEM more of those goods we produce.

But the crime is that we have a bunch of money that no Planners control. Professors and bureaucrats and planners should have control of that money. If they can't get it by a Marxist theory of Evil Exploitation, they can get it by Environmentalist Agenda.

And, as always, the little Europeans will join with the Third World and demand that all American accomplishments be turned over to the professors.

My reply is not very Intellectual. I say it's spinach and I say to hell with them.

September 7, 2002 - Experts and the Iraqi Crisis -- Meanwhile, Back in the Real World....

September 7, 2002 - Uncle Turkey Scared Them - For a Moment

September 7, 2002 - All That Happened Is That Nothing Happened

September 7, 2002 - Conservatives May Win Or Leftists May Win But Americans Have Already Lost

Experts and the Iraqi Crisis -- Meanwhile, Back in the Real World....

I have no interest in going to war with Iraq. What fascinates me, as usual, is just how mindless the present discussion about the situation is.

All the conservatives are, as usual, mystified by how things have developed. As usual, the "experts" on both sides are completely mystified by reality. So we pay them money and listen to every precious word that falls from their lips.

Everybody is asking, "What happened? A few months ago the whole world was backing everything Bush wanted and now we're all alone. How did this come about?"

Everybody in the world suddenly decided to back American action after September 11.

Now the liberals are back to talking like liberals and Europeans are whining about American Imperialism. Right after September 11, "National Review" had a cover picture of Americans by the thousands parachuting into war and death in World War II.

Happy days were here again!!

But all they got was a pitiful little war in Afghanistan. They want more and nobody seems to want to give it to them.

Now nobody seems to want lots of uniforms and lots of military money and all the other wonderful things conservatives were licking their chops over just a little while back.

The explanation is very, very simple. It is too simple for experts to have the slightest inkling of what is going on.

As always, what both experts and conservatives lack is a memory.

Uncle Turkey Scared Them - For a Moment

Right after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attack, I wrote a daily WhitakerOnline for the rest of the week. My September 15 column was entitled "Our Allies Love Us - For the Moment."

Thousands of Americans had just been killed and nobody knew how America would react. Even China and Iran tried to get on the right side of this suddenly new America, this America that might have turned really mean.

Until September 11, everybody loved to kick Sweet Old Uncle Turkey. If there was trouble in Europe the United States had to take care of it or Europeans would say they were Isolationists. When the United States got in there to take care of Europeans, the Europeans called them "Imperialists."

Americans ate it up. We get a big feeling of Humility when Europeans and East Coasters tell us how Evil we are. And East Coasters and Europeans love it, too. If you want to get elected in Europe, just bite the United States on the backside and say how smart and noble Europeans are.

I am not telling anybody a thing we haven't all known for years.

Things changed suddenly on September 11, 2001. The real point is, though, that exactly as I predicted, things changed TEMPORARILY on September 11. That day internationalists were afraid that the death of thousands of innocent American civilians might make America demand something for Americans for a change.

They needn't have worried.

Everything is back to normal. Europeans are biting our rumps and we are back to apologizing for having backsides at all.

All That Happened Is That Nothing Happened

Nothing happened. Europeans are telling us how imperialistic we are and we're back to eating it up, just like we were before September 11.

Last September 11, our "allies" - note that I used quotes then, too - were scared that thousands of dead Americans might make Sweet Old Uncle Turkey furious and therefore dangerous. For a few weeks nobody could decide.

Remember those few weeks after September 11? Nobody else does either.

First we quickly beat the primitive Taliban army. No surprise there. What scared our so-called "allies" was the language Bush used during that brief period.

Right after September 11, Bush said that "anybody who isn't with us was against us." That really sounded ominous. Normally all we ask of anybody is that they take our money and our troops and anything else conservatives and liberals can take from Americans and give to other people.

We hope they will not insult us too loudly after taking what we give them.

So when Bush said "you are with us or against us" it sounded like we had some purely American feelings all of a sudden. Bush for a very short period stopped sounding like the guy who wanted to give everything to Mexico. For a moment it sounded as if "We the People of the United States of America" might actually be capable of some resentment if we were kicked too hard.

That didn't outlast the Afghanistan war.

Everybody on the left, all the people Bush has spent his life trying to please, was taken aback by Bush's saying you were with us or you were against us.

Threatened with a loss of respectability, the Bush Administration began backpedaling. You see, said the State Department, being "with us" differed with each country. You could be "with us," for instance, by accepting our troops on your soil to protect you.

You are "with us," the Bush Administration explained, if you would take what we give you and not insult us too badly in return.

In other words, it was the same old song.

So everybody went back to business as usual.

But things will be worse than usual now, because all those people we crawl to for their good opinions after we save their tails again got scared after September 11. For just a moment, even the Mexicans thought that Bush had turned into some kind of American.

Nobody likes being scared. Especially, nobody likes being scared by a mouse they were momentarily afraid might turn into a lion.

Their brief moment of fear made the international community and American internationalists look silly. They are furious and they will make us pay for it.

Conservatives May Win Or Leftists May Win But Americans Have Already Lost

So "We the People" will get nothing. The Europeans and the Europeanists and the American left are sure that Good Old Uncle Turkey is back. Conservatives still hope to win by a highly successful invasion of Iraq by the United States acting alone.

As I said last week, conservative victory will give "We the People" nothing. Oil prices will skyrocket if there is a war, but the United States will not buy captured Iraqi oil at a reasonable price in order to cow OPEC. The oil will sit right where it is while Americans are gouged because of the crisis.

Why? Because everybody will agree that we should not use our idealistic war for the grubby business of getting oil.

So Americans won't win with a conservative victory. But conservatives will win. Conservatives will get the one thing they really live for.

Conservatives want lots of military money and lots of Americans in uniforms. As always, they're telling us that and only I seem to hear exactly what they are saying.

One after another, American conservatives are saying, "If we go into Iraq, we must be prepared to STAY A While." That's the conservative dream: lots and lots of American uniforms, big defense budgets. The bottom line is always the same.

And the part that both liberals and conservatives love is that none of this is for "We the People." We are in there to make a better life for the Iraqis, the Israelis, the Europeans. We are in there to SACRIFICE.

Ain't it great?

September 14, 2002 - White Race Traitors Are the True Idealists
September 14, 2002 - The "So-Called 'White' Race"
September 14, 2002 - You Are Either Anti-White Or You Are A Racist

White Race Traitors Are the True Idealists

Paul Craig Roberts' national column last week discussed a Jewish professor at Harvard who founded a group called Race Traitors:

<http://www.townhall.com/columnists/paulcraigroberts/pcr20020906.shtml>

Their motto is, "Treason to the white race is loyalty to humanity."

I have known about the organization for a long time, but it didn't strike me as anything impressive. There is nothing surprising to me about a professor openly demanding an end to the white race. It is one thing everybody in academia is required to agree on.

This particular anti-white Harvard Professor, Noel Ignatiev, is surprised that anybody is surprised by his being paid, like everybody else at a university, to preach an end to the white race. Ignatiev says,

"The goal of abolishing the white race is on its face so desirable that some may find it hard to believe that it could incur any opposition other than from committed white supremacists."

I have been hit with that line all my life, from both liberals and conservatives.

Coast to coast, a lot of conservatives are denouncing Ignatiev's perfectly honest statement of national policy. They act as if they haven't been saying the same thing.

Well, DUH! Every respectable conservative has to announce the means he prefers to follow to get rid of whites. People like Pat Buchanan may ask that immigration to America from the third world be slowed down, but even Buchanan has to demand that immigration and integration take place so that the white majority will be turned brown.

Buchanan tried to argue against the browning of America a couple of times and got slapped down.

Buchanan now obeys the rule that has been true all of my considerable lifetime:

Anyone who does not have a plan to get rid of the white race is anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews. No one is allowed to question the goal of a "raceless," by which they mean a whiteless, world. Nobody expects Africa to change or Asia to change its race, and no one cares one way or the other.

And this does not just mean leftist professors at Harvard. This is EVERYBODY: "There is no room for racism in America."

Ignatiev just said what he assumed we all knew:

"The goal of abolishing the white race is on its face so desirable that some may find it hard to believe that it could incur any opposition other than from committed white supremacists."

Everyone who is not a racist in this society subscribes to what Ignatiev says. So while I applaud Roberts's guts in talking about this guy, I wonder where the hell he has been all this time?

The "So-Called 'White' Race"

In his article Roberts follows the rules of respectable conservatism. He puts "the white race" in quotes, something he never does with blacks.

Ignatiev does not put "the white race" in quotes. He has no doubt about what he's trying to do away with. Neither does anybody else.

For a while, Craig Roberts himself ran the editorial page of the "Wall Street Journal." He must have been very good to be hired for that, because he has written columns asking why, in the Holy Name of Diversity, no one dares to say that white countries should be preserved.

But no one disagrees with the continued existence of white majority countries more than does the Wall Street Journal. The Journal officially demands that a constitutional amendment be passed that says, simply, "There shall be no borders."

The Wall Street Journal wants all the cheap labor that can flow in from the third world. Like the Libertarian Party, they assume that, when they become citizens, those masses would not vote to redistribute the wealth through a big government.

I was in school with Craig Roberts many years ago, and he is not that kind of fool. It takes guts to say what he said, and I applaud him. But Ignatiev is perfectly correct. Nobody is allowed to join in public discussion unless he can demonstrate that he is HONESTLY devoted to the abolition of white skin.

There is no room in this world for racism. Racism comes in only one color, and everybody who can read knows it.

And Craig Roberts says so:

"College students will tell you that a university education today is a guilt trip for whites." And Roberts reaches a conclusion that will not surprise readers of WhitakerOnline:

"Ignatiev has an idea like Hitler. A race is guilty and must go. The communists said it was a guilty class that had to go. If you thought genocide was left behind in the 20th century, be apprised that today genocide has a home in the educational system."

You Are Either Anti-White Or You Are A Racist

Paul Craig Roberts once wrote a column in which he pointed out that, if you love diversity, you should end third world immigration, at least to some white countries. A world without whites, he points out, is a world poorer in diversity.

Roberts knows as well as you and I do that liberals and respectable conservatives have no interest at all in diversity. Respectable conservatives like the Wall Street Journal want a wave of cheap labor.

Liberals know that that wave of cheap brown labor will vote leftist and make America's politics the same as that of the countries they came from.

But no one is interested in promoting immigration into Japan for cheap labor in that country where labor is expensive. Liberal and respectable conservatives agree on that.

What non-white countries do is their own business, but the most potent argument for open borders in every white majority country is "racism" because no one can say anything that might jeopardize the goal of ending the whiteness of majority white countries.

September 21, 2002 - We Don't Owe the Iraqis or the Israelis A Damned Thing

September 21, 2002 - Three Complex and Interrelated Requirements for UN and European Approval

September 21, 2002 - McCain Is A Hawk On Iraq -- I'm Thinking "Israel"

We Don't Owe the Iraqis or the Israelis A Damned Thing

First we hear the Administration arguing that we need to go into Iraq because Saddam Hussein is developing weapons of mass destruction.

But, after an impassioned talk about the immediate danger of the mass murder of Americans by Saddam, we then get a lecture about what we owe Iraq. After invading Iraq to remove the clear and present danger Saddam Hussein poses, our troops have to stay there until we give Iraq a stable democracy.

Nobody asks what one has to do with the other. Why do we owe Iraq a democracy in return for their threatening to murder us? As always, you will only see that question asked here.

"The road to peace in the Middle East peace lies through Baghdad." When I heard that said, my ears pricked up. "Middle East peace," when the media or respectable conservatives use the term, always means peace for Israel.

I do not want American troops dying for Israel. I do not want American troops staying in Iraq to make the world safe for Israel.

I brought up the danger of mass terrorism long before anybody else was concerned about it. See November 21, 1998 - SUPERTERRORISM, repeated September 11, 2001. But I am also very, very watchful about anybody using terrorism as an excuse to get Israeli lobby support.

If the objective is to destroy the Iraqi threat of weapons of mass destruction, that is one argument for invasion that has a clear objective. But the second they start talking about "our responsibility in Iraq," I say forget it. The only reason Bush says we have for a military interest in Iraq is because they are a threat to our lives.

Everybody but me seems to agree that, because they threatened our lives, we owe the Iraqis a stable government and a democracy.

It should be a warning to you that this is the only place you will find any objection to that nonsense.

Three Complex and Interrelated Requirements for UN and European Approval

We have all heard the old adage that, for a successful restaurant, there are three important factors: 1) Location, 2) Location and 3) Location.

In that order.

World Opinion is shouting loudly about US policy relative to Iraq. Everybody is debating what meaning European opinion has.

So let me explain the three factors which decide the European view of morality: 1) who wins the war, 2) who wins the war, and 3) who wins the war.

In that order.

Europe now jails anti-semites. If Hitler had won the war, those same Europeans would not only be chasing down Jews for the Nazis, they would be preaching about how moral it is to chase down Jews for the Nazis.

Respectable conservatives collaborate with liberals to destroy anyone liberals say is a political heretic. Like Europeans, respectable conservatives call this collaboration "morality." Respectable conservative collaboration is how they get liberal media to call them "respectable."

Like all collaborators, Europeans and respectable conservatives always end up on the winner's side. No one was ever accused of a War Crime who was not on the losing side. No one questions the morality of this but me.

No one even bothers to STATE this rule but me.

So much for all the BS. If Bush wins the war he will be approved by all the opinions that he cares about.

McCain Is A Hawk On Iraq -- I'm Thinking "Israel"

The most opportunistic senator of our decade --- and that's a hell of a distinction -- is backing Bush for immediate military action against Iraq. Normally McCain gets the liberal media to love him by backing Democratic initiatives, so why is he such a loyal Administration Republican on this one?

In other words, what would be the most obvious thing an opportunist would be thinking about in relation to Iraq?

I'm thinking "Israel." Am I too cynical?

Remember that motto: "The path to peace in the Middle East lies through Baghdad."

Absolutely nobody in Washington is worried about peace in the Middle East for the sake of Arabs. Nor do Americans ever demand that anybody in Washington worry about the Middle East for the sake of "We the People of the United States of America."

There is only one group of people who always demand that their people get something out of the Middle East and that is the supporters of Israel.

No doubt a lot of people know McCain's real motivation, but nobody else will say what we all know but Yours Truly.

September 28, 2002 - War For Oil May Be Bad Propaganda for the Anti-War Group

September 28, 2002 - Your Money Means Nothing to the Opinions that Count

September 28, 2002 - Look At What We're Scared Of!!!!!!!!!!

War For Oil May Be Bad Propaganda for the Anti-War Group

As you well know, WhitakerOnline routinely discusses things that are obvious to us but which all the commentators would never think of. Last week I talked about how absurd it is for commentators to talk about how, because Iraq is a threat to American lives, we somehow owe it to Iraq to go in and give them a stable government.

Some readers wrote me that they had been wondering about this, but they had also felt that they alone had any sanity about this nonsense, since nobody in the media questioned this absurdity.

At all the cocktail parties Bush advisors go to, and all the other cocktail parties which our Opinion Makers attend, everybody agrees that it will really turn off Americans if they think we are going into Iraq for cheap oil.

But the more the leftists and Europeans say that America is going into Iraq for cheap oil, the stronger grassroots support for the war in Iraq gets.

Your Money Means Nothing to the Opinions that Count

After losing the presidential election in 1960, Richard Nixon suffered with a lot of regrets. He had lost an election which he could easily have won if he had not made any one of many errors he made during the campaign.

So Nixon lost the \$100,000 a year job as President of the United States. He had to take a job with a California law firm that paid a million or so a year. This was in 1960, when a million a year was more like ten million today. And Richard Nixon was not a rich man.

Despite the fact that he made ten times as much as he would have if he had won the 1960 election, nobody has any real difficulty understanding why Nixon was so upset at losing the lower-paying job. A million a year as a lawyer does not compare to \$100,000 a year as President of the United States.

Yet you hear people who are trying to sound like Hardened, Practical Men (the world's dumbest collection of people) saying, "Well, it's all about money."

Money is like water. If you have plenty of it, you forget it exists. But if you're poor or thirsty, money or water is your universe.

It was routine for me in Washington to listen to some guy whose private sector income had been a million or so complaining about losing an appointment as Deputy Assistant Undersecretary in some executive department. The appointment he didn't get paid a hundred grand or so, max.

They had money. They wanted power.

No, in Washington it's not all about money. New York is about money, DC is about power. When you can buy all the swimming pools you want, power becomes more important to you.

When you have money, you want power. That is one of several reasons that the Bill Gates' and the Martha Stewarts' are so often leftist. Martha Stewart lately blamed all her problems on the "vast right-wing conspiracy."

Bill Gates' father recently fought any reduction in the inheritance tax. It was a routine part of his lifelong liberalism.

Money means a lot more to the average American than it does to the billionaires. Bill Gates was worth \$120 billion when the NASDAQ was hitting 6000, and he was worth \$43 billion at last report.

I don't usually share any information about my personal finances, but I have to admit something here. If I had just lost \$77 billion I would be in very bad shape. Yet no one expects Gates to jump out of any tall buildings.

So at the cocktail parties that are so important to Bush or Media Opinion, money is a lowly thing.

Lots of Europeans and other pinheads are moaning that America is planning to invade Iraq for the oil. That's supposed to be Evil.

But as I pointed out on August 24, 2002, The Only Moral Justification For War Today Is Oil.

Actually the last thing Bush is going into Iraq for is to break the world monopoly on oil production set up by OPEC. It hurts the average American, but it makes no difference to Bush.

All the people whose opinions matter to the circles Bush travels in couldn't care less about how much a family has to pay for gasoline and all petroleum by-products that drive up the average cost of living.

Look At What We're Scared Of!!!!!!!!!!

My guess is that the idea of a war that would break OPEC has a lot of appeal to the average American. But we won't hear about that because no American would dare tell a pollster that. He's afraid that the pollster will look down on him for it.

The president of CBS many years ago had a serious problem. He had a programming line-up that made his network number one, far ahead of the others. That doesn't sound like a problem, does it? He was making money, lots of it, and every time there are complaints about violence or filth on TV all the Hardened, Practical Men form a Greek Chorus that chants, "Well, it's all about money!"

The problem that the CBS head man had was that his programming was number 1 and it was profitable, but the cocktail circuit was laughing at him. His smash hits were "The Beverley Hillbillies," "Green Acres," "Petticoat Junction" and the like. They were riding high, but the network was getting laughed at by the sophisticates Americans bow and scrape to.

CBS executives vowed that they would not leave on a single country-based ("flyover country," for the elite in New York and the West Coast) show on CBS. They did it. CBS lost its lead, but its brass did not have to be ashamed of its programming before the people who mattered.

No, it's not "all about money." What it's really about is that Americans are terrified of a bunch of cocktail party trash on the East and West Coasts. Now isn't that a hell of an epitaph for a once-great people?

October 5, 2002 - On Solving Middle East Problems

October 5, 2002 - How to Get Profiled

October 5, 2002 - "Street People" Are Losers

October 5, 2002 - Urban Warfare and Why Not

On Solving Middle East Problems

Here is what an Egyptian-American had to say to people who have a solution for the Arab-Israeli conflict and similar matters:

- 1) God sent Moses, and he couldn't fix it.
- 2) God sent Jesus, and he couldn't fix it.
- 3) God sent Mohammed, and he couldn't fix it.
- 4) Do you think YOU can fix it?

--- Charles Issawi, "The Laws of Social Motion"

How to Get Profiled

The first airline hijackings by Arabs broke out in 1970. About a month after that I took a trip to Africa with a lot of stops at airports in Europe.

Before the 1970 rash of hijackings there were absolutely no searches of airline passengers. In the early 1960s, I once accidentally stepped onto a plane at Memphis airport that was completely empty! I went into the cockpit looking for somebody and then got off and found the plane I was supposed to be on.

The 1970 hijackings changed everything. Each airline tried something different. A lot of them had each passenger come into a little room and get a quick frisk.

To my surprise I found that I was getting profiled. Other passengers would go in and get out of the search room in a couple of minutes. They went over me with a fine toothed comb, taking ten or fifteen minutes and double checking. This puzzled me.

Somewhere in the air over Africa, I suddenly realized why I was being searched so especially.

I once worked in a prison. Everybody who came in, including the warden, got frisked before being admitted inside. Usually it was a light check, but they also had random thorough searches of each person who came in regularly.

So when I walked into the little airline search room, I took the perfect stance for being frisked. I held my jacket out in my right hand, kept my knees bent slightly, and held my hands rigidly out.

If there was a wall I probably propped my hands against it.

This worried the searchers. You see, the average airline passenger does not go into frisk position routinely as if he has lined up in a police station a hundred times before.

Do you think I was upset at the airlines? Of course not. I looked like I belonged to a suspect population, so they searched me. That was the whole point of the exercise.

"Street People" Are Losers

A lot of thirty-year-old white guys wear their caps backwards and their pants low. They want to look like Gangstah Rappers and they want to look Street Wise.

That's pathetic.

Another pathetic thing is young guys who have chains tattooed on them to show they have been in prison or to look like they have.

We live in a society where the Libertarians, who call themselves Intellectuals, insist that a wall to keep Mexicans OUT of the United States is the same as the Berlin Wall which kept people IN East Germany.

So naturally the people in such a society will brag about being IN a prison. After all, it's the same thing as being OUTSIDE a prison, right?

There's a lot of talk about how great it is to be an ex-con. You get all that wisdom, you see. It's called "street smarts."

All our Tough Guy talk and rule by so-called "intellectuals" has produced a society where young people honestly don't know the difference between success and failure. Our Libertarian Intellectuals don't know the difference between a country that has to kill people who try to escape and one that has to keep people out.

And absolutely nobody but WhitakerOnline.ORG is even going to point this difference out! Being in prison makes you a loser. Being on the street makes you a loser. Communist countries are losers.

Period.

Urban Warfare and Why Not

Teddy Kennedy has raised the prospect that an invasion of Iraq will involve street fighting against urban guerrillas.

Teddy Kennedy and his fellow liberals used to threaten America with the same thing back in the 1960s. They were always telling America that it would be DOOMED if minorities seized the cities and held them. As always, not one single person ever questioned how absurd this idea was.

I remember that nonsense was brought up to me one time and one time only at the University of Virginia. Somebody said, "Well what if the militants seize the cities, what would you do?" I replied, "I'd cut off the water."

But Teddy and all the other media types, people who think the earth begins at the city line, are simply incapable of realizing how dependent a city is on the outside.

City minorities are losers. There was urban warfare in Budapest in 1956 against the Soviet occupiers. But that was because the Soviet troops wouldn't get ruthless enough. So the Soviets brought in Asiatic soldiers and they crushed the Budapest uprising.

In the 1960s, when Teddy Kennedy liberals sent National Guard troops into cities WITHOUT AMMUNITION, the cities might have been a threat. But, in the real world, if we expect to do any real fighting, we had better begin by getting a grip on reality, and reality does not include taking Gangstah Rap or Street Smarts seriously.

October 12, 2002 - Some Murders Are Important

October 12, 2002 - Bad Guys Are For the War

October 12, 2002 - Bad Guys Are Against the War

October 12, 2002 - If the Bad Guys Are On Both Sides, What Can We Do?

Some Murders Are Important

The father of one of the kids grabbed and murdered recently made a point. It is one of those critical observations that everybody will forget except WhitakerOnline.

The father was being interviewed. The interviewer pointed out that media people keep saying that child-killings have been going on a long time. He said the media could not understand why people are making such a big deal of these routine killings.

The father immediately cited two cases with which the media is obsessed. Two or three years ago, a white man in Texas who had been raped by blacks in prison killed a black man by dragging him behind

his truck in chains. Nobody in the media is going to forget that because it is an argument for Hate Crimes legislation.

Another Hate Crimes case happened even longer ago than that. A boy was killed for being gay. The media are still talking about that as showing the need for a Hate Crimes Gestapo coast-to-coast in America.

Those cases matter to liberal news people. Forty or fifty kids being murdered each year is just routine. The media's Wise Commentators keep saying we are making far too much of it.

And nobody but me and that lonely father is going to be disagreeable about it.

Bad Guys Are For the War

WhitakerOnline readers are probably having the same problems with their gut reactions to the Iraq war as I am.

All the wrong people are FOR the war. Before even considering this, you MUST read December 29, 2001 - ISRAEL SPYING STORY SNATCHED OFF OF FOX.

One day a reporter for Fox had a huge featured story on Israeli spying in the United States. The next day it was pulled off without explanation. No explanation has been made. No explanation has been demanded by anyone in the media.

Nobody but me has any memory at all of anything the media don't want remembered, so this is your only chance to look at this truly creepy case straight out of George Orwell's 1984. The power of the Israeli lobby is enormous and frightening, and I don't want anybody to forget it for a minute. There is nothing healthy about a power that can make everybody forget anything on command.

The Israel lobby says "The road to Middle East peace" -- by which no one ever means anything but peace for Israel -- "Lies through Baghdad."

Bad Guys Are Against the War

Bush said that its attitude toward Iraq is making the United Nations irrelevant. That sounds very good.

My gut wrenches every time I hear someone say that the United States must obey the United Nations. No sane adult has the slightest respect for anything the United Nations says or does. When you listen to the United Nations, you are listening to the voice of unelected people from the most unsuccessful, poor and kneejerk oligarchies from every rathole on earth.

To mention the United Nations is the act of a retard, and everybody knows it.

The only Americans who mention it are those who think the way the UN does, and these are the bad guys, people who hate America and who hate whites. A lot of them are American and white, but that is supposed to show High Morality. For a white American to hate his own people is the epitome of true morality on every college campus.

If the Bad Guys Are On Both Sides, What Can We Do?

Since people who hate white America are ruling both sides, how can we make a choice?

The solution to this dilemma is a desperate and a hard one.

We may have to actually do some thinking for ourselves.

Everybody loves to talk about how hard it is to decide whether to send Americans to die in war, but that decision is nothing compared to the sacrifice I just mentioned. Thinking for themselves is something Americans quite honestly cannot imagine doing.

For example, Wise Men go on television and say "If we are going into Iraq, the Big Question is what comes AFTER we overthrow Hussein?" Everybody nods and drools and agrees with how Shrewd that statement is.

Actually, if Hussein is the immediate, overwhelming threat, then our sole interest is in getting rid of Hussein.

Period.

Left or right, everybody would far rather decide to get some Americans killed than they would to break the Flow of Shrewd on television by pointing this out.

The "after Hussein" kind of talk is useful for those who want to go into Iraq so we can stay there and make the world safe for Israel. It also serves the purposes of those who don't want any war for American national interests.

In other words, this "after Hussein" business serves all the bad guys. You may be sure that every statement made by Expert Commentators, which means people who get paid for their comments, is going to serve the purposes of the pro-war bad guys or the anti-war bad guys or, ideally, both.

It's a lot more relaxing to agree with SOMEBODY, either the conservative hawks who are interested in Israel or the anti-war leftists who do not want American interests to get too much of a hold on our thinking. Anything is easier than having to THINK or be disagreeable.

You would be disagreeable if you got sick of conservatives talking about how we need to listen to France because it is "an ally." The Cold War is over, gang, and France is in no way our ally. In the real, cold world of international relations, it's everybody for himself, and you had better believe everybody follows that rule except anti-American Americans and respectable conservatives.

Nobody who mentions "the Allies" is on your side. Nobody who mentions the UN has good intentions or good sense. Nobody who says "anti-white and anti-Semitic" gives a damn about whites.

Anyone who says "he is an enemy of the United States and Israel" is definitely not thinking about the United States.

If you keep these rules in mind you will be very disagreeable and sensible. It would be a lot easier to stop all that thinking, get some Americans soldiers bumped off, "feel their pain," and get on with life.

October 19, 2002 - National Review Responds to Bob
October 19, 2002 - CNN Jerks the Old Liberal Knee
October 19, 2002 - Thank God For Phil!
October 19, 2002 - Where Blondes Come From

National Review Responds to Bob

The following was published in the last National Review:

Dear Mr. Buckley:

Re a certain column of yours: The "southern states" and the "Southern states" are two totally distinct entities. The most southerly state is Hawaii. California, Arizona, New Mexico and Texas border on Mexico. Three of those four are not usually included in the term "Southern" and, according to Lyndon Johnson, neither should Texas be. And, of course, Puerto Rico would be included in "the south." In fact, "southern" includes many more states that are not Southern and they total tens of millions in population.

Robert W. Whitaker
Columbia, SC

Dear Mr. Whitaker: Yes, of course, and the confusion is common.

Cordially, WFB (William F. Buckley)

CNN Jerks the Old Liberal Knee

Last week we talked about how puzzled reporters have been that white gentile children being kidnapped and murdered has gotten so much attention lately. They point out that forty or fifty such kids are grabbed and done away with by perverts every year. What's the problem?

Those kids are almost always killed by criminals liberal crime policy lets back on the streets, so the media don't like discussing it. It has no "news hook" value, which means it has no value to some liberal cause.

National media are still talking about the 2000 murder of a black man by being dragged behind a pickup truck and an earlier murder of a young man for being homosexual. Those crimes were newsworthy because they were useful, but non-minority kids being murdered has no such value.

Nobody remembers anything, so we got a useful reminder on the Cable News Network of how this "useful news only" rule worked perfectly before the advent of Fox Cable News. We have been listening to reports about the Washington, DC, area sniper for a week with no "news hook."

So CNN did what it has always done when there was a crime: they started talking about gun control. They cross examined police experts about whether a gun control law would take care of this situation. They had a debate on gun control.

A couple of years ago every police official would have said that gun control was at least a part of the solution. It was the ONLY crime solution liberals ever offered, so everybody had to say it was very, very important.

But sometimes the bad guys do lose. Like all liberal policies, gun control doesn't work. It either increases crime or leaves it the same.

Gun control is very, very important to the media because it is the ONLY measure that liberals advocate that sounds anti-crime. Actually, if you poll any prison population you will find that almost every felon is all for gun control. Every liberal policy is pro-criminal, but this is the only one that at least SOUNDS like it's "getting tough."

So CNN did what all national media have always done: a crime spree meant a push for gun control. But this time it didn't seem to take.

Is it possible that liberalism may be seen to be so silly that even the national media have to suppress their knee-jerk reactions? Respectable conservatives are paid to regard leftism with great seriousness. But despite respectable conservative efforts, the sheer silliness of the idea that college professors should rule the world seems to be collapsing under the weight of its own failure.

Thank God For Phil!

Liberals want everybody to forget everything that liberals used to predict. They used to say that socialism was inevitable and efficient. Now not only do they not say that, their respectable conservative helpers forget they ever said that. They used to say that genetics had no effect on human action. With DNA and gene-tracking, respectable conservatives must forget liberals ever said that.

Pretty well everything that every Liberal Intellectual used to shout loudly is forgotten. So that CNN attempt to "news hook" the sniper for gun control was a reminder that no respectable conservative is going to mention.

In fact, Phil Donahue is the only regular reminder we have of at least a part of what the liberal faith used to be when there was no one to laugh at it. With Arab terrorists killing thousands, Donahue's only concern is that Arabs may be profiled. Even blacks, the liberals' most slavish supporters, favor profiling Arabs more than whites do.

Chris Matthews, who is on MSNBC just before Phil Donahue, is openly complaining that Phil could destroy his program. Old Phil is singing the old song and wagging his head in that way that always used to convince the housewives, but he is trying to sell that crap to an intellectually mature audience that was raised with all of Donahue's favorite social policies in action.

I hate Phil Donahue, but he is a great counterbalance to the pro-liberal efforts of respectable conservatives. He still truly believes that if you are nice to criminals they will be nice, too. He truly believes that bureaucrats and college professors are the only people who know how to run the economy and the only people not driven by guilt. He maintains his faith that, despite its disastrous failure in the past, educational experimentation will be a big success in the future.

As long as respectable conservatives rule the opposition, the only reminders we have of the old "Truly Intellectual" knee-jerk left are those who will never learn, like CNN and Phil.

Where Blondes Come From

There was a report in the news that WHO, the World Health Organization, had announced that there would be no more blondes on earth in two hundred years. WHO had made no such announcement.

It will be a lot less than two hundred years before real blondes are wiped out. There will be people with blond hair in two hundred years but they will be yellow-haired people with Oriental or Negroid features.

If a black child suffers extreme vitamin deficiency, he develops reddish hair as a symptom. So in a world without whites, there will be plenty of fair-haired children. They'll just be sick colored people the way most people were before whites came along or they'll be horrible-looking mixes, also with food deficiencies.

Genocide against whites is an evil thing, but nobody likes to say so. Buchanan likes to say whites are disappearing, but it's only because they don't have enough religion or because we are getting an empire not a republic.

The most miscegenated countries on earth have plenty of religion. But brown countries with more religion are just as stagnant and hopeless as ones without. A world without whites will be the same way.

My deepest apologies to Pat Buchanan and to the Reverend Ike, but God will NOT provide you with a brand new Cadillac for giving money to the preacher.

But it sounds much better to talk about Family Values or about A Republic, Not an Empire than it does to say flatly that whites are unique and doing away with them is EVIL. No one dares say "I am white, and I refuse to give up my race."

See September 14, 2002 - White Race Traitors Are the True Idealists.

So we quote Alan Keyes to show how non-racist we are, and talk in grandiose terms about empires and Family Values.

Sorry, but the real world is not designed to let you say only what makes you look good. On Judgment Day the question will be what you did about two simple four-letter words, Good and Evil.

October 26, 2002 - North Korea and Iraq

October 26, 2002 - North Korea, Iraq and Civil Rights

October 26, 2002 - If You're Shrewd, You Say Liberals Are Smart

October 26, 2002 - You Can't Survive If You Don't Get Real

October 26, 2002 - Back to Iraq and North Korea

North Korea and Iraq

North Korea has told the United States that it lied about abandoning its nuclear weapons program. The language, complained U.S. authorities, was "very belligerent." In fact, it was the kind of language our "allies" use: "To hell with you, we'll do what we want to."

So while we are preparing to attack Iraq because it is developing weapons of mass destruction North Korea tells us it is doing exactly the same thing.

We all know what the real problem is. The real problem goes back to the original civil rights movement, to the idea that all races are equal.

Conservatives keep begging liberal forgiveness for having opposed the civil rights movement, but the fact is that the racial equality idea is about to destroy us.

We say that India and Pakistan and now Korea are fully adult countries, peoples who have as much right to atomic bombs as western countries do. That's the way we originally dealt with Iraq.

Once you start treating non-white nations exactly the same way you treat white nations, proliferation of every means of killing - to which they have as much right as you do - is inevitable. You can't put those fires out one at a time.

North Korea, Iraq and Civil Rights

I wish I had a nickel for every older Yankee who has said to me, "Well, I supported civil rights at first, but it's gone too far." That is the fundamental principle of neoconservatives, which is the only group allowed to speak for conservatives on race-related issues.

We evil reactionary extremists told those dumbasses in the 1950s that you can't have basic civil rights legislation because it simply cannot stop there. This is, like most political truths, unacceptable, evil, naziswhowanttokillsixmillionjews, lacking in compassion and just plain unShrewd.

But it's true.

We Evil Reactionaries said in the 1950's that if you withdrew the old racist national origins requirements from our immigration law, we would be swamped by third world immigration.

True Intellectuals laughed out loud at us.

Reactionary predictions the last two generations were almost always perfectly accurate. The Shrewd conservative predictions are never right any more than are the predictions of the liberals respectable conservatives appeal to.

I wish I had a nickel for every conservative who told me that third world immigration was great because those colored people were pouring in to take advantage of the American Way. They would, insisted every single such Shrewd conservative, vote Republican.

No, I am not joking. Every conservative used to look me straight in the eye and say third world immigrants would vote conservative. Did you miss Bush's Mexican Convention in 2000?

Nobody will take conservatives seriously as long as they are Shrewd. It fools them but to everybody else it looks as silly as it is.

If You're Shrewd, You Say Liberals Are Smart

The Shrewd conservatives, no matter how wrong they have always been, continue to say what they always said. They insist that everything liberals did until recently was right. If liberals will just point out an Evil Racist to a respectable conservative, he will loyally kill the Evil One.

Black people get profiled because so many black people commit crimes. But no black will ever blame the black criminal.

By the same token, no respectable conservative will tell a black man that profiling is the fault of black criminals. Vice President Cheney almost cried talking to a black man about the evil, evil, EVIL police who treat a man with black skin as if he were more likely to commit crime than people with white skins.

That performance would have made me sick to my stomach, but by now I've seen it a thousand times. Whining about the Noble Red Man, the Noble Black Man, the Noble Anybody Not White is the standard age-old response of Shrewd conservatives to any challenge by the left on the race issue.

The heroes of the Shrewd right are conservatives who helped get us in the situation we face today. Charlton Heston brags that he was a loyal follower of Martin Luther King, Bobby Kennedy and finally Ronald Reagan. Teddy Kennedy's worshipper Orrin Hatch was out there fighting to make the world what it is today in the civil rights movement of the 'Sixties.

You Can't Survive If You Don't Get Real

Now the right is whining that 1) the growing minority vote is crushing conservatism. But they are also 2) denying they are saying that. And they used to predict 3) that would never happen because immigrant non-whites would vote conservative.

Three strikes and you're Shrewd.

If we ever drop shrewd and get smart, truth can be a major weapon for us. But you cannot use the truth and be Shrewd at the same time.

Minorities will never be conservative. Minorities will not preserve OUR values for us.

Minorities must be bought off. It would be a lot cheaper to buy them off than to pay for liberals, too. Liberals are just the minorities' middlemen. They are very costly middlemen.

"Show me the money!"

I think that whites will eventually realize that they are a threatened minority. When we stop thinking of ourselves as a guilty ruling class and start seeing this reality, we will be in a terrific bargaining position. Everybody looks to us as the superior race. This can have enormous advantages.

Everybody looks to us as the source of real talent and wealth, no matter how much nonsense leftists push to the contrary. Minorities are only leftists because they believe you can only get real money from whites.

Once we stop talking about blacks being just like other Americans, and settle for buying them off, we could win.

And I mean a straight buy, not a buy through leftist political theory and bureaucrats. That would be a lot cheaper than the leftist programs which have to support bureaucrats, lawyers and professors who get money for blacks but mostly for themselves.

The one thing conservatives always argue is that they don't want to get AWAY from minorities. The only worthwhile goal is to get away from minorities. If you try to hide that in Shrewd you just do it the hard way.

Minorities want things, we want things. Once this truth comes out, leftists will simply be more competitors with minorities for white money.

Eventually, when things get desperate enough, we can win by talking turkey.

Back to Iraq and North Korea

Right now the right is going to argue that they are not really being contradictory by pushing war with Iraq and negotiating respectfully with North Korea.

Both of those countries are developing weapons of mass destruction. The difference is that North Korea SAYS so.

We could invade Iraq to break OPEC, but that is what our "allies" - and incidentally our outright enemies - say, so we gotta be Shrewd and not do it for that reason.

Nossir, what conservatives are going to do is what they always do: say something Shrewd that everybody knows is nonsense.

Meanwhile, let me do the one thing that only WhitakerOnline does, tell you the unShrewd plain truth:

In the nuclear age, international racial equality means proliferation. It is too late to stop it. The sooner we get serious and start talking turkey, the better chance we have to survive.

November 2, 2002 - A Lying Liberal Professor Has Actually Been CAUGHT!

November 2, 2002 - The Practically Perfect Press

November 2, 2002 - Reporters and Actors Are Overwhelmingly Liberal

November 2, 2002 - Of Course Respectable Conservatives Aren't Bright

November 2, 2002 - A Very Southern Aversion?

A Lying Liberal Professor Has Actually Been CAUGHT

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/national/20021028-78905499.htm>

Michael Bellesiles, the history professor who wrote that firearms were rare in early America, has resigned from Atlanta's Emory University after an investigation found he "willingly misrepresented the evidence" in his award-winning book.

Robert A. Paul, interim dean of Emory College, announced that Mr. Bellesiles would resign effective Dec. 31 after 14 years at Emory, and said the university considers "authoritative" an investigative committee's report about charges of research misconduct against Mr. Bellesiles.

This is certainly not the first time a professor has openly lied to support a leftist cause, but I believe it is the first time in history that a professor has actually been PUNISHED for lying to support a leftist cause.

Professor Bellesiles will have no difficulty getting new job, of course. Can you imagine any professor ever getting another job if he had lied AGAINST liberals and been caught at it?

Bellesiles had gotten awards and grants for his new book after making up his facts to back the left on gun control. He was trying to counter research like that of Professor John Lott, who has shown repeatedly that where the people have the right to carry weapons the crime rate goes down.

Once again, like all liberal policies, gun control just does not WORK.

Now wait for respectable conservatives to chorus in about how this is very unusual, and how most liberal professors are honorable and almost never distort the truth.

The Practically Perfect Press

The other day I was astonished when a scandal at the Associated Press was actually reported on a TV talk show. It turns out that one reporter had been handing in false news from made-up sources for three years and finally got caught doing it. Some seventy of these stories had gone out on the AP wire service and were reported as authentic news from coast to coast on every medium.

False news did not surprise me. What astonished me in this case was that someone in the media actually MENTIONED it! And the reporter was FIRED!

Think about it. You have recently heard about scandals in Congress, scandals in business, scandals in the military, even scandals in the clergy, but you NEVER hear about scandals in the media.

About twenty years ago, a black reporter for the Washington Post was awarded a Pulitzer Prize for a story she had made up completely. She left the Post but she had no difficulty finding employment. Everybody agreed that except for this little slip she was generally a fine reporter.

No one questioned that all her other stories were completely true and unbiased. Leading the pack in saying how wonderful she was were the respectable conservatives like James Jackson Kilpatrick.

Everybody, especially respectable conservatives, agreed that such a made-up story never happened in the press except for that one "slip."

Every human institution where money and power is on the line has a lot of scandals.

Except one.

The press is a multibillion-dollar industry with enormous power. But everybody in the press agrees that the press is practically perfect. All the newsmen are honest, hard-working, truthful and unbiased.

I thought I would bring that up, since nobody else will.

Reporters and Actors Are Overwhelmingly Liberal

Everybody thinks his biases are really just objective truth. I have heard reporters say that they are liberals because they see oppression and real life so much. It is hard to imagine a more superficial comment.

We all think we have a special handle on real life, but only a really naïve person can BELIEVE that. This is not exactly a new idea. Socrates talked about how all men perceive reality the way a blind man perceives an elephant. One blind man feels a trunk, another thinks an elephant is all huge legs, and so forth.

But reporters regularly tell each other, in public, that they have the only realistic view of life.

And nobody laughs.

I very much doubt this was a new idea when Socrates talked about it. You really have to be naïve to think you have a special handle on reality.

When I was in college, it was an accepted rule that all freshmen are socialists, but most grow out of it. Like most such comments, it is an overstatement of a general truth.

Most freshmen of average intelligence have left home for the first time, and when their professors tell them that professors should rule the world they believe it. I never took the idea seriously that if government owned the whole economy and bureaucrats ran every aspect of production and distribution, it would lead to fairness and efficiency.

Socialism is silly. But professors naturally say that "intellectuals" like themselves should plan and dictate who makes what and who gets what. Only the mind of a not-too-bright freshman, new to the academic world, could take that seriously.

Reporters and actors are mostly people who remain not-too-bright freshmen. A reporter, after all, is someone who devotes his life to getting an item five minutes before the rest of the world gets it. If the item is a scandal in Hollywood, he is gossip columnist. If the news item is a congressional scandal, the reporter who gets it first is a professional journalist.

It is not surprising that a lot of superficial people would make the pursuit of hot items a life's work.

So when a group of "journalists" get together and one says they have a special handle on life and that is the reason they have their political views, nobody laughs. A bunch of none-too-intelligent freshmen

would sit around and tell each other how deep and unique their or their professor's insight is. So would an actor.

But everybody else would laugh at such naiveté, all the way back to Socrates.

Of Course Respectable Conservatives Aren't Bright

Reporters tend to be liberal because they are still college freshmen who never grew out of it.

These overage freshmen are the ones who choose which conservatives will be "respectable."

The commentators and anchor men you see on television were reporters first. They decided to devote their lives to finding out five minutes earlier what everybody will know in half an hour.

When Rush Limbaugh was on one network talk show, the press raised hell because he was not "a professional journalist." The public wanted to hear him, but he did not have the homogeneous worldview a reporter gets. So much for diversity.

So these overage freshmen have a monopoly on media commentary.

But the media had to let in some non-liberal commentators into the media over the years. They fought it for thirty years, but they had to make concessions, especially after Reagan was elected and most reporters didn't know a single Washington conservative.

It is these overage liberal freshmen who had to choose which conservatives are allowed in any interview or talk show. Not surprisingly, the conservatives they select have very little insight or intelligence.

The people liberals who control the media choose to label "respectable" conservatives are the ones who make liberals feel comfortable. Conservative spokesmen tend to be morons, not because of a conspiracy, but as a result of a natural process of selection.

A Very Southern Aversion?

Because the liberals and respectable conservatives who do interviews are neither bright nor perceptive, they let the people they interview get away with the most superficial evasions.

So when a politician is asked a question he often starts talking to himself. Someone asks him about a proposal he supports, and he begins the kind of dialogue with himself that one normally only hears from people who are seriously senile.

"Is it perfect?" The politician asks out loud. "No, it's not a perfect policy," he answers himself. With the interviewer sitting there silent he goes on, "Will it do what needs to be done? Yes." And then he proceeds to make a little speech in answer to his own softball questions.

Politicians have begun to have these dialogues with themselves in the middle of speeches. To me it is a bit shocking. I think it is shocking to me because it strikes me as so rude.

There is nothing more rude than the nitwit who starts asking himself questions when talking to someone else: "Is it perfect?," he asks himself. "No, it's not perfect," he answers himself. That person is treating his audience or his interviewer as if they did not exist, and treating others as if they aren't there is the height of bad manners.

I have not yet seen a Southern politician do that, though I have not seen all the examples. I hope this habit of talking to himself in the middle of an interview or a speech is the kind of thing only a New Englander would find acceptable.

Nobody should put up with it.

November 9, 2002 - How to Win

November 9, 2002 - First, We Start By Totally, I Mean TOTALLY, Rejecting the Respectable Conservative Strategy

November 9, 2002 - So How Do we get the Minority Votes We Will Need More and More in the Future?

November 9, 2002 - Would William Bennett and Ralph Reed Approve of A Buying Strategy Applied to Minorities?

How to Win

Every anti-liberal is depressed about the future. Until a week or two ago, I had no answer to this right-wing gloom about the long term.

The gloom comes from simple demographics. We are being overwhelmed by the minorities. No matter how ridiculous leftist programs are, minorities will vote for them.

So the bottom line for the future is that the West will become colored and the left will win.

But now I have the solution.

The respectable conservative solution is of course nonsense, as always.

All respectable conservatives agree that the right must "appeal to minorities" in order to win. Liberals agree. They want two anti-white parties.

Liberal policies NEVER work, as we have shown for four years in WhitakerOnline.ORG.

Respectable conservative politics NEVER work, as we have shown for four years in WhitakerOnline.ORG.

Respectable conservative politics are EXACTLY like liberal social policies: 1) They always sound wonderful; they always sound so logical it doesn't seem any rational person could disagree and 2) They ALWAYS fail.

This is not surprising, since media liberals choose the conservatives they feel comfortable with as spokesmen for the right. The respectable right thinks exactly the same way liberals do.

There is a way to get a substantial number of minority votes, but it has nothing to do with "appealing to minorities."

First, We Start By Totally, I Mean TOTALLY, Rejecting the Respectable Conservative Strategy

Everybody talks about how minorities vote for the left, but one thing nobody ever mentions is that whites are moving to the right.

Everyone knows that the minority vote is increasing by leaps and bounds and that it is solidly liberal. But Republicans have a higher percentage of the vote ACROSS THE BOARD than they have had since 1930. Where did all those votes come from?

Obviously, the WHITE move to Republicanism is enormous, or Republicans would be back to the permanent minority they were from 1960-1980, when moderates ruled the Party and they were "appealing to minorities."

In Maryland, the first Republican Governor since the 1960s was elected. He was elected because WHITE women voted 56% Republican for the first time in living memory in that state. Even more devastating for the usual theories, they rejected a female Democrat. Worst of all, they rejected Kathleen Kennedy Townsend, a woman who was kin to St. John of Kennedy Himself!

As only WhitakerOnline.ORG ever points out, politics will be an entirely different thing as whites come to REALIZE that they are a threatened minority. That is what is happening now. The liberal media is still in lockdown control of all OPEN discussion. Respectable conservatives are in lockdown control of all conservative discussion. So nobody but WhitakerOnline.ORG will ever mention this.

But the trend is there or there would be no Republican Party by now.

We need and we can get the white vote, so naturally all respectable conservatives want Republicans to be for open borders and integration and ignore whites.

That would get rid of the support we have. Republicans now have a solid majority of WHITE union votes. If we had stuck with the old moderate-respectable conservative line, we would have stopped complaining about things like busing, fought to keep the budget balanced, and the white union vote would have stayed where it was.

So we need to do exactly what liberals accuse us of doing. We must be "appealing only to the white vote." Horrors!

Liberals say that is appealing to fear.

They're right. White people are learning to fear LIBERALS. They have every reason to.

So How Do we get the Minority Votes We Will Need More and More in the Future?

We buy them.

Right now we are buying minority votes anyway. We are buying those votes for the liberals.

We give liberals enormous amounts of power and money so the "intellectuals" can pursue those programs they sell the young morons in class. Liberals let some of that money trickle down to their slave minorities in the form of direct welfare, food stamps, and for housing that slaves in the Old South would have found very familiar, rats and all.

Harlem is essentially a Democratic slave quarter.

We could buy those same votes a hell of a lot cheaper if we did it by giving the money directly to minorities who vote our way.

In the first place, we don't have to buy ALL the minorities. Liberals have to have them ALL to balance off the ever more overwhelming white vote against liberalism. In the second place, liberals and minorities are competing for the same money. Liberal programs and college professors and liberal activists all live from the same tax trough that minorities get money from. Liberals are first at the trough and let some trickle down to their slave minorities.

Minorities all vote liberal because liberals are the only ones bidding MONEY for their votes. But we could save a lot of money by outbidding the liberals and not having to pay them and live by their rules. We would save money by buying minorities directly even if we had to outbid the left for ALL minority votes.

But if we keep our base, we need only a minority of the minorities. We could eventually have THEM competing for OUR favor.

Until we get in on the bidding, we will continue paying for liberals to buy minority votes, plus even more money we pay the liberals.

This means we must do exactly what the left and the respectables accuse us of doing. They denounce it because they know it will work:

First of all, it means we say out loud we are trying to save the people liberals hate, and we use the true word HATE. We are for white survival, we are for America first, we are the outright enemies of criminals, and so forth.

And we openly say that, since nonwhites always vote for liberal hate, we want to buy OUR SHARE of that vote. We don't want to pay liberals the majority of the money so they can buy the whole minority vote at our expense. We won't buy the WHOLE minority vote. Unlike liberals, we can have lots of money and we can have minorities competing WITH EACH OTHER to be the ones who get our cash.

In the long run, it will be better for American minorities, too, but we should make our contempt visible and say that they will never figure that out on their own. We must stop acting as if it were okay for minorities to be stupid slaves to liberals. That open contempt will make more minorities act more rationally than conservative pandering has.

It couldn't do worse.

Would William Bennett and Ralph Reed Approve of A Buying Strategy Applied to Minorities?

Ralph Reed, the "Christian" conservative leader, has stated flatly that he would rather conservatives lose on abortion, prayers in school and everything else than that they win with a vote that is ninety percent white!

Reed and Kemp and William Bennett want to open the borders and use other liberal tactics to win minority votes. Respectable conservative political strategy NEVER works, just as liberal programs NEVER work, but old Ralph and William look so good in them coats and ties that all the rubes buy that nonsense when they say it.

My approach is, as always, purely American. My approach is plain English and pure politics. If a minority area votes our way, it gets money, real money, not filter down money and not "counseling services" that hire professor-types.

Minority areas have one characteristic that is purely American. They use the words, "Show me the money." Their preachers say "Give me FOLDIN' money!" The Reverend Ike advertises that a person who donated money to him got a new Cadillac from the Lord.

One thing no respectable conservative will admit is that minorities want MONEY. Bennett and Kemp want to talk about "empowering" and "racial justice."

And let me repeat, we only need a minority of the minority vote. Minority areas that vote for us will get lots of public MONEY.

The minority districts who stay off our bandwagon and vote liberal will be left out in the cold. The VERY cold. The colder the better.

If America rejects the left it will be better for minorities than making America one more third world country. But they will NEVER vote that way for that reason.

It will take some thinking, with all the respectable crap totally ignored, but we can develop a program of buying up minority votes. It will save us money.

It is also the only strategy that ever worked. The minority white population used this strategy to take the Deep South back from Reconstruction. Not only did our enemies control the majority black vote, they also had the Federal Government, the press, and owners of industry and big money all on their side for the ruling Republicans.

The strategy I have outlined made us the Solid Democratic South. It will win elections in the long run.

And, if anybody cares, it will also save our country and our race.

November 16, 2002 - The Real Liberal-Conservative Attitude About Hispanics

November 16, 2002 - Liberals and Therefore Respectable Conservatives Assume That All Minorities Are Mindless

November 16, 2002 - What Minorities Do Liberals -- and Therefore Respectable Conservatives -- Want Us to Appeal to?

November 16, 2002 - Our Hypocrisy is Crippling Us

The Real Liberal-Conservative Attitude About Hispanics

The other day a Mexican-American leader, complete with his accent, was attacking Americans for their racism. "They treat us," he complained, "As if we were some kind of foreigners."

What this Mexican-American leader was objecting to was conservatives who demand that illegal immigration from Mexico be stopped. He also objected to Americans who insist that Hispanics in America learn English.

Oh, and he was furious that Americans want to deny welfare benefits to illegal immigrants.

The fact is that anyone who wants American Hispanics to speak only Spanish is in fact being a foreigner in the United States.

Any American citizen who takes the side of Spanish-speaking illegal aliens against other Americans is being an alien inside the United States.

If you are a US citizen who wants illegal aliens to get American taxpayer money, you are doing just what this Mexican-American "leader" says: You are in the United States acting like some kind of foreigner.

But no one said that to this Mexican-American "leader." Respectable conservatives are not even allowed to THINK of saying anything about this because President Bush wants to "appeal to minorities."

The only Americans with Spanish names we might ever actually get to vote conservative are the ones who consider themselves Americans, not resident aliens. The only votes we might get are the votes of immigrants who do not want to be foreigners inside America.

But you can't appeal to that group of truly American Hispanic-Americans until you get off the "appealing to minorities" nonsense.

Legal immigrants of every kind would like someone to stand up for them, but conservatives won't do it. A lot of the people who followed the law and went through all the hurdles to get their US citizenship are very, very upset about the millions who just walk in.

But as long as you are appealing to the ones who just walked in, you can't get the votes of those who want to fight back. You can't conserve what a real American wants preserved if you follow the "appeal to minorities" line.

Every election a higher percentage of American whites vote conservative. In the long run conservatives only need a minority of the non-white vote To Go WITH THE WHITE MAJORITY. They can get it, but only if they forget the "appeal to minorities" nonsense and go for the votes that CONSERVATIVES CAN ACTUALLY GET.

Liberals and Therefore Respectable Conservatives Assume That All Minorities Are Mindless

Jamaica just celebrated the fortieth anniversary of its independence from the United Kingdom. Compared to African countries, Jamaica has done a great job since it ceased to be British colony.

So the biggest newspaper in Jamaica took a poll. It asked Jamaicans what they thought of independence. The result caused an uproar.

Only FIFTEEN PERCENT of Jamaicans thought independence was a good idea. FIFTY-THREE percent said Jamaica should have remained a colony of the UK!

There will be no more polls like that in Jamaica.

Nobody cares what blacks think, in Jamaica or anywhere else.

Liberals are perfectly right when they say there is an immovable racism at the basis of Western thought. But no liberal professor will let anybody discuss what that racism REALLY is.

Liberal professors are always telling students how evil everybody is EXCEPT THE "INTELLECTUALS," which is what professors call themselves. All that leftist doctrine we pay them to teach boils down to "professors should rule the world."

So let's get real. There IS racism at the base of Western thought. But that racism includes everybody, even the Holy Liberal Professors. Real Western racism is so deep that no liberal would recognize it. No liberal professor can realize that his attitude to the Jamaica poll is as racist as that of any Klansman.

So when only 15% of Jamaicans say they like independence and 53% say they don't, the response from the political left is the same as it would be from any other slaveholder:

"Those niggers don't know what's good for them."

What Minorities Do Liberals -- and Therefore Respectable Conservatives -- Want Us to Appeal to?

Respectable Conservatives are always repeating the liberal line that "We must appeal to minorities to win elections."

My first question is, "What do you mean by 'minorities'?"

If you ask me, "Are you anti-Semitic?," my answer is not to whine and grovel like a good conservative. My response to the question, "Are you anti-Semitic?," is the same as my answer to "Are you anti-Anybody?"

Whether or not I am anti-Semitic depends on the Semite.

I am very very anti-Semitic if you are talking about a Boasian Jew like Noel Ignatiev, who openly demands "the abolition of the white race." Minorities who demand the end of the English language or of America or the white race are my enemies. And those who demand the destruction of what we have are the ones respectable conservatives mean when they say "appeal to minorities."

This kind of "appeal to minorities" is not only immoral, it is also stupid. You will never get the votes of blacks whose main concern is that every white man genuinely desire that his daughter marry a black man.

Many black men say they will never date a black woman. If a white man says that, he is evil. But that black man is the "minority" we must appeal to.

The Hispanic who demands that Spanish be a national language of the United States will never vote conservative.

A Jew who demands the abolition of the white race is an enemy. He may say "abolish the white race" like Noel Ignatiev does. Other anti-whites, both Jew and gentile, demand the end of the white race in more diplomatic language. They say "There is no place in America for racism." "Racism" has become a code-word meaning "whites."

To quote Noel Ignatiev, "The goal of abolishing the white race is on its face so desirable that some may find it hard to believe that it could incur any opposition other than from committed white supremacists." Any white person who does not want his race "abolished" is a "racist." "No room for racism" means "no room for whites."

"There is no room in America for racism" has become a code phrase for "There is no room in America for whites." "Appealing to minorities" has become a code term for giving away everything a real conservative would fight to conserve.

The only votes we can get are the ones who want something besides our destruction, no matter how nicely and gently and diplomatically that demand for our destruction is phrased.

Our Hypocrisy is Crippling Us

The news is not that liberals are hypocrites about race. The critical point here has nothing to do with liberals.

My point is that respectable conservatives rule the right, and it is THEIR hypocrisy that must be overcome if we are to get the minority votes we CAN get.

Please read the above paragraph carefully. There is a big difference between "appealing to minorities" and the opposite idea of going for the minority votes we CAN get. Conservatives will never get the votes of American citizens whose real loyalty is to Mexicans.

But conservatives find it easy to believe that all nonwhite minorities always think like resident aliens. Most nonwhite minorities do vote like resident aliens, just as most blacks do vote slavishly for liberals. But theirs are not the votes WE CAN GET.

The California vote shows that most Hispanic-Americans DO think of themselves as resident aliens. Conservative Political Experts find that easy to believe. Like liberals, they assume that's just the way all colored people are and always will be.

As a result, we are knocking ourselves out to keep from offending people who are lost to us anyway.

As always, the respectable conservatives and the moderates are demanding an electoral strategy that is both immoral and stupid.

November 23, 2002 - The Lesson of the Texas School Non-Shooting

November 23, 2002 - What America AIN'T

November 23, 2002 - "The Business of America is Business" - But WHOSE Business?

The Lesson of the Texas School Non-Shooting

"Be afraid of no man who walks beneath the skies
As long as I am by your side I will equalize"

That poem was etched on each Colt revolver in the Old West.

The Colt came to be called "The Equalizer."

Studies show that a gun often saves women's lives today by being an equalizer:

"Whereas a woman may be severely beaten, even killed, if she resists by using her fists - where the man likely has her outmatched," - says gun expert Professor Lott -- "by far the safest course of action is to have a gun. A woman who behaves passively is 2.5 times as likely to end up being seriously injured as a woman who has a gun. "

All this is the direct opposite of the establishment position. You have heard that official position a hundred times and you will hear it hundreds more: cooperate with the criminal. Give him anything he wants. Invite him home to rape your daughter.

Above all, no one should fight crime except a uniformed representative of the government. That is the liberal solution.

No liberal solution ever works.

School shootings are celebrated regularly by the media as reasons for banning any honest person from being armed. In Texas, a school superintendent walked up to a boy with a gun and took it away from him.

According the official position of the National Education Association, that superintendent should be fired. He gave his students the worst possible example. Yet no one in the NEA had the guts to criticize him.

On Flight 93, September 11, 2001, the honest passengers broke the "no resistance" rule. They attacked the hijackers and died doing it. This kept the plane from being used as a weapon against the White House or some other target.

Once again, no liberal organization has had the guts to attack the Flight 93 passengers for their "vigilante" action. But official advice insists that they should have cooperated and waited for a duly credentialed and uniformed government employee to take action.

If a single honest passenger had had a gun on Flight 93, no one would have been killed. Oddly enough, that comment never appears in the press.

The liberal-European approach to crime is to have government, and only government, DO SOMETHING! In Europe, the crime rate has skyrocketed. Anywhere liberals rule, the crime rate shoots up.

Americans leave it to honest people to do something. The last thing any sane person would do when citizens are in danger is to spend government resources on an effort to prevent them from defending themselves.

So naturally disarming honest people is the first response of liberals and Europeans.

Americans leave it to the people to do something. Our greatest contribution to history has been in teaching the world that the best things come from what our government does NOT do.

What America AIN'T

Right after World War II, an American was telling a European refugee in New York about what was wrong with America. The immigrant replied, "Yes, but you just don't appreciate what America AIN'T."

It is very, very important for us to take this point seriously. Everybody wants to take credit for "what America is all about."

In my opinion, what makes America great is that we got a fresh start in 1790.

But that great start consisted mostly of NOT doing things. Our Founding Fathers were determined not to make the same mistakes Europe had, and they did a great job of it.

But I never see anybody, liberal or conservative, ever mention that what America is about is dropping the European nonsense. Today, the official historian of respectable conservatism, Michael Jaffe, says that about the only thing that America was founded on was five words in the Declaration of Independence, "All men are created equal."

A liberal will tell you that what America is all about is multiculturalism and multiracialism. Back here in the real world, there was not a single Founding Father who did not take it for granted that America was white and Northern European.

A conservative will tell you America Is All About Religion. We have the healthiest churches on earth, but we also have the first churches on earth that were built and maintained PRIVATELY. Every European state pays for its churches and sponsors its churches. And in every European country religion is dying.

"The Business of America is Business" - But WHOSE Business?

Liberals say that Calvin Coolidge was evil because he said "The business of America is business." They say the business of America is enforcing equality and integrating all white majority countries.

Conservatives say that they agree that What America Is All About is "all men are created equal." But they say that this should be done by capitalist means. Business will use the Free Market to bring third world labor into Europe, America, and other white countries.

Conservatives agree with liberals that making the first world brown is What America is All About, but they insist that ridding the world of white people can be done best by following Coolidge's motto, "The business of America is business."

The problem is not whether Equality should be enforced in the name of God, Social Progress or Capitalism. The problem is, as usual, that neither conservatives nor liberals have the slightest idea what they are talking about.

It was Teddy Roosevelt, not Calvin Coolidge, who is first quoted as saying "the business of America is business." Any person of reasonable intelligence knows that such an obvious pun would have been made thousands of times before even Teddy Roosevelt was born.

Benjamin Franklin probably said "The business of America is minding your business" when he was debating in favor of "Mind your business" as our national motto.

The sense of Franklin's "Mind your Business" motto is enshrined in the Preamble to the United States Constitution. The real founding document of this country says the exact opposite of "all men are created equal."

The Constitution of the United States says very specifically what the United States is NOT about. It dedicates America to the people OF THE UNITED STATES, to "OURSELVES AND OUR POSTERITY."

The United States Constitution starts with the declaration that all the United States Government is about is minding our own business and taking care of our own people.

The genius of the Founders was not what they felt America Is All About, but their conviction that America would never make Europe's mistakes. The genius of the Founding Fathers lies in their realizing what America AIN'T.

November 30, 2002 Nothing

December 7, 2002 - Michael Jackson's Baby, Michael Jackson's Face

December 7, 2002 - The South Was New England's Economic Colony From the Start

December 7, 2002 - White Gentiles Can't Suffer or be Exploited

December 7, 2002 - The Southern Founding Fathers Invented Uncle Turkey

Michael Jackson's Baby, Michael Jackson's Face

In all the row over Michael Jackson dangling his baby over the balcony in Berlin for his fans to see, one obvious point was not discussed. The baby had a towel over its head.

This was mentioned once, but the newscaster pretended to be mystified by it.

Maybe no one pointed this out because you are not allowed to discuss the obvious reason for the baby's head being covered. Or maybe everybody is so brainwashed by the time they get into the media that they genuinely don't know how to think any more.

Jackson went to the zoo with his kids, and all of them had covers over their faces.

Why?

Well, DUHHH!

Jackson has had his face totally transformed by surgery to get rid of his Negroid features. If someone had a frontal lobe, that would indicate to them that Jackson doesn't LIKE his Negroid features.

But, despite Jackson's plastic surgery, the children look like what they are, random mixes of Nordic women and a black male. Please see WhitakerOnline World View for March 23, 2002 - HALF COKE AND HALF BEER - YUM YUM!!

Jackson has covered his own face by plastic surgery. He is covering his children's faces with cloth.

What really worries me is that the media might actually be so brainless by now that they honestly can't figure that out.

The South Was New England's Economic Colony From the Start

Until early this century almost the entire Federal budget was paid for by tariffs. Tariffs were paid mostly by Southerners on industrial goods imported from Europe.

So what the South got from The Glorious Union from the word go was the privilege of paying for it.

But that was the least of what the Union cost the South. Paying for almost the entire Federal Government was not the only purpose of tariffs. It was not even the main purpose of tariffs.

The main purpose of tariffs was to make Southerners pay New England manufacturers more money for New England industrial products. Instead of buying cheaper European goods Southerners had to buy Northern goods because tariffs made European goods too expensive.

In other words, from the outset of the Glorious Union in 1789, the South had to pay the entire Federal budget plus lots of money each year to New England.

The moment the South stopped being a colony of Britain, it began being an economic colony of New England. It is likely that, when it comes to the dubious profitability of slave labor, New England got more of those profits than Southern slaveholders did.

White Gentiles Can't Suffer or be Exploited

Tariffs exploited white Southerners and black Southerners, but nobody is going to mention it. Our society says that white Southerners cannot be exploited.

So we sit still while people say that "Jews have a history of Suffering." This indicates that all gentiles have a history that was one long party.

My grandfather and his entire family were isolated in his home by a flood. They were jammed together in the cold and stench for days, and both his parents died, leaving him to raise his brother and sisters.

But that wasn't Suffering.

Nowadays, you don't have to be a Jew to say you Suffered, but you have to be at least a member of a minority group.

Nowadays, when we talk about immigrants we mean the heavily Jewish immigration that went through Ellis Island in the late 1800s and the early 1900s.

THEY Suffered.

The Ellis Island immigrants were in Third Class and ate bad food and were delayed coming into New York by immigration rules.

A white Southerner's ancestors were on dangerous, leaky wooden boats smaller than a good-sized yacht today, with rats the size of dogs. They had rats for companions and they often starved when they got here. And I don't mean Jane Fonda's "starvation." I mean the real thing.

Please see July 5, 2002 - WERE SOUTH CAROLINIANS STARVING CHILDREN?

How often did somebody starve at Ellis Island?

But I forgot. They Suffered at Ellis Island.

The Southern Founding Fathers Invented Uncle Turkey

The United States is the Uncle Turkey of the world today. We fight in the Middle East for Israel and to keep Europe's oil supply safe. We fight for people who hate us and we give foreign aid to people who hate us.

But what about the Southerners who joined the Glorious Union in 1789? They paid for the Federal Government and paid even more as economic colonies of New England. The more New England hated us the more money we gave them.

But if the original deal we made with the Glorious Union was a study in stupidity, it was nothing compared to how we paid after 1865. Not only did the tariffs increase after 1865 to pay New England industrialists more Southern money, but the South was banned from industrial production entirely.

Railroad rates were set up by the owners in New England so that it cost several times as much to ship industrial products north as to ship them south. The last of these discriminatory rail rates was removed in 1952. Yes, NINETEEN FIFTY-TWO.

Oddly enough, the moment discriminatory rail rates were removed, Southern industry began to grow wildly. Meanwhile, we learned to praise the Southerners who had helped form The Glorious Union and to curse those who had tried to secede from Our Beloved American Government.

You will never hear a word about this in any discussion of Southern poverty. We can't Suffer and we can't be exploited.

December 14, 2002 - Senator Lott Speaks Heresy!

December 14, 2002 - Fox Demands that Lott do the Southern Crawl

December 14, 2002 - Lott Must Face Our Holy Inquisition

December 14, 2002 - Internal Consent

December 14, 2002 - What Happened to Senator Lott

Senator Lott Speaks Heresy!

Senator Lott made the one mistake no respectable Southerner is ever forgiven for:

He told the truth.

At Thurmond's hundredth birthday party Lott said he was proud Mississippi had voted for Strom for president in 1948. He said if Strom had won then, "We wouldn't have the problems we have now."

WHAT PROBLEMS!?, screamed the respectable conservatives on Fox.

Horrors! In 1948, blacks were in separate schools and intermarriage was forbidden. The official line today is that segregation was the horror of 1948.

Just for a moment, let's go back to 1948. Remember, we are talking about a time when some people left their apartments unlocked in New York City and the idea of locking your car when you parked in downtown Columbia, South Carolina, was a joke.

While we are being horrified today by people in 1948 having segregation, let us look at American today through their eyes.

Most people in 1948 took it for granted that blacks went to separate schools. Today we take it for granted that schools are so violent that children have to go through metal detectors. Nobody in 1948 would have believed such a horror was possible.

In 1948, everybody was horrified by the rates of bastardy and drug addiction among blacks. That was one of the main arguments back then FOR integration. With integration, said liberals, white morals would stay the same and blacks would improve.

Nothing liberals advocate ever WORKS.

Now white bastardy is HIGHER than black bastardy was in 1948, and so is white drug use. Black bastardy and drug use have continued to climb. Please see September 2, 2000 - WE ALL LIVE IN SOWETO NOW.

Segregationists said in 1948 that after integration white rates of bastardy and drug use would go up. Liberals laughed at that idea, the same way they laughed at the idea that integration was aimed at intermarriage. I heard them laugh when I predicted all these results of integration in the 1950s.

And Fox wants to know what "problems" Lott could possibly be talking about.

Fox Demands that Lott do the Southern Crawl

In order to be a good boy, every Southerner must grovel and sob and drool when segregation is mentioned. I call this the "Southern Crawl".

In order to be respectable, every Southerner must do the "Southern Crawl" and conservatives must be the first to demand that every Southerner do the Southern Crawl. If a Southerner doesn't do the Southern Crawl or a conservative does not demand the Southern Crawl, that Southerner or that conservative goes on the liberal Black List and is not allowed to comment in the public media.

No one but me ever mentions this, but we all know it. It's called Liberal Free Speech, which means free speech is only for liberals.

No conservative who wants to stay Respectable can complain about this rule.

So Fox commentators demand that Fox do more than just apologize for his statement about Strom. They want him to sob and drool and grovel and renounce his ideological errors in detail.

Lott Must Face Our Holy Inquisition

But a "Southern Crawl" for Lott will not be enough. One Fox commentator spoke for all respectable conservatives when he said that Lott must be cross examined publicly on whether he has the True Faith in Holy Integration.

I say True Holy Faith and I mean True Holy Faith. Any form of hypocrisy in politics is not only allowed but expected, except this one. If you do not Believe and Believe-with-all-your-heart in integration you must be destroyed.

There was a movie in which Alan Alda played a Senator. He found out from an informer that an old Southern public school official, though he pushed integration, did not BELIEVE in it. As an idealistic senator, the Alda character exposed this when the old Southerner testified before his committee.

The man was ruined and the Alda Senator's Idealism and Fight for Right was confirmed.

I said Holy Faith and I meant Holy Faith.

No conservative ever objects to this.

Internal Consent

In a free country a person is asked to OBEY laws, but he is not required to APPROVE of them. You are free to believe anything you want to. You are punished for ACTS which violate the law.

In a totalitarian society you must not only DO what the State demands, you must BELIEVE what the state tells you. Absolutism requires not only external obedience but internal consent as well.

In any Religious Inquisition, it is not enough that a person merely conform.

In a Religious Inquisition one must Believe. That is what makes it Religious. That's what makes it an Inquisition.

Even the most absolute religious tyranny allows some discussion, so long as everyone allowed to speak is within the bounds of True Belief.

Political Correctness is our national religion. Some opposition is allowed, some discussion is allowed, but only within the limits of our imposed Faith.

We segregationists predicted all the horrors that would come with integration except one. No one predicted that after integration was imposed and all the horrors we predicted came about, we would still be required to say integration was good. No one imagined that, in America, we would have to BELIEVE that integration was good.

Again, all Good-thinkers today -- what we call the respectable people -- look with horror on the idea of blacks sitting at the back of buses. But people in 1948 thought that a drug culture, school violence, a country ruled by minority votes, a third world invasion and an America looking forward to a future as a colored country were real horrors.

Americans in 1948 would have been shocked by the Inquisition we take for granted. And anybody in 1948, including real liberals, would have been horrified at a national brainwashing. And it is today's "conservatives" who must lead in enforcing this Inquisition.

What Happened to Senator Lott

Poor old Lott. No conservative ever worked so hard to be respectable. When reporters ask him to, he praises the fairness of the liberal media.

A respectable conservative is called a conservative because he tells some of the truth. On the other hand, he can only stay respectable if he condemns any truth that is real heresy to our national true Faith.

As in any religious tyranny, it is hard for person who talks for a living to stay inside the lines set out by the Inquisition. Poor Lott, who has spent his whole life saying the right things, heard the applause for pro-Thurmond statements at that birthday party and said the wrong thing in praise of Strom.

Does Lott BELIEVE in the True Faith of Integration? Like all of our national spokesmen today, Lott doesn't believe anything. No one in power in our society has any true belief or any true loyalty to much of anything. This always happens when a society imposes an Inquisition on itself.

No one is enough of a True Believer to say the right thing all the time. When you impose a True Faith, the only person who can say exactly the right thing all the time is an absolute sociopath, someone who has no real conscience at all.

The True Faith of Communism ended up in the hands of real nut cases like Stalin and Mao and Pol Pot.

In an Inquisition Society like ours, only a true sociopath can be consistent enough to survive.

The society we live in today naturally produces bishops who help perverts rape thousands of little boys, businessmen who steal and all the rest. In an Inquisition society, lying is not merely OK, it is required.

Meanwhile, Fox News Network wants to know "What problems?!"

December 21, 2002 - Truths that work

December 21, 2002 - Chasing Down Southern Whites, Phase II

December 21, 2002 - The Argument for Integration Changes

December 21, 2002 - Black Schools could have been Equal

December 21, 2002 - Is it Possible for some minorities to have Real Pride?

December 21, 2002 - The Argument for Integration Changes, Phase III

Truths that Work

A long time I ago, by trial and error, I found the perfect answer to use on a Yankee who badmouths the South.

No matter what he says, my first reply is:

"You know, we didn't fight a war to keep YOU."

If you say that and stop right there, it leaves them furious and frustrated. Anything they say is going to be on the defensive.

The greatest war in American history, the war in which more Americans were killed by far than in all America's other wars combined, was for the express purpose of keeping the South IN the union.

All we wanted was to get away from Yankees.

Chasing down Southern Whites, Phase II

It's been called the Civil War, the War of the Rebellion and the War of Northern Aggression. The War to Keep the South covers all these names, and is the accurate one.

This title, The War to Keep the South, makes the perfect connection between that struggle and the (more recent) civil rights struggle for integration:

In both cases the main purpose of America was to keep Southerners from being left alone.

When I was coming up, the idea that blacks had a right to my company seemed absurd. Once again, they didn't want rights. They wanted US.

All the magazines are full of the black girl who is Bond's girl in the new film. She is on the cover of Jet Magazine with the Irishman playing Bond. That makes me nostalgic. In the 1950s, every single issue of Jet Magazine had a mixed couple on the cover.

Mixed couples were the only dream of black people in the 1950s. The argument for integration was the exact opposite of today's Holy Diversity. Back then no one dared use the word "black." They were "Negroes."

In the 1950s, a "Negro" was a white man in a coat and tie and a black skin. Every "Negro" on TV or in the movies had to look exactly like a white man, and they were usually less than a quarter black.

The original aim of the civil rights movement was that there be no diversity at all in America. Everyone would simply be brown. Everybody would have the same education, the same liberal outlook, and the same low rate of illegitimate births that whites had then.

This would all be done by forcing Southerners to integrate with blacks.

The Argument for Integration Changes

In the 1950s, the argument for integration was that it would end diversity. Everybody in every white majority country would eventually become a uniform brown. Funny, integration has never been demanded of any non-white country!

This ideal of ending all diversity in white countries was preached by Franz Boas as the means of getting rid of the white race, which he viewed as the common enemy of Jews and all other minority groups.

To be fair, a few of the most outspoken opponents of integration were Jews. The founder of US News and World Report, David Lawrence, demanded the repeal of the Fourteenth Amendment. In 1961 his issue commemorating the beginning of the War to keep the South was the best case ever made for the Southern Cause.

Right through the 1960s, the NAACP never had a single black president. They were all leftist Jews.

But by the 1960s, some blacks started to wonder what BLACKS would get out of all this. Some black leaders began to realize that "Negroes" was not just a hard word for Southerners to pronounce, it was also hard for BLACKS to pronounce. It had never occurred to any civil rights leaders that blacks had any purpose except as a battering ram against whites, and no black appointed as a Leader had questioned that goal.

So in the 1960s the old goal of getting rid of whitey was not enough. The argument for integration changed.

Integration became "de-segregation". This "de-segregation" was now "to get equal schools for blacks." You bused white children to black schools, said liberals, so that whites would be forced to give black schools equal funding.

Black Schools could have been Equal

Before 1954, on average black teachers in North Carolina were already paid more than white teachers. This was to avoid integration.

Governor Byrnes of South Carolina introduced the state's sales tax to provide equal funding to black schools. If blacks had been willing to trade integration for funding they could have had all the money they wanted for their schools.

For integration, blacks threw away their opportunity for huge funding for their schools. No one questioned the fact that the function of blacks was to act as a sledgehammer to break up white society.

So for liberals to say that they wanted busing just to get funding for black schools was nonsense. Yet by then,, no conservative would dare point this out.

But the bottom line on integration was the same as the bottom line on the War to Keep the South. White Southerners wanted to be left alone.

If we stick to that goal, we can win.

Please see November 9, 2002 From that: "HOW TO WIN" and also "DO WE GET THE MINORITY VOTES WE WILL NEED MORE AND MORE IN THE FUTURE?"

Is it Possible for some Minorities to have some real Pride?

The rise of black militants in the late 1960s changed more than the word "Negro." It also exposed how humiliating the whole liberal approach to integration had been. Please see February 9, 2002 - WHITE ANTIRACISM IS REALLY VERY RACIST.

Militants pointed out that "Negro" just meant a dark white man and blacks only goal was to mix with whites. It has always been true that leftists look upon blacks as more sub-human than Klansmen do, but Stokeley Carmichael and other militant blacks shouted that out for the world to hear.

By the 1960s, when Susan Sontag declared the open and honest liberal position that "the white race is the cancer of history," the blacks she depended on to get rid of whites were showing signs of having some purposes of their own.

The "Abolish Whites" Movement was being threatened by Black Pride.

The Argument for Integration Changes, Phase III

White integrationists still regard blacks as a sledgehammer with which they can break up white society and get rid of whites. Integration is NOT "race-mixing." Its NOT "mixing the races." Integration is only demanded in white majority countries.

Integration has nothing to do with "the races". It is ONLY intended to be used as a sledgehammer against the white race.

But regarding blacks as nothing but a sledgehammer against white society is insulting to blacks, so whites have not been able to say that since the 1960s.

So now integration is not AGAINST whites. It's FOR whites. It gives them Diversity. That shows that blacks educate us just by sitting beside us.

Oh, goody!

Meanwhile, I am still a white Southerner and I want to be left alone.

We'll pay blacks for the privilege of being left alone, just as we were willing to fight a war to be left alone.

But not leaving Southerners to themselves seems to be the only purpose Northern whites and liberal minorities have.

Pathetic, isn't it?

December 28, 2002 - Kentucky Prisoner Release

December 28, 2002 - Kentucky Prisoner Release is Moderation in Action

December 28, 2002 - If we ARE at War, Then We WERE at War

Kentucky Prisoner Release

The crew of an atomic submarine spends months without going into port. During those months each crewman is allotted half the space Federal regulations require for each convicted felon in prison.

Since extra space is allotted to officers on the nuclear sub, a lot of those aboard nuclear subs do hard and complicated work with even less than that one-half of the space required for a convicted felon in prison.

Kentucky is releasing convicted felons because its prisons are overcrowded.

Kentucky also says it is releasing prisoners because each prisoner costs about \$30,000 a year to maintain.

A sheriff in North Carolina keeps his prisoners for seven dollars a day. Kentucky can't do that because the courts and activists force them to spend \$30,000 a year to keep those sweet people comfortable enough.

Kentucky's example will be followed by other states.

Liberals constantly complain that too many people are in prison. The implication is that the way to deal with crime is to be nice to felons. That's the way they treated law breakers in the 1960s and 1970s.

Needless to say the crime rate skyrocketed during the 1960s and 1970s.

No liberal policy ever works.

Kentucky Prisoner Release is Moderation in Action

Rush Limbaugh tells us there will always be liberals and conservatives. Both are legitimate points of view. This is one of the ways Limbaugh and other conservatives remain respectable to enough to be permitted.

When you treat the left as if it were a legitimate point of view you must compromise with it. So while Kentucky has rejected the leftist policy of soft on crime it retains the Limbaugh respect for leftism. If prisons are too crowded you must compromise by letting prisoners loose.

The fact is that leftism is not merely mistaken, it is ridiculous. To be partly mistaken is not a way of being smart. It is a form of insanity.

For decades Republicans tried moderation. They said that there was a left a right and a center, so the key to victory was to be in the center. That sounds so good everybody repeated it like a mantra.

The Republicans had a bare majority in both Houses of Congress for two years after the landslide victory of war hero Dwight Eisenhower in the presidential election of 1952. From then until 1980 Republicans stuck to the middle of the road strategy, half liberal silliness and half a rejection of liberal silliness.

If you say "middle of the road" it sounds really Shrewd. If you say it as I just said it, ", half liberal silliness and half a rejection of liberal silliness", you get a realistic view of what moderation really is.

This so-called "moderation" doesn't work in real world politics. If you look at the real congress and the real legislature where people are really elected, they tend to be on the right or on the left.

Those who preach moderation never look at the real world. They just kept mumbling "middle of the road".

In 1952 the Eisenhower landslide gave Republicans a razor-thin majority in both Houses of Congress for two years. After that one two-year majority that Eisenhower won for them in 1952, Republicans lost both Houses of Congress for the next quarter of century.

All that time Republicans followed that "middle of the road" nonsense.

Finally in 1980 Republicans went Reaganite and won the presidency and solid control of the Senate for six years. Then Bush, Senior took over the party leadership in 1989. He was elected as Reagan's successor in 1988, but lost when he took over as his moderate self in 1992.

It was not until 1994 when Gingrich led a hard right strategy for Republicans that they won both Houses of Congress.

Liberalism does not work. Moderation does not work because it takes liberalism seriously. To be a moron is forgivable. To deliberately be half a moron is true insanity.

To be a Moderate is to be a half moron on purpose.

If we ARE at War, then we WERE at War

We are now fighting a Moderate War, a Middle of the Road War.

You see, in our Modern Age only dangerous extremists DECLARE war. In the Falkland Islands Britain and Argentina were in heavy combat.

But the very idea of declaring war never came up. If the Authorities say it's war, that's enough for Europeans and South Americans.

But Americans should not act like Europeans. We have a Constitution, and that Constitution tells us what a war is.

Liberals disagree, moderates disagree, respectable conservatives disagree. They tell us they can take away civil rights because we are in a war, but they refuse to declare war.

There is a practical way to call them on this. If America in combat is a war without any declaration, then Korea was a war and Vietnam was a war.

If Vietnam was a war Jane Fonda committed treason. There is no statute of limitations on treason. We can prosecute the Jane Fondas for crimes committed in the 1960s if we can punish Germans who committed War Crimes in the 1940s.

Hundreds of thousands of today's liberals marched on the streets with the enemy flag, the Viet Cong flag. A person who marched with the swastika in the 1940s would have been prosecuted.

If we are at war now we were at war in the 1960s.

January 4, 2003 - North Korea and Human Clones Represent the Same Problem

January 4, 2003 - Our Twin Towers Dialogue is Absolutely Insane

January 4, 2003 - Leftist Morality Can't Face the Future

January 4, 2003 - Rightist Morality Can't Face the Future

North Korea and Human Clones Represent the Same Problem

North Korea is going ahead with its program to develop nuclear weapons. A group that believes alien scientists invented humans says it has produced a human clone.

It doesn't really matter whether or not that cloning actually took place,. What matters is that there is no good reason it couldn't be done.

Human cloning and North Korea's atomic weapons are part of a fundamental problem we will have to face in the new millennium:

Technology is getting more and more powerful and more and more widespread. If we don't deal with this reality, the freaks are going to.

Trying to control nuclear and cloning technology is a lot like trying to deal with drugs:

1) All we ever talk about is how to clamp down on these things and ban them;

and

2) We all know we won't be able to stop proliferation, cloning or drugs.

While the desperate problems of the new century are growing, we just moralize about them. Meanwhile we drift ever farther away from reality.

Our Twin Towers Dialogue is Absolutely Insane

Media discussion about weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) is an example of how we are getting sillier and sillier when we discuss tomorrow's technical crises.

I wrote about WMDs on November 21, 1998 in SUPERTERRORISM. When my predictions started to come true I reprinted that article on September 11, 2001.

I made a recommendation on dealing with WMDs in the 1998 article. I repeated that recommendation on September 15, 2001 in FOR HEAVEN'S SAKE, AMERICA, SPREAD OUT!

What I said was that, if a few people can kill millions, the first thing we must do is spread people out so they will not make easy targets.

But nobody but me will talk about spreading out our population. Why? Because this involves talking about something nobody wants to think about.

If we spread out it means we are admitting the horrible likelihood that weapons of mass destruction can't be stopped just by Clamping Down on them. It means we have to face the fact they might be USED.

On the other hand, we can avoid that ugly thought by doing what New Yorkers want to do about the Twin Towers. They say we just need to Clamp Down on terrorism.

Not only are New Yorkers going to build another Twin Towers, many want to build them bigger and taller. New Yorkers tell themselves that this means they are not "giving in to terrorism".

What this really is, is wishful thinking. They want to believe that terrorism is over. Rebuilding the Twin Towers says we can have a target like that and no one will ever hit it again.

No one mentions spreading out because that would mean facing a reality that is horrible, ugly, and, worst of all, realistic.

No one wants to discuss the nasty reality that, IN THE LONG RUN, we cannot deal with weapons of mass destruction just by Getting Tough and Clamping Down.

Leftist Morality Can't Face the Future

I made another statement in SUPERTERRORISM that no one is allowed to talk about. I said that the development of WMDs probably means the end of Holy Diversity.

If we face the fact that a few hostile people can kill millions there is little room for a policy that forces hostile groups to live side by side.

On the left no one is allowed to question Holy Diversity. All kinds of people must be forced together by liberal social policy.

But what happens to Holy Diversity when any hostile person will soon be able to wipe out the whole community?

No one asks.

And we haven't even gotten started dealing with the real problem yet. The Twin Tower attacks were low tech. What happens when suitcase nuclear bombs and tailor-made diseases become common?

Nobody wants to think about that, so we are betting everything on our ability to Clamp Down on weapons of mass destruction.

Rightist Morality Can't face the Future

Conservatives deal with every technical reality of the new millennium the same way liberals do:

They Clamp Down.

Conservatives can't deal with tomorrow's weapons of mass destruction any more than liberals can. Anybody who wants to be a respectable conservative has to be every bit as fanatical about "diversity" as liberals are. Conservatives are always trying to prove they are more against "divisiveness" and "racism" than leftists are.

On human cloning and human embryo research the right wants to ban it all. But the millions of people sitting in wheelchairs or who are otherwise handicapped are not going to put up with that. Please see May 12, 2001 - TWENTIETH-FIRST CENTURY AMISH and FRANCE - THE BOY IN THE BUBBLE.

There is actually very little real difference between liberal moralists and conservative moralists on these matters. It is true that liberals favor abortion and conservatives oppose it. For people whose political debate is rooted in today, that is a big deal.

But where it really counts leftist moralizers and conservative moralizers are very much alike. Harvard sociology professors who call themselves "ethicists" talk about developing medical technology in much the same way conservative preachers and priests do.

On human cloning both liberal "ethicists" and moralists on the right say that all we need to do about the future is Clamp Down.

That saves a lot of thought. You can hide behind that moral posture and raise money with it and run for office on it.

But back on Planet Earth the clock keeps right on ticking.

January 11, 2003 - Remember When It Was Racist to Think That Illegal Aliens Might Be Mexicans?

January 11, 2003 - Good Politics is Stepping on the Right Toes

January 11, 2003 - Liberals Want the Draft Back Because they Want the Sixties Back

January 11, 2003 - The Wrong Feet Are the Same Today as They Were in the Sixties

Remember when it was Racist to think that Illegal Aliens might be Mexicans?

Since I am the only American who has a memory, let me remind you of a liberal campaign that was under way before September 11, 2001. Nobody, but nobody mentions it today.

Minority leaders were appearing on national television demanding that profiling on the Mexican border be stopped. They said that blond people were being allowed into the United States while brown people who spoke little English were being stopped and checked.

This, they said, was racism.

If you want to be a respectable conservative and get on national television, you never remind liberals of anything that might embarrass them. If somebody showed what liberals were saying about profiling on the Mexican border before September 11 they would be humiliated.

So, I am the only person who will bring this up.

Minority spokesmen were also tearfully pointing out that poor black kids in an affluent neighborhood were far more likely to be checked out by the police than were middle-aged whites in limousines.

This, too, was Hitlerism.

All this was serious stuff. I remember Vice President Cheney getting on TV and choking up at the idea that black people, just because black people commit ten times as many crimes as whites, might be checked more often by police than white people are.

Nobody has heard a word of any of this since September 11.

Does anybody care to guess why?

Good Politics is Stepping On the Right Toes

Until September 11, 2001 anything anti-white was good and all racial profiling, no matter how realistic it was, was bad. Police were indicted for checking out black people despite the fact that black people were ten times as likely to be up to something criminal as whites were.

Blacks were given jobs that white workers wanted and everybody cheered.

After all, the only people hurt by anti-white policies of this kind were working people. Rich people have plenty of police protection, so it didn't really matter if the police were made less efficient by being forced to check out as many whites as blacks.

But after September 11, 2001, all these silly anti-profiling ideas began to hit people who mattered. Nobody minded when busing led to dangerous schools where children were searched.

But after September 11, 2001 white American grandmothers were being strip-searched and the media started raising hell.

No, it wasn't just that grandmothers were being searched that caused all the trouble. What mattered was that the WRONG grandmothers were being searched.

At the airports after September 11 the whole nonsense of nondiscrimination began to cause problems for people who fly in airplanes. Al Gore got searched. Rich people got searched. Potentially dangerous Arabs did not get searched because profiling was outlawed.

Step on white working people and the media will worship you. But the minute you hit the upper middle class, expect to get kicked in the teeth.

Liberals Want the Draft Back Because They Want the Sixties Back

Black congressman Charles Rangel of New York has proposed that the military draft be renewed for the war on terror. Liberals say they want the draft back so that all classes of Americans would share the burden and risk of military service.

Back on Planet Earth, the last time the draft helped share the military burden was during World War II when practically everybody was drafted. Since then the rich have avoided serious military service if they wanted to, draft or no draft.

The reason the left wants the draft back is because Bush is using the War on Terrorism to win elections. The peace movement today is very, very weak.

The liberals' real reason for wanting the draft back is because they want the hippies back. Rangel wants all those wonderful leftist protests on campus springing up the way they did during the Vietnam War.

Back in the 1960s those campus riots were used to force the government to move left. Back in the 1960s those protests by young people on campus were also used to show that leftism was "the way of the future".

If the draft is renewed liberals think it will mean a return of The Good Old Days.

The Wrong Feet Are the Same Today as They Were in the Sixties

Actually all those campus protests in the 1960s had nothing to do with political leftism. The day that the military draft disappeared was the day that students totally lost interest in anti-war protesting.

What happened to the fashionable war protests in the 1960s was exactly what happened to the fashionable campaign against profiling after September 11, 2001.

Until the Vietnam War got serious, nobody minded the draft much. Working people got drafted but anyone who mattered could get an exemption by going to college or something.

During the Vietnam War very few upper income people were drafted and even fewer were forced into combat. But in the 1960s the slightest threat to the comfort of the class of people who fly commercial airliners today caused a major political explosion.

Even a hint of a serious military draft could cause a political revolution, and a serious draft has been politically impossible for decades.

Now if there is any kind of draft, Congressman Rangel has put liberal fingerprints all over it. He is stupid enough to be a respectable conservative.

January 18, 2003 - Why Lincoln Republicans Can't Handle Politics

January 18, 2003 - Frankly My Dear...

January 18, 2003 - Loyalties are Precious

Why Lincoln Republicans Can't Handle Politics

A person who is loyal to everything is loyal to nothing. This is why "Lincoln Republicans" can never play real politics.

Bush operatives are out there meeting with liberal black leaders and ignoring conservative ones. Cries of dismay are coming from the conservative rank and file. Where the hell have they been since the Gettysburg Address?

America adopted a Constitution dedicated it to "We the People of the United States of America". This means America was dedicated to Americans. Abraham Lincoln declared in the Gettysburg Address that America was dedicated to "ALL MEN are created equal".

He meant it.

President Bush wants what is best for All Men. A Mexican is as good as an American. He does not see himself as violating his oath of office when he refuses to enforce our immigration laws. Like Lincoln, he feels he has a Higher Loyalty.

This becomes a matter of practical politics. If he had his way, Bush would love to give more to minorities who vote Democratic than to whites who vote Republican. This would prove that he has no prejudice.

As a matter of principle you cannot devote yourself to "We the People of the United States" if all your effort goes into making all men equal.

But that is not just a matter of principle. Favoring your own people is the only way real politics can be practiced. If you want people to vote your way, you have to make it pay your friends to support you. If you want people to vote your way, you have to make voting the other way a costly business.

Most of Nevada belongs to the Federal Government. When Nevada kept voting Republican, President Clinton hit them hard on land policy. By contrast, Republicans desperately want everybody to see that no minority will be shunned just because it blindly supports our political enemies.

Frankly My Dear. . .

How do I stand on the war in Iraq? Do I think it is moral or evil? I am told I must worry about how it affects Iraqis and Israelis and whether it is moral to attack Iraq while we let North Korea get away with worse.

How do I stand on abortion? How do I stand on Family Values, prayers in school, the interest rate, nuclear proliferation, the infrastructure, the environment, labor unions, congressional pay, welfare reform, and so on and so on and so on.

I have some opinions on most things, but most things are not that important to me. On most issues I frankly don't give a damn.

You have to be economical about the number of ideas you are loyal to and the number of people you are loyal to.

A person who is loyal to everything is loyal to nothing. Every traitor claims that he is not being disloyal, he is just being Idealistic and Objective.

Our latest traitor, the American Taliban John Walker, honestly believes that he is not disloyal for being against America because his version of Islam is good for all mankind.

If you extrapolate from the astonishing revelations from KGB files, thousands of Americans worked for Stalin's Soviet Union against the United States. Every one of them felt that he was just being for the Universal Truth of Communism and against provincial prejudice.

Harvard professor Noel Ignatiev says that "Treason to the white race is loyalty to humanity." If you take a routine history course that blames white people for everything the way Hitler blamed the Jews for everything you have to agree with Ignatiev.

Every "Lincoln Republican" I know agrees with Ignatiev and won't say so. He is not honest enough to say so.

National Pro-Life leaders say that their only loyalty is to little babies of all races. They want a colored world as badly as any liberal does. This, they say, is not hatred of their own race, but loyalty to all humanity.

National "Christian" spokesmen are working to get colored children adopted into every white region of America. Ignatiev would certainly approve, but he and his fellow non-Christian leftists could not accomplish this for themselves.

Loyalties are Precious

A person who is fanatical on every issue is useless on the important ones. He can make no agreements for the sake of the important issues because he is already committed on all of them.

If you treasure your loyalty you cannot throw it around. How many conservative movements have been destroyed because of disagreements on one of the hundred Matters of Principle every conservative has to be monomaniacal about?

If you give your loyalty freely to every people or to every issue conservatives bring up you cannot expect anyone to take your allegiance seriously.

Loyalty to everything is loyalty to nothing.

Two last reminders:

As I said in "Wordism", May 15, 1999, there are thousands of principles that claim to be Universal Truths. Anyone who claims to unite THIS world with his particular Universal Truth out of the thousands of Universal truths out there actually divides humanity more than a racist or a nationalist does.

As I said in September 4, 1999, ONLY NATIONALISM CAN ALLOW FREEDOM OF THOUGHT: If your loyalty is to a single Universal Truth, you cannot allow any real freedom of thought. Anyone who argues against your particular Universal Principles is trying to break up your particular version of Wordist Universalism.

January 25, 2003 - The Reason the Malpractice Problem Exists

January 25, 2003 - The Medical Cover-up is like any Other Organized Crime

January 25, 2003 - Medicine, Vietnam and the New Organized Crime

January 25, 2003 - Or Get off the Pot

The Reason the Malpractice Problem Exists

Medical care is being destroyed because of malpractice suits. In Florida, an obstetrician pays two hundred thousand dollars - yes, I said two hundred thousand dollars! -- each year for malpractice insurance.

The excuse for these runaway malpractice suits is that it is the only way to keep doctors honest.

Lawyers say that malpractice lawsuits are the only way to punish bad doctors today.

That is true. Doctors cover up for other doctors, so you can't convict them in criminal court.

Medical associations routinely protect bad doctors to a criminal extent. You cannot find out what your doctor did wrong from a medical association. The medical associations openly abet criminal doctors who want to hide their past.

So instead of jailing the really awful doctors or exposing them, we use these hideously expensive malpractice suits as our only means of fighting back. The result is that every doctor pays more malpractice insurance and passes the cost on to us.

Instead of demanding that any physician who covers up for another go to jail, the people have settled for malpractice suits that are making medical costs prohibitive.

The Medical Cover-Up is like any other Organized Crime

When J. Edgar Hoover was head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, organized crime was in control of New York City. Garbage collection cost three times as much as it should have. Everybody paid for it but nobody dared challenge it.

Everybody in New York knew garbage cost that much because of the Mafia payoff. J. Edgar Hoover could not deal with the Mafia so he said there was no such thing as the Mafia.

In those days, a New York politician had to get approval from Mafia chief “Lucky” Luciano. The Mafia ran Las Vegas.

Everybody back then said that no one could do anything about Mafia power. They were wrong. A lot has been done about it. After J. Edgar Hoover’s death, Congress passed the RICO statutes that sent so much of the old Mafia leadership to prison.

You can do something if the people demand it.

But until we start jailing criminals in the medical profession, we will have runaway malpractice suits. Until we start jailing doctors who cover for criminal doctors, we will have runaway malpractice suits.

Medicine, Vietnam and the New Organized Crime

Malpractice suits are destroying medicine because we will not jail criminals in the medical profession. So we take the coward’s way out and the lawyers get rich.

We refuse to deal with the real problem and choose instead to take the coward’s way out. The result of refusing to deal with the hard reality is that what we end up with is the worst of both worlds.

The most obvious example of this was our Vietnam policy. In Vietnam, we didn’t want to really fight the war but we didn’t want to abandon it, either. So we got the worst of both worlds. We fought half a war and lost it.

The longest war America ever fought was in Vietnam, and it was the first war the United States ever lost.

We got the Mafia under control because Americans finally decided to stop lying to ourselves and go after them.

We dealt with the old organized crime, the Mafia, by going after them tooth and tong.

But we can't handle the new organized crime, the drug cartels. The reason we cannot handle the drug cartels is the same reason we can't deal with medical criminals. It is the same reason we lost in Vietnam. We refuse to really go after drugs and dealers but at the same time we refuse to call the war against drugs off.

So we have half a drug war, with the State of California on one side and the Feds on the other. The Bush Administration wants to make the anti-drug forces happy, but it also wants to make the ACLU happy.

The result is that we have enough drug enforcement to keep the price of drugs high and drug dealing profitable. But our enforcement doesn't make the slightest dent in the drug cartels.

Be it Vietnam, drugs or bad medicine, half a war is far, far worse than a real war or an outright surrender.

Going after bad doctors and medical associations will be very, very hard. But the present situation is impossible.

Or Get off the Pot

Most of our worst problems come from our failure to make a decision and stick with it. Our immigration law is a joke. We should either treat Mexican invaders as criminals or stop acting like we have a law against illegal immigration.

So, when the Washington sniper Malvo was caught as an illegal alien he was let go. He did most, if not all, of the shooting. Immigration law is only enforced against legal immigrants. They are easy to kick around, so the bureaucrats go after them and let outright illegals pour across the border.

Criminals are preying on us because liberal judges let them. We should clean out the courts, but no conservative dares demand that.

Instead of going after the judges, conservatives beat their chests and talk about strict enforcement of the law." What we end up doing is over-enforcing the silly laws right along with the sane ones.

In the end "strict enforcement" just means you use your resources to persecute legal immigrants rather than concentrating on stopping illegal immigration because that's too hard to do. "Strict enforcement" is an excuse to go after the easy targets.

A law should be enforced or it should be repealed. A war should be never be declared if you do not plan to fight it out.

February 1, 2003 - Rick Rowland's New Baby

February 1, 2003 - A White Father Is Free to Love His New Baby

February 1, 2003 - Everybody is Heartless but Liberals and Big Time Pro-Lifers

February 1, 2003 - Mother Love and Gator Jaws

Rick Rowland's New Baby!

There is a new Rowland in the world, a beautiful baby girl.

Actually it was Mrs. Rowland who had the baby, but Rick assures me that he did what he calls "the intellectual work."

Rick has a thriving business deriving from his own patent and two new children. Yet when Virgil had to go on to work on my new book, Rick jumped right in to help.

There is an old saying, If you need something done, ask a busy man.

Virgil Huston has five children, two masters degrees, and is in the active reserves. He was involved in the last Gulf War and he could be called up at any time for the next Gulf War.

Virgil created WhitakerOnline.Org and he guided it through its first four years. I just hope he feels that my book will be as worthwhile.

I cannot imagine two people with more excuse to say, I'm busy and concentrate on their own affairs. I am proud that men like this consider my work worth going out of their way for.

A White Father Is Free to Love His New Baby

I almost took it for granted that Rick's unborn baby would arrive safely for both mother and child. That is the assumption you make in today's white-created world. It never occurs to us to realize how unique we are in this way as in so many others.

In every society before this one a huge percentage of babies and mothers died at birth or soon afterwards. The attitude of other societies towards newborn children was very, very different from that which we take for granted.

Because they stood such a small chance of survival babies were not depended on to live. You loved the child but you could not consider it a full member of the family until much later. This attitude was necessary to protect oneself emotionally.

White people are considered the cancer of history by liberals and respectable conservatives, and credit for monumental achievements like healthy newborns is something no one is allowed to mention in connection with whites.

Only bad things were done by the white race," any good thing was done by "Humankind."

Political Correctness keeps telling us, on the basis of no evidence at all, that nothing good was ever created by white people simply because they are white. But all brown mixed countries are the same human disasters today that they always have been.

Because I care about babies I will not accept Political Correctness as an excuse to do away with white people.

Everybody tells me that is just because I am Evil and heartless.

Everybody is Heartless but Liberals and Big Time Pro-Lifers

Liberals tell us that only they have any decent feelings. No respectable conservative ever challenges them on this.

Liberals tell us that others are motivated only by Hate. Conservatives agree and scream at the so-called Haters, trying to convince liberals they are more anti-Hate than liberals are.

One group of conservatives has found a Shrewd way to fight back against liberals who claim everybody else is motivated by Hate. The national Pro-Life Movement claims it is the only group that is motivated by Love and only Love. It says that only National Pro-Life cares about babies.

All other conservatives take this National Pro-Life claim seriously. They insist that they are more anxious to create a world consisting entirely of third-world children than liberals are, and that makes them even more Pro-Love than liberals.

As for the rest of us, we never seem to be the slightest bit offended by being labeled pro-Hate and anti-baby.

Mother Love and Gator Jaws

It used to be thought that female alligators ate their young as soon as they were hatched from the egg.

Now we know that the trip from the ditch where the baby alligator hatched to the water is the most dangerous single trip that animal will ever make. So Ma Gator takes the hatchling in her ferocious jaws and carries it gently into the water to protect it.

No animal dares go after the little reptile being carried in those enormous jaws.

Other animals protect their children in different ways. The mother tiger uses her claws to protect her young, and if you want to die, one way to do it is to threaten a baby elephant when its gigantic kin are nearby.

We don't have enormous jaws or elephantine size or slashing claws. For our children's protection we have the most successful weapon nature ever devised, the human brain.

Just saying nice things, just using your jaws, is the morality of a reptile.

Liberals say Love is a guy in beads and bandanna strumming a guitar and singing nice things.

That is not what the Golden Rule says.

To do unto others as you would have them do unto you is not as simple as it sounds. It often requires hard work from both the brain and the heart.

Real human love is something that only comes from Homo sapiens, the creature with the brain.

February 8, 2003 - If We Shoot for the Stars, Martyrs Will Be Sacrificed

February 8, 2003 - The Space Program and Budget Reality

February 8, 2003 - The Huge Benefits of the Space Program

February 8, 2003 - A Man With A Memory Looks at the Space Program

If We Shoot for the Stars, Martyrs Will Be Sacrificed

Last week I pointed out that we are the first society in history that expects children to be born safely and mothers to suffer no harm.

By the same token we expect that people blasted into space will come back safely.

We just had a space disaster. The real measure of our space program is the fact that the death of those on board was a shock.

The measure of the greatness of our society is not that people die in childbirth or in space efforts. That is all that liberals talk about.

Our greatness lies in the fact that we do not expect such deaths. No liberal will ever mention that, so no respectable conservative will ever mention that.

The Space Program and Budget Reality

Liberals don't like science. They want all our problems to be solved by things like rationing that mean giving more power to bureaucrats and social science planners.

In 1977 the Carter Administration almost succeeded in destroying the space program. By then the NASA budget had been cut to the bone by Nixon and Ford in compromises with liberals. Then came what Carter and Company hoped would be the coup de grace. The 1977 appropriation budget bill that went to the floor of the House cut out the Hubble space telescope and the Jupiter Orbital Probe.

Yes, the Hubble Telescope, the one that is giving us whole new insights into the nature of the universe right now.

Liberals said they wanted the \$300 million -- yes it was just \$300 million -- cut from the space telescope and Jupiter probe to send to poor people programs. It was to join the trillion dollars we had already spent on the War on Poverty.

This cut was well planned and had the backing of the White House. The relevant Appropriations Subcommittee chairman, a Democrat, recommended it.

When it comes to the budget, the chairman of the subcommittee usually has his way. But this proposal to cut out the Hubble Telescope and the Jupiter Orbital Probe had more support than that. The Ranking Republican on the relevant budget subcommittee had joined with the chairman in recommending this cut.

The supporters of the space program were caught with their pants down. A lot of them wanted to do the General Lee bit and surrender nobly. Please see WhitakerOnline World View for February 1, 2003 --"General Lee's Fatal Mistake" and "Please, Please, PLEASE Stop Sniveling!"

There were space program snivelers who sobbed that all was lost. They kept reminding us that the combination of chairman and ranking minority member on the relevant subcommittee cannot be beaten on the Floor on a minor issue like this one.

So we decided it wouldn't be a minor issue.

We delayed the bill while the space advocates who were willing to fight back sent out telegrams.

I had no expertise on space but I had a hell of a lot of expertise on fighting in a corner. That was when the Democrats controlled both Houses of Congress and the White House, and a few of our last-ditch House members like my boss John Ashbrook were holding up a major portion of the liberal agenda by themselves.

The space program was already cut to the bone, and if this had gone through the essential personnel of the program would have been terminated. There was no coming back if we lost this one.

So I decided we wouldn't lose this one.

We had to get time and delay the thing past the weekend break so our forces could weigh in.

We got the time.

Over the weekend the pro-space movement poured in hundreds of thousands of telegrams. Everybody from the L-5 Space Settlement group to the Trekkies and young people in general hit Washington politically for the first time. All us nerds and kooks and romantics were in on it.

If you haven't been in on the mechanics of Capitol Hill legislation you cannot understand the sheer shock of the victory we won.

It is true that normally if both the Chairman and the Ranking Republican on the Appropriations subcommittee call for a cut, it is a done deal.

Unless you're dealing with the kind of people who would demand that Lee fight on after Appomattox.

We didn't just beat them. We beat them four to one!! As I remember they got 83 for the cut and we got 348 against it.

Almost every House member was there for the vote on what was no longer a minor issue.

The Huge Benefits of the Space Program

As a result of this victory on the House Floor the space program survived and the space telescope went into space and we orbited and sent back messages from Jupiter.

And that, ladies and gentlemen, is where Silicon Valley came from. The technology breakthroughs and personnel developed in the space program gave America what other countries now complain is an unmatchable advantage in the high tech future.

A lot was riding on what seemed to be a hopeless fight.

Hopeless fights were the specialty of my boss, John Ashbrook. In the House of Representatives with its 435 members nothing moves without unanimous consent. I think he just put the bug in the Speaker's ear that, once again, he and his tiny group of last-ditch conservatives would keep a member on the Floor and deny unanimous consent to everything if the space program cut were not put off.

I don't know exactly what happened. I was busy. The guy who hears the shrapnel sing is not the guy who has a clear view of overall strategy. I do know that when I tried to explain all the complications John just asked me "Bob, is it good for America?" and I said "Yes".

That's what senior staff is for. We both knew Ashbrook meant would it be good for America in HIS eyes, not in my pro-space romantic's eyes. I said "Yes" so he got the time from somewhere.

>From 1977 to 1981, when liberal Democrats controlled everything, Ashbrook's little group stopped one leftist initiative after another. "Reasonable" and "respectable" Republicans wanted to surrender and they hated us for blocking their "compromises". But no one will ever know how much was saved by this handful of guerrilla fighters, a little band I personally nicknamed "the Alamo squad".

I was once in a staff meeting in Congressman Bob Dornan's office. Dornan said, "I'll check with our leader." Someone said, "The Republican leadership wants to compromise."

Dornan responded, "I mean our real leader, John Ashbrook." It warmed my heart.

John Ashbrook's fight for principle in the space program paid off politically. John Ashbrook, a Midwestern conservative, was invited to be on a panel at the American Association for the Advancement of Science for this fight. In addition a lot more young people in his district became his fans.

A Man With A Memory Looks at the Space Program

Respectable conservatives earn that name "respectable" from liberals. Liberals give them that "respectable" label. Respectable conservatives are able to get on the news media while conservatives that liberals label "ultra-right" or "racist" are suppressed.

Nobody helps the liberals suppress "unrespectable" conservatives more than respectable conservatives do.

One thing you never do if you want to be a respectable conservative is to press any point that might shame liberals. Since nothing liberals do results in anything less than a disaster, it takes a lot of forgetting to make liberals look sane.

In 1969 when the Moon shot was ready to take off, there was a giant leftist demonstration against it. Black "leaders" brought in a mule train and a line of marching blacks all the way to Cape Kennedy to demonstrate against throwing money into space that should go to minorities.

Today only an obvious fool would challenge the enormous benefits the space program brought us (starting with the heart pacer if you want to talk about helping people). Now all the conservatives who grovel at the feet of leftist minorities would never mention the giant and insane mule train protest.

The mule train was big news in 1969. Everybody has agreed to forget it now. It would make a great symbol of leftism if the right were serious.

Since then those mule-train leftist minorities have won. In the name of compassionate conservatism the space program gets little backing from Bush. Once again Bush is throwing away support he could get from backing the space program to appeal to the mule-train minorities.

Guess how many mule-train minority votes Bush will get.

February 15, 2003 - America Exists to be Used

February 15, 2003 - How People Want to Use the American-Iraqi War

February 15, 2003 - Bush the Nowhere Man

February 15, 2003 - Bush Is What America Asked For

This week's fun quote:

Comment on France refusing to join the Gulf War coalition:

"Fighting a war without France is like playing football without an accordion."

America Exists to be Used

President Vincente Fox of Mexico wants to use America as a place to dump Mexican workers and bring in money for his country. President Bush is working with Fox to make this possible.

Israel wants to use the United States to crush the Arab countries that are blocking Israel's expansion and threatening its security.

Germans and Frenchmen are very upset that they no longer dominate the European Community. The EEC is expanding eastward so Germany and France are losing the one overwhelming power they used to have.

France and Germany hated America when those two countries dominated the European Economic Community because America was far more powerful than the Europe they controlled. Now they don't even control Europe, so they hate America even more.

In Eastern Europe, the Iraq war means a chance to get on the good side of the United States. So Eastern Europe tends to favor the war the Bush Administration wants, the war that France and Germany - and Russia! -- don't want.

Eastern Europe generally dislikes Western Europe for the same reason Western Europe hates us. Western Europe hates us because, while they threw away the twentieth century fighting each other, America prospered. Eastern Europe hates Western Europe because they drained away their lives under Communism after World War II while Western Europe got rich and powerful.

You can either learn the real lessons of history or you can hate somebody and blame your problems on them. So Western Europe blames America and Eastern Europe hates them.

As time passes you are going to see Eastern Europe hating Western Europe more and more.

North Korea is making trouble because they think that they are next after Iraq and Iran on the American hit list. China is also playing for its own stakes.

So the Israelis know what they want to use America for, Mexicans know what they want to use America for, Frenchmen and Germans know they want to use America for their blame game.

The only people who do not know what they want to use America for are Americans.

And that is where Bush Administration policy comes from.

How People Want to Use the American-Iraqi War

Nobody has the vaguest idea what we are doing in Iraq but everybody hopes that the Iraqi situation will get them what they want. Liberals want the old hippy Peace Movement back.

Conservatives want lots of flags and lots of uniforms and a really gigantic defense budget. When the liberal congressman Charles Rangel proposed that the military draft be reinstituted, every conservative commentator I heard from said Rangel's reasons were wrong but getting the draft back was a wonderful idea.

Conservatives blindly backed the Vietnam War because it put millions of Americans in uniform and jacked up the Pentagon budget. They really didn't care if it was about anything. It looked Patriotic.

Bush the Nowhere Man

So we know where liberals and conservatives are coming from on Iraq. Where is Bush coming from?

Nowhere.

And I mean that literally.

Bush has no goals and no aims. His policy is entirely a result of what he does not want to do and whom he does not want to offend.

You can easily explain where every country on earth stands on an Iraq war. You could have predicted that liberals would be promoting American self-hatred and conservatives would be out there in a pack baying for more uniforms.

Bush is reacting to all that.

If you took President Johnson's Vietnam War seriously, you can probably take Bush's War on Drugs and the War on Terror seriously.

After all, Johnson's two Wars came from exactly the same place that Bush's Wars come from.

Nowhere.

Johnson fought the Vietnam War because he couldn't just give Vietnam to the Communists without a fight. But a liberal cannot fight an all out war against a Peace Loving People's Republic like North Vietnam. All out war is only for rightist states like Hitler's.

Johnson's Vietnam policy was that he couldn't back down and he couldn't fight. So he just let the war escalate until America was bled dry.

The difference is that we can whip Iraq. So, like his father, Bush will win his war and lose out later. He wants to give America to Mexicans, not Arabs.

Bush's wars on drugs and terror come from the same Nowhere.

Bush can't legalize drugs if he wants conservative votes and he can't crack down on drugs because liberal minority "leaders" and the ACLU would attack him if he did. He can't fight drugs and he can't back down. That's where the present War on Drugs comes from.

Nobody in Washington wants to deal with illegal aliens or the "diversity" that makes terrorism inevitable in the United States. So Bush makes the conservatives cheer by putting Americans in uniforms and waving flags and building up the military. All those uniforms get conservative minds off the fact that we are not protecting our own borders, which is the whole point of having people in uniform.

Bush won't fight and he can't back down. That's where the War on Terror comes from.

Bush Is What America Asked For

Democracy is a system of government where people get what they deserve. More than that, democracy actually is a system of government where people get what they ask for.

Almost half a century in politics has shown me that Bush is exactly what Americans have asked for. Even Rush Limbaugh says that there will always be liberals and conservatives and that's the way it should be.

So what do liberals and conservatives stand for?

Liberalism is a Guilt Religion, a religion of self-hatred. Liberals say that the white race is the cancer of history and America is the cause of all human problems. Right now, the liberal line is that Iraq wouldn't have wanted deadly weapons if America hadn't forced those weapons on Iraq years ago.

As usual, conservatives are concerned only about what liberals think of them. Conservatives insist that they are neither "racists" nor "nationalists."

Conservatives don't openly hate whites or the American people like liberals do. They want liberals to know that they are completely indifferent to both the white race and the American people. Conservatives are for capitalism and uniforms. Conservatives have consistently been the main

supporters of open borders, and conservatives insist that their idea of Patriotism has nothing to do with the American people.

February 22, 2003 - The Three Word Solution to the North Korean Problem

February 22, 2003 - Another Word That Causes Respectable Conservatives to Grovel and Drool

February 22, 2003 - What Happens If You're not an "Isolationist"

February 22, 2003 - George Bush wants To Join OPEC

This week's Fun Quote

"I would not live within a hundred miles of a damned Yankee." -- Daniel Boone

The Three Word Solution to the North Korean Problem

In the 1960s there was a deep discussion going on at the University of Virginia about Urban Guerrillas. I just sat there, thinking it was all pretty silly.

Finally someone put it to me: "What do we do if Urban Guerrillas take over a major city?" I replied, "Turn off the water."

That had never occurred to anybody.

Everybody is having Deep Thoughts about North Korea right now. I sit there reflecting on what silly asses we have as commentators.

If anyone were to ask me what we should do about the Peace Loving Democratic People's Republic of North Korea, my answer would be one word shorter than what

I said about Urban Guerrillas: "Let 'em sink."

Like everything else leftist, Communism is silly. No Communist state has ever survived without constant help from non-Communist countries. Right after Lenin took over Russia Herbert Hoover led a major project that kept the Soviets from starving to death

North Korea wants the food and money and other means of survival that we have always given every Communist state throughout history.

We'll find a way to give it to them.

As for the safety of the United States, I have a suggestion: Let us pull American troops out of Korea and put HALF of them on the Mexican border. America would be much safer if we had half as many troops protecting our own Mexican border as we have protecting South Korea's border.

We could have saved hundreds of millions of lives throughout history if we had just let the Reds collapse with their own silliness.

Communism is still silly and the answer to it is still the same.

Another Word That Causes Respectable Conservatives to Grovel and Drool

Harvard professor Noel Ignatiev is one of the few honest men on the left. He says, "The goal of abolishing the white race is on its face so desirable that some may find it hard to believe that it could incur any opposition other than from committed white supremacists."

Respectable conservatives live to prove that they are more fanatically "anti-racist" than liberals are. "Anti-racist" means that one supports today's world policy of demanding massive third-world immigration and integration for EVERY white country and ONLY for white countries.

"Anti-racist" is a code word for abolishing the white race, as Ignatiev points out. No one is allowed to talk about what that code word "anti-racist" means. The word "racist" is used to make conservatives grovel and drool.

Respectable conservatives are allowed to speak on the liberal-ruled media because they satisfy liberals. To satisfy liberals, one thing they must do is gibber and drool when the word "racist" is used.

Another word a respectable conservative has to scream at is "isolationist."

An "isolationist" is a person who believes that America's vital interests are within our own borders.

What Happens If You're not an "Isolationist"

Earlier Americans took what we call "isolationism" for granted. As Secretary of State John Quincy Adams put it, "We are the friend of liberty everywhere, but the guardians only of our own."

The same liberals who require conservatives to gibber and cry if they are called "isolationists" are now complaining that America has abandoned "isolationism."

Liberals are moaning that the Bush Administration is going to attack a country that has not attacked us. This complaint would be okay if I made it, but it is truly ridiculous coming from liberals.

If you are not an "isolationist" it means that you believe that America's vital interests are all over the world.

As President Bush would be the first to point out, only an "isolationist" would take America's borders seriously.

Earlier Americans objected to using force outside our own borders unless we were attacked. But if you condemn "isolationism" you have condemned the assumption that our borders are critical to our vital interests.

Where a country has "vital interests," that country has the right to use force. If you are not an "isolationist", you are saying that our vital interests are everywhere.

So if you are not an "isolationist" you are saying that America now has the right to use force all around our "interdependent" world.

Liberals say so.

Conservatives say so.

So we can attack anywhere we damned well please.

If you condemn “racism,” you are anti-white. Anti-racist is a code-word for anti-white. By the same token, if you condemn “isolationism,” you are saying that America has as much right to use its forces outside our borders as inside them.

No conservative will ever mention this, so WhitakerOnline will.

George Bush Wants to Join OPEC

Respectable conservatives live by liberal words like “racist” and “isolationist.”

There is a huge amount of competition between conservatives to get that label “respectable.” In order to be a respectable conservative, you have to prove that liberal approval means more to you than anything else on earth.

The one thing that is important to President Bush is to show that he is not in Iraq “fighting for oil.” That is what the liberals told him he had better not do, and their wish is a respectable conservative’s command.

Exactly how would you prove that America fought “for oil” in Iraq? Liberals are saying that Bush will fight in Iraq “to get cheap oil” for Americans. What does “cheap oil” mean?

“Cheap oil” means that Americans would get oil for a price lower than that set by OPEC. George Bush would rather die than get cheap oil for Americans.

So the price for Iraqi oil under Bush will be whatever price OPEC sets.

See WOL World View for February 8, 2003 – “America Will Join OPEC against Americans”

A respectable conservative will back OPEC, abolish the white race and bus his children into the ghettos to keep liberals from calling him names. No price is too high for a conservative to avoid a liberal label.

American politics is hungry for a party devoted to selfish American interests, rejecting diversity, punishing criminals cheaply, paying off minorities, white “racism” and everything else respectable conservatives and liberals oppose.

March 1, 2003 - Playing in the Little League**March 1, 2003 - How Much of Your Investment Money Would You Invest in the United Nations****March 1, 2003 - A Man with a Memory Looks at “Territorial Integrity”****March 1, 2003 - The New Colonialism Fights for the Old Colonial Borders**

This week's Fun Quote:

This is a direct quote from a Fox interview. BOTH PEOPLE WERE PERFECTLY SERIOUS.

Defense Lawyer: "He is a very good man."

Interviewer: "How can you call him a good man? He's been convicted of 86 rapes."

Defense Lawyer: "Nobody's perfect."

Playing in the Little League

The United Nations is different from the old League of Nations.

There were very few countries when the League of Nations existed, and almost all of them had deep roots.

So the League was almost entirely limited to professional major league diplomats.

Most of the so-called "nations" in the United Nations are leftover colonial subdivisions like Iraq and Zambia.

The United Nations is an affirmative action version of the League of Nations. Libya is now head of the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations and Iraq has taken over the committee handling weapons of mass destruction. Nobody questions any of this because membership on such committees has nothing to do with qualifications. It is entirely a matter of affirmative action, i.e., quotas and rotation.

The Secretary General of the United Nations holds that job because he is an African. It was their turn.

The so-called "nations" in the United Nations are places where no one lives unless he has to. Anybody with any talent in Africa has long since immigrated to Europe or America. But the United Nations delegates from a country have to be from there and return home regularly.

So they have to be picked from what's left after all the talent has moved out.

You are supposed to consider this affirmative action version of the old League of Nations to be some kind of authority.

Especially moral authority. Like Libya.

I think the United States government, which is run by respectable conservatives, is silly enough. They are going to get us into the business of suppressing Arabs for the sake of Israel.

The neoconservatives who run the United States Government are bad Americans, but most of them objected to going to the United Nations in the first place. They are a hell of a lot less idiotic than those who leave American troops sitting in the desert while they play footsy with the United Nations.

How Much of Your Investment Money Would You Invest in the United Nations?

The price of labor is ten times as high on the American side of the Rio Grande as it is a hundred yards away on the Mexican side. Why?

The reason labor is so cheap in Mexico is because no one wants to live in Mexico and no one wants to invest in Mexico. The reason no one wants to live in Mexico is because it is inhabited by Mexicans. The reason no one wants to invest in Mexico is because the country is run by Mexicans.

In other words, the same people who talk about how much they want the Mexican culture in America are the very people who are not about to put real money in Mexico. But anybody would rather put his money into Mexico than he would into Mozambique or Haiti.

“Put your money where your mouth is.” Michael Douglas talks tearfully about how great the United Nations is, so we should take all of his money and let the All-Wise United Nations invest it for him.

If anybody tried to make Douglas put all his investments into the UN every Hollywood leftist would go ballistic.

Barbara Streisand loves to talk about her love of the poor folks, but she will kill before she loses a dime in royalties. Streisand and Douglas are happy to put American lives in the hands of the United Nations, but you had better not try to put any money they really need to live on into the United Nations.

American liberals and conservatives are willing to put American soldiers' lives into the hands of the United Nations, but not their own money.

A Man with a Memory Looks at “Territorial Integrity”

No cliché is too silly for Americans to get their soldiers killed for. General Wesley Clark announced that he would cheerfully kill his men to keep any country in Europe from being what he calls “ethnically pure.”

Clark is a pro-busing Democrat. He would like to call in his troops to force third world immigration into any European country.

See June 12, 1999 - BUSING BY BOMBER.

But being willing to kill for anti-racism is not a purely liberal trait. In fact, respectable conservatives want to be known for that. The reason Serbia invaded its former Yugoslavian neighbors like Bosnia was because someone in the first Bush State Department gave them the go-ahead.

Serbia was trying to restore the "territorial integrity" of Yugoslavia after it broke up. A Bush (Senior) appointee told them that the United States had done the same thing under Lincoln, so we would not object.

I am probably the only human being alive who remembers what Saddam said right after he had taken over Kuwait. He was asked in an interview seen by most Americans whether he would withdraw from Kuwait after Bush's warning that the United States would attack if he didn't.

Sadam didn't even mention Kuwait. He said that he would fight any attempt to break up the "territorial integrity" of Iraq, just as Lincoln had. Sadam referred to "the seventeen provinces of Iraq," Kuwait being the seventeenth.

You see, a Bush rep had also told Saddam that America wouldn't intervene if he invaded Kuwait.

Lincoln again.

After his visit to the White House, the Chinese president pointed out that Formosa was recognized as the southern part of China by the United States. He said we should either stop objecting to a Chinese invasion of the place or take down all those Lincoln monuments, pictures, and quotations.

The New Colonialism Fights for the Old Colonial Borders

The Kurds want their freedom. The Shiites want their freedom. But the United States is willing to kill off an unlimited number of its soldiers to maintain Iraq's "territorial integrity."

No one is more fanatical about this than conservatives.

They want to show they're for Lincoln and against racism.

Once again, I am the only living American who has a memory. I remember that what we call "Iraq" was created by the British colonial administration as a very random administrative collection of people and territories.

Looking at Iraq's history since Britain owned it, a rational person would conclude that this particular administrative unit was not a successful lineup after independence.

But "territorial integrity" is a blind monster and no human consideration enters into it.

So the Wesley Clark liberals and the Lincolnite conservatives are agreed that no sacrifice is too great to destroy real group identity and force people to live together.

And in an age where one hostile resident could have a weapon of mass destruction, what could be better than jamming mutually hostile people together by force?

Please see September 11, 2001 - LEFTISTS SHOW US HOW NOT TO DEAL WITH TOMORROW'S TERRORISM

(originally published April 1, 2000).

March 8, 2003 -- A Man With A Memory Looks at American Foreign Policy

March 8, 2003 -- Eisenhower was Owned by the Military-Industrial Complex Just Like the Bushes Are

March 8, 2003 -- The Treason Factor

March 8, 2003 -- Conservative Wins, Liberal Victories

-- Fun Quote: Cameroon Rules!

The Security Council is the enforcement arm of the United Nations. We all watched while the United States, the United Kingdom, Russia, China and France sat around looking to the ultimate authority on the Security Council, the Chair of the Security Council, Cameroon.

Why do we need more than one Cameroon to decide international policy? If the United Nations is a Moral Authority, why is not Cameroon our Moral Authority of the Week? Why listen to two hundred Cameroons when you have one sitting right there?

No one ever asks why the two hundred Cameroons called the United Nations has Moral Authority, so why not just turn the whole shebang over to one Cameroon?

Cameroon rules! Moral Authority forever!

A Man With a Memory Look at American Foreign Policy

Respectable conservatives are ecstatic. We've got the Cold War back.

Just like the Communists in the old Cold War, America's terrorist enemies in our new Cold War are inexcusably evil. And liberals are lining up to apologize for them just like they did for the Communists.

Just like in the 1950s, the United States is going to take on all the expense and casualties while Europe sits around and plays hard-to-get. We will be tearfully grateful to those Europeans who allow us to defend them and we will be sweet to the Europeans who bite our hand for feeding them.

All this happened in the 1950s.

I was in Europe in 1959 when President Eisenhower came to Europe. We were paying for most of Europe's defense against the Soviet Union back then and most of the troops in Europe were American troops. That was what we had signed up for right after World War II when Europeans were starving in the streets and Germany was under occupation.

By 1949, the Soviet Union had occupied Eastern Europe and only American forces could protect Western Europe. But, by 1959, the whole situation had changed.

In 1959, Western Europe had a lot more people than the United States did and we had responsibilities around the world. By 1959, the Western European economy was many times larger than those in the East. That was the year Eisenhower came to Europe.

In 1959, Eisenhower declared that nothing was going to change. In 1959, Eisenhower went to Europe and guaranteed that the United States would provide the troops forever and the United States would provide the money forever. Europe could just sit there and bitch at us.

Thirty years later, Europe was still sitting there and bitching at us. It was the United States that had to force the Soviet Union to take down the Berlin Wall.

Does any of this sound familiar?

Eisenhower was Owned by the Military-Industrial Complex Just Like the Bushes Are

Everybody quotes President Eisenhower as warning against "the Military-Industrial Complex" in the United States.

Eisenhower's reason for going on record with this warning is as old as Shakespeare: "Methinks he doth protest too much."

When Eisenhower went to Europe in 1959, well over half of the Federal budget went entirely into military expenditures. Over half of those billions were devoted to American forces stationed in Europe and their support back home.

If Eisenhower had demanded that Europe pay for its own defense, it would have ruined the American military-industrial complex.

So, when Eisenhower told Europe that American blood and treasure would protect them forever, he also guaranteed the American military-industrial complex enormous power and money for generations to come.

Eisenhower then went down in history by carefully warning American to "Beware of the Military Industrial Complex." This is nice and quotable and American conservatives and liberals are nice and stupid, so nobody understood that Eisenhower was the best America's military-industrial complex ever had.

Does any of this sound familiar?

The Treason Factor

Eisenhower was a horrible man. Party-loyal Republicans are horrible little bastards. They have no interest in the American people. Moderate Republicans 1) want to keep their military-industrial complex happy and, 2) they want to keep liberals happy.

That is what moderate Republicans called "middle of the road," keeping liberals on the one hand happy and the generals and big businessmen happy on the other.

But if moderate Republicans were bad, liberals were worse. Republicans just wanted to sell out America. Liberals wanted to destroy us. They openly hated whites. They openly hated America.

Today, liberals are for "peace," but they are only for "peace" with those who hate America. When defending Saddam, every liberal spokesman makes it look like Saddam is right on every point and America is evil. Liberals really love that last part.

During the entire Cold War, liberals insisted they were not actually friendly to the Communists. But they always made every argument that any Communist would have made.

Liberals said they were anti-Communist, but they were being Shrewd about it.

See January 26, 2002 - "WHEN DUMMIES TRY TO BE 'SHREWD'."

After decades of this, every Polish hard hat in Chicago could listen to a liberal on television and he would say, "This guy hates America and loves the Reds." But William F. Buckley and every other respectable conservative would insist that his beloved liberal opponents were wonderful people and great Americans, and mean it.

If liberals could not tell that respectable conservatives really meant that liberals were loyal Americans, those conservatives would no longer have been "respectable." To be respectable, you don't just have to be mindless, you have to be TRULY mindless, SINCERELY mindless.

Does any of this sound familiar?

So during the Cold War, we had a choice between following truly mindless people or supporting outright traitors.

Does this choice sound familiar?

Conservative Wins, Liberal Victories

During the Cold War, conservatives did everything to please liberals. That is why the end of the Cold War had to wait for Ronald Reagan.

Liberals have no interest in American victory over anything but right-wingers like Hitler.

Liberals want a continuing crisis so the government can have the power to pursue their real goals. World War II was fought against Hitler and Mussolini and to save Stalin, so it was the liberals' dream war.

Conservatives cheer for anything that expands the military so they loved WWII as much as liberals did.

After World War II, liberals did not want to fight Communism but they did want to keep the government big and intrusive. Conservatives were willing to sell anything out for a big military.

The result was that conservatives got their big military and lots of anti-Communist talk. That army was used to enforce integration on the South. After all, said conservatives, we needed to suppress segregation to get the third world on America's side in the Cold War.

Eisenhower created the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. He told conservatives that to keep liberals on our side for a big military we had to give them lots and lots of things.

Today, the policy of getting a big military by giving liberals lots and lots of goodies is called "compassionate conservatism."

So Bush openly gets us back into the "nation building" his father started in Somalia. He says that will get us support for a war in the Middle East.

Please see September 21, 2002 - We Don't Owe the Iraqis or the Israelis a Damned Thing.

Whatever Bush says, conservatives say "DUHHH!," which is respectable conservative language for "Yes, Master!"

So when Bush says ♦territorial integrity," conservatives say "DUHH!"

Every time Bush repeats another liberal cliché, conservatives sit there with their mouths open.

Please see March 1, 2003 - A Man with a Memory Looks at "Territorial Integrity" and - "The New Colonialism Fights for the Old Colonial Borders".

So the bottom line in the Cold War was that conservatives did the fighting and liberals got the spoils.

And if that doesn't sound familiar yet, you haven't been keeping score.

March 15 2003 Real Loyalty Versus American "Patriotism"

March 15 2003 American "Patriots" Are Hypocrites

March 15 2003 If They Turn on Me, They'll Turn on You

March 15 2003 What Do You Expect of a Moderate?

March 15 2003 The McCain File

-- Fun Quote

There is a whispering campaign going on behind my back.

They're saying I'm paranoid.

Real Loyalty Versus American "Patriotism"

O'Reilly is upset that a Moslem FBI agent refused to wear a wire when meeting with Arabs suspected of terrorism. "A Moslem," said the FBI agent, "does not record other Moslems."

So what's the problem?

When O'Reilly asked John McCain whether Mexican-Americans should vote on immigration policy in the interests of other Americans, McCain said flatly that Hispanic Americans owed their loyalty to "Hispanic culture." O'Reilly did not say a word.

Please see June 15, 2002 - PATRIOT MCCAIN SAYS STOP DEMANDING LOYALTY FROM MINORITY GROUPS!

So why should anybody be upset at the Moslem who is following McCain's rules?

No one faults a Jew for demanding that Israeli spy Jonathan Pollard be released. Alan Dershowitz demands Pollard's release and is constantly warning that America is out to get the Jews. Geraldo Riviera states that he would give his life for Israel. Evangelical Christian leaders keep telling us that America is nice, but God is only interested in Israel.

American "Patriots" are Hypocrites

You know the rules:

American "patriotism" is a fake. Loyalty to minorities is real.

I am sick of all the fake caterwauling about America's men and women dying in combat.

Spare me the fertilizer! Nobody cares about America's borders and none of these "patriots" will challenge McCain. They don't care about a bunch of white gentiles in uniform.

If anybody cared about real Americans, somebody would say something about McCain saying Hispanic-Americans should be loyal to Mexico. Nobody said a single word.

Nobody said a word because we all know McCain was stating the real rules as they really exist.

So please spare me the blubbing.

That Moslem agent who refused to tape Moslem terrorists is a real American patriot as America demands.

If this isn't true, don't contradict me, contradict McCain.

If They'll Turn on Me, They'll Turn on You

Turkey suddenly decided not to let American troops use its territory to attack Iraq.

Turkey is not loyal to the United States because the United States was not loyal to them. Before Desert Storm in 1991, Turkey threw itself behind the United States against Iraq. President Bush let them take on enormous cost and gave them nothing at all in return.

The same President Bush Senior urged the Kurds to rise up against Saddam with a promise of support. They rose and Bush let Saddam kill them by the thousands.

Ross Perot gave numerous examples of the Bush White House calling on him for help and then dropping him the second they got what they wanted. He said, "They rode me hard and put me up wet."

In 1988, Ronald Reagan got Bush elected president. Conservatives, whose first loyalty is always to stupidity, threw themselves into Bush's campaign.

The minute Bush took over the presidency he cleared out every single Reagan appointee. Early in 1989, one operative bragged openly that he had been the first to get rid of all the Reagan people in his area.

Does anybody notice a pattern?

Well, not one person has ever mentioned a pattern in President Bush, Senior's behavior. No one mentions McCain's definition of loyalty.

Anybody notice a pattern here?

What do You Expect of a Moderate?

Well, gee, who would have guessed that the first President Bush, a professional moderate, would sell everybody out the second he had used them?

Republican moderation has always been an active, open lack of principle. Moderates say they are being Shrewd because you get votes by going halfway, no matter what they believe. Moderates use the stupid conservatives to give something real to liberals so liberals will love them.

Who could have guessed that a person who openly declares a political principle like that, might just sell YOU out?

Former president James Earl Carter from Georgia denounces the United States and our enemies are his friends. He loves Castro. He constantly declares that America is evil.

The way Carter got started in national politics was by denouncing Southerners and segregation. Who could have guessed that the guy who started by selling out his own people would be selling out America when it makes him look good?

Bush Senior was a professional moderate Republican. Jimmy Carter was a professional moderate Democrat.

Does anybody notice a pattern here?

Moderates shout from the rooftops that their entire reason for being is to sell people out. When they sell us out, we all shout "DUHHH!" again.

I am probably the only person who notices a pattern here. If anybody else does, they never mention it.

The McCain File

Only McCain and the North Vietnamese know what he told the interrogators. McCain insists that he showed not the slightest heroism. He insists that he gave them information to survive. He names others who did not and who died for it. He says he did not want to die so he cooperated.

According to the public record and his own words, McCain cooperated with the enemy from the very first.

Vietnam has the McCain file. Senator John McCain is the best friend that North Vietnam has in the United States Senate. Every group looking for American POWs in Vietnam hates him.

Some day that file may surface. McCain is ready for that. He has made it very, very clear that he gave the Viet Cong what he wanted. It is other people who keep insisting that he heroically resisted. McCain insists that he did no such thing.

I believe him.

March 22, 2003 "America Wins Wars But Loses the Peace"

March 22, 2003 You are Watching America Win the War and Lose the Peace Again

March 22, 2003 To Get Americans into a War and to Fight a War, You Have to be Rational
March 22, 2003 Compare the Justifications for Getting into War and the Justification of After-War Policy
March 22, 2003 Iraq is a Ridiculous Geographic Combination
March 22, 2003 American Self-Interest Would Avoid a Battle of Baghdad
March 22, 2003 Has Anybody Noticed Noticed That We are Joining OPEC?

Fun Quote --

A general being interviewed was asked what he learned in the Gulf War. He said he found that tanks stopped working because they got sand in them.

I see his point. How could the Pentagon have guessed that the Arabian desert has sand in it?

"America Wins the Wars but Loses the Peace"

It is an axiom of American history that America wins the fighting and loses the peace.

For example, America won World War I for the Allies in a matter of months after they had been bogged down in trench warfare for four years. It was a famous victory.

But World War I led directly to World War II.

America was instrumental in destroying Nazi Germany and militaristic Japan. It was supposed to victory over tyranny. But over the next decade a quarter of the entire human race was turned over to Communism in Europe and Asia.

You are Watching America Win the War and Lose the Peace Again

The fact that America wins wars and loses the peace is supposed to be great mystery.

This is WhitakerOnline, and what we do here is explain the obvious. We kill mysteries.

For instance respectable conservatives say that leftism is brilliant and idealistic but flawed. They say the failures of liberalism and socialism and Communism are mysterious and complex.

Meanwhile, back here in the real world WhitakerOnline lives in, leftism is just plain silly.

By the same token there is nothing complicated about why we win wars and lose in the post-War period.

You are watching America win a war and lose a peace right now. Once again, everybody will say that there is something terribly complicated about what is wrong with our post-war strategy.

Again, the real problem is not complicated. When we talk about the war we have clear goals and are practical. The instant we start talking about post-war policy we get silly.

We win wars because our planning for war makes sense. We lose the post-War because our planning for the post-War period is always ridiculous.

To Persuade Americans to Go to War, You Have to be Rational

It is hard to get America into a war. We got into World War I after Germany said its subs would sink any ship on the Atlantic, including ours. We got into World War II after Japan attacked us and Hitler declared war on us.

We know what winning a war is. It is a huge job and America is great at huge jobs. Those forces going into Iraq are highly professional.

But the instant you get into talking about “post-War Iraq”, every word is dripping with imbecility. People start babbling about what government we should impose on Iraq and how much money we owe the Iraqi people. Everybody agrees that Iraq owes us nothing at all.

Compare the Justifications for Getting into War to the Justification of After-War Strategy

The minute any country starts talking about an ideal government for another country, it is ridiculous. The instant anybody starts talking about how much they owe other countries, they get silly.

So let us look at the justifications we use to get into this war: We have to argue that getting into this war is in our national interest.

It may be true that this war is in our national interest or it may not be true that this war is in our national interest, but the discussion on that point makes sense. We are talking about our own national interests, which is something we know about.

When we are talking about self-defense or our national interest, the whole world can agree that that is a justification for going to war. We may make a right decision or we might make a wrong decision, but the decision itself is not ridiculous.

The instant anybody starts talking about a post-War Iraq all self-interest is forgotten. We begin to debate what is good for the Iraqis. We begin to assess how much of our money we owe Iraqis. We join OPEC, because if we got Iraqi oil at a price below that set by OPEC we would be selfish and imperialistic.

We go into every war with a debate on whether we have a national self-interest in doing so. That is why we win wars.

We go into all post-War planning worrying about the well-being of the people we defeated and those we fought with. Our discussion of post-War Iraq, like our earlier discussions of post World War Europe, does not include a single word about our own self-interest. It is our proudest boast that we fight wars and get absolutely nothing out of it.

It has never occurred to anybody that if we looked to our own national interest in the post-War period, we might actually win a peace for a change.

Iraq is a Ridiculous Geographic Combination

All the commentators agree that America “ must maintain the territorial integrity of Iraq.

Why?

Well, first, Lincoln maintained the territorial integrity of the United States. What Lincoln felt was good for Americans is also good for Iraqis.

Actually Iraq is a ridiculous combination of hostile peoples. Iraq was set up by the British Empire. Why should the “territorial integrity” of a British colony be important for Iraqis?

But the moment we start talking about “what is good for Iraqis” we start imposing Abraham Lincoln on a former colony.

One reason you get a dictator like Saddam in a place like Iraq is because it takes a despot to hold that hostile, ridiculous combination together.

What we should do is look to our own interests. It would be better to split Iraq up into smaller, more homogeneous and stable units. Iraq cannot be a democracy and keep its present geography.

We don’t know what is good for Iraq, but we do know that a united Iraq has been bad for us. If each people makes an agreement on the basis of what they know is best for themselves, we might get a rational conclusion out of this.

That’s not going to happen. We’ve learned nothing. We are going to send Abe Lincoln ghost to Iraq.

We are also going to join OPEC against ourselves. We should use Iraq to break OPEC. That would be a terrific service to our own people. The despots who rule in the Islamic world would not be able to control the world with their oil.

That’s not going to happen. All the commentators are glorying in the fact that this war will do nothing for us.

There is nothing complicated about why America wins wars and loses the peace. We are winning a war and losing a peace right now.

Again.

American Self-Interest Would Avoid a Battle of Baghdad

As I keep pointing out, if urban guerrillas hole up in Baghdad, what you should do is but off the water and wait. Why on earth would we slaughter our troops to fight street to street in Baghdad?

The only reason we would fight street to street in Baghdad is for the Iraqis. We will say that they need their capital city soon or we will say “We must finish the job” or some other ridiculous motto.

And, of course, there is always the battle-cry of slavery, “Ah, the CHILDREN!!!” If the guerrillas hold some Iraqi women and children no number of American lives would be too many to save them.

If we stick with self-interest, an interest in the lives of our own troops, as the Constitution tells us to, there will be no Battle of Baghdad.

Has Anybody Noticed that We are joining OPEC?

Bush would rather die than be condemned by liberals, and liberals have said this war is for cheap oil.

Has anybody considered what it means if this war does NOT obtain cheap oil?

We will have to be sure that Iraqi oil goes out at the "normal" price. What is the "normal" price?

The "Normal" price is the price set by the OPEC cartel. In fact, all OPEC consists of is a group of countries who agree not to sell oil below the price OPEC sets.

When we agree to sell Iraqi oil at the OPEC price, we join OPEC.

March 29, 2003 -- Human Movement is a Total Mystery to the Media

March 29, 2003 -- If Anyone Mentioned Humans, What Would Happen to the Great Debate?

March 29, 2003 -- Media Ideology is a Serious Professional Problem for the Media

March 29, 2003 -- A Cry of Frustration

Fun Quote:

Watching the war coverage you hear "War is bad" over and over and over and over.

I'm happy they explain that to us, but why is this endlessly repeated wisdom limited to war?

Every day a hundred Americans are killed on our highways and hundreds more are badly hurt. But did you know that automobile accidents are bad? If Americans think war is nice, then Americans also think that a serious automobile accident is a fun thing.

We need for our wise media commentators to constantly explain to us that being killed or seriously injured in an automobile accident is an unpleasant experience.

You know, like war is.

Human Movement is a Total Mystery to the Media

The way a person becomes a "respectable conservative" is by obeying liberal rules. One of the most rigid liberal rules is that nobody talks about the human flow. You will never hear any respectable conservative or any liberal mention the fact that every Communist state had to kill people who tried to escape, and ONLY Communist countries killed regular citizens who tried to escape.

No fascist regime ever had to shoot ordinary people for trying to get out of the country in peacetime. That is a universal novelty of the Peace-Loving People's Democratic Republics.

Recently the media was going “DUHH!” again. They were sitting in Jordan waiting for a huge number of Iraqi refugees to leave Iraq.

Ordinary people don't run AWAY from Americans. During the Vietnam War liberals kept talking about how the Vietnamese people loved the Communists, but nobody ever mentioned a flow of refugees TO Communist areas.

If a single white person was ever photographed trying to sneak into a predominantly brown country it would be history's most famous photograph. Political Correctness tells us how happy independent brown countries are. But out in the real world, as always, nobody believes a word of what they all have to say.

There were huge streams of refugees from Iraq during the last Iraq War. But if American troops had been coming in back then, there would not have been refugees.

Real people NEVER choose brown lands or Communist countries. Real people don't run away from Americans. If you mention that rule, if you even KNOW that rule, you cannot be a respectable conservative.

If Anyone Mentioned Humans, What Would Happen to the Great Debate ?

Respectable conservatives make their livings by conducting a respectful debate with the left.

What would happen to the respectable conservatives' livelihoods if they talked about the human movement in the above article?

I have never met a Communist who could deal with the fact that every Communist country had to kill ordinary citizens who tried to escape. That's why respectable conservatives never mention this point. You can't take leftists seriously if you realize they ALWAYS have to stop escapes. And you can't be respectable if you make leftists look as ridiculous as they are.

No rightist country has ever had to build a wall around itself. Blacks were free to move out of apartheid South Africa.

It is bad enough that apartheid South Africa never kept blacks in. What is even worse is that blacks kept pouring INTO South Africa during the apartheid days. No conservative could mention that and keep the debate with a liberal serious.

But to enforce leftist racial policy in America you have to chase whites down and bus them. The minute busing ends, the schools resegregate. The minute affirmative action is not enforced minorities disappear from major white campuses.

That is now the main liberal argument FOR affirmative action. They have to brag about the fact that real people don't want their policies.

Liberals talk about how bad white people are and how bad America is. But no conservative will ever mention the fact that refugees always move towards Americans and minorities always want to live in those evil, awful white countries.

To repeat, out here in the real world Africans wanted desperately to be admitted INTO South Africa under apartheid.

Leftists always said that the Vietnam War was awful because of all those poor refugees. No liberal ever mentioned that those refugees were always moving away from the Communists.

So no conservative mentions that.

Liberals love to talk about how evil whites are, but all mass movement is from brown lands to white lands. Wonderful as they are, those wonderful brown and black people don't make countries people want to live in. No conservative will ever make any liberal explain this.

Respectable conservatives make their living by being dumb and cowardly and never threatening liberals. Where else can dumb and cowardly people get paid for being dumb and cowardly?

The liberals who run our media learned all their politics from liberal professors in college. The only alternate argument they have ever heard has been from respectable conservatives.

So we have reporters assigned to cover all those Iraqi refugees coming across the borders of Jordan and Iraq and Turkey to escape the Americans.

Those reporters are plaintively asking, where are all the refugees?

And there is nobody to explain the world to them.

Media Ideology is a Serious Professional Problem for the Media

It is not just that liberals and respectable conservatives have predictable stands on the news. What is worse is that are so locked into the fashionable ideology that they cannot UNDERSTAND the news they report. They were clueless about the breakup of the Soviet Union, which was so obvious to me. They cannot understand why an artificial country like Iraq or Yugoslavia can only be kept unified by a tyrant like Saddam or Tito.

Please see March 1, 2003, "The New Colonialism Fights for the Old Colonial Borders."

Since the media cannot take any notice of the direction of refugee flow, they are sitting there in Syria and Turkey and Jordan waiting for the flow of refugees from the Americans. After all, they saw refugees running from Saddam during the Gulf War.

These are not minor oversights. Liberals and respectable conservatives, no matter what big-time professionals they think they are, have to be clueless about the real world or they will be fired.

A Cry of Frustration

WhitakerOnline talks about the power of the Israeli Lobby, but we also offer an alternative. Israel and Europe and foreign aid recipients are able to use America because our own citizens simply will not demand that we pursue THEIR interests.

I keep saying that we need to go to a consistent policy of "We the People". We need to stop dedicating ourselves to "Iraqi Freedom" or providing Europe with military welfare or chasing after "Middle East Peace".

I cannot get the slightest bit of attention to this concept. Everybody tells me how good France is or how bad France is. I get endless e-mailings about how Israel is what God is all about and from others who denounce the Israeli Lobby.

None of this addresses the real problem American policy has had for the last sixty years. When you talk about Israel or France or the poor little Iraqis, you are still in the same old groove: You are asking "What about THEM?"

We should be obsessed with our own interests. We should be every bit as obsessed with cheap oil for ourselves as leftists say we are and conservatives say we're not.

We are in a war so somebody has to worry about OUR soldiers. Please see "American Self-Interest Would Avoid a Battle of Baghdad."

Everybody wants to debate whether we should have gotten into this war or not. We're there. What matters now is our interests, our soldiers' lives.

Could somebody please send me just one note about American self-interest so I can feel like somebody is interested in something besides the moral condition of France or what we should have done a year ago?

April 5, 2003 Me and Baghdad Pete
April 5, 2003 OPEC Delenda Est
April 5, 2003 Shoot Them or Shut Up

Fun Quote:

In this section last week I said how grateful I was that every single commentator and reporter tells us that "War is bad." That should take care of all those Americans who think war is a fun thing.

Now they are telling us something else that we need to hear.

Whenever anyone expresses gratitude for our low casualties, the media tell us that statement means that we are happy that Americans are dying.

A lot of us are deeply grateful that the American death rate in Iraq has been so low. Reporters say that we should realize that this does not mean that the death of even one soldier is good.

So they have to remind us, over and over and over, that the death of any American soldier is bad.

I am so glad they explain that to me. But I also need for them to keep telling me that war is bad.

Me and Baghdad Pete

I went ballistic when the Twin Towers were attacked on September 11, 2001. That upset a lot of people. They said I had repeatedly talked about the power of the Israeli Lobby, so I shouldn't go chauvinistic when America got attacked.

Nobody raises more hell about the Israeli Lobby and America's criminal subservience to it than I do. But I do not think in terms of abstract principles, I think in terms of loyalties. For all the talk about how secessionist Southerners are "traitors" to the "principles of America", you could depend on us to fight a real foreign invader after all those Lincoln conservatives were collaborating their guts out.

I do not hate America. Liberals hate America.

Peter Arnett is a media liberal who has been repeatedly accused of being anti-American.

No, no, no said all the media liberals. No, no no, said all the media conservatives

Everybody at Fox and all the other networks kept telling us that Peter Arnett was a loyal New Zealand-American and an opponent of the Saddam dictatorship. Now he has gone on Iraqi television and thrown himself openly on the side of the Saddam regime.

Gee, what a shock! Like any other liberal, Arnett doesn't give a damn about Iraq or anybody else. He hates Americans and he hates white people. Almost everybody in the media hates America and white people.

But you've heard the old line: Arnett may have acted like he hated America, but us sophisticated people know that things are not as they appear.

Arnett is an example of the fact that most things ARE as they appear. That's why God gave us eyes to see.

OPEC Delenda Est

In the Year of our Lord 1941, the United States was OPEC. We were the world's main producer of oil.

In 1941 Franklin Roosevelt wanted desperately to get America into World War II so he cut off all American oil shipments to Japan.

It worked and the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor.

Ten years from now everybody is going to be whining, "Why didn't we take out OPEC when we had the chance in Iraq?" Ten years from now, absolutely everybody will be saying that they wanted to take out OPEC but others didn't want to.

Look around you. Do you see anybody besides Whitaker who has even mentioned the possibility of using Iraq to end OPEC?

The OPEC cartel is a hostile act against America. Nobody denied that before the Iraq War. Nobody will deny that after the Iraq War. But right now we have to get that stupid idealistic look on our faces and repeat, "That oil belongs only to the Iraqi people."

In ten years everybody will be asking, "So why didn't you break OPEC when you had the chance? Why didn't you make a contract to get Iraqi oil at a decent price for the long term and only for the United States?"

Anybody ten years from now who admits he had the attitude Americans have right now will look like the cliché-mongering fool he is.

So everybody will say they were for it.

Only Whitaker mentions it, as usual. Only Whitaker will remember later how stupid everybody is right now.

Shoot Them or Shut Up

The most famous quote from President Ronald Reagan is, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall!"

While Reagan's Berlin Wall speech was being finalized, Reagan's staff removed that line from the speech THREE TIMES! It was blunt and unsophisticated and everybody but Reagan agreed that an American President shouldn't say a thing like that.

On Capitol Hill I worked for John Ashbrook, a conservative Republican from Ohio. John Ashbrook was a pain in the hinder parts to moderate Republicans. He was such a pain to moderates that Republican Ohio legislatures redistricted him three times trying to get rid of him.

But John Ashbrook kept winning even as his district became more and more Democratic. The reason Ashbrook kept winning even in districts designed to defeat him was because, like Ronald Reagan and Harry Truman at their best, he spoke plain English.

Right after a hurricane in Florida, Ashbrook demanded that looters be shot on sight. The local liberal newspaper went ballistic. It said that shooting looters was evil and primitive and out of date. Then they took a poll of their readers, mostly liberals. Eighty-three percent of their own readers agreed with John Ashbrook.

Shooting looters is the routine thing people have always done. It is not out of date. It is the only way to retain civilization in an emergency.

Shooting soldiers who are caught out of uniform is routine.

Using human shields gets you shot the same way.

If the Iraqis are killing American soldiers by such tactics, we should shoot any Iraqi soldiers caught out of uniform or using human shields and we should let the world know we are doing it. Do it or shut up about how they are being bad boys.

Do it like a war and you won't make any enemies you don't already have. You might even get some respect for it.

Or do it like a game. But don't play a game and call it war.

April 12, 2003 : -- It's a WAR, Stupid!

April 12, 2003 : -- If I Were an Iraqi, I Would Fear a Saddamite Comeback

April 12, 2003 : -- In a Serious Situation there is no Room for Games

April 12, 2003 : -- The Terrible Myth of Moderation

April 12, 2003 : -- This Message is Desperately Important Right Now

April 12, 2003 : -- A Personal Postscript

Fun Quote:

The Bible is by far the best-selling book in human history. Every year the Bible is the world's best seller.

So if Jews are such great businessmen, why didn't they copyright it?

It's a WAR, Stupid!

International reporters reporting on the Saddam side stayed in the Palestine Hotel. Iraqis used the Palestine Hotel to shoot at Americans. Americans shot back at that hotel and reporters got hit. The international press squealed like pigs.

The international press was in the middle of a war in Baghdad but they expected to be safe.

They want American forces to watch out for them.

As usual, fashionable reactions make a decent person sick. They beat their chests and shout about how brave they are, but when they get hit, as any fool knows they will, they scream like babies.

This beating their chests and then whining is a standard part of fashionable opinion.

A few years back the Communist Workers Party went to North Carolina and demanded that the Klan come out and fight. The Klan came out and there was a gunfight. The Communists got shot to pieces.

As always the so-called Workers Party did not have a single worker in it. They were just Communists, city boys who couldn't shoot straight. So they cried and went to court. They got laughed out of court.

The History Channel showed a leftist documentary declaring what sweet and innocent kids the poor little Communist "Workers" were. Poor babies!

Actually the Communist "Workers" asked for trouble, said how brave they were, and then squealed like pigs when they got caught at it.

Just like the reporters in Baghdad.

That's sickening.

If I Were an Iraqi, I'd Fear a Saddamite Comeback

Iraqis are terrified that Saddam's minions will come back some day.

President Bush Senior urged them to rebel and then abandoned them. Iraqis remember how horrible it was for them then. If Bush Senior hadn't done that, Iraq may have fallen like a house of cards in 1991. If Bush Senior hadn't done that, Iraq might have fallen even quicker this time. Remember how easy it looked at the start?

When he backed out on the Shiites and the Kurds, Bush Senior was just being a good moderate. But many Americans and Europeans were against the war, so he compromised.

Bush Senior fought the war and then pulled out at the halfway point moderates always go for. That's what moderates do. If a few hundred thousand Iraqis ended up in torture chambers that is just the routine the price of moderation.

I am sure that George Bush Senior is still wondering what all the fuss was about.

After all, he ran the Central Intelligence Agency that way.

Nobody but Whitaker will denounce moderates like Bush Senior for what they really are. Nobody but Whitaker will remember how vicious moderates like Bush Senior are.

So moderates and liberals will keep running the government.

Right now everybody is out to get Saddam. But in a few years he or his successors will probably be back and we won't quite want to do anything about it.

When Saddam's minions take over again, they will REMEMBER whom to punish.

As I have pointed out many, many times, Americans don't have a memory. Many a person who has depended on our memory has lived to regret it.

And died for it.

In Serious Situations There is no Room for Games

This year Iraqis watched while we went to the United Nations and played that pathetic game with them. They watched while we courted Cameroon's UN vote while letting our diplomacy with Turkey lapse. They watched while our soldiers later ended up floating around outside Istanbul.

South Iraq hated Saddam, but they weren't about to rise up against Saddam when the son of the wimp Bush Senior, who had just spent months being a wimp himself, sent troops in.

This all happened because Colin Powell wanted to appease the liberals. To appease Powell Bush Junior went the UN route while opposition grew.

Colin Powell represents both blacks and liberals, so the Bush Administration had to humor him. Powell keeps demanding that Bush abandon conservative blacks and deal only with liberal black "leaders."

This was the moderate "balancing act" that made us fight in the first Iraqi War and ask the Shiites and Kurds to rebel and then abandon them. Bush Senior appeased the conservatives by fighting, then he appeased the liberals by pulling out, as practically the entire Democratic Party demanded.

I wonder why no blacks trust Bush!

Moderation in our domestic affairs is a disaster. Bush Senior went from 90% approval in 1991 to defeat in the election the very next year. But we survive moderation because we don't have a Saddam in power.

We all know that America will always play this "balancing act" game. That means Saddam's crowd, which does not play games like that, will probably be back. And, unlike conservatives who keep dribbling back into the "balancing act", Saddam's crowd has a memory.

The Terrible Myth of Moderation

How could anybody be as stupid as Bush Senior? How could anybody be as murderously stupid as to apply "moderation" to Iraqi politics?

Once a stupid person hears about "the middle of the road", he can never be cured of it. It is no accident that the retard Jerry Ford is still the champion of "the middle of the road". Jerry Ford tried the "middle of the road" in 1976 and lost. Reagan went to the right in 1980 and not only crushed the same Jimmy Carter who beat Ford, but for the first time in forty years Reagan won the Senate away from the Democrats.

Reagan got reelected and he got Bush Senior elected as his successor. Then Bush Senior went back to "the middle of the road" and lost, big-time, in 1992.

Then, in 1994, Newt Gingrich took the party to the hard right and won both Houses of Congress, including the House of Representatives for the first time in over forty years.

Almost every member of the real congress, the one that gets elected, is either left or right. So what kind of moron could say that victory lies "in the middle of the road"? Even Bush Junior learned not to call himself a moderate the way his father did.

But the last time I saw an interview with Jerry Ford, he was still saying the key to victory was in the middle of the road. It just sounds so nice and logical that once he hears it, a truly stupid person can never think beyond it.

CNN's official political expert Bill Schneider and every other liberal advises Republicans to go to the middle of the road.

Meanwhile, political commentators do not say that Democrats need to go to the right. They say Democrats lose because "They don't stick to their principles and offer a real alternative".

If you are an American, this middle of the road drivel just costs you a political disaster in the long term. But when you mouth absurdities in Iraqi politics, the result is a human nightmare for the people.

Nothing liberals advocate ever works. The moderate policy of compromising with insanity in American politics is just stupid. In Iraq it is murder, and worse than murder.

This Message is Terribly Important Right Now

Please, please read February 22, 2003 - The Three Word Solution to the North Korean Problem.

This article explains that we must make a CHOICE about North Korea.

Right now we are moderating with both Koreas. We don't challenge North Korea, but we are keeping troops in South Korea. South Koreans have elected two consecutive presidents who demand that our troops get out. So we are begging and bribing them to please let us protect them.

We will end up compromising. We will find a way to prop up the North Korean regime, just as we constantly saved every other Communist regime. We will end up bribing anti-Americans and compromising with the South Koreans and the Chinese and the Japanese.

If we gave Koreans and Japanese a date line for pulling our troops out, they would have a cow. We would get more cooperation than we ever wanted. But that would be a real decision. That would be a one-way decision that would offend liberals.

A real decision would offend the people who want to please liberals: the moderates, respectable conservatives, and neoconservatives.

If Bush even hinted at pulling troops out of Korea, the media would just mention the word "isolationism" and he would be on his knees.

Please, please read February 22, 2003 - What Happens If You're not an "Isolationist"

North Korea is a deadly serious matter, like asking the Iraqis to rebel was in 1991.

But we fall down in front of a cliché. Can anybody see how horrible it is to play with lives to avoid clichés?

A Personal Postscript

I cannot get those betrayed Iraqis out of my mind. They were too much like me.

They believed.

Despite all my education and experience, I am not a sophisticated person. As I pointed out when I bragged about saving the Space Telescope that is up there today, I have always been a silly idealist, a believer, a space junkie.

I am that impossible combination, a redneck and a nerd

I am an overeducated guy from Pontiac, South Carolina. And I am deeply proud of it.

But no matter how idealistic and naïve I was I got betrayed in exactly the same way over and over and over, so I learned from it. I cannot believe that today's right wingers are still being betrayed in the same old way.

I am not sophisticated, but I am not a damned fool.

And I am a man with a memory.

I took part in the slippery viciousness of the Cold War and the nasty politics of Washington.

All those years everybody thought they were sophisticated and smart. But they never seemed to learn anything. They ended up being more air-headed than idealists like me.

During all that time I could look beyond the people who thought they were terribly smart and sophisticated. My sacrifices were in late hours and frustration. But I had heroes to look to who paid far, far more.

For my inspiration I looked to people who, like me, were both sane and idealistic. These people were the Freedom Fighters.

The Cuban Freedom Fighters -- like the ones who got caught at Watergate -- were wonderful people to me. Honest Contras were wonderful.

The defiant diggers under the Berlin Wall and other escapees I met were heroic.

Many Freedom Fighters were idealists and they died for it.

Iraqis and Cuban Freedom Fighters died in prison.

A lot of those Iraqis and those Cubans and those Contras were from small towns like me. Whatever the size of the town they came from their culture was also more naïve.

I identify with those freedom fighters who have been sold out decade after decade. Leaders of the freedom fighters wouldn't listen to my warnings about American leaders. I wasn't a Big Man like a CIA Director or a high career official of the State Department. And I hate to think about what happened to the freedom fighters' followers as a result.

Betrayal for me was routine. I got betrayed by Republican moderates. Then I got betrayed by the moderate Republicans' modern successors, the neoconservatives and respectable conservatives. But I got used to it, and I never ended up in a torture cell in our more civilized nastiness.

Freedom fighters had a huge opinion of America. They never got used to betrayal because when you trust an American moderate or an American liberal in a situation like that, you do it only that one fatal time.

April 19, 2003 How the Third Half Lives

April 19, 2003 CNN Admits It Hid the Truth for Saddam's Regime – What a Surprise!

April 19, 2003 If Only America Could Look Unrespectable!

Fun Quote:

You're not going to believe this one.

An interviewer asked General Franks whether America should blame Syria because Iraqi leaders are escaping there.

Frank replied, and this is an exact quote:

"Any country that wants to control its border can do so."

How the Third Half Lives

Russian President Vladimir Putin said that Operation Iraqi Freedom could not be justified because it freed the Iraqis from oppression. Putin said that if America could invade countries to free them from oppression, she would have to invade most of the world.

That makes Putin a Nazi.

A conservative must earn the "respectable" label from liberals if he is to be allowed on the major media. No conservative is allowed to question liberal policy toward minorities. Anyone who does not want to be labeled a Nazi must praise every "liberal accomplishment" in Racial Progress.

First and foremost, you cannot question Glorious Integration.

Another thing every respectable person must praise is the freeing of third world peoples from evil colonialism.

Putin is pointing out that those nonwhites that liberals "freed from colonialism" are not free.

You and I know that there are people screaming in agony right now in almost every African country. All over "liberated" Africa people are being tortured exactly the same way Saddam tortured his people.

You and I know that every day most former colonies are doing things to people that colonial powers would never have done.

You and I know that every day in most former colonies things are being done to people that would have the media screaming bloody murder if any colonial power had done them.

We all know that. But we never say that. Only Nazis say that.

Putin said that. That makes Putin a Nazi.

CNN Admits It Hid the Truth for the Saddam Regime -- What a Surprise!

Just last week I pointed out that anti-Communists behind the Iron Curtain didn't tell reporters how they hated the Communist regimes. I stated flatly that people under a Communist regime are afraid to talk

to the Western press they fear because the media might turn them in to gain brownie points with the Communist regime.

I didn't know whether I should say that because it sounded so extreme.

See World View for April 5, 2003, On Popular Opinion the Media are Clueless and the Experts are Even More Clueless.

This week CNN publicly admitted it did something very similar. A top CNN executive, Eason Jordan, was told by Saddam's brother that, when two of Saddam's family came back after defecting to the West, they would be killed.

Jordan didn't warn them that they would be killed. Jordan said he did it to keep the CNN office staff in Baghdad safe.

Jordan also admitted that CNN hid stories of the Iraqi regime torturing people so Saddam would keep cooperating with CNN.

On MSNBC, a respectable conservative was rubbing this in, denouncing CNN with shock and outrage. One of his guests calmly pointed out that almost all the media in Baghdad covered for Saddam. He said only a fool wouldn't know that.

Of course any fool would know that. But every conservative has to say that the media are filled with honest, patriotic people. The fact that the media routinely sell people out is something everybody knows but no one is allowed to say.

CNN is the only cable network that has been allowed to have a Havana office. Do you think any sane Cuban would tell CNN what they really think of Castro?

But every conservative will tell you that, while Ted Turner may be mistaken in his political views on some issues, he is a gentleman and a scholar and a patriotic American.

But as soon as CNN is caught red-handed and begins admitting one of its sellouts, we are told that the media all sell out, not just CNN. And nobody remembers that a week ago every conservative commentator would have denied it.

That's how it always works. One minute it's McCarthyite to say something and the next minute everybody admits it's something anybody but a fool would know about. This is exactly the phenomenon I talk about in the World View for March 15, 2003, "Whatever Happened to the Communist Conspiracy?"

In the 1950's you were not a respectable conservative if you said that many if not most liberals loved the Communists.

By 1968 hard-core liberals hit the streets praising the Viet Cong. Huge crowds were marching with Viet Cong flags and shouting their support for Ho Chi Min.

To be a respectable conservative you have to condemn whatever liberals say isn't true. What liberals forbid one day is something everybody always knew the next day. Conservatives have to know what

the liberal line is every day. Respectables must follow that line slavishly and talk about how wise and honest and consistent liberals are.

You cannot be a media conservative unless liberals call you a “respectable” conservative. Every respectable conservative has to say that leftist may be wrong, but they are gentlemen and patriots and honest and honorable.

They aren’t. But then again neither are the conservatives who say that.

If America Could Only Look Unrespectable!

Liberals and respectable conservatives are worried to death. They cannot stand the idea that this war will make America look dangerous and mean.

Oh, goodness gracious, all the cocktail parties will turn against us if we look dangerous.

Meanwhile, back in the real world, nothing could be better for a real war on terrorism.

Liberals want America to be “respected”, by which they mean they want us to beg other countries to please let us protect them while we lie down on the floor for them to walk over.

I love the idea of looking unrespectable. When you are dealing with the third world or with terrorists, there is nothing better than having them fear that you may suddenly tear their tongues out and stuff them down their throats.

That’s how third world governments govern. That is the only thing that would cost state sponsors of terrorism a night’s sleep.

The very idea of looking unrespectable is a nightmare to liberals. So respectable conservatives denounce the idea of America looking “unsophisticated” and scary. What would the Europeans say about us?

For me, America acting a little threatening would be a gigantic relief.

Throughout the Cold War America begged other countries let us protect them. We paid them hundreds of billions of dollars to bribe them to let us protect them at our expense.

I got so sick of Uncle Wimp, once known as Uncle Sam, being Uncle Turkey

It would be so wonderful if, just once, America was the country everybody else was a little scared of.. It would a relief if we demanded that people listen to us when we speak.

And Lord, wouldn’t it be great if, for once, we were the people other countries had to appease!?

April 26, 2003 -- Santorum Joins Lott and Moran in the Doghouse

April 26, 2003 -- As Long as Santorum Thinks Like a Yankee He is a Hypocrite

April 26, 2003 -- The "Ally McBeal" Heresy

April 26, 2003 -- Today's Conservatives Think Just Like the Leftover Hippies Do

Fun Quote:

A little while back the "B.C." cartoon said something that I could not believe a mainline cartoonist would dare say:

In this B.C. episode, the guy who sends messages by throwing them into the ocean wrote:

"We have a new Department of Homeland Security to protect us. I recommend it to you."

The reply said, "We don't need it. We just enforce our immigration laws."

B.C. author Johnny Hart is a very brave man.

Santorum Joins Lott and Moran in the Doghouse

Republican Senator Rick Santorum of Pennsylvania has joined Senator Lott and Congressman Moran in the doghouse. He said one of the many things that are true and that no one is allowed to say.

Let's review these three heretical comments:

Lott said that if Strom Thurmond had been elected president in 1948 we would not have the problems we have now. Moran said that if Jewish leaders had opposed the Iraq war strongly it would not have happened. Santorum said that if the Supreme Court's "privacy" doctrine applies to homosexuals, if people can do anything they want to behind closed doors, then people have the right to commit incest.

Liberals said Lott's comments were racist, Moran's comments were anti-Semitic, and Santorum's words were gay bashing.

All three statements were true. But under today's doctrine that calls itself "Free Speech," that doesn't matter. A British judge sent a man to prison for a year under the British Hate Law for telling the truth. In his decision in *The Crown Versus Joseph Pierce*, 1986, he said, "The truth is no excuse."

If you think about it, if the truth is no excuse, there is no point to Free Speech.

As Long as Santorum Thinks Like a Yankee, He is a Hypocrite

The reason that Lott was right is the same reason that Santorum was right. Santorum said that the Supreme Court has torn up the Constitution. What is really wrong with Santorum's comment is that he thinks like a Yankee.

Like other Northern Catholics, Santorum thinks that the Supreme Court didn't start to tear up the Constitution until its decisions on abortion and gay rights. Those decisions, which started in the 1970s, violate tenets of conservative Catholic morality. When the Supreme Court invented a "right to privacy" to strike down all state abortion laws, Northern Catholics suddenly decided the court was getting out of line.

But in 1968, when the Supreme Court struck down all state laws against racial intermarriage, they openly threw the Constitution out the window. The amendments the Supreme Court cited for its 1968 decision were adopted by states almost every one of which had and enforced laws against racial intermarriage. But every Catholic leader praised that decision to the skies.

When it struck down state anti-intermarriage laws in 1968 the Supreme Court simply said that it would be a good idea to strike those laws down, precedent be damned. Every single Catholic leader said that was the way it should be done.

Then when the Court did exactly the same thing about abortion and gay rights, Catholic leaders went ballistic, just like Santorum did. Santorum came down as hard as anybody on Lott's comments about Thurmond, but the fact is that, if Thurmond had been elected, the decisions Santorum is objecting to would not have been made.

To put this in Lott's own words, "If Strom had been elected in 1948 we wouldn't have had all these problems."

The "Ally McBeal" Heresy

If conservatives don't want homosexuals kissing on network television, they have to respect my right to object to blacks and blonds kissing on national television. Until they stop thinking like Yankees, they're hypocrites.

"Ally McBeal" is a television show that is wildly popular with young people. It is about an unmarried woman of about thirty who is a lawyer in a really hip law firm in Boston. She is pro-homosexual and once said that if a particularly bad decision was made in court, "We might as well be in Alabama."

But when the blond Ally McBeal had her obligatory love affair with a black man, fans raised hell. The network was absolutely stunned. Surely all those "with it" young people would be all for an interracial affair! One fan of the show in a newsgroup I was in said he or she had stopped watching the show when that happened.

Like all liberals, the show's producers are living in the 1960s. The hippie creed said that "The white race is the cancer of history." Intermarriage was the Final Solution to the White Problem, and hip young people in the 1960s praised it to the skies. No trendy person in the 60s generation would dare object to interracial sex.

Interracial kissing is ugly. Many of today's young people don't know that they are not ALLOWED to object to it. So they did object, big time. To repeat, "Ally McBeal" executives were totally astonished. If they allowed this kind of criticism they would be in the same dog house with Lott and Moran and Santorum.

Normally the network executives would have told viewers to go to the Bad Place if they didn't like this interracial affair. To show how desperate networks are to court trendy opinion, CBS gave up a solid Top Ten lineup by 1970 because hit shows like "The Beverley Hillbillies" and "Green Acres" were getting them laughed at at their cocktail parties.

It is simply not true that the bottom line in show business is money. CBS threw away huge fortunes to get rid of its reputation in fashionable circles as "the hick network."

When you see how desperate these products of the 60s are to court fashionable opinion, you would think they would have put Ally McBeal right in bed with her black lover to show viewers who was boss.

Instead, McBeal begged the black man for sex but HE refused. No more of the kissing that fans objected to. That must have been a hell of a lot of fans!

And these were fans who showed every sign of supporting gay rights and abortion.

These young people don't like to see a blond girl kissing a black man. Unlike their elders, they don't realize that they are not allowed to say that.

Today's Conservatives Think Just Like the Leftover Hippies Do

All the rightists I know assume that everybody who is pro-gay is anti-white. But opinion really is divided among young Americans, and throwing all their opinions together is stupid.

The 60s leftovers and today's conservatives have exactly the same picture of young people. Both assumed that all the young people on campus would be against the Iraq War the way "young people," meaning leftover 60s hippies, were.

The fact is that what looks unnatural and ugly to me and you looks unnatural and ugly to young people. Liberals have told young people what opinions they are allowed to express, and the truly rebellious young people won't accept it. Conservatives and leftover hippies think that "campus rebellion" means loud mouthed leftists. But a surprising number of young people realize that the so-called "revolutionaries" are the most obedient servants the ruling liberal professors have.

Those so-called "campus revolutionaries" are the thugs who enforce Political Correctness. A lot more students realize that than do leftover hippies or professional conservatives.

I find those young people a lot easier to deal with than conservatives who thump the Bible and give in to fashionable opinion when liberals demand it.

May 3, 2003 -- Compromising With Insanity is Insanity

May 3, 2003 -- An Example of the Above

May 3, 2003 -- Wouldn't Everybody Hate Us if We Told Liberals to go to Hell?

Fun Quote:

Q: Who gives out Iraqi credit cards?

A: The Dinars Club

Compromising With Insanity is Insanity

Conservatives and sometimes liberals like to say that America's foreign policy should be dictated by America's national interests. But the first thing you notice is that America is the only country in the world that pays little or no attention to its own self-interest.

South Korea hates our guts. The only time we get any response from South Korea is when we threaten to pull our 35,000 troops out. We get nothing out of keeping our troops there. In fact, as long as those troops are there South Korea, Japan and China will look on North Korea as our problem.

Our interest dictates that we make South Korea and Japan pay plenty for our troops being there or we pull them out.

Making them pay to keep us there would be a better strategy, too. Japan, South Korea and China can have an effect on North Korea, but they don't bother. American troops are in South Korea, so it's our problem. That could be fatal attitude.

So why, in the name of sanity, would a rational country never even seriously consider pulling out troops out?

Well, the problem here is that liberals would pull all troops out of everywhere when they threaten Communist countries like North Korea. Meanwhile, however much they mouth the words "national self-interest", respectable conservatives have to compromise with liberals to stay respectable. So Bush ends up begging the liberals to LET us keep troops in South Korea. South Korea sees how to blackmail us, so Bush ends up begging them to please let us keep our troops there because they know we are desperate.

National self-interest would be the best possible policy for a person who was genuinely interested in our self-interest. But we cannot consider that because we must compromise with liberals.

In other words our foreign policy represents a compromise between American self-interest and a compromise with liberals who hate America. They really do, though no respectable conservative would say "liberals hate America." Conservatives say that liberals "Blame America first." If someone said "Blame Jews first", don't you think conservatives would say they were anti-Semitic?

But to be a respectable conservative you have to insist that liberals are patriotic.

Meanwhile, back on earth, liberals are anti-American and anti-white..

So we have a compromise between those who hate us and those who claim to be in favor of our national self-interest, as any rational country is. So we get a sick foreign policy.

This is what is called compromise. This is what is called listening to both sides. This is what is considered moderate and adult.

Meanwhile back in the real world giving liberals half of the national dialogue is exactly like negotiating with terrorists.

An Example of the Above

Sometimes dealing with crazy people makes me feel a little crazy.

So let me outline the present situation for you:

- 1) America has serious economic problems;
- 2) Everybody agrees that a reduction in the price of oil would be as good for the American economy as any tax cut;
- 3) What keeps the price of oil high is a cartel called OPEC, which everyone agrees is pure blackmail;
- 4) We have just liberated Iraq from a tyranny at a high cost in money and a cost in lives;
- 5) We can't have a tax cut because we have to pay for that war, which we claim was salvation for Iraq; and
- 6) To rebuild Iraq at our own expense. Meanwhile
- 7) Iraq has the second largest oil reserves on earth.

Isn't there a very obvious solution here?

The reason we don't do what a rational country would do is because liberals accuse us of "fighting the war for oil." We have to compromise with liberals, which means they may forgive us for the Iraq war if the whole burden of that war in lives and money falls on America and we continue to allow OPEC blackmail.

Compromising with insanity is insanity.

Wouldn't Everybody Hate Us if We Told Liberals to go to Hell?

If you say that moderation is stupid you will be told that you are not being Wise and Practical. You will be told that "Politics is the art of the possible" and that compromise is what politics is all about. You will be told that while amateurs like you demand a move to the right, all the experts agree that victory lies in the middle of the road.

Well, the third biggest publisher on earth published one of my books on politics. That is about the only qualification you need to be a political expert, and I have a lot more qualifications than that, a whole lifetime's worth.

Let me tell you once again that moderation does not work politically. In the real Congress, there are very, very few people who are really elected to that body who are not on the right or on the left. In presidential elections in our generation, every moderate Republican lost and Reagan won twice. The only elected moderate was Bush, Senior, and he was elected as Reagan's successor and defeated when he ran on his own in 1992.

You will see an example of the reason that moderation loses if you look at the two articles above.

Let me ask you a political question:

Would Bush get more votes if he continues to worry about liberals who would accuse him of "fighting the war for oil," or would he win if he said "We liberated the Iraqis, but they should pay at the least the monetary cost of their own liberation by helping us undercut OPEC."

In fact, I wouldn't even insist they break OPEC completely. Australia and Britain produce their own oil, so I think OPEC should be left free to blackmail Europe. Britain and Australia produce their own oil and we deserve a big break on our oil imports.

Would Bush get more votes if he made sure Iraq got OPEC prices from Americans for its oil or if would he do better if he used Iraq to break OPEC and give us an economic boom and tax cuts?

A moderate is not in the middle of any real political road. A moderate's politics comes from compromising between conservative politicians and the liberal elite.

05/10/03 : O'Reilly Agrees: the only Point of Integration is to get rid of Whites

05/10/03 : Liberals Say We Need to Enforce Integration Because Nobody Wants It

05/10/03 : How Did O'Reilly get so Screwed Up?

05/10/03 : Liberals and O'Reilly Say "Diversity" Must be Enforced Because it Doesn't Work

05/10/03 : One Way to End Freedom is to Trivialize it

Fun Quote:

I wrote this in the Southern Partisan many years ago:

"The word 'moron' is a legal, not a medical, term. It means a person with an IQ between 50 and 70. An 'idiot' is a person with an IQ between 0 and 30."

"In other words, a moron is twice as smart as an idiot." "This proves that there is a real difference between Republicans and Democrats."

O'Reilly Agrees: The Only Point of Integration is to get Rid of Whites

To prove his respectability, O'Reilly of "The O'Reilly Factor" went ballistic about white Georgia students who held their own prom.

As O'Reilly knows, integration is not about equal educational opportunity.

Among liberals the discussion goes straight to interracial sex.

Harvard professor Noel Ignatiev put it honestly and bluntly,

"The goal of abolishing the white race is on its face so desirable that some may find it hard to believe that it could incur any opposition other than from committed white supremacists."

O'Reilly says that if the races don't dance together, it is Evil.

He says that since this is called the "United" States, mixed dancing is mandatory.

O'Reilly says that American patriotism requires interracial dancing.

O'Reilly says that American soldiers died in Iraq for mixed dancing.

O'Reilly is a sicko.

Liberals Say We Need to Enforce Integration Because It Doesn't Work

While everybody has to praise integration to the skies, its supporters have been reduced to arguing that it is good because people don't want it.

Liberals point out that the minute affirmative action is ended, minority enrollment in primarily white schools drops to near zero.

Liberals say that if integration is not enforced, the races will separate, the way they want to. O'Reilly admits that blacks and Hispanics have their own groups and he says he's against that, too.

You and I both know he doesn't care about that. Lots of his viewers pointed it out and he said that didn't justify that Evil White Prom.

Ads on television show black high school students not wanting a white at their table in the school cafeteria. Another ad shows younger white kids playing together and black kids playing together. In both ads, this is Evil and force clearly needs to be applied.

How Did O'Reilly Get so Screwed Up?

It took a long, long time for the alcohol and drug recovery experts to admit that alcoholism is hereditary. Social sciences hate heredity, since what they sell is environment.

After all, the more important heredity is, the less education alone can save the world. The more important heredity is the less psychology can change the world. The more important heredity is, the less sociology determines the future of the world.

Stalin killed most of his geneticists for saying heredity was important. Leftism hates heredity because they want to change the world by their own programs. The more heredity matters, the less leftists can change the world.

O'Reilly was a school teacher. He was raised on education courses that told him that heredity couldn't matter. So he told the audience that nobody can be born with more susceptibility to alcohol than anybody else.

When identical twins are adopted into different families at birth, they not only tend to commit the same number of crimes, they commit them at the same age and they tend to be the same crimes. That is because identical twins have the same genes no matter who adopts them.

O'Reilly stated flatly that genes don't make people do anything. That is a good line for an education major. That is a good line to make you respectable to liberals. But it makes no sense at all.

O'Reilly is fun to watch and he has guts. But always remember that the only education he ever had was education courses, and, on some issues, he never grew out of it.

That is why O'Reilly, who has common sense on any other issue, is such a nut-case integrationist.

It is also the reason he is allowed on national television.

Liberals and O'Reilly Must be Enforced Because it Doesn't Work

On one program O'Reilly criticized home schooling because of its lack of "diversity."

He then admitted home schooling provided a much better education , but that doesn't matter the way diversity does.

O'Reilly then proceeded to wonder out loud why, while more money is being poured into it, public education keeps getting worse.

It might just be because of "diversity."

"Diversity" is bad for real education. Children need to learn their ABCs at that age. They do not need to learn to study with rap music and shouting around them at the same time.

The District of Columbia spends about ten thousand dollars per year per student and its schools are in a state of collapse.

This "diversity" nonsense fits into the general pattern of "modern" education. Everything, especially "social adjustment" stuff, is more important than education.

That is the main reason public education gets worse and worse with more and more O'Reilly normally pushes integration in the name of "equal education."

But his having a fit about a separate prom shows he wants integration for its own sake. Your education doesn't include the prom.

One Way to End Freedom is to Trivialize It

O' Reilly and all the respectable conservatives love to bear their chests and shout about how much they love Freedom.

A person who loves freedom would talk about the fact that all Communist countries had to kill people who tried to escape, while we have to keep them out. Conservatives never mention the Communist border guards and they only apologize for our need to patrol our own borders.

They say our border guard is a regrettable necessity rather than something to be proud of. In other words, the fact that we are a country everybody wants to live and people want to escape from Communist countries means nothing to respectable conservatives. That has nothing to do with the respectable conservatives' idea of Freedom.

So what is this so-called Freedom these respectable conservatives are so big on?

Conservatives are for any freedom that doesn't seriously offend liberals.

Liberals and respectable conservatives trivialize the idea that freedom is a bunch of "ordinary" people doing what they want and getting what they want.

So O'Reilly says that the fact that white students want a separate prom doesn't mean a thing.

Real freedom is doing what you want to do. It does not have to call itself A Class Struggle or a True Democracy or True Diversity or anything else.

If you make your society a Class Struggle you build walls to keep real people in, what conservatives call "ordinary people," in. The argument that keeps those walls up is that the Class Struggle is more important than just letting people do what they want to do.

In the name of their capitalized Freedom they trivialize real freedom.

Notice that I capitalize O'Reilly's idea of Freedom. It is nothing like real freedom. Real freedom means doing what you want to do.

Real freedom can only be limited on a case-by-case basis. There is no easy-to-use general recipe that will make a free society.

Freedom does not mean the right to do anything that does not offend others. As a matter of fact, real freedom means nothing if it does not offend and inconvenience others. Communists offer you any freedom that they feel does not hurt others. So do Nazis.

Clichés will not give you freedom. If all you had to do to have freedom was say, "You have the right to do anything that doesn't bother other people," freedom would be as easy as liberals think it is. The third world could be free without any painful thinking on the part of voters.

But freedom is a case by case thing, a matter of judgment. It means nothing if you have no right to do anything that others don't like.

Freedom is a matter of judgment. That is why a country that is full of third world voters cannot be free.

See April 7, 2001 - CALIFORNIA BROWNOUT

Freedom is a matter of judgment. That is why a nation run by social scientists and education majors cannot be free.

May 17, 2003 So What's the Problem?

May 17, 2003 And Now a News Bulletin About Mammoths

May 17, 2003 Politically Correct History is a Game of Trumps

May 17, 2003 The Politically Correct Hate List

May 17, 2003 Make Up Your Mind, Do it NOW and Do it RIGHT!

May 17, 2003 All Inquisitions Are Like This

Fun Quote:

"The Civil War was when the north invaded American"

-- Granny Clampett on The Beverley Hillbillies

So What's the Problem?

Jayson Blair is a 27-year-old black man who sped right up into reporting on major stories for the New York Times. It was a job many a middle-aged, highly experienced white reporter would have given his right arm for.

The New York Times just discovered that Blair has been handing in fake stories for years. He didn't even go to the places where the stories were.

A lot of talk shows that cover the media have been discussing this Blair scandal. They all agree that the fact that a reporter could publish fake stories for years does not mean that anything else that was false ever got into the New York Times.

A New York Times reporter some years back got a Pulitzer Prize for a completely fake story and had to give it back.

These are two that got caught.

The next question reporters ask each other on these talk shows is, "Did Blair get his job because he was black?"

If you can ask that with a straight face, you're a better actor than I am.

The black man has a job for being black. He brought in stories for years that were faked. He didn't even go to the places he was "reporting" from.

So what's the problem?

A fake reporter did some fake reporting.

Well, gee whiz!

And Now a News Bulletin About Mammoths

About ten thousand years ago there were mammoths in North America and giant sloths in South America. About that time the Indians crossed the land bridge into America.

It had always been taken for granted that “man destroyed the mammoths.” I remember seeing pictures of white men in animal skins killing mammoths. It was the ice age, but everybody was depicted as being half naked, which was the signal for “barbarian.”

But when it came to North America, the historians have suddenly had a Revelation.

They had routinely condemned “Man” for killing the mammoths and showed those white guys doing it. It suddenly hit them that Man, in North America, meant Native Americans, those innocent lovers of Nature.

You can almost hear the "Screech!" of brakes as historians reassess this idea that Man destroyed the mammoths. The mammoths had existed through millions of years of ice ages and hot ages, but now the historians tell us that they died out naturally at exactly the time the Indians got here.

I am sure that we will soon be told the Native Americans tried to save them.

Politically Correct History is a Game of Trumps

The last article is not about mammoths. It is about the Blame Game of Political Correctness. We all know that Political Correctness blames everything Evil on Mankind.

But leftism also requires that all the sins of Mankind be the fault of the White Man. In contrast to the Evil White Man, non-whites are highly moral beings who are at one with Nature. This makes things a bit complicated, but modern history always adjusts instantly in order to make it fit into the Political Correctness scheme.

Fortunately, Political Correctness can count on the fact that no college graduate does any thinking at all. So when they showed white cave men killing mammoths while running around half naked in the Ice Age, nobody asked a single question.

So now when the image of Evil Mankind collides with the Noble Native American Who Loves Nature and who would not hurt Brother Mammoth, nobody asks about it.

When Indians came across the land bridge, mammoths, who had survived millions of years and a huge number of ice ages, just happened to drop dead.

So Politically Correct history is a lot like a game of trumps. Mankind is Evil, but that is trumped if the Mankind being referred to turns out to be non-white.

The Politically Correct Hate List

We have lived all our lives with this game of Politically Correct Trumps, but nobody has put down in detail exactly what the trumps are.

We all know that Political Correctness says that White Men are Evil and that Non-Whites are lovers of Nature and moral paragons.

Another rule of Political Correctness is “Animals good, People bad.” So if man is greedy that is just awful. If an animal is greedy he is just following nature. When people destroy forests it is pure evil. When elephants destroy trees, it just shows how nice they are.

So we know these two rules: Whites Bad, non-Whites Good and People Bad, Animals Good.

But then we run into a case like the mammoths. When it was white men killing them, history declared man killed the mammoth. But if Man killed the mammoth in North America, then those men were non-white.

In this case “Man Bad, Animals Good” runs up against “White Man Bad, Indian Good.”

Another rule of Political Correctness is “Poor People good, Rich People Bad.”

Political Correctness lives on Guilt, and there is no point in making poor people feel Guilty because you can’t get anything out of them. So the Virtuous Poor People are the victims of the Evil Rich.

You can get Guilt money out of the Evil Rich.

But what about a case where a person is a rich member of a minority? Here “White Man Bad, Minority Good” runs into “Rich People Bad.”

Another rule of Political Correctness says, “Men are Evil, Women Good.” We know that men who make unwelcome advances cause traumas that leave all women psychologically wrecked.

But what if the woman is white and the man is black?

White Bad, Black Good. So isn’t it her fault for leading him on?

Make Up Your Mind, Do It Now and Do It Right

You have never heard any liberal admit he was just plain wrong about anything.

You never will.

Political Correctness is never wrong, and therefore Political Correctness never admits that it changed its mind.

Every historian will tell you that all decent people always knew that women’s rights were a good idea. It was just sexual impotence or meanness that made men oppress women.

Likewise black people.

Likewise animals.

So far it’s easy.

But it gets dicey when we run into a case where historians have gotten everybody feeling

guilty about the killing of the mammoths and then suddenly have to reverse course when they realize they are blaming the Nature Loving Native Americans for it.

The problem is that Political Correctness insists that it never changes. If you get it wrong, psychologists will explain how you were fundamentally Evil from the get-go.

For example, PC says that men oppressed women, not because they had the outlook of their own time and place, but because men felt impotent or were just plain evil.

PC explains that a slaveholder in 1750 was an evil man, not just a man who had been raised with slavery.

In other words, those who violate Political Correctness are Evil, not mistaken.

Like every other Inquisition, the Politically Correct Inquisition says that if you're wrong it is because you're Evil and must be punished.

After all, only Evil People are ever wrong. So no liberal is ever wrong.

All Inquisitions Are Like This

Nazism depended heavily on selective breeding, race and genetics in general.

Communism depends just as entirely on the idea that genes mean nothing and a Communist world will make everybody equally smart and productive.

So when the Medicogenetic Institute of Moscow did the mother of all identical twin studies in the 1930s and found, as all such tests do, that heredity is vital, Stalin killed them.

To quote Soviet sources, the head of the Medicogenetical Institute, “confessed his ideological error and was shot.”

In the Middle Ages it was pretty routine for someone on the losing side of a theological argument to end up being burned alive for his error. Even if half the experts believed one way and half believed the other way until the final decision, the half that was wrong was Evil and deserved punishment.

In 2001 a Polish court – a court in post-Communist Poland -- determined that a particular concentration camp had been part of the Holocaust.

It is a felony in Poland to deny any aspect of the Holocaust. So the minute that the court decided that that concentration camp was part of the Holocaust, it became a felony to say it was not.

So the Polish lawyers who had argued against that concentration camp being in the Holocaust came into the building arguing one thing, but they could and WOULD have been arrested if they had said the same thing when they walked out after the decision.

Several French scholars who did research on the World War II period came to conclusions that ran afoul of the Holocaust law. They were threatened with imprisonment. The professors who oversaw their research were also threatened with prison.

These researchers and their professors actually cried and professed their complete orthodoxy. In other words, they acted like anyone facing Heresy charges under any Inquisition.

But this was not the Middle Ages and this was not the Soviet Union. This was Western Europe in the 1990s. Not one single liberal, American or European, saw the slightest problem with this. No academic, European or American, made the slightest objection.

Academic freedom is one thing. Heresy is another.

Academic freedom protects leftist professors from the political right. But you cannot allow Heresy in the name of academic freedom.

Questioning the left on campus is not academic freedom. Questioning the left on campus is Heresy.

May 24, 2003 -- When Israel Gets Into Trouble, Leftist Money Dries Up

May 24, 2003 -- When Israelis and Palestinians Mix it Up, My Concern is Us, not Them

May 24, 2003 -- I Want for My People What Israelis Want for Theirs

Fun Quote:

Question: Which came first, the chicken or the egg?

Answer: There were eggs long before there were chickens.

When Israel Get into Trouble Leftist Money Dries Up

In the 1970s Israel was in the midst of a crisis. During that crisis there was an election in the United States.

The result was that a Republican campaign manager in Arkansas made one of those statements that,

1) everybody knows is true; and

2) You can get killed for saying.

He said that liberals were losing the election because all their campaign money was going into dealing with the current crisis in Israel.

We all know that when Israel gets into trouble, money that would be spent for leftist causes in America goes to the Israeli Lobby and to Israel. That was true in the 1970s and nobody denied it. They just wanted anybody who said it lynched.

Today when Israel gets into trouble it drains money away from American leftists. No one actually denies this obvious fact, but they will still lynch you if you state it.

Only an Evil Man would say this.

That's what you have me for.

When Israelis and Palestinians Mix it Up, My Concern is Us, not Them

I do have some sympathy with the Palestinians. See September 13, 2001 – MY ARAB SYMPATHIES.

I hate terrorism, so the death of Israeli civilians is certainly not welcome to me.

But as I pointed out in the most recent WhitakerOnline WorldView, May 10, 2003 -- I'm Too Bigoted to be Anti-Semitic, what is important to me is neither Israelis nor Palestinians.

The political left is the great enemy of my people.

The political left increases the number of murders of my own people here with a pro-criminal policy. Leftism is the fatal disease of my own country. If you help the left here, you are a criminal and a terrorist. No one seems to mind that terrorism at all.

Israel wants to preserve Jewish identity, but the same people who fund Israel are dedicated to the complete destruction of my identity. Liberal Jews are Boasian Jews. They consider Jews to be a minority group, and they see all minority groups as joined in a common war against white people.

Leftism demands the end of white people and of America. When it comes to Israel liberal Jews are outraged at the idea that a peace settlement would allow five million Palestinians to return to the land in modern Israel that was taken from them. But the same big-money contributors who want to preserve the Jewish identity of Israel demand that America's borders be opened up to the third world.

Liberals want third world immigration to pour into EVERY white majority country.

Liberals demand that third world immigration pour ONLY into white countries.

Jewish Liberals want two things:

- 1) The preservation of Jewish identity in Israeli;
- 2) The destruction of all white gentile identity.

So if I do not get all upset about terrorism in Israel, it is because terrorism there reduces terrorism here.

I Want for my People What Israelis Want for Theirs

Public Television had a tribute to Franz Boas as the founder of the black-Jewish alliance. Franz Boas was a Jew from Prussia and he regarded white gentiles as the common enemy of all minorities, including Jews.

Everybody agrees that liberal money is largely Jewish. I am just not supposed to say that.

But it is a critical consideration when American policy in the Middle East comes up.

What I am saying here is

- 1) What everybody knows is true; and
- 2) What you can get killed for saying.

As long as the overwhelming majority of American Jews remain dedicated to Boasian ideas, I cannot wish Israel well. If American Jews got off their anti-white kick, I would be as concerned about bombings in Israel as any decent person would be. But as long as the money that finances Israel also finances open borders and anti-white policies in America, my interests run counter to Israeli interests.

I did not make it that way. I did not declare this liberal war against my people. But it is there and it is very, very real.

Israelis cannot help that their money comes from American liberals. But Israelis are also not ignorant. Israelis know more about what is going in Jordan than the king does.

American Jewish liberals want a third-world America. That would destroy us, but it is also stupid for Israel. How long would Israel survive if America were third-world country?

Jewish liberalism is like moderate Republicanism. It is not only unprincipled, it is stupid.

If conservative Israel supporters demand that Jewish liberals stop backing our enemies, it will have an effect. But as long as all the demands go one way, everything for Israel and nothing for us, conservative Israel supporters are selling us out.

When those who finance Israel stop financing the enemies of my people, I will wish Israel well. But until liberal Jews call off this war against us, I cannot sympathize with Israel.

May 31, 2003 -- Hitler and Saddam

May 31, 2003 -- Why I Didn't Bother to Oppose the Iraq War

May 31, 2003 -- Leftists Shot Themselves in the Foot over Iraq

May 31, 2004 -- Why Fashionable European Opinion is formed by Nasty Little People

May 31, 2003 -- So Who Didn't Shoot Themselves in the Foot Over Iraq?

Fun Quote:

Hitler was living in Argentina in the 1960s when some Germans asked him to come back and take over.

After they spent hours trying to persuade him, Hitler said:

OK, I'll come back on one condition."

"What's the condition?" asked the Germans.

"This time," said Hitler, "No more Mister Nice Guy."

Hitler and Saddam

An African economist I knew was often faced with proposals to build little inefficient railroads. Some of those railroads got built despite his opposition. Those who had wanted the railroads built would then ask my friend whether he thought those railroads should now be destroyed.

No, he said, with all the money already sunk into them, it would be better to keep them than to tear them up. People would then say that he was wrong to oppose building those railroads in the first place.

Any logical person can see why this conclusion was wrong.

Once something is built, you are no longer dealing with the question of whether or not to build it.

Today those who supported the war in Iraq are saying, “Would you like to have Saddam back?”

The question of whether or not one wants Saddam back is not the same as the question of whether we should have gone to war in Iraq. The fact that Saddam was a horrible man was not the reason we went to war.

There is a lot to be learned from decent people who opposed the Iraq War. There is a lot to learn from decent people who opposed America’s entry into World War II. This does not mean that we want Hitler back.

But just because you don’t want Hitler back doesn’t mean that there was not nothing wrong with the way we got into World War II.

Why I Didn't Bother to Oppose the Iraq War

I stopped opposing the war in Iraq as soon as I saw it was inevitable.

I have supported Lost Causes in my time, but if I support a Lost Cause, it has to be one that is very important to me. Saddam was not very important to me.

When something is inevitable the best thing you can usually do is to get in and try to redirect it. But that is a rule you have to be very, very careful about. Supporting something because it is inevitable is an awfully tempting path to immorality.

I have complained about people who say that the odds are on the bad guy’s side, so we should all give up. First, I don’t think that’s true. Second, if you surrender to evil simply because it is strong then you are as bad as the enemy.

Defeatism is the enemy of good. Anyone who argues that we should surrender for any reason is an enemy, no matter what his real opinions may be.

On the other hand we cannot simply throw our limited resources into lost causes.

Leftists Shot Themselves in the Foot Over Iraq

Leftists who opposed the Iraqi War shot themselves in the foot. This is not because they were wrong, but because their opposition to the war showed their warts. Leftists hate America and what they said in opposing the war was one long exercise in Hate America rhetoric.

Many leftists are now trying to say they were right about the war because no weapons of mass destruction have been found. If they had said they opposed the war because they doubted the existence of weapons of mass destruction, they would be in a strong position now. But that is not what anti-War leftists said in the period leading up to the war.

In the pre-war period leftists said America was Evil. They said that America was killing its young people just to get cheap oil. They said America was greedy, bloodthirsty, imperialistic and racist, and those were our good qualities.

Ever since World War II Americans have paid professors in American colleges to insult the American public. Every leftist spent most of that time telling us how awful Americans were and how good our enemies were.

Especially Communists.

Americans never did anything but grin and applaud these insults.

But at last, during the run-up to the Iraq War, those grins actually faded. Even the people who had cheered most loudly every time professors and Europeans told us how awful we were in the past suddenly woke up and wiped the drool off their faces.

Liberals shot themselves in the foot by opposing the Iraq War, but not because they opposed the War. They shot themselves in the foot because of the way they opposed the war.

For decades we have paid social science professors to insult the American public in college classrooms. For decades we have paid the United Nations to attack us.

Many people felt particularly good about paying professors and the United Nations to attack us because a lot of people have the idea that if something hurts it must be good for you.

That's sick thinking. In this world, you will be denounced plenty without paying anybody to do it.

Anti-War people who joined in the chorus about how evil or ignorant Americans are were the ones who really screwed up.

Those people included leftists, the United Nations, and Europe's Fashionable Opinion.

Why Fashionable European Opinion is Formed by Nasty Little People

It is hard for a person who can take criticism to become really nasty or really mean. It is the people who cannot imagine that they are anything but wonderful who get really small and nasty.

If you can look at yourself from the outside there is a limit to how bad you can get. If you assume you are practically perfect in every way there is no limit to how bad you can get.

At the turn of the twentieth century Europeans thought they were wonderful as their sophisticated brilliance led them into World War I.

Europeans in the 1930s thought they were sophisticated and wonderful as their continent divided between Communists and Fascists.

Western Europeans insisted they were brilliant after World War II, when a third of them voted for the silliest kind of democratic socialism, a third of them voted Stalinist and the other third became Catholic theocrats.

In the run-up to the Iraq War, Europeans once again insisted they were being brilliant.

European opinion opposed the Iraq War because they said Americans were awful and low and ignorant and selfish. They said, as usual, that Europeans were True Intellectuals and True Sophisticates and that Western Europeans were the only people who were capable of Generosity and True Compassion.

In other words, Europe went back to the same old crap. But this time some Americans actually noticed how silly they were.

So Who Didn't Shoot Themselves in the Foot Over Iraq?

As America went to war, National Review had a cover article saying that those on the right who opposed the Iraq War were traitors.

It didn't stick.

In fact, all that National Review managed to do in attacking rightists who opposed the war was exactly what liberals did while opposing the war. They showed their hates.

If you opposed the war by saying Europeans were brilliant and Americans were stupid, you screwed up. But if you had previously said that that Europeans, the United Nations, and leftists hate America, you had a right to dissent on Iraq. The rightists who opposed the Iraq War had consistently done that.

If you opposed the war by saying that neoconservatives just want to use America to please the Israeli Lobby, you may yet be proved right.

The lesson is that if you are going to fight the mainstream, you had better be damned careful you make it clear exactly why you are doing it. Don't join America's enemies against America. Don't join the leftists in their hates.

June 7, 2003 -- Will We Ever Get Out of Iraq?
June 7, 2003 -- Is Truth a Shell With Feathers?
June 7, 2003 -- Moderation in Action
June 7, 2003 -- There is no Easy Out

Fun Quote:

The Supreme Court has declared that you cannot be put to death if you are mentally retarded. Being mentally retarded means you score less than 70 on an IQ test.

So liberals insist that no one should have to pass a test to get a high school diploma, but you do have to pass a test to get executed.

Will We Ever Get out of Iraq?

Not if we compromise.

No one will ever see the real lesson of the Vietnam War. The hawks say that the lesson of Vietnam was that fighting to win is good. The doves said that the lesson of Vietnam was that peace is good.

The real lesson of Vietnam was that there is nothing worse than half a war.

No one can see this lesson because our society is still based on the kind of thinking that got us into the Vietnam mess. We got into half a war in Vietnam because we compromised between fighting the war and getting out.

Our national obsession with compromise says that there are two sides to every question so the truth must lie somewhere in the middle. No mindset could be worse for dealing with military matters.

When you are putting lives on the line you have to decide either to fight it out or get out fast.

This is common sense, but the first thing our compromise mentality does is throw out common sense. When we have a problem, we don't look for the solution. We look for the compromise.

If you compromise all the time, you never finish anything. One side will want to keep doing what you are doing and the other side wants to stop. So you compromise. You don't do it and you don't quit.

Most of America's real policy disasters can be traced back to our failure to do it or to get out of it. Vietnam was just a very obvious example of this.

So when will both sides agree to get out of Iraq?

Well, the United States Army landed in Western Europe in 1943.

The Soviet Union stopped being a threat in 1989.

Our troops are still in Western Europe. They're still there and we are still compromising about them.

Since we became obsessed with the idea that truth equals compromise the only major military commitments we have gotten out of have been Vietnam and Somalia.

Do those two names tell you anything?

Is the Truth a Shell With Feathers?

Which came first, the chicken or the egg?

Well, according to the way we now make our life-and-death national policies, what came first was a compromise, a shell with feathers.

Like most sayings that sound Shrewd, the idea that Truth lies somewhere in the middle is really dumb.

To start with, “the Truth lies somewhere in the middle” sounds like a reasonable approach, an approach that allows for human error. But if you say that “the truth lies somewhere in the middle,” you are assuming that both sides already know all subject that there is to know.

“The Truth lies somewhere in the middle” means that half of all you need to know is one side and half of all you need to know is on the other. So you just mix them and you get all the Truth there is.

Sounds stupid when you say it in plain English, doesn’t it? Most Shrewd Sayings sound retarded when you state them in plain English.

Moderation in Action

In mid-sixteenth the Protestant theologian John Calvin ruled the city of Geneva, Switzerland. In 1553 Calvin had a former classmate of his, Michael Servatus, burned alive. Servatus started screaming when the flames reached his face. He stopped screaming over twenty minutes later.

The burning of Michael Servatus was an act of Moderation.

In Calvin’s world, the Catholic Church was his deadly enemy, the “other side” of the world of Christianity. There was Calvin on one side and the Pope on the other. But Servatus was not in the center between them.

Servatus was a Unitarian, a belief condemned by both sides.

So in a rare show of cooperation, the Catholic authorities sent Calvin evidence that Michael Servatus held beliefs that were anathema to both Catholics and Protestants.

Catholics on one side, Calvinists on the other, the Truth in the middle, right?

There is no Easy Out

The world would be a safe and easy place if all we had to do was compromise.

Freedom and safety would be easy if the Truth were in the middle of the road.

It isn’t.

Freedom and safety require just as much intolerance as tolerance.

Yes, intolerance is very dangerous. But you cannot do the right thing by an endless series of compromises. Some things are true and some things are false. Some things work and some things do not work.

What people call political Moderation is a good example. Moderation is a compromise between liberal policies which are always disastrous and simple political sanity. But in the real world a compromise between sanity and insanity is still simply insane.

As long as we remain committed to the nostrum of compromise what we do will not work. That's where Vietnam came from. That's where Somalia came from.

Insanity has been defined as doing the same thing you always do and expecting different results this time. Another name for that is Moderation.

June 14, 2003 -- Americans are Beginning to Realize That People Hate Them. Well, DUHHH!

June 14, 2003 -- The Final Solution to the America Problem

June 14, 2003 -- So We'll Soon Wipe Their Spit off Our Faces and Thank Them

June 14, 2003 -- We Can Learn From European Hatred or We Can Do What We Always Do

Fun Quote:

This was a popular, and illegal, joke in Russia under the Soviet Union:

"Saudi Arabia just went Communist. The government has announced that they have a shortage of sand."

Americans are Beginning to Realize That People Hate Them. Well, DUHHH!

For two generations we have paid professors to insult America and white people.

Now we are astonished that a lot of people who went to college hate America.

DUHHHH!

I have been in Europe repeatedly since the 1950s. Every time I have been in Europe I have taken it for granted that Europeans hate Americans. What I mean by "hate Americans" is that Europeans always express the same opinion of America you hear at our universities or in New England or in any other place where Fashionable Opinion rules.

What everybody calls the European Point of View is really just what they read in our own dominant media like the New York Times. This is what Europeans hear quoted in Europe.

That is the opinion Americans pay to hear, so why shouldn't Europeans assume it's the straight scoop?

What the average American never understood was that when a New Englander or a Walter Cronkite says white people or Americans are unspeakable, he is engaging in hate.

When the Cronkites or New Englanders or American professors go to Europe, they talk a lot worse about us than the Dixie Chicks ever did.

But everybody knew when American liberals said nasty things about America that was different from Hate. That was Fashionable Opinion.

The Final Solution to the America Problem

Fashionable Opinion routinely says the same thing about white people that Hitler said about Jews, but Fashionable Opinion can't be hate, you see. What Hitler said was Hate. What Fashionable Opinion says is Constructive Criticism.

Fashionable Opinion talks about America, white people, the male sex, and the human race in general exactly the same way the Klan talks about minorities.

Fashionable Opinion says the only solution to the "race" problem is for the third world to pour into EVERY white majority country and ONLY into white majority countries.

The liberal solution to the white problem, which their code language calls the Race Problem, is to get rid of whites.

Which is exactly what Hitler said about Jews.

All respectable conservatives agree.

So we cheer them for their intellectual bravery.

Fashionable Opinion says that white people are the cancer of history. They say that whites are guilty of everything bad that was ever done by the human race.

That's precisely what Hitler said about Jews.

So We'll Soon Wipe Their Spit Off Our Faces and Thank Them

For the last fifty years, when Europeans spit in our faces, we said they were just giving us their exotic point of view. It wasn't hate. It was American Fashionable Opinion.

All those years I noticed the American attitude was the same as the attitude of the guy in the cartoon who looked up at a bird in a tree and said, "Go ahead, everybody else does."

The difference is that the guy looking at the bird was disgusted. Americans cheered wildly while they got dumped on.

You can only hate minorities. All of Fashionable Opinion has said that for decades and we have paid them to say it.

Then came a new era. During the Iraq War, Europeans grabbed us by the ears, looked us right in the eye, and shouted, "LISTEN, YOU STUPID ASS, I HATE YOUR GODDAM GUTS!"

Suddenly Americans had a Revelation. "You know something, they said, Europeans really don't LIKE us!"

Then something else began to occur to the American public. Americans began to realize that all those insults they had cheered and paid for down the years were actually not nice at all

Don't worry, Fashionable Opinion. Americans have the memory of a fly on LSD. They will soon forget they resent anything Europe ever said.

We Can Learn from European Hatred or We Can Do What We Always Do

So how will Fashionable Opinion keep Americans from learning anything?

All Fashionable Opinion has to say is that you're not a real grownup if you resent European insults. That always works.

Let bygones be bygones, the commentators will tell us.

Soon we'll be back to normal. Everybody will be spitting in our faces and we'll be cheering wildly.

Again.

For a moment Americans almost caught on to the fact that the Left hates everything about us.

But when the day comes that Americans realize that leftist hate is just hate, the left will be doomed. It won't happen this time.

When Europe got Americans killed because they would not let us use their air space to attack Libya for terrorism, some people woke up.

After Libya we were told that that it was just holding grudges, so we stopped.

So once again the hatred we usually approve of was a little too bare-toothed and some people almost woke up.

Briefly.

Respectable conservatism will help put us back to sleep.

But don't worry. Tell Americans about how they're just being childish again and they'll forget it quick. Things will get a lot worse before we have to face the fact that Europeans and our own young people and everybody else hates our guts.

Why do they hate our guts?

Because we pay people to tell them to.

June 21, 2003 -- The New York Gun Law is Imposed in Iraq

June 21, 2003 -- Conservatives Begin Crying About Poor Martha Stewart

June 21, 2003 -- When A Liberal Gets Mugged, I Cheer

June 21, 2003 -- James Bond, the British Class System and Interracial Coupling

Fun Quote:

If any reader had a lingering hope that Whitaker had any taste at all, this pun should put it to rest:

What do you call people of the Hebrew persuasion who live in Northern Ireland and support the Protestant Government there?

You call them Orange Jews.

Does that pun apPEAL to you?

New York Gun Law is Imposed on Iraq

There is now a one-year mandatory prison sentence for Iraqis with banned weapons.

Now where did they get that law?

In New York there is a one-year mandatory prison sentence for anyone who has a gun. Washington, DC copied that law. It is standard liberal policy.

By the way, another standard liberal policy is opposition to all mandatory sentencing except for gun control.

There are huge differences in the Iraq law and the New York law. But anything that smells of the New York law should be attacked and debated. Is there a single person who believes that such a law will keep one single terrorist from getting a gun?

Of course not. Gun laws only apply to honest people.

Fourteen rifles have been handed in so far in Baghdad. Anyone whose house is searched and a banned gun found will go to prison regardless of circumstances if the law is enforced. So the US authorities will either enforce it, which will be a disaster, or not enforce it, which will be a disaster.

The American Federal system has given us fifty different experiments in controlling weapons. General mandatory sentencing for possession has been a failure here. It's probably a bad start in Iraq, too.

Conservatives could generate a new debate on the failure of gun control by brining this issue up. Gun control lost the last election for Gore.

But conservative spokesmen remain respectable by staying away from issues that could really hurt the left.

Conservatives begin Crying About Poor Martha Stewart

Respectable conservatives are city people who keep quiet about the insanity of gun control. Since it is soldiers in Holy Uniforms who have imposed the New York gun law in Iraq, this gives them an added impetus to stay silent about it.

So what are the conservatives screaming about? They are sobbing loudly over the Federal prosecution of the hard left limousine liberal Martha Stewart. Martha fights for gun control. Martha likes nothing better than to see a law-abiding people imprisoned when they have guns to protect themselves in DC and New York.

Martha Stewart would be the first to report on an honest person who had a gun and send them to prison. She blames her problems on the “vast right wing conspiracy.”

So why are conservatives going to pieces about Poor Martha? For the same reason they are ignoring the false start in gun control in Iraq. If men in Holy Uniforms enforce gun control in Iraq, that trumps any concern about whether it makes sense.

Such a debate would be good for America and for Iraq. But the good of America is never the first concern of respectable conservatives any more than it is for liberals.

For conservatives, anything done by a Holy Uniform is Good. By the same token, conservatives have another rule: Martha Stewart is Rich and therefore Martha Stewart is Good.

When a Liberal Gets Mugged, I Cheer

I can't be a good pro-lifer because there are lot of things that are more important to me than life. For example, I would much rather go down shooting than stand helplessly while thugs trashed my house and abused my family

Britain bans weapons for every honest citizen. British burglars no longer wait for people to leave their houses. Almost half the burglars go in and trash the place while the family is there and the father is cowering in a corner. The Brits don't mind that, because it is truly pro-life: no criminal gets killed and all life is precious.

Leftists object to the New Hampshire state motto, "Live Free or Die" that is on the state's license plates. They would "rather be Red than dead." A lot of pro-lifers on the right are finding common cause with a lot of liberals because of this myth that life is infinitely precious.

When the left and the respectable right get together, you are really in trouble. The left and the respectable right are getting together for Martha Stewart. The left and the respectable right got together to defend Bill Gates, Junior when he faced anti-trust charges.

When Bill Gates, Junior got prosecuted, conservatives were outraged. Please see May 7, 2000 - MICROSOFT CASE: A LIBERAL GETS MUGGED. Conservatives told each other that Bill Gates was a poor boy who made good. They said Microsoft was started on nothing in a garage.

Recently Bush proposed an end to the inheritance tax. A group of fabulously wealthy liberals came out against him. Leading the list was the fabulously wealthy Bill Gates, SENIOR. He was rich when Bill Junior was born, and Gates' limousine liberal mother was a high-ranking executives who made the contacts he needed to get Microsoft going.

But all conservatives could say was, “Him Rich, Him GOOD.”

When government mugs liberals, I cheer. They want everybody else mugged. They can have guards with guns, so they want us arrested for having guns to defend ourselves.

That's the kind of logic we are enforcing in Iraq. Nobody thinks it will work. But liberalism never works.

The liberal media is pleased with the gun law in Iraq, and that is all that matters to the Bush Administration. It looks respectable and New Yorkish.

That kind of wimpy nonsense could make Iraq a graveyard for Republican politics.

James Bond, the British Class System and Interracial Coupling

The latest James Bond movie is famous because of its co-star. She is black and she is the girlfriend of the white James Bond.

When they want a white person to do a first in interracial coupling, they do it with an English white person and an American black. The first time a white girl was shown in a romantic scene with a black on American television, the couple was Harry Belafonte and English singer Petula Clark.

James Bond in the person of Roger Moore was the first white man to kiss a black girl in a major movie. As far back as the 1950s every single newspaper had a picture of the queen of England dancing with the black president of newly independent Ghana.

British accents often front for leftists in America.

The media has long had a desperate shortage of liberal radio talk show hosts. They used to have a guy with a British accent who, like a good little Englishman, repeated every conceivable liberal cliché with a perfectly straight face.

Another Englishman, Christopher Hitchens, was the token Marxist on American television. But he made a fortune on Public Television and is becoming too American now in his political opinions. They might have to find another Englishman to front for the nut left in America.

I think the reason for this use of Englishmen for interracial couplings and liberal clichés is that an American who did it would be laughed at. But, for an American, an Englishman is one step removed from reality.

The Queen of England wants anybody in the old British Commonwealth to be able to come to England. A peasant, she says, is a peasant, no matter what "colour" he might be. Anybody who is loyal to the Queen, says the Queen, is as English as anybody else who is loyal to the Queen, and has just as much right to live on that cold little island as someone who was born there. So the Queen is everything because of how she was born. A white Englishman is nothing because of how he is born.

The modern Englishman eats that up.

The English do not discriminate. To be able to tell one thing from another is one meaning of the word "discriminate."

Truly, the trendy Englishman does not discriminate. That makes him the perfect shill for American leftists.

June 28, 2003 -- No Conservative Has the Guts to Support Real Freedom of Speech

June 28, 2003 -- What Was Maurice's Big Crime?

June 28, 2003 -- The Last Straw: Fox News Conservative Cowards Beat Their Scrawny Little Chests

June 28, 2003 -- Southerners Who Call Themselves Conservatives Don't Back Bessinger, Either

June 28, 2003 -- News Watch Personnel

Fun Quote:

Philosophers say:

"It'll all come out in the wash."

Revolutionaries say:

"It'll all come out in the bloodbath."

No Conservative Has the Guts to Support Real Freedom of Speech

When I was a Reagan appointee in Washington in the early 1980s, I had one reminder of home. The wide grin of my old friend Maurice Bessinger could be seen in on the label of his bar-b-cue sauce in grocery stores. His was a nationwide business straight out of Columbia, South Carolina.

A couple of years ago, Wal-Mart destroyed Bessinger's national business. He put up a Confederate flag and he had political pamphlets in his restaurant in West Columbia. If those had been Communist pamphlets no one would dare have boycotted him for it. But this was right-wing stuff. This was heresy.

Wal-Mart took Bessinger's sauce off its stands nationwide. Not only that, but Wal-Mart announced a nationwide boycott of Bessinger's bar-be-cue sauce. Black thugs backed them up in other grocery stores by taking the sauce off the shelves and pouring it on the floor.

No one denounced the black thugs. I heard about them second-hand.

No Columbia or national media reported the black thugs.

None of the conservative media that constantly complain about being suppressed said a word in Bessinger's favor.

What was Maurice's Great Crime?

What was Maurice Bessinger's big crime? Wal-Mart said that one of the pamphlets he sold in his restaurant said that black Americans were lucky their ancestors were brought to America as slaves.

Every one of us who were raised with black people has heard at least one black person say that. As Whoopie Goldberg put it, “Am I an African-American? I’ve SEEN Africa. I’m an America.”

I’ve seen Africa, too, and any American black who has seen that place had better be glad he’s here.

In Africa, black people STARVE to death. I know Jane Fonda talks about “starving children in South Carolina,” and leftists talk about starvation all the time. But if you ever saw a real human being really dying from hunger, you would be ashamed to use that word in America.

So Bessinger’s pamphlet certainly had a point.

But the question is not whether Bessinger is right or wrong. The question is, did he have the right to have that pamphlet in his own restaurant?

Libertarians would have raised hell if anyone had boycotted Bessinger for a Communist pamphlet. We have not heard one single word from any of those brave libertarians organizations and all the conservatives are hiding as usual.

Bessinger fought Red Chinese and North Korean Communists in Korea. But that doesn’t mean he has any of the rights to free speech he fought for.

By the way, you remember who the Red Chinese are? They’re the ones who seized an American plane a little while back and held it hostage. The Red Chinese are the ones who produce half the goods Wal-Mart sells.

You remember who Wal-Mart is? Wal-Mart is the company that is boycotting and ruining Bessinger.

The Last Straw: Fox News Conservative Cowards Beat Their Scrawny Little Chests

A respectable conservative would cheerfully allow liberals to rape his children if he needed to do that to keep his “respectable” label. As the Wal-Mart example shows, anybody who is declared unrespectable by liberals is not just suppressed, they are ruined. Respectable conservatives make their living by pleasing liberals.

I hate leftists, but respectable conservatives make me sick. It turns my stomach to see a respectable conservative acting brave.

The last straw for me was when a bunch of respectable Fox News conservatives told the world how brave they were about free speech.

A few weeks back, Wal-Mart decided to withdraw two semi-pornographic magazines from its stands. Liberals went ballistic. Conservatives wanted to show liberals they were just as outraged at this suppression of free speech as liberals were.

Fox has a program called “Fox News Watch” that is supposed to criticize news coverage. They started talking about Wal-Mart’s “boycott” of Maxim Magazine and the other one. They never mentioned the Bessinger boycott.

I wrote News Watch about Bessinger, but naturally I didn’t get a word back.

As usual, I am willing to bet I was the only person who made the connection between Wal-Mart and Bessinger in a letter. Their address is

newswatch@foxnews.com

Please write them or send a copy of these articles to them.

Southerners Who Call Themselves Conservatives Don't Back Bessinger, Either

We all know why no conservative says a word about Bessinger. Respectable conservatives are only loud when liberals allow them to be. When liberals say, "Sic 'em, boy", they demand to be allowed to lead the liberal lynch mob against "racists," or anybody else who liberals condemn.

You might think Southerners and especially South Carolinians might be willing to whisper something in Maurice's favor. What about all those brave South Carolina "traditionalists"?

Southern "Traditionalists" have no time for Bessinger. From the Southern Traditionalist point of view, Bessinger has two fatal weaknesses.

First, he's alive. Traditionalists are very brave when it comes to defending the reputations of dead Confederates. Defending dead people lets you hide behind history and not offend liberals directly.

More important, Bessinger was ruined over a year ago. When Brave Southern Spokesmen aren't talking about dead people, they are mailing out the latest stuff to each other. The people who remember every battle fought in 1863 have forgotten Bessinger.

I would like it if WhitakerOnline readers would e-mail their friends about Bessinger and Fox or mail out these articles.

I also much appreciate it when readers put these articles in news groups.

Once again, the address of Fox News Watch is

newswatch@foxnews.com

Please write them or send a copy of this article to them.

Maurice Bessinger deserves our support, despite the fact that he is alive. Maurice Bessinger is a real, living hero and martyr to our cause and the cause of free speech. It is time we gave some of the attention to him that we give to the latest conservative fashion.

News Watch Personnel

The Fox News Watch panel has two respectable conservatives, Al Thomas and Jim Pinkerton..

Jane Hall and Neal Gabler are the standard and packaged liberals, and the moderator Eric Burns brags about his devotion to free speech and straight talk in the news.

July 5, 2003 -- The Supreme Court Outlaws Plain English
July 5, 2003 -- The Case against Diversity
July 5, 2003 -- Conservatives Begin by Surrendering
July 5, 2003 -- California Today is the Diversity Showcase
July 5, 2003 -- Diverse California is in a State of Permanent Disaster

Fun Quote:

Graffiti found on wall in Pompeii:

"Nothing lasts forever."

The Supreme Court Outlaws Plain English

The big buzz right now is about Supreme Court decisions. On affirmative action, the Court decided two things.

First, the Court struck down a college admissions system which gave a member of each racial group a certain number of points. You got some extra points for being black or Hispanic and whoever had the highest number of total points got admitted.

The Supreme Court decided that this system of giving each racial group so many points was not what the Founding Fathers were thinking about when they wrote the Constitution. They said it was too openly anti-white.

But in another case the Court decided that, while giving actual points for being in a minority group was too much like a straight quota system, states do have to favor non-whites.

In this latter case the Court decided that diversity is a good thing and government should favor non-whites over whites to achieve diversity. But you can't do it in a blatant way like a points system.

So if you put this in plain English the Court made two contradictory decisions, one for racial discrimination and one against racial discrimination.

The Court said that you must divide up a pie and give more to minorities without giving less to whites.

This proposition does not work if you use plain English. That is what the points system does. The points system puts discrimination in plain English.

So the Court struck down the use of straight English.

On the other hand the Court said states must favor non-whites. It declared that diversity is "a compelling state interest." The logical problem here is that it is impossible to discriminate FOR somebody unless you discriminate AGAINST somebody.

Our national policy defies logic. So the Court outlawed logic.

The Case Against Diversity

All respectable conservatives have to insist they are “melting pot” fanatics. To be a respectable conservative you have to be the first to condemn anyone who criticizes Holy Diversity Itself.

Those of us who have always condemned integration (which was the old name for Diversity) have always said that if different races are together, they will be in conflict.

Those of us who opposed integration (now known as “diversity”) said that “diversity” would end freedom of speech. We said that a society with two equal races cannot talk frankly about race.

Since then every country where you have different races and a doctrine of Equality has imposed Hate Laws that imprison people for saying the wrong thing.

Those of us who were always against integration, a.k.a., Diversity, always said that government cannot be neutral between different races. In a democracy, someone will take advantage of race, just as someone will take advantage of anything else.

The recent Supreme Court decisions said we were right. The Supreme Court just declared that government must favor non-whites over whites.

The court says that is good because diversity is good.

We who opposed integration, now known as diversity, have argued for fifty years that you cannot have Diversity and speak plain English. In the name of diversity, the Supreme Court just outlawed both logic and plain English.

Conservatives Begin by Surrendering

You cannot have racial diversity and freedom of choice. The Supreme Court just said that.

The Supreme Court has ruled that it is "a compelling state interest" to keep whites from going to the school of their choice.

More to the point, every country which proclaims diversity has outright hate laws or policies which limit freedom of speech for the sake of diversity. Every university which proclaims diversity has Draconian penalties for saying the wrong thing.

No conservative can say either of these things and be respectable.

Every respectable conservative must agree that “the race question is very complicated.” In other words, it can’t be dealt with by simple English and simple logic. When you agree with that, you have surrendered the important points.

California Today is the Diversity Showcase

The last Republican California governor tried to stop giving welfare to known illegal aliens. Republicans have lost every state-wide election since then.

The last Republican governor of California believed what conservatives keep saying. Conservatives are for diversity, so they say that Hispanic citizens in California, including those of Hispanic descent, are just as American as anybody else. Since Hispanic Americans are as American as anybody else, they would naturally join with the overwhelming majority of their fellow American citizens in America and support the rights of American citizens over illegal Mexican immigrants.

The last Republican governor of California bet everything on the idea that, “Regardless of his ethnic background, an American is just an American..”

When the question of denying welfare to illegal aliens came up, California’s Hispanic population had a choice between backing Americans and backing illegal aliens from Mexico. Diversity had a chance to prove it was a very American thing

When push came to shove Americans of Hispanic descent in California took the side of illegal Mexican immigrants over other people with United States citizenship papers. As always, the minute you try that melting pot crap out in the real world, it collapses.

Did conservatives admit this was a defeat for their silly "melting pot" ideas? Of course not.

Did liberals admit this was a defeat for “diversity”? Of course not.

Liberal commentators tell us that the Republican proposition to deny welfare benefits to illegal aliens was political suicide. They tell us that conservatives were insane to imagine that Americans of Hispanic descent would think of themselves as Americans first and Hispanics second.

In other words, it doesn’t matter whether or not A Hispanic calls himself an American. His real loyalty naturally goes to other Hispanics.

That is how Diversity really works.

Diverse California is in a state of Permanent Disaster

California is coming apart politically. It has just had an unprecedented energy crisis. The government of California is about to go bankrupt. The governor is being recalled.

Why is all this occurring just now?

It just so happens that the last California census showed that Diversity had scored a historical triumph: For the first time in this century California’s English-speaking white population is a minority.

The Democrats control every branch of the California government. California Democrats openly rule by combining liberals in a common front with minority groups against native English-speaking white Americans, the “Anglos.”

It so happens that Democratic policy since that historic census has been such a disaster the governor is up for recall. They had a crushing energy crisis and they are now facing bankruptcy.

It so happens that, now that it has True Diversity, California politics is working just as well as Mexican politics work. Instead of moving toward the American standard of living, California has taken the first steps toward a Mexican standard of living.

And as long as “diversity” is “a compelling state interest,” California will keep sliding down.

The race problem is not complicated. Diversity is bad.

July 12, 2003 -- Mandatory Sentencing is Only for Violations of Political Correctness

July 12, 2003 -- The “Blood Bath” that Never Happened

July 12, 2003 -- Liberalism Would be Discredited if Respectable Conservative Reminded Liberals of their Predictions,

July 12, 2003 -- Gun Crime Depends Entirely on Who Has the Guns

July 12, 2003 -- We Need Discrimination!

Fun Quote:

From a bumper sticker:

“To err is human.”

“To forgive is divine.”

“Neither is Marine Corps policy.”

Mandatory Sentencing is Only For Violations of Political Correctness

Liberals oppose all mandatory sentencing for crimes against persons or property. But they have a consistent mandatory sentence for violations of Political Correctness.

No respectable conservative will ever mention this in a debate over mandatory sentencing.

There was a case in Britain called "The Crown versus Joseph Pierce" (1986). Pierce was accused of "inciting racial hatred." The case got a lot of attention because the court declared that, when it comes to race hate, “The truth is no excuse.”

So the court gave Pierce the mandatory one year sentence.

In New York a person with no previous record gets a mandatory one year sentence for carrying a weapon for self-protection.

In France and German, a first offense for contradicting any Politically Correct statement about the Holocaust carries a mandatory one year sentence.

Liberals say that the longest journey begins with a single year.

The "Blood Bath" That Never Happened

Liberals point out that Europe and Japan have rigid gun laws and low gun crime. But Switzerland has millions of privately owned guns and no more gun crime than any other European country. Lately there was a school shooting in Germany, but there haven't been any in Switzerland.

No respectable conservative ever brings up Switzerland.

Twelve years ago there was a national debate over laws to allow honest citizens to obtain concealed weapons permits.

Almost every liberal shrieked that, if states allowed concealed weapons permits, there would be, and I quote, "a blood bath", unquote.

Soon a majority of states passed those concealed weapons permit laws. Nothing happened. So for the first year liberals were saying that the "blood bath" would begin soon.

Liberals haven't said a word about that "blood bath" for almost a decade.

No liberal and no respectable conservative has ever mentioned that "blood bath" in all those years.

Leftism Would be Discredited If Respectable Conservatives Reminded Liberals of Their Predictions

No liberal prediction ever comes true, but no respectable conservative ever reminds them of their predictions. That's how you become respectable.

If you want to be allowed to make your living in the media, you cannot embarrass liberals

But what has happened with concealed weapons permits over the last ten years is not just the usual embarrassment to liberals that respectable conservatives protect them from. What has actually happened with concealed weapons permits would be a breakthrough, breath-taking news story if anybody ever reported it.

There have been hundreds of thousands of concealed weapons permits issued over the past decade. The result of giving respectable people the right to carry weapons in America has been exactly the same as it has been in Switzerland.

We are speaking of millions of years of honest citizens legally carrying concealed weapons, multiplying hundreds of thousands of permit holders by the number of years they have had these permits.

There have been NO violations! I did not say there had been no bloodbath. I did not even say the permits have not caused a single wrongful death in ten years. I said there has been NO misuse of permits that caused any real trouble anywhere!

Gun Crime Depends Entirely on Who Has the Guns

The case of Switzerland and our years of experience with concealed weapons permits demonstrate that the misuse of guns only occurs when bad people have them.

Does anybody really believe that any criminal who wants a gun can't get one because of a gun law?

Come on, world! The reason a person is a criminal is because he doesn't OBEY laws.

So the experience of permit holders and Switzerland just confirms what any person who is not actually mentally retarded would expect: if good people have guns, crime goes down, not up.

Nobody is going to march into a store in Switzerland and start shooting. Somebody there probably has a gun and will kill the terrorist with it.

Terrorists do their shooting in gun-free zones, where honest people obey the anti-gun laws and terrorists – surprise, surprise!! – don't.

The leftist stand for taking guns away from honest people shows once again that leftism is not “the other side” in a rational debate. Leftism is mentally retarded.

Respectable conservatism respects liberal intelligence. It is retarded, too.

We Need Discrimination!

According to liberals, if a repeat offender doesn't have the same rights as everybody else, we are all doomed.

Meanwhile, back on earth, honest people should have guns and criminals should not.

In other words, what is true is exactly what the lawyers say is not true. Lawyers say that the rules must protect everybody equally. Reality says that rights need to depend heavily on the individual's history.

In one case, a nineteen year old killed four people running away from the police in a car. He had been arrested EIGHTEEN TIMES for the same offence.

We keep being told that we need to do something for hardened criminals in prison because they will soon be back among us. Liberals say, "You can't keep them locked up forever."

Why not?

I was watching an episode of “COPS” where a young guy was laughing at going back to jail again. He had been there so often it was a joke.

To stop crime, what we desperately need is just what all the leftist lawyers like Alan Dershowitz tell us we cannot have: some discrimination between crooks and honest people.

Liberals argue that you must treat a repeater just like an honest citizen.

Liberals argue that you must treat a person with a clean record who carries a weapon just like you would treat any professional thug.

Liberals are ALWAYS wrong.

And when it counts, respectable conservatives are ALWAYS silent.

July 19, 2003 -- Giggling at a Funeral

July 19, 2003 -- Why the Well-Trained Mind Does not Giggle in the Wrong Places

July 19, 2003 -- Another Funeral I Laughed at

July 19, 2003 -- One More Example of Many When I Laughed at Another Politically Correct Funeral

Fun Quote:

"That's what us educated people call an add hominy remark."

Giggling at a Funeral

Every time I listen to a Politically Correct speaker giving a grave and deadly serious lecture, I am afraid I am going to laugh at the wrong moment. I am like one of those guys who tends to giggle uncontrollably in the middle of a funeral eulogy.

This happened while I was watching a biography of Confucius on the Discovery Channel. The concluding lecture was about how Confucius was Politically Correct. He was a champion of the Working Class, just like Chairman Mao and our other recent idols.

OK, that's standard stuff. But then the Politically Correct narrator made the flat statement that Confucius was directly responsible for the high level of prosperity the Chinese people have enjoyed since his day. To me, the idea of Chinese peasants as prosperous was funny, but it wouldn't be to a modern college graduate.

The flat statement that the average Chinese peasant has lived high on the hog since the fifth century B.C. caused me to give that laugh I am so afraid of. But a roomful of today's college graduates would be able to sit there with that grimly determined look every professors likes to see while he's repeating the liberal lines for the hundredth time.

Why the Well-Trained Mind Does Not Laugh in the Wrong Places

Some of our readers may have a certain problem with the idea that Asia has been a model of individual prosperity. He may laugh at the idea just as I did.

Four years in college will prevent a person from making my mistake of laughing out loud at the idea that a Chinese peasant has been the world's model of good living for over two millennia.

It starts with the fact that every student has spent hundreds of hours learning that, "Things are not as they appear."

So when the Aztecs slaughtered thousands of human sacrifices and kicked headless bodies down the stairs of their temples, it wasn't really a bad thing. Europe was just as bad. If you don't agree with that, you are Hitler.

Schools into which large numbers of ghetto children were bussed produced a generation of white children who consider foul language normal and schools where drug dealers and pimps have become routine. But college students are told that this is not bad. This is exposing white kids to experiences they would not otherwise have. This is broadening their social horizons. If you don't agree, you're Hitler.

So the well-trained mind is expected to fill in the gaps and not laugh. A young person has heard hundreds of explanations as to why our provincial mind might think that peasants who live in squalor and starvation are, to the untrained eye, not prosperous. After all those lectures you just fill in the blank without a tedious explanation.

So you don't laugh.

I have an untrained mind. I laugh in all the wrong places.

Another Funeral I Laughed At

The first time I heard the Preamble to the Soviet Constitution was when a professor read it in class. I laughed out loud.

Nobody else saw the joke.

That Preamble said that the Soviet Union would be a union of "workers, peasants, soldiers, AND INTELLECTUALS."

No ten-year-old would fall for that crap.

Let's say that several ten-year-olds were talking about setting up a country. One of the kids says, "OK, Tommy, You'll be the soldier. You'll do the fighting and get your leg blown off. Will, you'll be the peasant. You'll spend your whole day out in the mud and grow all our food. Frank, you'll be the worker. You'll spend all day in the factory."

Naturally, being intelligent ten-year-olds, Tom and Will and Frank will ask, "So what will you be doing?"

To which the guy setting things up will reply, "I'll be the intellectual. I'll sit around and tell you what to do."

No reasonably intelligent ten-year-old would be taken in by that line.

But leftist intellectuals would not question that line. A room full of students in class with me saw nothing funny about it.

I laughed out loud. I laughed out loud because I was more than ten years old and I had a mind to prove it.

It had never occurred to the rest of my class that there was anything funny about this crap.

One More Example of Many When I Laughed at a Politically Correct Funeral

Back while the Soviets were still occupying Hungary, I was listening to a tour guide in Budapest.

At that time everybody still remembered that the Soviet Army had brought in troops from the Orient to crush the 1956 Budapest uprising.

No one in Soviet-occupied Budapest dared mention the 1956 slaughter. So I was wondering if Hungarian hatred of the Soviet occupation might come up the way things do come up in totalitarian societies, in an underground joke.

It did. At one point the Hungarian guide pointed across the river where there was an old fortress with a huge hammer and sickle on it.

That place with the hammer and sickle, said our Hungarian guide, had been the Turkish center of power when the Turks occupied the other side of the river. The Turkish cruelty centered in that tower was legendary. It was a strong fort, but none of the many armies who occupied Budapest since then had ever used that fort. The Turks had such a horrible reputation that that hideous site had been left unoccupied.

Then, the guide went on, in the late 1950s the people of Budapest had made that old Turkish fort into a memorial to Soviet troops who died "liberating Budapest." The Soviets were very proud of this touching tribute and Soviet troops visited it regularly.

I caught myself, once again, laughing out loud. As always, everybody else looked at me like I had a tulip growing out of my forehead. The guide didn't laugh either, though I think her look was very friendly.

Everybody in Budapest understood the joke except the Politically Correct ones. The ancient sign of unimaginable tyranny had been reopened by the people of Budapest with a huge hammer and sickle on it. The Politically Correct Soviets saw nothing funny about that. The Politically Correct European and American college graduates around me saw nothing funny about that.

I have never met an intelligent Hungarian who was not in on the joke. Except the Marxists, of course, and I did say "intelligent"?

July 26, 2003 -- Ann Coulter

July 26, 2003 -- Bush the Second, Somalia the Second

July 26, 2003 -- Is an Innocent Person Ever Executed in America?

Fun Quote:

Advertisement for a restaurant in Peking:

"We serve genuine American fortune cookies."

Ann Coulter

The only thing I admire about Ann Coulter is her mind. The fact that she is a great looking blond means nothing to a purely philosophical person like Bob Whitaker.

You can sure tell I was in politics, can't you? I wrote that with a perfectly straight face.

No, Virginia, I don't believe it either.

All I have read of Ann Coulter's latest book is its main title. The book is about the liberal record of hatred for America. The book is about liberals always being on the side of America's enemies.

If Tucker Carlson or William Buckley or any other respectable conservative were writing that book the title would be "How Well-Meaning Idealists on the American Patriotic Left Have Sometimes Made Honest Mistakes About What Approach to Foreign Policy Has Been Best for America."

Coulter's title is:

"Treason."

To be a respectable conservative, 1) You have to prove to the liberals who dominate the media that you are harmless and 2) You have to praise liberals to the skies. Respectable conservatives have to say that every liberal is personally lovable, honest, patriotic, idealistic, well-meaning, highly intelligent, highly intellectual, and a string of other wonderful characteristics that make the Boy Scout Qualities look like a string of insults by comparison.

Ann Coulter knows that history shows that liberals cannot be 1) patriotic AND 2) intelligent.

Ann Coulter knows that history shows an intelligent person cannot be 1) well-meaning and 2) liberal.

Leftists are nasty little people and what they are doing is either treason or they are too mentally retarded to know the difference.

I like the fact that Ann Coulter gives no quarter to this scum.

Well, what do you know? When I get past the photograph, I DO admire Ann Coulter for her mind!

Bush the Second, Somalia the Second

Retards like Gerry Ford say that Republicans can win only if they are moderates, which means they would be half liberal and half conservative.

In the real world, conservatives destroy themselves when they try to please the left.

We are about to send troops into Liberia for exactly the same reason we sent troops into Somalia. Liberals accused Bush Senior of worrying about every continent except black Africa, so he went into Somalia to please them.

Bush Junior is taking military action or threatening military action in Asia, the Middle East, and we continue to keep troops in Europe. So now that there are problems in Liberia, Bush the Second has to send troops there or he is open to the charge that he is ignoring black Africa.

That charge keeps Republicans awake at night. Republicans want desperately to prove that they know that Africa is just like every other continent. They want to prove they do not treat blacks differently, so if Americans are in Yugoslavia and Iraq, they should be in black Africa, too.

I have been where the decisions are made, and I assure you that that is the mentality the real Bush decisions are coming from. So Bush will go into black Africa again.

The fact is that Africa IS different. But there is no way Republicans will ever learn that, so let's make another point here.

Republicans are always trying to prove something to Democrats. It is when Republicans try to prove something to Democrats that they create a disaster. That is what happened in Somalia.

Conservatives are always trying to prove something to liberals. It is when conservatives try to prove something to liberals that they create a disaster. That is the danger in Liberia.

We will go into Liberia to prove that liberals and Democrats are wrong about the conservative and Republican attitude toward black Africa.

Insanity is defined as doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results.

Is an Innocent Person Ever Executed in America?

Let me ask a question about the American legal system. Here it is:

There are a lot of hardened criminals in prison right now. When they are released will any of them kill innocent people?

There are two answers to this question.

The first is, of course innocent people will be killed by repeaters released this month.

The second answer is, "So what?"

This is a question that doesn't matter. When it comes to innocent non-criminals, nobody expects the legal system to be anywhere near perfect.

Now let me ask you the question that does matter. This is the question to which at least one documentary will be dedicated this week. This is the question on the mind of every European and Canadian:

"Has an innocent person ever been executed?"

The crime rate in Europe used to be so low it shamed America. Now a small town in Europe is more dangerous than a big city in America. So what do Europeans worry about?

Europeans worry about the American death penalty.

And we take them seriously.

Only nine percent of American burglars actually enter homes while the family is still at home. This is good, because the effect of burglars breaking into a home with children there is horrible. The children watch their father cowering against the wall, helpless to protect them.

In Britain, almost half of the burglars break into homes when the family is there. The burglary rate in Britain used to be very low. Now every kind of robbery in Britain is far more common than in America.

But if you ask about the crime problems of developed countries, no one will mention those cowering, whining fathers in British homes.

The only question that matters is:

“Has an innocent person ever been executed in America?”

In Europe, human life is so important to the legal system that nothing else matters. In America, a lot of things matter besides just keeping people alive.

I would much rather be in America.

August 2, 2003 -- Making It to 100

August 2, 2003 -- South Carolina's Tax-Paid Anti-Gun Lobby

August 2, 2003 -- Why SLED and Other Anti-Gun Lobbies Want to Keep Permits the Way They Are

August 2, 2003 -- The Magic Policeman

Fun Quote:

"By definition, a melting pot is nothing specific. Anyone who can be deeply loyal to nothing specific is in desperate need of psychiatric care."

Me in the Southern Partisan, 1985

Making it to 100

I remember reading about how often the ancient Greeks stayed active until they were very old. A lot of them stayed active into their late 90s, one until he was 99. But then they died, and none of those mentioned made 100.

It is no accident that Strom Thurmond and Bob Hope made it to 100 and promptly died. My grandfather reached 90 and promptly died because he knew he would not make it to 100.

George Burns had a big party planned for his 100th birthday. Then he died at 99, too.

But Strom and Bob Hope made it to 100 and then died.

I wonder if this is like the four-minute mile. In my youth the big deal was for somebody to finally run a mile in four minutes. Roger Bannister did it, and soon another man did it. Then even college athletes began to beat the four-minute mile.

That happens with most records. First everybody barely misses it, then lots of people break it once the barrier has been crossed.

Maybe Hope and Thurmond have started a trend.

South Carolina's Tax-Paid Anti-Gun Lobby

Every state and every major city in America has a tax-paid anti-gun lobby. That lobby wears police uniforms and gold braid on their hats.

In South Carolina the state-supported anti-gun lobby is called SLED, the South Carolina Law Enforcement Division.

In a proposal from Sen. Dave Zien to state of Wisconsin found at http://home.wi.rr.com/ccw4wi/ppa_intro.html

Florida has the most studied concealed carry law and the one after which the bill is most closely modeled. From passage in 1987 to January 31, 1996, Florida had issued 320,571 carry licenses. Only 58, or 0.02%, have been revoked because the holder committed a crime (not necessarily violent) while in possession of a firearm. During the same period, over 300,000 firearm crimes were committed in Florida by non-licensees.

According to FBI uniform crime reports, after enactment of their concealed weapons law, while Florida's homicide rate was dropping 27% and its handgun homicide rate has dropped 38% while increasing 8% and 43% respectively in the U.S. as a whole. Florida's homicide rate has now dropped 41%.

When the concealed weapons law was proposed in 1992 the South Carolina Law Enforcement Division (SLED) fought desperately against allowing permits for law-abiding citizens.

My information is that when they lost that fight, SLED officials fanned out over the state, telling store owners to put up "No Guns Allowed" signs to make permits as useless as possible.

Unofficially, of course.

I have talked to a lot of pro-gun people about this. Every one says, 1) Yes, it's true and 2) No one is allowed to complain about it.

South Carolina gun lobbies want to go along and get along, so SLED's anti-gun fixation is not mentioned by any decent person.

So I'll talk about it.

When the permit law came up for renewal, SLED did what any lobby has to do: it accepted the inevitable. Permit holders have done better than any type of police in handling their guns, so SLED did not try to get the law repealed.

When the time came for the legislature to renew the permit law, all that SLED and all the other anti-gun lobbies could say was, "Permits are working just fine, let's just keep them like they are."

Police brass want to go back to the good old days. Before the present law, sheriffs and the police doled out permits to people who could do them some political good.

Why SLED and Other Anti-Gun Lobbies Want to Keep Permits the Way They Are

Permit holding has been tried. Permit holders have done a superlative job. As a result, permit holders today ought to have all the rights that permit holders had back when the police doled them out for political pull.

SLED and the other anti-gun people want to keep the present gun permits because they aren't worth much. You can't carry a gun to and from a restaurant that serves alcohol, so criminals are safe in mugging those people. When the old permits were handed out by the sheriff for political pull, you could carry a gun if you were crawling out of a bar, no problem.

Today's holder of non-political permits can't carry a gun at night to and from a hospital, so criminals don't have to worry about nurses pulling a weapon on them. The State newspaper went ballistic when it was proposed that permit holders be allowed to carry weapons to and from church

The State paper headline was, "GUN LOBBY WANTS GUNS IN CHURCH!"

So if you want to mug people on the way to church, feel free, courtesy of SLED and the State newspaper.

In South Carolina only the weapons rights that go with a badge are worth having. And that's just the way SLED and the police brass want it. They hope that once permit holders will give up on getting real permits.

Then we can go back to the old system where SLED, sheriffs and the police brass gave real permits to those with the political pull to do them some good.

Pro-gun people tell me that it is stupid and dangerous for me to talk about SLED as a state-paid anti-gun lobby. Everybody tells me that. But my whole life has been a string of stupid and dangerous activities, and today the only stupid and dangerous moves I regret most are the ones I was too smart to make.

SLED may deny everything I said above. Their stance on renewing the law on permits is a matter of public record, but I am willing to bet that some of them will deny that, too.

What if I am wrong? Nobody else is going to mention this tax-paid anti-gun lobby, so sometimes you just have to stick your neck out.

I feel someone needs to mention SLED's lobbying because no one has privately denied it and no one will publicly attack it.

The Magic Policeman

Conservatives insist that anybody who puts on a uniform becomes superhuman. So they insist that the police should have guns anywhere.

Liberals and conservatives agree that you are not magically endowed with the power of putting a gun to good use if you are not wearing a uniform.

No decent person questions this. So I will.

So far permit holders, hundreds of thousands of them, have a perfect record of using their weapons. By contrast, the rate of suicide and heavy drinking among policemen, for good reason, is very high. The real statistics favor the permit holders. But SLED will never mention that.

What really ticks me off is the fact that liberals and anti-gun people like SLED are always saying ridiculous things, and they never lose an ounce of credibility for it.

One outstanding example was the "forty-three" myth. For years liberals told us that an honest person with a gun was forty-three times as likely to have that gun taken away and used against him as he was to use it for his own defense. No conservative challenged this number.

No police official debated it. They promoted this kind of thinking.

Then career policemen began writing a few letters to local papers. A typical one pointed out that he had been a cop for twenty-five years and he had never even heard of some criminal genius taking a gun away from somebody and using it against them.

Other cops wrote in, saying they had never heard of that, either, but all of them knew of people who had successfully defended their lives and property with a gun. They referred to themselves as "street cops" or "working cops." A policeman who tells the truth about gun control will never get that gold braid on his hat.

Please see WorldView for September 7, 2002 - THE COP WITH THE DEGREE

August 9, 2003 -- The "Central Park Jogger" Case in Plain English

August 9, 2003 -- No Decent Human Being Would Say This

August 9, 2003 -- The Blatant Discrimination No One Will Mention

August 9, 2003 -- Liberals and Conservatives Only Disagree on What to Deny Honest People

Fun Quote:

A sense of humor is a sense of proportion.

The "Central Park Jogger" Case in Plain English

Blacks are rioting because of the horrible injustice of the Central Park jogger case. It turns out that the white jogger was raped and tortured and disfigured in Central Park by a black repeat torturer and rapist who was on the streets again.

The black kids who were convicted of raping and torturing her were innocent of the rape. Instead they were out doing what they do every night, "terrorizing"-- beating and robbing -- white people in Central Park. The black community is outraged at this false conviction, and all decent white people are apologizing desperately.

The Central Park jogger herself was a New York Yuppie, just the sort of person who would fight to get a torturer-rapist released from prison and to allow black kids to be back out beating whites.

No Decent Person Would Say This

- 1) The attack on the World Trade Center would not have occurred if Americans kept tabs on immigrants;
- 2) The reason we do not keep tabs on immigrants is because those who control our government have a vested interest in not enforcing our immigration laws;
- 3) The biggest lobby against immigration laws is our Hispanic population. The bottom line is that American Hispanics are loyal to Mexicans and not to other American citizens;
- 4) The second biggest lobby against strict immigration enforcement is those who say it would hurt our international trade. That lobby's strongest support came from those in the World Trade Center.

The Blatant Discrimination No One Will Mention

Over the years I have become a real connoisseur of liberal spokesmen. I have debated with thousands of them. Liberals have given up trying to say that any policy that liberals demand actually works.

Liberals can't defend their policies on practical grounds, so all they have left is guilt or moral righteousness. They follow the old lawyers' adage, "If you have no case, attack like hell."

When it comes to guilt and moral righteousness the best spokesmen are black. A black liberal can repeat every liberal line with a speed and deftness whites cannot match.

But all I ever see as the liberal spokesman is a lily white person. In fact, the spokesman on the liberal side is usually a White Anglo-Saxon, Protestant or Catholic. Bill Press is MSNBC's official liberal. How white can you get?

The only reason there is any leftist power left in America is because liberals own the minority vote. Yet they do not allow anything like their quota of black spokesmen, accented Hispanic spokesmen, or any other minority. Meanwhile liberals constantly demand racial quotas for everybody else.

I demand that Bill Press give his job to a member of a minority group.

I am serious about this. Press demands that other whites give up their jobs or schools for minorities, so he should take the lead.

The situation is worse at CNN. On Crossfire the two liberal spokesmen are not only white, they're white SOUTHERNERS! White Southerners are about the bottom of the liberal vote category, so their quota as liberal spokesmen should be very, very low.

The two Southern whites who are Crossfire's permanent professional liberals demand that all other whites give up their jobs to minorities. I demand they give up their jobs immediately.

And yes, I am perfectly serious.

Liberals and Conservatives Only Disagree on What to Deny Honest People

I was watching Donald Rumsfeld saying there is nothing wrong with American intelligence agencies. He says it's a tough job, so everybody should butt out.

After all, who the hell are we? It's not our country or our safety. Rumsfeld says that buddies in the intelligence agencies should not be criticized.

That's typical conservative. In my articles on September 11, 2001 I predicted that not one person in the entire intelligence establishment would lose anything because of that disaster. I did another article on March 16, 2002 called IF YOU WANT A PROMOTION, CAUSE A CATASTROPHE.

Sure enough, all the people who let that catastrophe happen have been promoted and their agencies have just been handed a lot more money, no questions asked.

Liberals want to keep private citizens from having any means of self-defense. The other side of this coin is conservative desperation to keep information away from the public..

I think America would be much, much safer if almost everything were declassified. I think America would be safer if every honest citizen were allowed to carry weapons when and where he chooses.

Right now intelligence information is restricted to the intelligence community, where professional traitors can get hold of it routinely. Guns are kept out of the hands of honest people, but no criminal ever has the slightest difficulty getting a gun if he really wants one.

August 16, 2003 -- The Red Herring is Dead, Long Live the Red Herring!

August 16, 2003 -- The Most Important Liberal Victories are the Ones Conservatives Never Saw Happening

August 16, 2003 -- Conservatives Led the Fight to Make California Liberal

August 16, 2003 -- Respectable Conservatives Quietly Gave the Supreme Court to Liberals

Fun Quote:

"We have a balanced ticket. I am Catholic. My running mate is anti-Catholic."

-- Congressman John Schmitz, 1972 American Party candidate for president

The Red Herring is Dead, Long Live the Red Herring!

For decades the crime rate rocketed upward and liberals were openly the friends of "the so-called criminals." Did conservatives use this fact to make the public realize that liberals were their enemies? No way.

Every time crime was mentioned liberals screamed "Gun Control!" So instead of saying liberals were openly pro-criminal, conservatives debated what liberals wanted to talk about, which was gun control.

If any conservative pointed out that liberals always took the side of criminals against the public, respectable conservatives insisted that liberals loved the people dearly and were good people.

So nobody blamed liberals for the crime rate everybody was afraid of and the only people who got blamed for anything was the conservatives who got blame for all the guns out there.

Even liberals are now aware of how many leftists just plain hate Americans. Everybody knows liberals have been pro-criminal and anti-American for decades. Even Bill Press recently said it was good the leading Democratic candidate, the former governor of Vermont, was not "one of the anti-gun nuts."

So the red herring that prevented conservatives from mentioning the leftist pro-criminal record has gone down. So what is the red herring now?

The death penalty is the new liberal red herring. That's what the left wants to talk about, so that's what the right talks about.

The Most Important Liberal Victories are the Ones Conservatives Never Saw Happening

Decades ago, conservatives never blamed liberals for being openly pro-criminal. The liberal media wanted to talk about gun control, so conservatives who became media spokesmen talked about two things: 1) gun control and 2) what nice people the liberals were.

But somebody did use the crime issue the right way. Someone did attack politicians for being pro-criminal. Guess who?

The left, of course.

Criminals never had a greater friend in public life than New York Congresswoman Bella Abzug. She fought as hard to get as many repeat felons back on the streets as any other liberal ever did.

One day in the early 1970s Bella Abzug and some other leftist women decided they would become The Women's Movement. So they held a press conference and declared they represented Women's Rights. One thing they denounced was all the rapes that were being committed by repeat rapists who were

being putting back on the streets. They said, and I am not joking here, that repeat rapists were on the streets because men were to blame.

One day Bella Abzug was fighting to get every repeat felon back on the streets and the next day she was screaming about all these repeat rapists who were on the streets. So did conservatives make a laughing stock of that?

Of course not. Not a single conservative spokesman even mentioned it. Abzug was a leftist and she wanted to talk about an Equal Rights Amendment, so what conservatives, ALL the conservatives, talked about was the Equal Rights Amendment. Abzug's pro-criminal record never came up.

Early in the Viet-Nam War, Bella Abzug had gone down to Cuba to worship Castro. While she was there the Cubans showed films of American planes being shot down over North Viet Nam. Abzug and her fellow Patriotic Liberals cheered and clapped loudly.

National Review mentioned that Bella had worshipped Castro and cheered at the death of America pilots, but it stopped there. Every conservative spokesman will tell you that Bella may have made some honest mistakes, but she was a True Patriot, like all liberals.

Respectable conservatives gave the crime issue to the liberals from the word go. They surrendered the whole battle before the argument started.

Conservatives Led the Fight to Make California Liberal

I have to keep repeating points until some dumbass conservative spokesman finally realizes how useful they are. Let me give you an example.

Pat Buchanan used to support open borders. He joined all the other conservatives in saying that that "free enterprise means the free movement of goods AND LABOR."

But the reason labor moves out of Mexico is because Mexico is a political disaster. If those laborers move to a country which is not a political disaster, they become the people of their new country. So they turn the country they move into into the same political disaster they came from.

I tried desperately to get conservatives to face this obvious fact. But they kept repeating, "free enterprise requires the free movement of goods AND LABOR." Open borders forever! I wanted to grab them by ears and shout into their faces, "You idiot, labor VOTES!"

So conservatives talked about free enterprise and worked to bring in all the anti-free enterprise immigrants they could.

I tried for years to talk to those morons about reality. I gave a paper at a major economic conference with a Nobel Prize-winning economist in the audience in which I pointed out, in more technical language, that if politically stupid people come up, they ruin the economy. No one disagreed.

Conservatives kept repeating that "free enterprise means the free movement of goods AND LABOR."

In 1982 I put together "The New Right Papers" for the world's third largest publisher just so I could make this one point in it. I finally got the respectable conservatives' attention. Free enterprise finally

had a good argument against the "Free enterprise requires the free movement of goods AND LABOR" argument. This helped a lot in making National Review and other respectable conservatives oppose immigration.

Being against importing leftists always made political sense, but the argument was needed. Arguments matter. Ideas matter. And there is nothing that is as hard as getting conservatives to accept a good idea.

Conservatives take all their arguments from what liberals say. And liberals never approve anything that would be a good idea for conservatives.

So conservatives fought for open borders for decades. Again they surrendered the real fight without conservatives even knowing it was going on, and now the biggest state in the Union is a leftist bastion and the left's minority base is large and growing.

Respectable Conservatives Quietly Gave the Supreme Court to Liberals

In 1968 the Supreme Court struck down all state intermarriage laws and the Catholic bishops and main line conservatives all applauded wildly. All of the states that had adopted the Constitution enforced laws against miscegenation. In order to strike down all state anti-miscegenation laws the Court just openly ignored what the Founding Fathers intended and everybody knew it.

Conservatives and Catholic bishops were in their glory when they praised the Supreme Court for its decision striking down miscegenation laws. Every time they praised that decision, liberals patted them on the head and told them what great anti-racists they were. Conservative live for liberal praise.

Liberal praise is also what Catholics who have an inferiority complex live for. So in 1973 the Supreme Court invented the right to abortion. Bishops went ballistic. Conservatives went ballistic.

This year the Supreme Court struck down all state sodomy laws and conservatives went ballistic. "What happened," they screamed, "To the Original Intent of the Founding Fathers?"

I want to grab them by the ears and shout in their faces, "YOU happened to it!"

Conservatives gave up original intent so they could get liberals praise for being anti-racist. They also gave up their constitutional principles without a fight. They also gave up on the membership of the Supreme Court without a fight. Now they are asking what happened there, too.

Conservatives blindly backed Bush Senior for President. He put the most liberal member on the Supreme Court, Justice Souter. The Court is split with four conservatives against four solid liberals, one of whom is Justice Souter. And who is the one who votes half liberal and half conservative? Bush Senior's other appointee, Justice O'Connor.

Conservatives gave up the Supreme Court without a fight, and now they are whining and crying.

August 23, 2003 -- Conservatives are Sophomores

August 23, 2003 -- It's Called Supply AND DEMAND

August 23, 2003 -- "Hispanic" Attitudes Have a Fatal Flaw

August 23, 2003 -- Another Little "Wake Up Call"

Fun Quote:

The man in uniform works for a guy in a coat and tie. The guy in a coat and tie works for somebody who wears what he damned well pleases.

Conservatives are Sophomores

The word sophomore means “sophisticated moron.” It was invented when many students still studied Greek, so the “sopho” is from the ancient Greek word for wisdom, from which the word “sophisticate” also derives. The “more” in sophomore is from the Greek word for fool, from which the word “moron” also derives.

Last week’s WhitakerOnline talked about one of the many sophomoric comments conservatives are always making. Conservatives look very, very wise, and then they say, “Free enterprise requires that there be free movement of goods AND LABOR.”

It takes a fool not to realize that labor VOTES. Immigrants go from the country they have ruined to a new country, and the trick is not to let them destroy the new one. But the poor dumb conservative has finally gotten some understanding of the free market, which is more than any liberal will ever do, and he thinks he is wise.

Conservatives used that stupid phrase, “Free enterprise requires the free movement of goods AND LABOR” to fight for open borders for many critical years. The growing minority vote that the liberals own is largely their doing.

Someone who says, “Free enterprise requires the free movement of goods AND LABOR” is wise enough to understand what a free market is about, but he is still an absolute, destructive fool.

It's Called Supply AND DEMAND

One reason conservatives are so bubble-headed is because they preach “supply and demand” but they never pay any attention to demand.

Conservatives talk about how a good economy requires grim self-discipline or hard work on the part of producers, but no conservative ever mentions what kind of buyer that makes a good economy. They say German goods are good because of the German work ethic, but is that really why German goods have to be good?

German products have to be clean because Germans won’t accept anything dirty. If you produce something crappy and sell it to a South American or a Frenchman, he will give one of those famous Latin shrugs and not worry about it. If a German’s watch quits, he goes ape.

Everybody likes to say how sophisticated those wonderful Latins are when they just shrug when something is dirty or breaks down. But the fact is we would rather buy something a German would buy. But if you listen to a conservative talking about economics, you would never think about that.

German goods are worth having because Germans won't accept less. Germans produce good stuff because of German demand. But if you listen to a conservative talk about supply and demand, you would never know that.

"Hispanic" Attitudes Have a Fatal Flaw

Oh , how philosophical those Latins are! They don't take things so seriously. If their water is dirty or products are shoddy, they shout "C'est la Vie!" and shrug in a sophisticated way.

How wonderful!! How Wise!

Unless, of course, you would rather have water that is clean and products that work. To have those things you have to live among people who will accept nothing less.

Those who talk about "Hispanic culture" glory in the Mexican attitude. But real Mexicans keep desperately trying to get OUT of Mexico and into the United States. The United States has that Northern European attitude that won't put up with what Mexicans take for granted.

I don't want a bunch of third worlders in America for exactly the same reason that the third world wants to be here. All third worlders demand is an America that is like the countries they come from, except for the wages.

Third worlders will accept a level of dirt and poverty in their homelands that no American would stand for a minute. Big businessmen think that's wonderful. It means labor is cheaper.

The same thing goes for government. The third world minority vote demands very little. They are not spoiled like Americans are. The third world voter is happy to accept promises instead of results. They don't ask that anything actually WORK.

Conservatives have been saying that they were going to get the minority vote for the last fifty years. Conservatives say crime is a far more serious problem in minority areas than it is in white areas, so minorities will soon be voting for them and for their Law and Order platforms.

But crime has steadily gotten worse in minority communities, but they are just as slavishly liberal as they ever were.

In America, minorities do not demand results.

In Africa and Latin America the police kick people around routinely in ways no American whites would allow for a minute. Third worlders do not demand results. Their water is dirty, they take starvation wages, their products don't work, and their governments are awful.

So if all those people come to America, what kind of magic will keep America so different from the countries they came from?

A country full of third worlders becomes the third world. But conservatives will never think of that.

Another Little "Wake Up Call"

The entire electrical system of the Northeastern United States collapsed again last week. That's the third time that has happened in my memory.

Nobody will get fired. Nobody will get blamed. It's another "wake up call."

When three thousand Americans were killed on September 11, 2001, it was a "wake up call" that told our intelligent services that they needed to watch terrorists. But we didn't want to be mean about it.

I think that when an intelligence agency fails to give needed information to another, the person who did that should be fired and charged with a felony.

I am a tough customer. And that is only way you will ever get results. A tough customer makes a good economy. A tough voter makes a good government. Democracy is a system of government where people get what they deserve. Democracy is a system of government where people get what they ask for.

August 30, 2003 --Sometimes Rumsfeld is a Pain in the ... Sometimes Rumsfeld is a Problem

August 30, 2003 -- Rumsfeld Cannot Admit He Might be Wrong

August 23, 2003 -- Sometimes O'Reilly is a Pain inSometimes O'Reilly is a Problem, Too

Fun Quote:

Moderation in all things is an extreme

Sometimes Rumsfeld is a Pain in the ...Sometimes Rumsfeld is a Problem

Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld is often a great relief because he often says what us mere Americans wish to hell SOMEBODY would say, even when he's wrong.

A lot of us are desperately tired of hearing people who think they are sophisticated talking about how we should never get mad at anybody and we should say nice things no matter what. I've been in international negotiations, and believe me, when it gets serious, nobody gives a damn what you said about France last week. Least of all the French negotiators.

Besides, when these self-styled "sophisticates" use the word "diplomacy," they mean "lie." When Americans talk turkey, they get laughs and admiration. When they try to act diplomatic, it just looks as silly as it is.

On the other hand, Rumsfeld has the bad characteristics of a conservative. Liberals want to keep weapons out of the hands of honest Americans. But honest Americans are not the problem when it comes to weapons. Rumsfeld wants to keep information away from "the common people" and limit it to professionals. But the fact is that it is the professionals who are an information sieve.

My boss was senior on the Select Intelligence Committee, and I was Special Assistant to the head of the entire Federal service on security clearances. Let me tell you something you may believe or not as you choose: the only reason the Soviet KGB did not know every secret it wanted to know was because they were stupid and grossly inefficient.

The head of the Cuba section of United States Defense Intelligence Agency spent her entire career reporting directly to Castro. She was only recently caught and sent to prison. She was not the only person Cuba, the KGB, and all the rest had reporting directly to them from inside the United States Government.

And they STILL didn't have all our secrets!

But they didn't have some stuff because they were hopelessly incompetent, despite what all the books tell you.

I will tell you what is NOT, NOT, NOT the reason the Communists didn't have all our secrets. It was NOT because those secrets were kept by the little shirt-tail Napoleons like Rumsfeld and his precious officials with all the clearances.

It is among those professional bureaucrats that our enemies plant their agents.

Rumsfeld is big on keeping secrets for the same reason that some policemen are big on gun control. He wants to be mysterious. In fact, it is a tribute to the dedication of working policemen – the ones who don't get promoted — that so many of them are not for gun control. After all, with gun control they are big men, because only they are allowed to have guns.

Being the only one who gets to carry a gun is big thing to a little man.

Likewise Rumsfeld wants to keep secrets for the privileged folks like himself. That part of him is a little man.

Rumsfeld Cannot Admit He Might be Wrong

"I beseech you, in the bowels of Christ, consider that you might be mistaken!" This is a famous quote from Oliver Cromwell to the Scottish Presbyterian rulers before he went to war with them.

When a good soldier is asked a policy question, his answer is, "That question is for a higher pay grade." I was in such a pay grade, and God knows the people who trusted me were at that level. If you have a conscience, you keep telling yourself that you didn't really make that decision that keeps you awake at night.

Sometimes you believe it, sometimes you don't.

My blood runs cold when I hear a quote from Lyndon Johnson. A reporter said that he leveled with them once about the Vietnam War. Said Johnson, "I will not be the first American president to go down into history for losing a war."

As I say, that statement gives me cold chills. Here was a man who was making decisions about the deaths of thousands of Americans on the basis of how he would look in the history books.

I seem to be the only person who gets the willies at thinking about this statement. If I caught myself thinking that way, I'd go to the nearest insane asylum.

Rumsfeld suffers from the same disease. He will not consider that maybe the critics were right, maybe we do need more troops in Iraq. I don't say we do, I just say that Rumsfeld will not consider it because it would mean he is wrong.

I have a feeling that Rumsfeld and Bush worry a lot more about being right than they do about being personally responsible for getting Americans killed.

Sometimes O'Reilly is a Pain in the ...Sometimes O'Reilly is a Problem, too

Like Rumsfeld, Bill O'Reilly of The O'Reilly Factor on Fox Cable News is a real relief for us Americans. He often says exactly what we are dying to say, and that is why he is the most popular person by far on cable television.

But O'Reilly is a Northern Irish Catholic who spends all his time in the national media which consists of Jews and WASPs who look upon Catholics, and especially ethnic Catholics, as peasants. Anti-Catholicism was accurately described a century ago as "the anti-Semitism of the Intellectuals." Back then people generally looked down on Jews, but the academic community, including its large contingent of Jews, looked down on Catholics.

They still do.

The result is that Bill O'Reilly has the same weaknesses that are shown by the leading Northeastern voice of Catholic conservatism, National Review. O'Reilly and National Review like to say that they don't care what WASPs and Jews think of them, but their every thought and statement begins and ends with what the "Intellectual anti-Semites" think of them.

William Buckley, who founded and owns National Review, is not only a Catholic, but his family is Southern. That is a double whammy from the media point of view. He is the peasant's peasant. When he went to Yale he was, from the point of view of the anti-Semitism of the Intellectual, both Jewish and black.

Buckley and O'Reilly desperately try to prove they are good Yankees. This gets very tiresome. National Review insults the South at every opportunity. It refers to Southerners as "southerners," even though that category is just plain WRONG. Hawaiians are living south of the Mexican border, as are Puerto Ricans. Southern California is as far south as the Old Confederacy.

The real "southerners" of the world are researchers at the South Pole. This is the kind of distinction National Review talks about all the time, but no inaccuracy is as important as proving to Northern intellectual anti-Semites that they are good Yankees, not at all like the Catholic peasants or the Southern peasants.

O'Reilly went to pieces over Georgia high school students who didn't want to dance with blacks, so they held their own private prom. Bill Press was proud of O'Reilly for that. Press said, "That's what America is about. Blacks and whites go to school together, they should dance together.

O'Reilly said that when the Founding Fathers called this "the United States," the word "united" referred to interracial dancing.

Yes, Virginia, that is what Bill O'Reilly SAID, and he said it more than once.

When it comes to proving to Northern Intellectual Anti-Semites that they are not bigoted Catholic peasants, O'Reilly is true fruitcake. When it comes to proving to Northern Intellectual Anti-Semites that they are not a bunch of peasants, National Review goes for simple bad spelling.

September 6, 2003 -- Bigotry is Healthier Than Self-Hate

September 6, 2003 -- The "Melting Pot" Theory Says That You Keep America by Giving it Away

September 6, 2003 -- A Conservative Spokesmen Has to be an Intellectual Baby

Fun Quote:

America is truly The Land of Opportunity. In Europe you have to be born a bastard. In America you do it yourself.

Bigotry is Healthier Than Self-Hate

"Would you fight your brother? Would you fight for the rights of another?" These words are the mantra of the History Channel. These words embrace our present idea of American idealism.

Meanwhile in California the front runner for the governorship is a Hispanic who has already been elected lieutenant governor. He belongs to a Hispanic organization whose motto is, "Everything for our race, nothing for others."

Lieutenant Governor Bustamente of California has refused to renounce or to denounce this group.

Conservatives are offended by Bustamente's stand.

I'm not.

Hispanic voters in the United States have made it very, very clear that their only loyalty is to Mexico. If you want the Hispanic vote, you give everything to illegal immigrants: welfare, tuition, preferences, driver's licenses, and no questions asked. I am a political realist, so I don't go into my Moral Outrage Act the way conservatives do.

The reality is that Hispanics who happen to be born in the United States are loyal to Mexicans.

What offends me is not that Hispanics who happen to have been born in the United States demand everything for Mexicans. America gave them the vote and they have a right to do whatever they want to with it.

The sicko here is not the Mexican who happens to reside in the United States. Like any other normal human being, he favors the people who look and talk like him. That's how evolution works. That's the only reason there ARE people who look and talk like him.

Survival of the fittest has no mercy on a group that does not seek its own preservation.

It is not "American" Hispanics who are the unnatural ones. The sicko here is the guy who says, "Kill your brother. Kill for the right of someone else to vote for their own people against mine."

The "Melting Pot" Theory Says That You Keep America by Giving it Away

Conservatives worship the melting pot and they say giving America away to third world immigration just makes America more American.

When I was in Washington, the big agricultural lobbies loved foreign aid. America backed trade deals where Russia bought wheat from America and then forgave the loans. While the Soviet Union threatened our very existence, we kept them going with American wheat that American taxpayers ended up paying for.

We kept the Soviet Union going for seventy years with our free food, from the Hoover Commission in 1920 to the very end of the Cold War. Now we do it for North Korea.

Congressmen backing this wheat giveaway to the USSR had a theory. They said that giving free food to other countries was good for America. They used a very complicated economic theory called "the multiplier."

Like so much in economics (I used to teach it) the flaw in this theory was just too boring for people to listen to.

So my answer was different. I said that if giving things away was good for America, we should do good for me, too. Instead of giving stuff to foreigners and getting us all those benefits indirectly, they should give lots and lots of money to ME, right here in the United States.

If that multiplier magic worked out, America would benefit by giving ME billions of dollars at taxpayer expense. And unlike the Russkis, I was not the enemy.

Nobody listened to me. Worse still, nobody gave me a damn thing.

A Conservative Spokesman Has to be an Intellectual Baby

We have all watched babies try to give us things. This is charming in a baby, because we know the baby doesn't realize that if he gives us his sucker or his doll, he no longer has it. It will be a year or so before a child realizes that when he gives something away he no longer has it.

When someone tells you you can give away American food to our enemies and come out ahead, he is being baby in a more complicated way. But he is still being a mental infant.

That's why you have to be a retard to be a conservative spokesman. A conservative spokesman has to say that if we give our country away to the third world, we will still have it.

Conservative spokesmen keep quoting the inscription on the Statue of Liberty as True Americanism. That inscription says the whole world should dump its surplus population into the United States:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,

The wretched refuse of your teeming shore."

Emma Lazarus wrote that inscription.

Emma Lazarus said that the American ideal was "the melting pot." All conservative spokesmen love that "melting pot"!

Emma Lazarus preached "the melting pot" for America. Israel Zangwill invented that "melting pot" concept.

Emma Lazarus and Israel Zangwill were Jews, and both of them wanted massive immigration into America so that America would not continue to be ruled by white gentiles.

But Emma Lazarus and Israel Zangwill agreed that Jews should NOT be melted into a melting pot. They both wanted a homeland especially for Jews.

Neither Zangwill nor Lazarus was stupid enough to think that a Jewish homeland would be more Jewish if it became a melting pot.

And neither Zangwill nor Lazarus would have killed their brother for the rights of another. Zangwill and Lazarus were not mentally ill.

You have to be sicko to want your people melted into a melting pot. You have to be a sicko to consider it ideal to kill your brother for the rights of another.

You have to be a conservative to want your people melted into a melting pot. You have to be a conservative to consider it ideal to kill your brother for the rights of another.

SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

I would consider it a personal favor if you would read the special articles I wrote on September 11, 2001. [Click here.](#)

WhitakerOnline is now five years old. As you will see if you look at our Archives, our first article appeared on September 12, 1998.

I need your help. I think I make good points, and I sure work my tail off writing and rewriting and I spent a lifetime learning what I say here. But all I get in my e-mail is forwards of articles about Iraq and demands that all of us spend our time defending helpless, poverty-stricken little Mel Gibson.

You are all I've got. I need for you to PROMOTE WhitakerOnline. That means sending articles to your friends. That means posting it in Newsgroups. That means not forwarding one article about Mel Gibson and Iraq and instead finding something in my five years of hard work that is worth sending out.

Too many of my readers seem to be fixated on anything that the conservative buzz says is the Issue of The Moment. That is precisely what WhitakerOnline aims to avoid.

This relates directly to what happened on September 11, 2001. Do you remember what the Great Conservative Issue was on September 10, 2001?

Me neither.

But until Sept. 11, 2001 we spent all our time forwarding articles about whatever the buzz of the moment was while terrorists saw our weaknesses and hit them.

If you look at my articles on September 11, 2001, you will see many links to my previous articles. I had been talking about the exact problems that led to September 11 all along.

Am I a prophet or a genius? Naturally I think so, but the reality is that the reason I predict the future is because I am not sunk down into the Current Buzz.

Take a breath. Look around.

Or you can stay with The Buzz and get caught with your pants down the way we did two years ago.

September 20, 2003 -- The Movie "The Scorpion King" Shows History As it is Taught
September 20, 2003 -- Great Civilization Theory Says Man is a Very Large Ant
September 20, 2003 -- Caution! Conservative Trying to Look Smart!
September 20, 2003 -- Our History Says That Everything Was Invented in the Garbage Dump
September 20, 2003 -- To Get Somewhere You Have to Stop Being Stupid Trying to Look Smart

Fun Quote:

Talking to the Service Department:

"There's no sound."

"What do you mean there's no sound?"

"I mean there's no sound."

"Did you try to adjust it?"

"How do you adjust it if it's utterly silent?"

"Did you try the volume? If the volume is too low you don't hear it."

"Yes, I tried the volume."

"Maybe this model doesn't have sound."

“It’s a stereo, it’s got to have sound. That’s the whole point of a stereo.”

“Did you try the volume? Sometimes when you have the volume too low...”

The Movie "The Scorpion King" Shows History As It Is Taught

The History Channel had a special discussing the Founder of Egypt’s Great Civilization, the Scorpion King. They were, of course, relating this to the movie.

The Scorpion King movie is history as we pay professors to teach it today. All the Evil Barbarians who tried to destroy Civilization in The Scorpion King are white. They’re filthy, cruel, and primitive.

But there is Hope. In The Scorpion King, a coalition of colored people save the Great Civilization. The Scorpion King himself is dark brown, and he and a black Hero shake hands at the end of the movie after destroying the Evil White People.

This is not a parody. This is the actual movie. Nobody but me noticed any of this.

In order to get the complete coalition of non-whites together, the Scorpion King’s girl friend is CHINESE!

The first wife of the first Pharaoh turns out to have been Oriental. That is the greatest historical discovery since conservative preachers decided that Israel in the time of Christ was HINDU!

See October 21, 2000, The Hindus in Roman Palestine.

Great Civilization Theory Says That Man is a Very Large Ant

Conservatives are sophomores, “wise fools.” They always say things they think will make them look Intellectual.

And when conservatives get that puffed-up look and start to pontificate, they are always wrong.

For fifty years I have seen that puffed up look appear on conservative faces when they said, “We are going to get the Negro vote this time.” It’s the "African-American" vote now, of course, but the goofy look on conservatives' faces is still exactly the same.

Another statement that goes with that Intellectual, constipated look is, “As Milton Friedman says, open borders would be fine if there were no welfare.”

You import tens of millions of bloc voters for socialism, and there is still no welfare?

Labor VOTES, you idiot!

Conservatives are true retards!

Another theme of this conservative retard version of smarts is talk about Great Civilizations. Ibn Khaldoun came up with this Great Civilization crap in the eleventh century, but he was probably the hundredth Great Mind to come up with it.

Khaldoun and Spengler and all their predecessors said that each Great Civilization rises, does everything important, and then dies. It's all predictable, and all Great Civilizations are created equal.

Ants form colonies that are perfectly predictable and all ant colonies are created equal. According to conservatives, human beings are the same way. People like the Scorpion King set up Great Civilizations which then mature, build a lot of big stuff, and then die away.

Caution! Conservative Trying to Look Smart!

According to our official history those Great Civilizations invented everything. For this reason, every time historians make a real discovery, it knocks out everything they have said.

The discovery of facts is disastrous for official history.

For instance they found Caucasoid mummies in China in the 1980s. The Caucasoid mummies were wearing clothes that history officially declares were invented in the Middle East a thousand years after those blond folks died – in CHINA.

No historian ever imagined that there was any white influence in China back then. Least of all from NOMADIC white people.

History says that the Chinese Great Civilization did everything itself.

They recently found a frozen man from about 1,000 B.C. in the Alps. He had tattoos showing acupuncture on his body. Acupuncture, according to official history, was invented in China a thousand years after he died.

Stonehenge is the largest “henge” we have from a civilization that covered Europe and died out about 3,000 B.C. One of those henges is in the Middle East and they go on north to Stonehenge in various forms.

So historians naturally declared that the oldest of these henges was the one in the southern Mediterranean, where Great Civilizations invented everything.

Then came carbon dating. It turns out that Stonehenge is the oldest henge, the Middle Eastern one was built last.

To repeat, every time a basic discovery is made it blows our official history.

But we still teach exactly the same history.

Our History Says That Everything Was Invented in the Garbage Dump

Great Civilizations are the garbage heaps of history. Egypt got iron from the invading Hittites, who smashed their heads in with it. They got the wheel from the Hyksos, who rode over them with it.

But the Hittites who invented iron were on the move. So were the Hyksos. So we found the first wheel in Egypt and said that Egypt invented it. The earliest iron we found was in Egypt, so it was assumed for a long time that Egypt invented iron.

Those clothes of the fair-skinned mummies in China were wearing were of a type that was first found in the Middle East a thousand years after those Caucasians in China died. So until twenty years ago official history said that those clothes were invented in the Middle East.

The Great and Ancient and Mysterious acupuncture that was a product of the Chinese Great Civilization turns out to have been in Europe a thousand years earlier, and Lord knows how long before that.

Conservatives marvel and drool over the "Great Inventions" of China, too. The Chinese invented movable type long before Europe did. They used it to print some playing cards and then forgot it. They invented gunpowder, then forgot how to make guns. A Chinese gentleman named Sung invented a mechanical clock. It disappeared, and they didn't build two.

To Get Somewhere You Have to Stop Being Stupid Trying to Look Smart

Every science starts out as primitive as history is today. Astrology was silly. Astronomy isn't. Alchemy was laughable. Chemistry isn't.

University-educated doctors bled George Washington to death when he had pneumonia.

How did alchemy become chemistry? How did astrology become astronomy? How did the murderous medicine that began the nineteenth century become the life-saving medicine of our age?

I'll tell you how they DIDN'T do it. They DIDN'T make their insanity into science by blindly going on with the nonsense they had. Medicine began to cure people when doctors faced the fact that bleeding was INSANE. Astronomy got somewhere when every intelligent person stopped believing that your mother's toothache could be deduced from the stars.

History will get somewhere when historians face the fact that they are ridiculous. So will conservatism.

September 27, 2003 -- In South Africa You Can See America's Leftist Future Today
September 27, 2003 -- South Africa's Past is Our Past, Its Future Our Future
September 27, 2003 -- Respectable Conservatives Get Plenty for Selling Us Out
September 27, 2003 -- Would Afrikaners Make Good Australians?

Fun Quote:

Bumper Sticker:

"As a matter of fact, I DO own the road."

America's Ideal Leftist Future Can be Seen in South Africa Today

If white Americans want to see their future, they should look at South Africa's Afrikaner population. The Afrikaners trusted their conservative spokesmen, and now they've lost their country.

The majority of South Africa's white population is made up of Afrikaners. They are also known as the Boers. They still speak a form of Dutch, but it is very different from modern Dutch.

I used to speak it myself.

The only reason the rest of the world had any interest in white South Africans is because they were in control of a country where the overwhelming majority was black. That is the only thing anyone will mention if you talk about the three million Afrikaners now caught in the collapsing South Africa the new black regime has created.

Boer history looks very different from the point of view of an American, and very especially from the point of view of an American Southerner.

To everybody but Southerners and Afrikaners the only important thing about whites is that they are Evil. The only places where many children are taught to be proud whites is among the Boers and in the American South.

Yankees conquered the South in the Civil War and the British conquered the Afrikaners in the Boer War. Since then the Yankees have tried to teach us to hate whites and the British have tried to teach the Boers to hate whites.

A lot of Southerners try to please Yankees by hating white people and a lot of Afrikaners tried to please the British by hating whites. But many of us still have our natural love of our own kind, and that drives Yankees and Brits into fits.

We are not allowed to say it, but Southern whites know that American blacks are lucky to be here and not in black Africa. Afrikaners knew that South African blacks were much better off in white-ruled South Africa than they were in black-ruled or "liberated" Africa.

Who told the Boers that blacks were better off in white-ruled South Africa than in black-ruled Africa? Black people did. They poured into South Africa as illegal aliens after their countries began black rule.

The required doctrine today is that everything done by the white man was Evil. All the food and medicine and everything else we have produced was produced by something called "mankind." You can lose your job for saying that anything good was done by whites.

Real Boers and real Southerners don't believe a word of that crap. They know the world would be a hideous place to live without white people.

South Africa's Past is Our Past, its Future is Our Future

There were two Afrikaner Republics in 1898. The Afrikaners who settled in those Boer Republics came from Cape Town, where their ancestors had lived for two centuries when Cape Town belonged to the Dutch. Those Boers left Cape Town about 1837 after the British took it over and moved to upper South Africa. In Afrikaans they called this great movement the Great Trek.

That's where we get that word Trek, as in Star Trek.

At the same time the Afrikaners were moving north, our own pioneers were moving west, and if you had seen one of their wagon trains and one of ours from a distance, you wouldn't be able to tell the difference.

Britain conquered the two Afrikaner republics, the Orange Free State and the Transvaal, in the Boer War. Like Confederates they were overwhelmingly outnumbered, but the Boers whipped the whole British Empire for along time.

The British invented concentration camps during the Boer War, which lasted from 1899 to 1902. You might say the British invented the Twentieth Century.

In fact, the only way the British beat the Boers was by imprisoning their women and children in a new invention the British called "concentration camps." Those concentration camps would have a great future in the twentieth century, but the British seldom get credit for inventing them.

A major portion of the Afrikaner women and children died in those British concentration camps. The figures I can find show there were a total of 120,000 Boer men, women and children against the British Empire:

<http://www.onwar.com/aced/data/bravo/boerwar1899.htm>,

. The number of women and children who died in the British concentration camps is estimated to be about 27,000, or about a quarter of the Boer population:

<http://www.boer.co.za/boerwar/hellkamp.htm> 27,000

Neither figure is accurate, but both are in the ballpark. The total Boer army is estimated at 35,000, about the same as the number of women and children the British killed.

The British couldn't beat the Afrikaners by fighting their men, so they won the Boer War by making war on women and children.

So most Afrikaners got where they are on wagon trains, like so many Americans did.

The Afrikaners have another important thing in common with Americans. The Boers (Afrikaners) are the only large European population outside Europe that does not maintain its European political ties.

Australians and Canadians, for instance, have old white populations, but their military uniforms still have the British Crown on their hats, and each of them considers Queen Elizabeth to be their sovereign.

The ruling British monarch during the Boer War was Queen Victoria. She LOVED those concentration camps! Real Afrikaners always hated the British monarchy.

What I just said will upset respectable conservatives. Most conservative historians love the British Monarchy, and conservative historians brag about the great Victorian Era.

So what I just said about Victorian Regina will really piss respectable conservatives off.

Oh, well. I suspect respectable conservatives don't love me anyway.

Respectable Conservatives Get Plenty for Selling You Out

So the Afrikaners have been trying to have their own country for over a century and a half. They had Cape Town to themselves until the British took it over in 1815. Then the Boers moved away from the British in the Great Trek. Then the British took those Afrikaners over again in the Boer War.

The Boers finally took their country away from the British again in the 1948 election. That year the Afrikaner National Party won the elections.

The only reason anyone is interested in that 1948 South African election today is because the new National Party government set up the apartheid system.

The Afrikaners have ruled South Africa since 1948. Then respectable conservatives took over the National Party. They told South African whites that black rule would be just great and all those alarmists were silly.

So the Afrikaners voted to trust their respectable conservative leaders. Everything the alarmists said about black rule has come true, and then some.

But like respectable conservatives in America, the Afrikaner government that sold out their people did very well out of it. They got prizes and jobs and all the rest.

The Boers asked to be betrayed, and they were. They have lost their country, and they have nowhere to go.

Would Afrikaners Make Good Australians?

If you think America's old Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) never enforced the law, you are dead wrong. Hard-working Afrikaners settled in the United States and the old INS (with new names) is fighting to deport them.

Australia is the size of the continental United States, but three-quarters of its population is in the cities. Afrikaners would be just the people they need to settle the Outback, but don't hold your breath.

The respectable conservatives who now rule Australia brag endlessly about how they got rid of Australia's "whites only" immigration policy. There must be no place on earth to which whites can escape, and Australian conservatives have made sure their country is no exception.

The Boers still in Cape Town are largely colored, a mix of white and the Hottentots race the Boers saved. But the Boers who went on the Great Trek, the ones who would settle the countryside of Australia, are white.

Of course the fact that the Boers who would make good Australians are actually white is the reason Australia would not dare take them. So the Boers whose forefathers went on the trek now have nowhere to go.

The Boers trusted their respectable conservatives and they are trapped in a nightmare. Substitute the word "white Americans" for "Boers" in that sentence, and you may be writing the history of America's future history as we are writing it today.

We are building a country our children will want to escape from.

And nobody will take them.

October 4, 2003 -- An Educated Man Knows His Bible, But...

October 4, 2003 -- I Make a Mighty Revelation Unto You

October 4, 2003 -- Does Anybody Care Whether Jesus Spoke Greek?

Fun Quote:

The new rich in every Southern city are desperate to prove they are not Provincial and Predictable.

As a result, Southerners who think they are Sophisticated and Original are the world's most provincial and predictable people.

Every statement a Southerner makes to show he is unprovincial and unpredictable comes through the same pipeline:

- 1) The New York Times said it two weeks ago;
- 2) the Atlanta Journal said it last week;
- 3) the local newspaper, which is part of a national chain, said it this morning, and
- 4) It is the Southern Sophisticate's Independent Thought for today.

An Educated Man Knows His Bible, But....

Jesus never once criticized anybody for not reading the Bible enough. In fact, one of the two people in his parables who went to Hell knew the Bible inside and out, backwards and forwards.

The proud Priest of the Temple, the Jew of Jews, who stood proudly before the altar was condemned to Hell, whereas the humble sinner who was in the shadows was saved. But according to all the Bible literalists I hear, if you are a good Jew and you read the Old Testament enough, you go to Heaven.

Jesus said, "No man goes to the Father but by me."

But who cares about that? It's not in the Old Testament.

When it comes to Jesus, there is one huge difference between me and a real theologian. Jesus often said "It is written." A theologian thinks Jesus said that because only what was written by a Jewish scholar was a Real Authority to Jesus.

I think Jesus quoted things that were written only when what was written said what Jesus wanted to say.

I don't think Jesus ever needed anybody's Authority but His own.

I Make a Mighty Revelation Unto You

Like everybody who has read the Old Testament a lot, I now know everything about everything. I know True Evolution, I can tell doctors how to practice medicine, I know True Physics, all of it.

But since I am a busy man and my business is politics, I will only tell you all about that.

For instance, I can tell you the true reason the Middle East is in turmoil. Here it is:

Moslems don't eat pork. Israelis don't eat pork.

When a person is deprived of pork chops or Maurice Bessinger's pork bar-be-cue, he becomes irritable. Then he becomes violent.

That's how Yankees got that way.

There is a whole segment of the Planet Earth where people completely deny themselves pig meat. That area is in a constant state of violent and bloody conflict.

You take away my pork chops and you too will be in a state of violent and bloody conflict.

Now that I have explained this, I expect a Nobel Prize by return post.

Does Anybody Care Whether Jesus Spoke Greek?

If you have to be a good Jew to get to Heaven, I've had it. I am dead certain that Hell is a place without pork products. I expect to be Up There with my plate in my hand and Maurice Bessinger handing out the viands.

A lot of my fellow Bible Belters think that they will get to Heaven by hashing out theological points. That is not the hash I am concerned with.

I have lots of qualifications to be a big-time intellectual, but that is not how an old Southerner thinks. Senator Sam Ervin of North Carolina was the unquestioned top expert on constitutional law in the United States Senate. Even the liberal black congresswoman Barbara Jordan went straight to him when she had constitutional questions to ask.

One day when Senator Sam was chairing the Judiciary Committee, Howard Baker got fed up with his always saying, "I'm just a country lawyer from North Carolina." He said, "Dammit, Sam, you're a MAGNA CUM LAUDE graduate of the Harvard Law School!"

The senior senator from North Carolina grinned and replied, "Yes, Howard, but nobody will ever know it."

Just like Senator Sam, I think a lot of myself, but not the way the people who call themselves "intellectuals" do. The so-called intellectuals think it's great when they use language nobody understands. Like Sam Ervin, I know that any fool can take a course in Ancient Greek and give a whole speech nobody understands.

To me, a real intellectual is someone who can take the most complicated point and understand it so well that he can explain it in a way everybody can understand. That takes smarts. That shows deep knowledge and deep understanding.

In ancient Palestine those who spent every waking hour studying the Law and the Prophets spoke only to each other. Jesus talked to fools like me.

I don't think there is any question that Jesus was intelligent.

I happen to think He is a good deal more than that.

October 11, 2003 -- No One Will Mention That Kobe Bryant Defense is Based Partly on "White Racism"

October 11, 2003 -- Does Being in a War Make You A Hero?

October 11, 2003 -- Heroism and Drugs

October 11, 2003 -- Rush Limbaugh, Been There, Done That

Fun Quote:

Socialists and libertarians say the only important issue in politics is how big the government is. That is like saying that transportation is entirely a matter of how many airplanes there are.

Short Observation:

You remember how Clinton's Attorney General used to react to Administration scandals?

She said, "We will investigate." That was the last you ever heard of it.

You know about that attack on September 11, 2001? Two years ago I said nobody in the Intelligence bureaucracy would even be criticized, much less fired, for letting that happen.

In 2003 the Bush Administration still says, "We will investigate."

No One Will Mention That Kobe Bryant Defense is Based Partly On "White Racism"

Kobe Bryant is a black man who is one of American basketball's best players. Kobe Bryant has been accused of sexually molesting a white woman. I am proud to announce that WhitakerOnline has enough foreign readers to make this explanation worthwhile.

In the preliminary hearing Bryant's lawyers implied that his accuser had had sex with two men on the two consecutive nights before she had sex with Kobe Bryant. They probably have some proof of this. But it is a good tactic for another reason.

A white woman who is alone with a married man is usually assumed to be there to go all the way. A white woman who is alone with a BLACK man in a motel room is assumed to be there to go all the way for sure.

This is a prejudiced attitude. But those who want limits on sex are accused by the Playboy/ Penthouse types of being just plain prejudiced against sex. To an Inquisitor, mercy is just a prejudice. To an integrationist, any white who doesn't want to marry a colored person is prejudiced. To a libertine, all sexual morality is prejudice.

When the Marquis de Sade wrote the introduction to his novel Justine, which was "dedicated to the triumph of evil over good," he referred to his opponents repeatedly as "bigots." He was writing in French, but the word meant exactly the same thing it does in English: anyone who did not approve of torture as a means of sexual pleasure was just prejudiced.

Fashionable opinion says that a white girl who does not kiss a black man is just prejudiced. Nonetheless, if a white girl goes to a motel room and voluntarily starts kissing a black man, it is hard for the average person to believe she didn't intend to go all the way.

If she violates one "prejudice" one tends to believe that she will probably violate another.

You can scream at me all you want to, but that is the way real people think.

So Kobe Bryant's lawyers are using what they would call "racial prejudice" as part and parcel of their defense.

I am the only person who will mention this.

Does Being In a War Make You A Hero?

Those who worship uniforms forget a basic fact of life.

When heroes go into battle on one side, there are Evil Ones on the other side who are also wearing uniforms.

So how do you tell the heroes from the villains?

Here's a clue: No one on the winning side has ever been convicted of a War Crime.

No one on the winning side has ever been ACCUSED of a War Crime.

Uniforms are worshipped if they were worn by the winning side.

Heroism and Drugs

We all know that a lot of junkies came back to America from the Vietnam War. Drugs were cheap and easy in Nam, and they were one of the few forms of relief our people over there had.

It is less well known that over a hundred thousand morphine addicts came back from the Union Army after the Civil War. There were no good pain-killers then except for morphine, which had only recently been developed from opium. Union Army doctors called morphine G.O.M., God's Own Medicine.

Ironically the Confederate Army had many less addicts because the Union, in direct violation of the rules of war, used its blockade to keep medicine out of the South.

But this huge "addiction problem" after the Civil War was not that much of a problem. Union veterans ordered their morphine in large quantities cheaply through the mail in the plain brown wrappers that are still being used for other things. If there had been a War on Drugs then it would have been a disaster.

The War on Drugs made criminals out of Vietnam Era addicts.

The point is that many a man who won medals in war could not throw off drugs later on, while they ruined him, his family, and everything else. If being in a war automatically made you a general-purpose hero, these post-war drug problems would never have occurred.

Rush Limbaugh, Been There, Done That

Rush is right. There is nothing heroic about being hooked on drugs.

Yes, Virginia, I did THAT wrong, too! I went through recovery and "the program" for a long time.

It can't be just a matter of Will Power and Courage. The death rate in recovery is enormous, and a lot better men than I am died trying to dig their way back from addiction.

You might think that people with a low level of natural drive would get hooked on stimulants, "uppers." You might think that people who are too "up" would take calming drugs to get "down." It's just the opposite.

In my high-pressure occupation I used stimulants to keep working day and night. In high-pressure places like Hollywood and Capitol Hill it is the stimulant cocaine that is popular. Over a century ago Conan Doyle had his wildly aggressive Sherlock Holmes using cocaine, not opium or morphine.

So I tend to think that Rush fell into his drug overuse by accident. I don't think he would naturally choose the drugs he did because they are "downers." He could not stop using them after they were prescribed.

This "uppers" and "downers" business is not an absolute rule.

Anybody who states an absolute rule about addiction is a self-righteous moron or he is somebody who gets paid for his opinions.

And he probably lies about other things, too.

October 18, 2003 -- History's Hostages

October 18, 2003 -- The Negro Outrage Gambit

October 18, 2003 -- Nobody Calls a Fool a Fool if He's an "Expert"

Fun Quote:

"He was French enough to get spiritualized by any Indian, even a cigar-store one."

-- Robert Sheckley

History's Hostages

President Bush just announced that we are not in Iraq for our own security. He got us into Iraq by saying it was for our own national interests. Now he says the Iraqi War had nothing to do with American interests.

Lyndon Johnson made the same switch about justifying the Vietnam War when that War got out of hand.

Bush's switch from arguing the war in Iraq is in our national interest to saying it for foreigners is routine. It happened with Lyndon Johnson and it happened with Franklin Roosevelt.

You can't criticize Roosevelt for getting us into World War II because so many fine young Americans died in World War II. If you attack Roosevelt, you are insulting those young Americans.

The young Americans who died in World War II are the hostages who justify Roosevelt's getting us into World War II. If you dare to criticize World War II liberals say, "Do you want Hitler back?"

Bush is trying the Hostage Strategy and Johnson tried the Hostage Strategy because Roosevelt succeeded with the Hostage Strategy.

When we first went into World War II, President Roosevelt said it was for America's national interests. Then a lot of Americans got killed. Those Americans who died became President Roosevelt's hostages.

Once all those young Americans had died for Roosevelt's war policy, you were not allowed to argue that Roosevelt was wrong to get us into World War II. Any American today who questions Roosevelt's foreign policy is called a traitor.

Those young Americans who died in World War II have become Franklin Roosevelt's hostages. So Johnson used those hostages to get tens of thousands of young Americans killed in Vietnam.

Lyndon Johnson got us into Vietnam by saying American forces were attacked by North Vietnam in Tonkin Bay. Then the Tonkin Bay Incident was shown to be a fake. But by then Johnson had gotten thousands of young Americans killed in Vietnam.

So after his original justification was discredited, President Johnson said that all those fine young American men had died for the sake of Vietnam and he would keep fighting for their sakes and for the sake of Vietnam.

Bush got us into Iraq by arguing that that war was necessary for America's security against terrorism. Now he says the war was all for the sake of Iraq and Israel and "America's allies." Apparently he thinks enough fine young Americans have now died to let him fall back on the good old hostage strategy.

And Bush's punch line is, "Do you want Saddam back?"

The Outraged Negro Gambit

You can tell by the title that is an old, old, old liberal strategy. It was old back when blacks were called Negroes.

I got an example of the Negro Outrage Gambit the other day. A guy who said he was black repeated every liberal cliché in the book about white evil. Since he is black, I am supposed to take this, not as a recitation of liberalism's silliest crap, but as genuine Negro Outrage.

It was probably from a liberal. Everybody knows exactly what the Outraged Negro is going to say.

These Negro Outrage things always include a threat or two. He told me how blacks would get white women.

If a white person writes a whole book and happens to mention to mention that he would like to get rid of blacks somewhere in it, you would expect a black man to pick up on that. All Negro Outrage includes a reference to getting white women, but whites are not supposed to notice.

I pointed out to him that present "anti-racist" policy requires that EVERY white majority country bring in and integrate with non-whites, and that liberal policy demands that ONLY white majority countries bring in the third world and mix with them.

Blacks and browns are regarded by liberals as a weapon against whites, and that was what he was talking about, too.

I told him that I am white, and I don't like his genocide.

He never wrote back. They never do.

The one thing that neither liberals nor Outraged Negroes can deal with is a white man who insists that he has feelings, just like people do. No respectable conservative will ever say that.

But then again, no respectable conservative ever has the guts to identify himself as white.

Nobody Calls a Fool a Fool if He's an "Expert"

Someone has been planting weapons on planes to show up the Federal bunglers who are supposed to handle security at airports. They had a former New York City Police Commissioner to comment on it, and he said exactly what you would expect a former New York City police commissioner to say.

He said the sickos who planted the weapons were the real problem. He said the real problem was that some terrorist who didn't have a weapon might happen to find those box cutters and use them. Security wasn't to blame.

When he was New York City Police Commissioner, the same guy said the reason there were a lot of murders in New York was because honest people had guns which the poor, innocent criminals got hold of.

This clown is now handling security in Iraq.

October 25, 2003 -- Call Treason by Its Name

October 25, 2003 -- Everybody Has Forgotten What a Neoconservative Is

October 25, 2003 -- Neoconservatives and the Neo-Conservatives

October 25, 2003 -- North Korea Has No Exports, but Neither Did the USSR

Fun Quote:

The preacher had double bypass surgery to keep him alive.

The preacher wore glasses.

The preacher had a fortune worth of dental work.

The preacher had a hearing aid and false teeth.

He was preaching about how man should not interfere with nature.

Call Treason by its Name

I was watching a program about Cold War espionage. On that program a former KGB officer who oversaw the KGB in America listed the people he looked for to work against the United States. He said, "Socialists, liberals, beatniks," the latter being a term which included hippies.

And when the real KGB files were open for a while, it turned out that every single American the left called "an innocent victim of the anti-Communists" turned out to have been an actual Soviet agent. Even I was amazed.

When you get the facts, the left is always wrong.

Ann Coulter recently wrote a best-selling book called "Treason." "Treason" recites endless examples of what we all know, the fact that liberals always just happen to be on the side of America's enemies.

What make Ann Coulter's book different is that she does not follow the usual respectable conservative line about leftist turncoats. In order to be accepted by the national media as a "conservative spokesman" you have to say that all those liberals are honest, patriotic Americans who happen to be honestly mistaken.

In the 1960s those patriotic liberals by the million openly declared themselves to be Communists, but everybody forgot that when the reaction set in. The same thing happened in the 1930s when those patriotic liberals openly praised Comrade Stalin. When anti-Communists brought that up in the early 1950s, everybody who got on the media had to agree it had never happened.

So Ann Coulter simply refused to accept this Respectable Conservative Brain Wash. If it spends decades looking like a traitor, it's a traitor.

For decades the left has consistently been against white people.

Please see World View for May 5, 2003, Can You Love Your Country and Hate Your Race?

The left is always against America.

Respectable conservatives say this is just a coincidence.

Everybody Has Forgotten What Neoconservatives Are

Conservatives have put neoconservatives in charge of the White House.

Like liberals neoconservatives want to use America for their own purposes. Like liberals neoconservatives want to abolish the white race.

Neoconservatives insist that they ARE liberals.

A neoconservative is one who believes that everything liberals until on or about January 1, 1970 was wonderful. Everything liberals did after that Magic Date went inexplicably wrong.

Neoconservatives say they were always right. Neoconservatives say liberalism was right until January 1, 1970. But they also insist that conservatives were wrong before January 1, 1970.

Real conservatives warned that integration was part of a genocidal plan against whites.

Real Conservatives said the so-called liberals did everything they could to help the Communists.

So real conservatives warned that leftism was evil to its roots. There was not some kind of Magic Moment on January 1, 1970. Liberals just continued a program that became so obviously evil that even some liberals finally caught on.

Neoconservatives say none of this is true. Neoconservatives say that suddenly, on or about January 1, 1970, liberalism suddenly and inexplicably became evil.

Neoconservatives really HATE Ann Coulter.

Neoconservatives and the Neo-Neoconservatives

Neoconservatives are the War Hawks who control the Bush White House. They have their own agenda. Americans mean nothing to them. They view the white race as something that can best be done away with by open borders.

Respectable conservatives worship neoconservatives. Now all of a sudden neoconservatives are getting out of hand and regular conservatives are getting nervous.

People like me warned against neoconservatives from the beginning. But respectable conservatives say they were always right to worship the neos. They say we were wrong to warn against the neos.

Respectable conservatives are slowly beginning to realize they have been displaced. Soon they will start experiencing the political disaster the neos have caused. But respectable conservatives will never admit they were wrong and we were right.

So respectable conservatives will say that neoconservatives were wonderful until on or about January 1, 2000. Respectable conservatives will say that on or about January 1, 2000, neoconservatism went suddenly and inexplicably wrong.

After all, respectable conservatives hate whites, too: See September 20 World View,

If Hitler Hated Jews, Then All Of Our National Spokesmen Hate Whites

I keep warning you about following these respectable conservative spokesmen. Some day you will tell me that those national conservative spokesmen were just fine until on or about January 1, 2020. Then they went inexplicably wrong.

Sometimes paranoids have real enemies. Sometimes us alarmists are just plain right.

Just once it would be nice if someone listened to us BEFORE the next disaster.

North Korea Had no Exports, but Neither Did the USSR

Speaking of treason, Teddy Kennedy is out there fighting for North Korea.

Teddy wants the United States to have unilateral talks with North Korea so we can finance North Korea's Communist regime the way we have every other Communist regime in history.

North Korea has NO exports. It lives on weapons money and drug money, and its people are in desperate want, as has always been the case with Communist regimes.

The Soviet Union, during seven decades of concentrating on industrial development, never had a single industrial export. It had caviar, sable and oil and, as always, its people were in desperate need. The Soviet Union survived on American help, direct and indirect.

No non-Communist economy has ever survived without producing one single thing anybody else wanted. Only an economy planned by "intellectuals" can be totally worthless.

It is all in the tradition of the founders of Communism, Marx and Lenin. Neither of them ever did a day's productive work in their entire lives, and either one of them would have held a pitchfork upside-down if they had ever actually touched one.

Marx and Lenin spent their whole lives talking about The Working Class and Communist regimes spend their whole time talking about production. The Founders didn't do any work and the regimes didn't do any producing.

November 1, 2003 -- The Supersonic Transport and Manned Space Travel Have Stopped
November 1, 2003 -- What Really Happened to the Manned Space program?
November 1, 2003 -- The SST Died Because There are Limits to Manned Business Travel, Too
November 1, 2003 -- Professional Predictors Are Always Wrong
November 1, 2003 -- We Pay for Seniority, not for Results
November 1, 2003 -- There is Big Money in Predictions, But not in ACCURATE Predictions

Fun Quote:

Even paranoids have real enemies.
As a matter of fact, paranoids are likely to MAKE real enemies.

Observation:

If it is truly better for a hundred guilty men to go free than for one innocent man to be punished, then you must abolish the legal system. No human institution will ever be that perfect.

The Supersonic Transport and Manned Space Travel Have Stopped

The Supersonic Transport (SST) made its last trip last week.

Again and again we hear the announcement, "The age of supersonic transport is over."

The last manned mission into space took place a generation ago. As one science fiction writer put it, "When I was a child I expected to be alive when the first man reached the moon. I never dreamed I would live to see the LAST man reach the moon."

For those who love to be hopeless, the end of the SST and the Manned Space program make good hopeless-ing material.

What Really Happened to Manned Space Travel?

If you want to know what happened to the manned space program, take a look at science fiction programs that were made when the manned space program got under way. You will see the space adventurers sitting there in their rocket ships talking. Then you will see something amazing.

In a 1950s television show the members of the rocket ship crew would get ready to do something and they would take down their orders. How did they take down those orders? Each one of them pulled out a SLATE to write on! It was a clipboard with notebook pages that you could detach.

America got into the space program to prove it could beat the Soviet Union in space. By the time we had done that, manned missions were out of date.

This does NOT mean that the age of space flight is over. What it does mean is that we do not have to send human beings to Pluto so they can look around and write what they find down on slates. At the risky stage of space exploration you send up machines you have developed that are much better observers than people could ever be.

The SST Ended Because There are Limits to Manned Business Travel, Too

While Britain and France were hiring giant companies for a Giant Leap into the Future in supersonic transportation, little companies in America were just beginning to develop Silicon Valley.

Britain and France and their mega-companies were finding a way to get people on different continents together in a hurry. Those people would take their writing slates with them.

In the modern age if you are in a desperate hurry you use a fax and teleconference. If you can wait on a supersonic transport, then you can wait on a nice first class transatlantic flight at a fraction of the cost of an SST ticket.

During the trip you can work on your laptop computer.

If you have to have an emergency conference, you can do it with the telephone on the plane.

Professional Predictors Are Always Wrong

Every move you make starts in the brain. If you want to move an arm, an impulse in the brain goes to the leg or arm you want to move.

This year, the same year the SST ended, scientists put electrodes into the brains of monkeys that made robot arms move. The monkey was moving his arm, but the signal in his brain moved a robot arm instead.

You know how fast technology moves. Within this century you will be able to shake hands with somebody in Europe while you are at home.

And you literally won't have to lift a finger.

But I wouldn't invest a lot of money in this technology. Something else is sure to come along before then.

Predicting the future is a deadly serious business, and it is very difficult. That's why I resent people who blithely claim they know what is going to happen and get paid to do so.

Marxists and political "progressives" claim they know the Inevitable Future. That's silly.

Marxist professors, "Progressive" political commentators and tarot card readers all claim they know the future. Tarot card readers, political "progressives" and Marxists are all exactly equal, and you can throw in horoscope makers with them. All of them are paid by the public, and all of them are not just frauds, they are obvious frauds.

Anybody who claims to know the future is damned fool, and that includes conservative whiners. Please see World View January 25, 2003 - Please Please PLEASE Stop Sniveling!!

We Pay for Seniority, not for Results

Professional judges have been giving hardened criminals light sentences for decades. In response to this, legislatures have been passing minimum sentences and sentencing guidelines.

The news media have just had a big story: It turns out that a lot of judges don't like those minimum sentences. The media say we have to listen to those judges because they have "Experience". A lot of them have thirty years of experience in handing out sentences, so they are experts.

A sane person would laugh at this. Those are the judges who have been letting repeat criminals back on the streets for thirty years. Who in hell would listen to them?

Everybody will listen to them. When those judges told the media that they wanted the right to put psychopaths back on the street, all they had to do was to point out that they had "Experience" in being judges.

And nobody laughed.

These same judges gave hardened criminals light sentences because they said those criminals would reform "if we give them a chance."

The judges were wrong, decade after decade. But that doesn't matter.

The judges just say all those years they were wrong gave them "Experience".

If you are wrong again and again and again, you just have to stop talking about how wrong you were and talk instead about how much Experience you have had.

Talk about Experience and every conservative will listen, smile, nod and drool.

That is how we choose everybody who determines what our future will be.

There is Big Money in Predictions, But Not in ACCURATE Predictions

Experts on Wall Street get paid billions for their predictions about stock trends. The predictions of these experts have repeatedly been put up against such things as monkeys hitting buttons randomly. The monkeys are always neck and neck with the experts.

We still pay those experts a fortune, not because they do anything useful, but because they have Experience.

There is a whole industry called Futurology. It is financed by grant money. Nobody ever asks a Futurologist if he was ever right. To be a professional futurologist you must make predictions that sound right to the people who control the grants.

The only prediction that matters to a Futurologist is whether Professor Fuzz, who is on the Grants Committee, will want a Marxist Future or a Progressive Future.

If a Futurology applicant can come up with a good case for Global Warming, the grants committees will feed him well for the rest of his life.

If you look at an application for a job as a Futurologist you will not find one word in it about any accurate prediction that the applicant ever made. He will say he has studied Futurology, and he will detail how many years he has spent in whatever field he is going to tell the future of.

November 8, 2003 -- Something Else That No Decent Person Would Say

November 8, 2003 -- Who Would Call Themselves “The Greatest Generation?”

November 8, 2003 -- Poor Babies!

November 8, 2003 -- If the “Greatest Generation” Saved the World, Why Have We Lost So Much?

November 8, 2003 -- Moral Cowardice

November 8, 2003 -- The Obedient Generation

Fun Quote:

The preacher had had double bypass surgery to keep him alive.

The preacher wore glasses.

The preacher had a fortune worth of dental work.

The preacher had a hearing aid and false teeth.

He was preaching about how man should not interfere with nature.

Something Else That No Decent Person Would Say

When a liberal writes a book about how wonderful somebody is, something smells. Tom Brokaw worships the generation that fought World War II.

Nothing liberals say ever works. If a liberal says it, it is not true.

The World War II generation is the one I was raised with. It built the world I was born into.

Tom Brokaw loves that world.

No one is allowed to contradict Brokaw. First of all, a lot of fine young Americans died in World War II, so any criticism of Roosevelt or Brokaw is Evil and Forbidden.

Please see Whitaker Online for October 18, 2003, History's Hostages.

Secondly, this is very personal. We all have family in that generation, so any criticism of Brokaw or Roosevelt is an insult to everybody's Loved Ones.

A large part of my family was in uniform in World War II.

But a lot of our families were in Korea and Vietnam too. I have noticed that World War II is the only war no one is allowed to criticize.

If you say anything against World War II, you are Evil because so many Americans died in it.

Lots of Americans died in Korea and Vietnam, but you can praise the Peoples' Peace-Loving Democratic Republics all you want to.

Loving Castro is one of the great virtues of our age.

As usual, there is a great coincidence here: the one thing that no decent person is allowed to say just happens to be what liberals don't want said.

That's what you have me for. I don't care what decent people are allowed to say.

Who Would Call Themselves "The Greatest Generation?"

First, let's get one thing straight. You are going to say, "But they didn't call themselves The Greatest Generation, Tom Brokaw called them the greatest generation."

Let me tell you something every professional writer knows. You don't write for yourself, you write for the market.

When I wrote speeches for politicians, no one could say, "But the congressman didn't say that, his speechwriter Bob Whitaker wrote that."

The book called "The Greatest Generation" sold like hotcakes because the World War II generation wanted to be called that.

Poor Babies!

If you want to know how the World War II generation looks at itself, look at Bob Dole's favorite picture of himself.

You have seen that picture at least twenty times. It shows Bob Dole as a young man in his hospital bed, back to the camera, all alone with his war injury. He is lying in bed, and no one is there.

Actually, Dole's entire home town of Lawrence, Kansas threw itself behind the young man who had been injured in the War. But the picture Dole's generation likes is the one of him all alone and forgotten, the Silent Hero.

No generation of Americans has ever been less forgotten than the one that calls itself The Greatest Generation. Those who fought in World War One received no veterans' benefits at all. The veterans of Vietnam were reviled, the heroes of the Korean War were forgotten.

But only the Greatest Generation Truly Suffered.

If "The Greatest Generation" Saved the World Why Have We Lost so Much?

Every liberal says that the Greatest Generation "saved the world." Bill Clinton says that all the time.

When the Greatest Generation took over, Germany and Russia were dictatorships.

When the Greatest Generation ceased to control things, about 1980, totalitarians ruled a third of the human race.

Liberals love the Greatest Generation because it got rid of the rightist extremists like Hitler and Mussolini and gave a third of the world to their beloved Peace-Loving People's Democratic Republics.

Brokaw thinks that's wonderful. Clinton thinks that's wonderful.

I don't think that's wonderful.

No decent person would say that isn't wonderful.

Which leaves it up to me.

Moral Cowardice

One thing no one dares accuse The Greatest Generation of is cowardice. Every book written says that they were all heroes. Every book written for the market says they were the Greatest Generation. Every book written for the market says they Saved the World.

If you disagree you are a traitor and you hate our men who died in World War II.

I speak German. I lived in former British colonies. I know an awful lot of people who served on both sides in World War II. I have never heard one single person say that the Americans who fought in World War II were good soldiers except Americans and those who write for the American market.

To a conservative, this is a HORRIBLE thing to say! Conservatives worship uniforms and being a good soldier is everything.

I see no reason why Americans should do especially well in a war on somebody else's continent. I do see a reason why we should be realistic about that.

Americans can be good at anything if they want to be. Our present volunteer army is probably the best one on earth.

America wins wars like no one else in history. But that is not because we are good soldiers. We are great innovators and producers.

The reason that World War II was such a hideous failure was not because those who call themselves The Greatest Generation were not good soldiers DURING the War. They failed because they lacked another kind of courage AFTER the War.

Moral courage.

The Obedient Generation

No one talks all the time about what a hero he was in the War if he has had a life since.

People my age know a lot of people who talk all the time about how rough they had it in World War II.

Those guys are pathetic, but they are not the problem.

Most of the World War II veterans I know do not flout it. The World War II veterans I am kin to do not flout it. They talk about the lives they have had since.

Let me tell you the real problem I have with those who call themselves The Greatest Generation.

On television there was a public discussion of immigration. One old World War II veteran had on his paper hat, and he said, "I fought a war so there wouldn't be borders."

There had to be other World War II veterans in the audience, but not one of them contradicted him.

They never do.

They never have.

They never will.

Do you know what it feels like to be fighting to close our borders to open immigration and to have some old man who says he's a war hero saying he fought and all his buddies died to open the borders?

Can you imagine how it feels when not one single old man in the audience has the courage to contradict him?

Well, I know EXACTLY how it feels. I have been in that position a number of times. That is why I do NOT worship the group that calls itself The Greatest Generation.

Twenty years ago I remember Pat Buchanan saying that American soldiers fought and died in World War II so that Europe would be opened up to third world immigration.

Yes, Pat Buchanan. Yes, that is what he said.

No, Pat Buchanan is not a member of the Greatest Generation. But at least a hundred thousand members of the Greatest Generation heard him say their buddies died for third world immigration.

Not one single member of the Greatest and Bravest generation had the guts to tell Pat, "My buddies fought for freedom. They did NOT fight for third world immigration!"

What bothers me about the group that calls itself The Greatest Generation is not the braggarts who had no life since the War. Most of them are not braggarts.

What is wrong with the self-declared Greatest Generation is not the clowns in the paper hats who say they fought the War to open up white countries to the third world.

What bothers me is that I have never heard one single member of the Greatest Generation who ever had the courage to say these words IN PUBLIC: "No, that is NOT what my buddies died for."

Not one.

Ever.

EVER!!

November 15, 2003 -- A Quick Note to “Anti-Racist” Conservatives

November 15, 2003 -- Tribute to an Extinct Species

November 15, 2003 -- If You Are Careful About Your Statements, Will People Trust You?

November 15, 2003 -- I Say “Never” a Lot

November 15, 2003 -- I Would Rather Make The Point Than Win the Argument

Fun Quote:

Alcoholics Anonymous recommends that a person who just stopped drinking should attend one AA meeting every day. After that AA recommends they attend at least one meeting a week.

Then there is a group called Workaholics Anonymous.

They go to fourteen meetings every day.

A Quick Note to "Anti-Racist" Conservatives

Respectable conservatives tell us that, as a good white gentile Americans, they do not care about white gentiles.

Then they complain that Hispanics born in America, whether their parents are Cuban, Mexican, or El Salvadorian, consistently prefer the interests of illegal Hispanic immigrants over those of their “fellow Americans.”

“Anti-racist” conservatives complain that Moslems worry about Arab interests rather than those of “their fellow Americans.”

They complain that when it comes to a confrontation between the white police and black thugs who terrorize them, the black public always favors the black thugs.

So let me briefly explain reality to these conservative spokesmen:

- 1) Hispanics favor Hispanics;
- 2) Blacks favor blacks
- 3) Moslems favor Moslems;
- 4) You are an idiot.

Tribute to an Extinct Species

The best fact-checking reader we have for Whitaker Online is not only a socialist professor, he is a white man who has a black wife.

Nobody knows his quotes and facts better than this fellow. He is a throwback to the old leftist intellectuals who actually liked facts and discussion. Believe it or not they actually liked to hear different points of view. When he dies, there won't be any of them left.

When I was at the University of South Carolina, I set up a lot of groups. I never had any shortage of student members, but, as on today's campus, that didn't matter. You had to have a faculty sponsor. Then as now, leftists could get sponsors, rightists couldn't.

When I showed up with that "I need a sponsor-for-my-new-group" look in my eye, professors ran, hid under tables, or went into fetal position.

Except for one: Professor John McConaughy. He was a liberal from Chicago. His father had been a law professor. I never had a problem with him. If I had some members, as I always did, he would sponsor my group.

John McConaughy was an actual, honest-to-God free speech liberal.

He's dead now.

If You Are Careful About Your Statements, Will People Trust You?

No.

If my leftist fact-checker tells me something I believe him, even though he is off the edge of my world politically.

If John McConaughy said something, I would believe him because he had earned my trust.

But I am the only person who is like that. No matter how insane a leftist spokesman's last pronouncement was, every conservative, respectable or not, treats his next pronouncement as if it were the Voice of the Prophet.

When a liberal makes another stupid statement about gun control, no conservative has ever been heard to say, "What about the last time when you said that if a person had a gun, he was exactly forty-three times as likely to have it taken from him and get killed with it as he was to defend himself with it?"

Every liberal spokesman is always treated as if he spoke the Gospel, no matter what he said last time. His words have to be carefully considered and dealt with respectfully and only with something you have looked up.

So what's the point in honesty?

Every national liberal spokesman openly predicted that if people were able to get gun permits, there would be a "bloodbath."

No conservative has ever been heard to remind any liberal of this fact. Every time a liberal makes another pronouncement, he is assumed to be factually correct until somebody finds a reference to the contrary and finally gets a chance to publish it somewhere.

I used to write speeches for my congressman that drove his main opponent to shrieks of rage. And all I did was to repeat the nonsense he had said the year before.

No conservative ever does that. So what is the point in a liberal being right?

I Say "Never" a Lot

I am careful about using a word like “never” or “always.” But I would rather use those words and make my point than not use them and win an argument.

For example, I couldn’t find the exact statistics in time for a WhitakerOnline, so I stated that hundreds of thousands of permits had been issued and there had not been one violation. Nobody else ever mentions that, so it is critical that I make the point.

I figured that if there had been any violations, the press would have pounced on them.

Since I wrote that piece, Rick Rowland found out that, in Florida alone, the number of permits is more than 200,000 and the number of violations is five. I would dearly love it if an anti-gun nut jumped on that and won the argument against me.

What do you think everybody listening to this debate would remember? Would the important point be that I lost the argument or that the actual statistic was one violation for every 40,000 permits?

I’ll stick my neck out that far any time to make a point like that.

I said in the last WhitakerOnline that the group that calls itself "The Greatest Generation" allows liberals to say that they fought World War II and their buddies died in that War so that third world immigrants could pour into America and Europe. If they contradict this statement publicly they could be embarrassed. That would take a form of courage they don’t have.

I don’t have a lot of courage, but I do have a little moral courage. Among conservatives, that makes me like the one-eyed man in the land of the blind.

I Would Rather Make the Point Than Win the Argument

When I was in graduate school, people learned to beware when I made an argument too easy for them.

I would say things like, “Every Communist country has to kill people to keep them in.” Well, that was a big statement, and it gave them a chance to show Whitaker up. Everybody knew I was a notorious ass, but it was frustratingly difficult to beat me in an argument, so the temptation was great.

One fellow told me Yugoslavia was the exception to my rule. I asked him if Yugoslavia didn’t require an exit visa. Like most people who argue with me, he claimed that he knew the answer to this obscure question right off the top of his head: “No.”

I then let him win. “If Yugoslavia doesn’t require any exit visa, then they don’t keep people in like the other Communist countries do.”

He got his win, but he later regretted it, because I got my point. You see, during the entire generation that the Berlin Wall stayed up and escapees were being shot, if you mentioned dictatorship everybody talked about Hitler. But everybody who listened to that argument remembered that Communists were killing escapees while we discussed it.

The left wants to think about Hitler, not the Berlin Wall. I never let this guy or his listeners forget the Wall.

November 22, 2003 -- Homosexual Marriage: It's All Over but the Shouting

November 22, 2003 -- November 22, 1963

November 22, 2003 -- For the Media, America Begins and Ends in the Northeast

November 22, 2003 -- For Old Liberals, Kennedy Was the Last AMERICAN President

Fun Quote:

Everybody else is self-centered.

I'm not.

I am just very, very important.

Homosexual Marriage: It's All Over but the Shouting

The Massachusetts Supreme Court has ruled that the state must approve homosexual marriages. All the precedents are on their side.

In 1945 the California Supreme Court struck down that state's ban on interracial marriages. The California Supreme Court defied all constitutional history to do that. Everybody who ratified the California state constitution was for a law against interracial marriages.

The California Supreme Court simply and openly dictated social policy and it won.

Every state that ratified the United States Bill of Rights had and enforced laws against interracial marriage. In 1968 the United States Supreme Court struck down every law in this country against interracial marriage by saying they violated the Bill of Rights.

People like me said that was a dangerous precedent. Everybody said we were just being alarmists.

You can scream all you want to about homosexual marriage. You lost that fight thirty-five years ago.

November 22, 1963

The entire country used to go into deep and ostentatious mourning on this day each year. It was the date on which Saint John the Kennedy was shot.

Saint John the Kennedy has gone the way of Saint Christopher. The liberal popes have declared him a fake. The absolute silence about the real John Kennedy that the media maintained for so long has been breached. The truth about John Kennedy has come out, and the truth ruins liberals.

The truth ruins leftists. That is why the files on Saint Martin Luther the King have been closed by law for fifty years. They'll be burned before they are opened and no one in the press will ever speculate on what's in the King Files.

The late Veneration of Saint John the Kennedy is directly related to the runaway popularity of Howard Dean among Democrats. Howard Dean is from New England. He is the first New England presidential candidate since Kennedy that everybody doesn't yawn at.

You know all those pitiful, elderly people who still think they are the "With It" Generation of 1965, the Old Hippies? Keep them in mind and I'll explain another, bigger group of liberals to you.

For the media, Kennedy represented the Good Old Days when presidents came from New England. Back then there were three TV networks. In Kennedy's day all three networks and the two national wire services were in New York City.

In the days of Saint John the Kennedy, in the days of Camelot, all the media were in New York City, of New York City, and by New York City. New York was the Center of the World back then and the world was the Northeastern United States.

In the Kennedy days, the only Republicans who mattered were the Rockefeller Republicans of the liberal Northeast. Any part of America outside of the Northeast was openly considered to be alien territory, populated entirely by yokels.

Nowadays most people won't know where the Allegheny Mountains are unless one points out that it is the upper part of the Appalachian Range. But in the Kennedy Days, the Alleghenies were the western border of the media's idea of the Real America.

As Ralph Waldo Emerson said, "Europe extends to the Alleghenies. That is where America begins."

The media's idea of the "Only True America" has another border. It is the Mason-Dixon Line.

For the Media, America Begins and Ends in the Northeast

Camelot, the Kennedy Days, was the last time when the Northeast was everything.

Those were The Good Old Days, and the liberals want the Good Old Days back.

In the 1960s the media explained their version of American history in a multi-part series narrated by Dick Cavett. The program was put together under the supervision of the National Education Association (NEA).

At the beginning of the program Cavett gave a quick overview of the NEA-Big Media view of American history. Cavett explained he would describe "how America grew from a small settlement in Massachusetts to become a nation that reached from coast to coast."

Back then you routinely said that the first permanent English settlement in America was the Plymouth Colony in 1620. Nobody dared to contradict that.

Meanwhile, back in the real world, Jamestown was the first permanent English settlement in America.

But if you mentioned Jamestown back in the 1960s the NEA and the media would lose patience with you. The NEA would humiliate you by saying, yes, there was a Lost Colony in North Carolina and a Jamestown down in Virginia, but serious history meant the history of the Northeast.

For Liberals and the Media, Kennedy Was the Last AMERICAN President

One thing young people today don't remember is that the successor to Saint John the Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, kept insisting that his native state of Texas was not in the hated South. He said Texas was in the West and had nothing to do with the despised Southern states.

For the media, it was tragic and horrible to go from the young John Kennedy, with his lack of any accent at all -- from the media point of view -- to Lyndon Johnson, with his gross Southern speech.

Kennedy had been born and raised not only on the East Coast, but in Boston itself. Boston is actually north of most of even Canada's population. Kennedy graduated from Harvard. His Cabinet was carefully selected to be from the Northeasterners the media looked upon as The Only True Intellectuals.

For people whose minds are proudly stuck in the 1960s, Johnson was bad, but things got worse. Since Kennedy, every single president has been either 1) a Republican; or 2) a Southerner. Now we have the ultimate nightmare, a Republican president who CLAIMS to be a Southerner!

Every time the Democrats nominate what the hippies and the media would consider a real American for president, a Northern liberal, he gets trounced at the polls: Humphrey, McGovern, Mondale, Dukakis (the guy from Massachusetts in 1988), they all got trounced. Only Carter of Georgia and Clinton of Arkansas were elected by the Democrats.

So no matter how much dirt comes out on St. John the Kennedy, he will be missed until the present media and the Old Hippies all die out.

November 29, 2003 -- What in the Hell Are We Doing in Iraq?

November 29, 2003 -- Bush Doesn't Care About America, Leftists Hate Us, Buchanan's Chasing His Tail

November 29, 2003 -- SNAFU

November 29, 2003 -- Everything is Coming Apart, and Whitaker is Right At Home

Fun Quote:

Old folks can have fun, too.

For instance, I celebrate my senility by hiding my own Thanksgiving Eggs.

What the Hell are We Doing in Iraq?

American troops are in Iraq because the Bush Administration will not protect our own borders. The United States was attacked on September 11, 2001, and the United States is far and away the greatest military power on earth. So we had to do SOMETHING.

Right now there is a big trial going on about the sniper shootings in the DC area. The younger murderer, Lee Malvo, is an illegal alien who was caught and then allowed to run free by Federal authorities. All this happened long after the terror attack of September 11, 2001.

Nobody brings this point up any more when the sniper trial is discussed. There has been no crackdown on the kind of illegal alien activities that brought on the September 11 attack. We all know there won't be any such crackdown. Hispanic voters don't want it.

Bush will never get the votes of the Hispanic voters who favor illegal aliens, but he thinks he has nothing to lose by going after them.

The simple fact is that Bush will never enforce any immigration laws. But in the end his voters will back him because Bush's opponents are worse. Bush doesn't care what happens to America, but his Democratic challengers actually hate America. Anyone born here is, to them, an true alien.

That sounds crazy, but it is the exact truth. And every election, Americans elect somebody with Bush's attitude, someone with the Democratic attitude, or someone in between.

So we have troops in Iraq.

And we are going to keep troops in Iraq. Why? Because they're our boys, you see, and we want to be patriotic. We want to be so patriotic about Iraq that we cannot spare any troops to patrol the American border.

We are in Iraq because American voters are chasing their tails.

Bush Doesn't Care About America, Liberals Hate Us, Buchanan's Chasing His Tail

Bush's Iraq policies have the usual knee-jerk leftist opponents. They hate America and they hate the American military. They say they love the United Nations and France, but they don't. They just hate us.

There is the usual slaving support for anything in a uniform that comes from conservatives.

Then there are the Buchananites.

They are against the war. But like Pat's 2000 presidential campaign, they are totally unnoticed because they never settle on anything. Pat ended his campaign insisting that evolution was wrong because he didn't want to be a monkey.

Big issue, right?

One minute these Buchanan types are the True Believers in the Statue of Liberty. I remember when old Pat led the Nation of Immigrants charge.

Next the Buchananites are True pro-Lifers. They say they want to fill the world up with birth defects. They think that's Shrewd because it shows the liberals that Buchanan is the REAL Humanitarian. He would spend every dime we have on preserving every human vegetable on earth.

Pat also wants to prevent birth control in the third world.

For a while there, old Pat wanted to save the white race. Now he just wants us to slow immigration so we can have more time for "assimilation," which means slow racial suicide instead of fast racial suicide.

Lately Pat wrote a book about how "the West" was dying out and the third world was multiplying and overrunning us. I happen to know that Pat himself was absolutely overwhelmed by the popularity of that book.

Pat's off that kick now.

You see, Pat has to follow his fans, and his fans have the concentration of a four-year-old at a party. Right now they're big on being against Iraq.

SNAFU

So we have the Bush crowd. They think they're real pros and political opportunists. Then we have the liberals, whose only clear idea is that white people and Americans are evil. They think they're political opportunists, too.

When a real political force emerges, all those groups will vanish like the snow in spring. And I can tell you exactly what that force will look like. I've made correct predictions of this kind decade after decade. And every time, people kept chasing their tails until the reality I had told them about over and over, exploded in their faces.

Then everybody said they knew it all the time.

Meanwhile, all those people who think they're real politicians are pathetic. But they will last until the rest of us stop chasing our tails. So they're less pathetic than we are.

Instead of an opposition, we have the Buchananite crowd who think they're patriots. They think they're loyal to the Lord Jehovah, to the True Spirit of America, to The Melting Pot, to the latest popular Eternal Moral Value, to people on life support, to the Ten Commandments, to the fifteenth child being born in an Indian ghetto in Delhi, to whatever the latest rumor is on the Internet and you-name-it. The you-name-it will be part of all the group mailings I get in my e-mail tomorrow.

Everything is Coming Apart, and Whitaker is Right at Home

The entire political mess over Iraq makes no sense to a sane person, but it is business as usual to me. I have been in the middle of dog-chases-tail politics all of my life.

At the end of every political campaign I have gotten panicked calls from people who were new to politics who told me everything was coming apart. I assured them, "Everything is always coming apart on election day."

When the titanic Persian Army came into Greece in ancient times, it looked hopeless for Greece. But a few Greeks stood shoulder-to-shoulder and whipped the Persians.

Rome took that strategy to miraculous levels. A few Roman soldiers could beat a hundred thousand Eastern soldiers in their hordes or thousands of disorganized Celtic warriors.

There is a political strategy that not only can win, it will win. I try to explain it, over and over, in WhitakerOnline. Each time I explain it, I get responses from people who tell me they liked what I said, which I appreciate. They then make further comments that show they have not the slightest idea what I am getting at. They then give me the latest news about how Bush is a bad guy and is lying.

The strategy I see coming would happen without me. People like me do a lot of big things because we can see reality while everybody else is chasing the Latest Thing. We don't create the big movements, but we sure help.

I was part of the ground-laying that got Goldwater nominated in 1964. Then Goldwater went to the "real pros" and lost it all. I spent years helping form the "Reagan Democrat" strategy that won in 1980. Every year before that conservatives were dashing around with yet a new excitement, but I kept on.

I had a ticket to the Reagan Inauguration. I gave it away and worked on the next thing.

I stopped the Internal Revenue Service from imposing racial quotas on private schools. I saved the Hubble Space Telescope. American politics is a huge world, and one person can do a lot.

But I never did anything by dashing around madly chasing whatever the Latest Big Deal is in political news.

Politics, like everything else, is a matter of keeping your eye on the ball. Everybody else will keep you up on the play-by-play action. That's where the fun is.

Whitaker Online is aimed at winning the World Series years from now.

December 6, 2003 -- Pain is Cheap, So is Philosophy

December 6, 2003 -- Great Philosophers Excuse the Rulers Who Do Nothing for Us

December 6, 2003 -- Only Western Civilization Has Been Based on Real Benefits

December 6, 2003 -- The First Step to Wisdom is to Stop Being a Damned Fool

Fun Quote:

Let me save you some pain.

You're worrying about what they they are thinking about you, right?

They're not.

Pain is Cheap, So is Philosophy

The Spanish have a saying, "Of course life is mostly pain. If it weren't we wouldn't need so many philosophers."

The more miserable a place is, the more philosophers it has. Even sub-Saharan Africa produced, "It takes a village to raise a child."

China has had wall-to-wall philosophers throughout its history of agony and tyranny. India is the homeland of Buddhism and of an endless string of gurus.

Is it agony that produces philosophers or philosophers that produce agony?

Great Civilizations, the ones that produce all that pain and all those great Thinkers, are based on two things, 1) threats and 2) promises they never have to fulfill.

The Pharaohs used the whip and a promise of everlasting life in The Book of the Dead. India used the whip and the promise of Nirvana after a lot of lifetimes. Before Nirvana, if you were obedient, you too would be in the upper classes in your next life.

I make fun of all this because I am in the modern West. This is the first civilization in history that justifies its existence mostly on promises kept.

When Western Civilization gets to a country, all its Great Philosophers are dumped. The Great Civilization melts like thin ice.

Conservatives tell us that is because we are superficial. Liberals tell us that is because we are Evil.

I think it's because the great Cultures were frauds, and so are leftists. Conservatives are retards.

Great Philosophers Excuse the Rulers Who Do Nothing For Us

Pain is cheap. Pain is easy.

Any retard knows how to hurt people. A brilliant person can work all day and not come up with anything to amuse the people around him.

You can hurt anybody. You can't give pleasure to everybody. So society is based on punishment. Pre-humans could break an arm ten thousand years ago. We only very recently found out how to set a broken arm.

Pain is cheap, and that is what society is built on.

Promises are free. I can promise you eternal joy at no cost to me, and I can get you to pay for it here and now, big time. Jesus offered salvation "free and without price." Paul was a tentmaker and Peter earned his living and was a married man. The idea of a working preacher or a married Pope is heresy now.

The Pharaoh said that if he didn't do his daily prayers, the sun wouldn't come up tomorrow. He did his prayers and the sun did come up, every single day. Pharaoh promised those who built his pyramids they would live forever after their earthly death.

Maybe the Pharaoh was right. We have heard no complaints from dead people and the sun is still coming up.

So every Great Civilization has produced great Philosophers and Great Moralities, and the West produces Coca-Cola and computers.

The one thing Americans don't seem to produce is Great Philosophers.

Only Western Civilization Has Been Based on Real Benefits

A Great Philosopher explains to you why you need all that pain. A Great Philosopher explains to you why you should forget this world and talk about the Next.

A Great Philosopher will tell you to forget what you Want. The Great Philosopher tells you what you Need. This is very convenient, since no Great Civilization ever produced what people wanted.

Great Civilizations melt like thin ice when the West shows up. India can talk itself blue about what great Philosophers it used to have, but there is no way they are going to go back to their loin cloths.

Not a single eskimo lives on the old ice fields any more. They sit around on welfare and bitch about people who forget to call them Inuits.

In all the old so-called Great Civilizations anybody who could write worked for the ruler. They sat around and tried to find ways to justify why everybody should obey the Pharaoh or the Emperor and why everybody should be grateful that were so miserable.

We have lawyers and liberals to do that.

Oops. I almost forgot to give respectable conservatives their share of the credit!

But the rest of our literate population spends its time trying to figure out a way to give people what they want. They make money by giving people what they want. They get elected by giving people what they want. That's where Coca-Cola comes from. That's where computers come from.

Those who love Great Philosophers also love huge tomes like Karl Marx's "Capital" or the Old Testament.

People like me want to take the Golden Rule and get on with the business of making things better for people.

You don't need me to justify misery. There's plenty of misery to go around already.

The First Step to Wisdom is to Stop Being a Damned Fool

Get up off your stomach! Stop trying to find somebody to be wildly grateful to.

Demand more! Don't try to Understand why the poor government can't help. Don't tell yourself that everybody deserves big money for sitting in a big office. What have they done for us LATELY?

They sure as hell got PAID lately. So what did they DO lately? Gathering cobwebs and seniority and what they call Experience won't do us any good.

So let's stop paying for it.

Every time you want to know why you aren't safe on the street, the government tells you about its programs in Southeast Goobooiland and what you owe to All Mankind.

Please, please stop being a fool.

Fools get robbed. Fools get lied to. Fools get cheated. Fools get everything we keep complaining that we are getting.

December 13, 2003 -- Do You Remember the Movie "Soylent Green?"

December 13, 2003 -- Next They Said Liberals Must Rule the World to Control Third World Population

December 13, 2003 -- Help Wanted! Fashionable Opinion Needs Author for Its Next World Crisis Book

Fun Quote:

I plead insanity and I've got witnesses.

Do You Remember the Movie "Soylent Green?"

In the 1960s, at the end of the post-World War II "baby boom," Fashionable Opinion said the white population was growing wildly. The solution to this, said Fashionable Opinion, was for bureaucrats to take over population control. To save the world from overpopulation, we had to let the professors, the "intellectuals," decide how many children each person should have.

Charleton Heston's 1973 movie "Soylent Green" was about the Inevitable Future when America was so packed with people that everybody was desperately poor. We ended up eating each other.

In "Soylent Green" Evil Americans had killed every other form of life and ended up eating each other. "Soylent Green" was made when Charleton Heston was a big Bobby Kennedy supporter -- he says he still is -- and the big liberal demand was to turn birth control over to the bureaucrats.

At the same time that "Soylent Green" came out there was the usual flurry of science fiction books saying exactly the same thing. One of them talked about the Inevitable Future when white people would be jamming Britain so tightly that no one could move.

Shortly after "Soylent Green" was produced, the liberal line changed. It turned out that by the 1960s the world's white population was not expanding, it was dropping. It took quite a while before Fashionable Opinion realized that, once again, its predictions were wrong.

After it sunk in that the post-World War II white "baby boom" was over and the white population was declining, all those books were forgotten.

As usual, the Inevitable Future predicted by liberals turned out to be silly. So they needed a new Inevitable Future.

The next Inevitable Future was typified by a book called "The Population Bomb."

Next They Said That Liberals Must Rule the World to Control Third World Population

"The Population Bomb" was written about the runaway growth of third world populations in the 1970s. It replaced the "Soylent Green" books because we had found out by then that the white world was having a population bust, so "Soylent Green" was silly.

The Social Message of the "Soylent Green" books was that liberal planners, guided by social science professors, had to take over population control in America and Europe because whites were having too many children. When the white Baby Boom turned into a Baby Bust, the "Soylent Green" fad fizzled. Like all liberal Social messages, it was silly to begin with.

Then came another wildly popular book called "The Population Bomb." This book showed that the third world population was expanding wildly. So in the new Inevitable Future, the third world population increase would go on forever.

Just as "Soylent Green" was the main shark in a feeding frenzy of science fiction books about a wildly overcrowded white world, "The Population Bomb" was the central book in a feeding frenzy of books about the runaway third world birth rate.

"Soylent Green" and all the little books surrounding it in the 1960s had a single Social Message. "The Population Bomb" and all the little books surrounding it in the 1970s had a single Social Message.

By the most amazing coincidence, both "The Population Bomb" and all the little science fiction books circling around it had exactly the same liberal Social Message as "Soylent Green" did.

"The Population Bomb" said that liberal social planners had to set up a world birth control program. World bureaucrats would control population in the third world. Bureaucrats would also supervise a program to move excess third world population into white majority countries.

To solve the third world's population problems, excess third worlders would be sent into ALL white majority countries, and ONLY into white majority countries. None would be sent to Japan or Taiwan or any of the open lands in the third world itself.

By another amazing coincidence, sending the world's excess third world population into ALL white majority countries and ONLY into white majority countries just happened to be what liberals had wanted to do all along.

Once again, the only way to save the world was to do what liberals had always wanted to do.

Now that Inevitable Future has died, too. The runaway population expansion in the third world ended well over a decade ago. Third world population is leveling out.

Another Inevitable Future is gone.

So now we need yet another Inevitable Future. The next Inevitable Future must prove the same thing the last two Inevitable Futures proved. It must show that the world can only be saved if bureaucrats rule the world and the white race disappears.

Help Wanted! Fashionable Opinion Needs Author for Next World Crisis Book!

The next crisis book will say that liberals have to rule the world to save it from global warming or global freezing or whatever. The new version of "Soylent Green" will dramatize how the world will be destroyed because we have not ratified some version of the Kyoto Treaty.

The Kyoto Treaty would stop all development in white countries and let the third world go for broke. Any version of the Kyoto Treaty, no matter how you watered it down, would go a long way towards turning world economic policy over to the bureaucrats and halting Western growth.

And turning the world over to bureaucrats is what Fashionable Opinion is all about.

The media have hit Bush hard for not negotiating some version of the Kyoto Treaty, so Bush has already begun to cave in. Not one single member of the United States Senate would dare support the present Kyoto Treaty, so all that Fashionable Opinion asks is that we start taking it seriously again.

So Bush is starting to go back to negotiating the Kyoto Treaty. But what is really needed is a book that will get the yuppies howling for Kyoto and scaring Bush all the way to the conference table.

Bush is on the run, but we still don't have the book we need, the new "Soylent Green," the new "Population Bomb."

Hundreds of science fiction writers are out there waiting waiting for somebody to put that book out so they can put out little versions of it.

Everybody is waiting for the next Inevitable Future, and the rewards being offered for it are stupendous.

Every movie about the Holocaust gets dozens of awards. The professor at Emory who got fired because his pro-gun control book was such a tissue of obvious lies got lots of awards for it. Whoever writes the new "professors must rule the world" and "The white race is the cancer of history" book has fame and money and awards and professorships lined up waiting for him.

Where is that book?

December 27, 2003 -- Strom's Colored Daughter

December 27, 2003 -- The Ten Commandments Controversy

December 27, 2003 -- An Awful Man is Captured, and Awful People Care

December 27, 2003 -- Liberals are Getting Hurt and They are Ordering Respectable Conservatives to Help Them

December 27, 2003 -- Iraq Has Caused Conservative Spokesmen to Forget Their Duty to Protect Liberals

December 27, 2003 -- Neoconservatives Demand That Conservatives Follow Liberal Orders

Fun Quote:

If you say someone is judgmental, what are you being?

Strom's Colored Daughter

I do not understand homosexuality or interracial sex.

What Strom did in fathering a child with his black maid disgusts me, but that sort of thing has never been considered much of a moral lapse in any society.

It has always been the attitude of the group that regards itself as superior that there is little wrong with males impregnating the inferior race, but their women are the life of their own race. So superiors are not all that upset with men bedding the housemaid in a British home or an American home. But if the male servants bed the ladies of the house, that is a scandal.

What impresses me most is what an honorable person Strom fathered. The media cannot understand why she didn't capitalize on the situation. She says she didn't want to hurt her father. Yankees are absolutely mystified by this.

I just think there are some decent people in the world, and it's good to hear about one of them.

The Ten Commandments Controversy

Conservatives who are not babbling about Saddam are babbling about the Alabama controversy over the Ten Commandments.

Once again, like talking about Our Boys in Iraq, this is a good way to ignore what really needs to be done.

I often laugh to myself about how outraged a group of these frantic e-mailers on the Ten Commandments would be if some young man walked up and said, "You don't need the Ten Commandments. All you need is the Golden Rule."

They would say he was just awful. They would say he was unChristian.

Well, a young man did say that. He said it two thousand years ago. His name was Jesus.

The Ten Commandments, they tell us, form the basis on which all law and decency was established. Hogwash. They also tell us that God is worried to death about the State of Israel.

Like the capture of Saddam, none of this has anything to do with anything important.

An Awful Man is Captured, and Awful People Care

The capture of Saddam Hussein will allow the Bush Administration to put more men in uniform in Iraq. Our own borders remain wide open. Congress just agreed to give the Iraqis more billions of our dollars.

If Hussein hadn't been captured, liberals would have had another weapon in their struggle to turn over American policy to the United Nations. Leftists used our failure to catch Saddam to prove that France was right. They call it "cooperating with our Allies," but it means France.

Liberals love the France that gave Parisian citizenship to the American cop-killer.

Nothing a decent American could care about is being dealt with in Iraq. Capturing Saddam disappointed the French and their kind. The United Nations was hurt by the capture. Liberals hate any American success. That was the nice thing about Saddam's capture.

Now let's talk about something that matters.

Saddam's capture just demonstrates again that America is very, very powerful. The critical question is not who controls Iraq, but who controls America. The evil people in America fight each other over who controls Iraq.

We must keep our eye on the real goal. We must defeat both the neoconservatives in the White House who want to use America for things like controlling the Middle East AND we must defeat the leftists.

This will not be done by frantic e-mails about the Ten Commandments or Saddam or Bush or whatever other issue is the big fad of the moment.

Liberals are Getting Hurt and They are Ordering Respectable Conservatives to Help Them

St. Thomas More gave us an invaluable lesson on the most effective weapon to use against Evil. He said, "The Devil, Proud Spirit, cannot bear to be mocked."

Nobody is allowed to laugh at the left. They see themselves as brilliant and radical. You can accuse them of anything you want to, but if you point out that they are just plain ridiculous, they go ballistic. Exposing liberal silliness has become such a habit that even Jay Leno has made it a regular part of his opening monologue.

Leftism is SILLY.

The idea that a whole country run by bureaucrats will be efficient, a.k.a. socialism, should be laughed at, not debated. The idea that criminals are basically sweet kids should have been ridiculed away before liberals ever had the chance to kill thousands of people by putting hardened killers back on the streets.

Like Satan, the left cannot bear to be mocked. So every respectable conservative treats every liberal spokesman with deep respect and regards every word of his drivel as serious stuff.

Like Jay Leno, who is a liberal, grassroots anti-liberals have begun violating the rules that govern conservative spokesmen. We are laughing at them, ridiculing them.

Another thing no respectable conservative is allowed to do is to have a memory or talk about the liberals' pattern of behavior. The last ten liberal policy disasters are quickly forgotten as conservatives gravely discuss the latest leftist proposal.

We are beginning to call leftists what they are, in plain English. That is something else that no conservative spokesman ever does.

In the Iraq war, the left is once again on the side of anybody but Americans. Ann Coulter wrote a book about them called Treason. She goes into detail about a pattern we all know: that liberals are always on the side of America's enemies and detractors.

The left is being hurt by the very weapons respectable conservatives are supposed to protect it against, a sense of humor and a memory. For decades, any time a conservative hit them where it really hurt liberals simply called him a racist or something and the respectable conservatives ate him alive.

Liberals are screaming "Wolf!" and "Hitler!" but anti-liberals are having too much fun and too much effect to listen.

Where are the liberals' conservative protectors?

Iraq Has Caused Conservative Spokesmen to Forget Their Duty to Protect Liberals

Conservative spokesmen have not been doing their jobs as respectable conservatives. Liberals are getting hurt. Liberals are getting laughed at. The anti-liberals who have memories and talk about treason and the pattern of leftist policy failures are gaining popularity, and no conservative spokesman has stepped forth to denounce them.

Liberals have been screaming their usual orders to conservatives, in the form of outrage and insults and cries of "Racism," to kick the anti-liberal opposition back into line. Historically whoever they screamed at on the right was instantly lynched by the respectable right.

Neoconservatives Demand that Conservatives Follow Liberal Orders

The Kristol family rules the respectable right.

Kristol, Senior made his name and fame as a liberal back when that was the thing to be. He was in the very bowels of the liberal establishment. Then Kristol Senior saw that liberalism was becoming unpopular, so he started a movement.

He called this movement from the bowels of liberalism Neo-Conservatism. It consists of people who say that liberalism was The Only True Faith until on or about January 1, 1970. On or about that date

liberalism suddenly and inexplicably did every horrible thing that conservatives had said all along that liberal policies would lead to.

The National Review types rejoiced madly when neoconservatives joined them. Here were former Big Names at Harvard and New York liberal circles who were willing to sit and have lunch with the conservatives they had before regarded as Irish peasants. Not only that, these Big Names were willing to WRITE for them!

Respectable conservatives were delirious. And who knew better how to be respectable conservatives than neoconservatives who had been (and, they tell us, still are) leftists? So the top spokesmen of the respectable right today are the "neos." The "Neos" rule the White House today and even the liberals cite neoconservatives, not conservatives, as the group that got America into the Iraq War.

But while the neos are leading America into their war abroad, their attention has gotten off the one that counts, the war here at home. Kristol Junior has now heeded the liberal commands.

Recently Kristol the Younger wrote an editorial in which he asked for "civility in our political debate." It was all getting mean, he said. Kristol says that liberals are justified in being upset at the outrageous attacks on them from the right.

It is time, said Kristol the Younger, for us to stop laughing at liberals, ridiculing them, and recalling their patterns of treasonousness and hating Americans.

Liberals have called out the big guns, the neoconservatives, to stop the assault. Soon the Buckleys and all the other little respectables will be demanding this "civility."

But the right has tasted blood and it won't be easy to recall the troops.

January 4, 2004 -- A Man With a Memory Looks at the "Stop Dean" Movement

January 4, 2004 -- It is Time to Strike at the Enemy's Homeland

January 4, 2004 -- Making Life Hard for Liberal Professors

January 4, 2004 -- Why Leftism Always Fails yet Demands More Power

January 4, 2004 -- This is a Demand for Revolution

January 4, 2004 -- We Have Allies in the Enemy's Homeland

Fun Quote:

"All things come to him who waits, provided that he worketh like hell while he waiteth."

A Man With a Memory Looks at the "Stop Dean" Movement

The big political news of January 1, 2004 is the "Stop Howard Dean" movement.

The political news of January 1, 1964 was the "Stop Goldwater" movement. Goldwater got the nomination.

In January 1, 1968, Richard Nixon was the only candidate left standing., and everybody was looking for an alternative. Nixon got the nomination.

The big political news on January 1, 1972 was the Stop McGovern movement. McGovern got the nomination.

On January 1, 1980 the big news was the Stop Reagan movement. Reagan got the nomination

Buchanan tried to stop the Bush nomination. Bush got the nomination.

In 2000 the big news was McCain's Stop Bush, Junior. Bush, Junior got the nomination.

I have never heard of a Stop Somebody Movement ever succeeding. But I am also the only person who notices things like that.

It is Time to Strike at the Enemy's Homeland

It is time for us to attack the enemy base. I have been working on my new book, "Why Johnny Can't Think," for over two years. I have done fourteen, I said fourteen, complete rewrites.

One publisher accepted it and then not only changed his mind, but wiped all reference to this dangerous attack on academia from his computer!

"Johnny Can't Think" is actually about to be published.

This is very, very important book, or I would not have exhausted myself on it. "Why Johnny Can't Think" uses the one weapon leftists cannot deal with.

Ridicule.

"Why Johnny Can't Think reveals something else that no respectable conservative ever shows:

Rage.

Making Life Hard for Liberal Professors

Many college students would like to give their professors a hard time. "Why Johnny Can't Think" is written so that an intelligent person can read it and use it.

This is a short book that makes the case that a student needs to make life impossible for his leftist professor. I have been doing that for almost fifty years, as a student, as a professor, as a debater and commentator, and as Director of Oversight of the House Education and Labor Committee.

When it comes to tearing leftists apart in their power bases, the universities themselves, I am a past-master. One copy of "Why Johnny Can't Think" in the hands of one student will affect a hundred students.

Why Leftism Always Fails and Yet Demands More Power

"Why Johnny Can't Think" is forty thousand words dedicated to a tiny, consistent range of topics. It shows that leftism just means, "Professors should rule the rule." It then demonstrates why each totally inbred generation of professors chooses a new generation of professors that is even more inbred and leftist.

"Why Johnny Can't Think" shows what actually happens when college graduates and their professors actually try ruling the world through socialism, through criminal "rehabilitation," and through the New Education.

Whatever they call it, socialism or environmentalism or multiculturalism, each leftist program just means that professors should rule the world. And every time they try, it is a disaster.

But college graduates keep pushing new leftists policies.. that what they learned in school.

That's what we pay professors to teach them in school.

This is a Demand for Revolution

"Why Johnny Can't Think" is not just the usual conservative criticism of liberal policy. We want action.

We want affirmative action **HIRING** of rightist professors. They must be the very people today's professors hate. We demand affirmative action **FIRING** of today's professor, who is a product of an insane inbreeding and the author of endless human misery.

As in all movements, it will be an astonishingly tiny number of people who stick to the subject and make the university revolution.

Once those few get the fight going, allies will pour in. The enemies of Political Correctness are now legion.

There are thousands of solid right-wing professors we could hire, and they can help in taking this fight to the enemy. Our enemies are using hundreds of billions of dollars for their purposes.

We want a major portion of that money for our people.

It's called the spoils of war, and this is a war.

Our aim is to take away the real base of leftist power, the universities. We will not hesitate to use their money and power against them.

We Have Allies in the Enemy's Homeland

In "Why Johnny Can't Think," I give example after example after example of how professors have lined up to testify in favor of one insane liberal proposal after another. Then there is a quote you can use:

"If leftists need frogs to have hooves, ten thousand professors will line up tomorrow to testify that frogs have hooves." And I proceed to give yet more examples.

If professors want to rule the world by imposing a worldwide plan to prevent global warming, ten thousand professors line up to insist that global warming is coming in fast. If leftists want global freezing, ten thousand professors will line up to testify to that.

If you want to have a job on any campus, you have to testify to anything liberals want said.

This doctrine rules over every field of study, from sociology to physics.

All the chemists and meteorologists and geneticists and other hard scientists must say anything social scientists want if them to say. They must also divert huge sums of research money into pure social science drivel. Schizophrenia is primarily biochemical, but for every dime of research that goes into biochemical study, a dollar has to go into totally discredited research in psychotherapy.

The anger of hard science against social science is building steadily. Our enemies have made lots of other enemies. Many in the hard sciences are getting sick of this oppression.

"Why Johnny Can't Think" is an attack on the enemy homeland, something no conservative has attempted. There are plenty of allies right there in the enemy's homeland, from bored students to hard scientists. But nothing less than a call to revolution will allow them to act.

It will take time for the ideas in "Why Johnny Can't Think" to filter down, but I have done this sort of thing twice in my life before, and the effects were stunning.

Conservatives have respectfully criticized the leftists' iron rule on campus for long enough. It is time for revolution.

"Why Johnny Can't Think" is the call for that revolution.

January 11, 2004 Nothing

January 17, 2004 -- Morons Versus Mars

January 17, 2004 -- Moon Shot Versus Cheap Shot

January 17, 2004 -- I Would Rather Die Than be a Mars Moron

Fun Quote:

From "The Martian Dictionary::

Negroid, n: -- "One of the non-green races."

Morons Versus Mars

The reason I can write this web page and you can read it is a direct result of the program that put America on the moon in 1969. Everybody who is being kept alive by a heart pacer owes his life to that same space program and the basic research that went into it.

Only a fraction of a percent of our national income goes into basic research in the hard sciences. All of our scientific advances eventually result from that research. A major part of the money spent on space programs like the moon shot in 1969 and the Mars shot today goes into basic research.

During the moon shot project from 1962-1969, you could have said, “We have priorities down here on earth? What will we get out of throwing a lot hardware at the moon?”

Back then, no one could have said, “Because it will lead to the heart pacer, to Silicon Valley, to a whole long list of great things that Bob Whitaker won’t be able to remember.” No one knew that yet.

That is why it is called “basic research.” No one knows yet where it will lead. But it has proved itself again and again.

One thing is clear.

Anyone who says, “Why are we spending all that money out in space when we have needs here on earth?” has always been wrong.

So they’re out there again. The Moron Brigade is saying once again that we shouldn’t be doing this Mars thing because we have needs here on earth.

Every time there is an advance in the space program, we should have a special Moron Room. Naturally it would not be labeled “Moron Room.”. The sign would read, “Special Seating for Tough, Practical, Realistic People.”

In that room, the morons would say, in chorus, “We have Real Needs here on earth. Money should not be wasted out in space.” Tapes would be made of this chorus and sent to each panel discussing the latest step in the exploration of space.

Morons always win the argument at first. That is because at the beginning no one can tell them what good basic research will do in the future. The whole point of basic research is that no one knows where it will lead. So if you asked the inventor of the microscope exactly what he was going to find with that microscope, he could not have told you.

Moon Shot Versus Cheap Shot

William Proxmire was a liberal Democratic senator that conservatives loved dearly. Each week he presented a Golden Fleece Award to a government agency for the biggest waste of money.

But finding out about real waste took work. Then Proxmire made a discovery that saved him all that work.

Each week every congressional office receives a report from the National Science Foundation (NSF) on the grants that it has made that week for basic research. Proxmire was delighted to discover that the title of almost every basic research project funded by the NSF was incomprehensible jibberish to the average layman.

From then on the Golden Fleece award was no strain, no pain. Proxmire just picked a title that no one understood and declared it a waste of money.

Let me explain to you how this Proxmire Method works out in real life. Let us say you have a serious medical condition and your doctor needs to find out about how to deal with it. The journal he is reading will make no sense to you at all. So Proxmire would ban it.

Right now there are life-saving medicines being developed from deep sea animals. Proxmire would have said, "Why waste all that money sending diving bells a mile down in the ocean when we have Real Problems here on the surface?"

No one could have told him, because we didn't know what would come of deep-sea research. That, to repeat, is why it is called BASIC research.

I Would Rather Die Than Be a Mars Moron

Conservatives worshipped Proxmire. One day a congressman called me into his office. I was known for knowing a lot of things, including scientific terminology. He told me he wanted to do on the House side what Proxmire was doing in the Senate. He wanted me to look at the National Science Foundation weekly report and pick titles to ridicule.

There was no job security on Capitol Hill. You could be fired on the spot, and a lot of people were. I risked my career by telling the congressman that Proxmire was not only a moron, he was an enormously destructive moron. I told him about some of the basic research programs Proxmire had tried to destroy that had led to enormous advances. I explained to him that because of Proxmire the National Science Foundation had given grants to far less valuable research projects because they had titles Proxmire wouldn't attacked.

I asked the congressman not to be another Proxmire, and if he had to, to get someone else to do the dirty work. He actually listened and dropped it. I was very lucky. Not only can you lose your job by refusing point blank to do what a congressman asks, that is the best possible way not to get another job on Capitol Hill.

I would rather have died than be ruined professionally.

But I would rather have been ruined professionally than join the Moron Brigade that is attacking the Mars program right now.

January 24, 2004 -- WhitakerOnline is Bob's Opinion, not God's

January 24, 2004 -- The Drug War is a Vietnam

January 24, 2004 -- Our Whole National Policy is a Vietnam Policy

Fun Quote:

I leave prophecy to others.

Even my hindsight needs glasses.

WhitakerOnline is Bob's Opinion, not God's

Last week I repeated my all-out support for space exploration. A lot of you, including Rick, have a healthy suspicion of President Bush and said his Mars program was hogwash.

But Rick and the most of the rest of you hated to disagree with me openly. I appreciate the respect and courtesy this shows, but you are missing the point of WhitakerOnline.

I am putting out the best ideas I can. Your job is to chew them over and spit out what you can't use. If you disagree with the old man, the old man wants to hear about it. You do me the favor of reading my stuff. That's all I ask.

I never know what to say when someone tells me, "You know, Bob, I can't agree with everything you say."

What I want to say is, "You been in this country long?" It never occurs to a real American that anybody agrees with him all the time. Somehow I am vaguely insulted that anybody would think I would expect that.

I think WhitakerOnline readers are a special breed, and you know I don't deal in flattery. I write for people with strong minds who can use what I say in their own way. That is the only kind of person who is worth my time.

The Drug War is a Vietnam

A lot of people compare the Drug War to Prohibition. Actually it is more like Vietnam.

America could have won the war in Vietnam, but to do that, we would have had to fight it. We would have had to fight a real war in Vietnam to win there.

The question is, would it have been worth it to fight a real war in Vietnam to win there?

And that is the question we never asked. We sent our soldiers to die in Vietnam, but we never decided to make it a real war. You can't get more immoral than that.

What we did in Vietnam was to send our men to fight with their hands tied behind their backs. Meanwhile, we here at home lived a very prosperous life. There were lots of ways for people with influence or money to avoid serving in Vietnam.

A real war in Vietnam would have put the draft dodgers in jail. A real war in Vietnam would have put people who marched in parades carrying enemy flags in jail. A real war in Vietnam would have risked a nuclear confrontation. That would have endangered those of us at home.

The only alternative to a real war in Vietnam was surrender. Several people heard Lyndon Johnson state his attitude about that. He said, "I will not be the first American president to lose a war." So he spent tens of thousands of American lives so that the war would not be lost until Nixon was in office.

We have exactly the same situation in the Drug War. Illegal drugs could be stopped if we clamped down on all our civic freedoms. Big time drug lords, people whose names the police know very well, would be arrested and put away for good, or they would be killed. We would trample on the sovereignty of any country that harbored drug lords. We would get them, period.

There would be no more fashionable drug use among rich Americans. They would be hunted down and punished as felons.

As in any war, your house would be open to search. Rights would be suspended.

Is winning the Drug War worth all that?

The alternative is surrender. Like President Johnson, every politician refuses to declare that we have simply lost the War on Drugs and call it off. And no politician is going to openly demand that we make a total war of it.

So we don't fight and we don't give it up. The Drug War is Vietnam.

Our Whole National Policy is a Vietnam Policy

We have another Vietnam on the question of controlling our borders. The only place on earth where a third world country shares a border with a first world country is on the Rio Grande.

People who violate the law are either criminals or they are not. People who break into Federal facilities repeatedly are not gently led back out. They are convicted and they go to jail.

People who violate our immigration laws are either criminals or we shouldn't have immigration laws.

"But, Bob, under the Constitution, illegal immigrants have rights, too."

'Fraid not. The Constitution specifically says it applies only to "Ourselves and Our Posterity."

This was not chance wording. The Founding Fathers had just fought a war for our independence and they said our business was ourselves and foreigners were none of our business. That is what independence means.

If you do not regard the immigration law as a real law, then you should stop enforcing it completely.

We have over two million people in our prisons because we cannot decide whether to treat criminals as criminals or be human about the whole thing. This situation overlaps with our Drug War Vietnam.

If drug dealers are criminals, then we should go after them all out, wherever they are. By the same token, every court room every day has people before the judge whose occupation is crime. "He keeps getting into trouble,," they say. No one mentions what that "trouble" costs one innocent victim after another.

"But, Bob, criminals have rights, too."

I'm afraid not. The term for someone who lives outside the law in Anglo-Saxon law was "outlaw." He is outside the law.

But we do not have the courage to decide. In each case, the moral question is, "Is it worth total war or do we surrender?"

We are fighting an endless number of Vietnams because we do not have the moral courage to make the decision to fight or to surrender

January 31, 2004 -- Shouting Out the Truth

January 31, 2004 -- Freedom Requires Discrimination

January 31, 2004 -- The Patriot Act is a Triumph of Nondiscrimination

January 31, 2004 -- The Right Wants Everybody to be a Child, the Left Wants Everybody to be a Criminal

Fun Quote:

In 1680, under the rigid Puritan laws governing Massachusetts, one was not allowed to buy more than five quarts of beer per day.

This stringent rule was made tolerable by the fact that you could purchase all the opium you wanted.

Shouting Out the Truth

A Supreme Court justice once said, "Freedom of speech does not include the right to shout 'Fire!' in a crowded theater."

I must have heard that piece of hogwash a thousand times, and every time the person quoting it thought he was being Truly Wise.

But what if there IS a fire in a crowded theater? Am I supposed to walk quietly to the exit and let everybody else cook?

What scares me is that I am the only person who has ever brought that up.

In Britain, the question I just posed has been answered. Joseph Pierce was sentenced to a year in prison for "inciting racial hatred." The court admitted that everything Pierce said was factual, but it also declared (The Crown versus Joseph Pierce, 1986) that "The truth is no excuse."

So if there is a fire in a British theater and you see it, walk to the exit and keep your mouth shut.

America has not degenerated to that extent yet.

Another Truly Wise quote is, "Freedom means you have the right to do whatever you want to, so long as it doesn't hurt anyone else."

In other words, I can say anything I want to say, but only so long as not one person is offended by it.

A slave has that much freedom.

Please see March 17, 2001 - HARMLESS FREEDOM IS AN OXYMORON

Freedom Requires Discrimination

Right after the September 11 attack, they began strip searching grandmothers at airports. The reason for that was that the Feds didn't want to discriminate.

The Secretary of Transportation was a Japanese-American, and Japanese-Americans had been mistreated during World War II. So he didn't want Arabs discriminated against. He didn't want profiling because of a sixty-year-old grudge. He insisted that everybody be treated like a potential terrorist.

Lawyers love to say that a repeat criminal who lives outside the law has just as many rights as you and me. What they don't mention is that that means that you and me get treated just like repeat criminals.

If everybody is treated like a terrorist, there is no freedom. If everybody is treated like a career criminal, freedom is a myth. But I have never heard anybody mention that fact.

If illegal aliens are just "undocumented workers," that means that you and I are here only at the pleasure of those who issue those "documents."

If illegal aliens have all the rights of a citizen, that means that you and I are without a country. They have Mexico, we are in the United States only because we are "documented."

Allowing the Secretary of Transportation to oppress all of us because he has a sixty-year-old grudge is insane. Treating everybody like a repeat criminal is insane. Saying that you and I only have a right to reside in the United States because those who issue documents let us stay here is insane.

And insanity as national policy has consequences.

The Patriot Act is a Triumph of Nondiscrimination

Under the Patriot Act, everybody is a potential terrorist. The FBI can search your house randomly, because if the law said anything else, it would be discriminating. Some people have found this shocking.. They shouldn't.

Once you accept the idea that everybody should be treated as a career criminal, you have given up your rights. Once you accept the idea that potential terrorists cannot be profiled, you have declared that you yourself should be treated as a potential terrorist.

Once you accept the idea that illegal aliens are "undocumented aliens," it means you are only in this country because those who issue those documents, the Federal authorities, let you be here.

So those who let you live in this country, the Federal Authorities, have a right of search and seizure which is unlimited.

You cannot limply accept each stage of the process and then suddenly get upset when the logic you have accepted turns into the Patriot Act.

And if everybody is a potential terrorist, if everybody is a criminal, if everybody lives here at the sufferance of those who issue documents, how can we be free?

The Right Wants Everybody to be a Child, the Left Wants Everybody to be a Criminal

The right wants to censor the Internet. They say they are all for freedom, they are just concerned about the children.

The right says that children can get into adult movies, so there should be no adult movies.

That means that any communications medium children can get access to should be treated as a medium for children.

If you treat everybody like a child, you don't need a dictatorship.

The right wants to censor the Internet in the name of the children. The left wants to censor violence. Any citizen who owns a gun is regarded by leftists as being the same as a repeat criminal who has a gun.

When it comes to guns, the left often uses the right's excuse. They say that the National Rifle Association wants to hand out guns to kids.

There is a coalition for censoring the Internet. Leftists who want to treat everybody like a criminal are making common cause with the rightists who want to treat everybody like a child.

February 7, 2004 -- Is Labor Losing Political Influence?

February 7, 2004 -- Labor Versus the Working Man

February 7, 2004 -- John Kerry

Fun Quote:

The softest thing in the universe is a hard vacuum.

Is Labor Losing Political Influence?

There is a lot of talk about the declining influence of "Labor" in American politics.

Let's get it straight what the word "Labor" means when the media uses it.

A couple of weeks ago I mentioned the case where a group I headed was on the ground fighting busing in Louisville. White working class children were lining up at five o'clock in the morning to be bused into the ghetto and come home in the freezing darkness. Like every judge I have ever heard of who ordered busing, the judge who ordered busing in Louisville had grandchildren in private schools. They were still in bed at 5.

So our ally in this battle was the biggest electrical workers' local in America. They were infuriated that busing was only practiced on their children.

The head of the national AFL-CIO called the Louisville union and told them that if they continued to protest busing, he would withdraw their charter. They folded instantly.

That is what "labor" means to the media: it means those who take liberal orders.

During the fight over campaign finance reform, the liberals and their pet conservative senator John McCain kept complaining about the "deal breaker" that could destroy the bill. This was a proposal that would force unions to get members' permission to hand out political money instead of union bosses handing out political money as they chose. This, said the media and McCain, was an "anti-labor" idea.

Most union dues are spent backing political causes. To the media, "Labor" is the group that hands that money out. It is the group that is pro-busing.

Labor Versus the Working Man

For McCain and the liberals who love him, the ideal "labor leadership" was in place in the Labor Party in Britain before Tony Blair took over the Party. Back then, at Labor Party conventions, whoever owned the union cast all his member's votes for them.

So who owns the unions? Often organized crime does. Organized labor is one of its staple sources of income. The point here is not that labor is still controlled by organized crime. The point is that the so-called "labor leaders" can be puppets on a string and the media will still refer to them as "labor."

"Labor" has no use whatsoever for the opinion of a bunch of working stiffs. They are straight liberal, and supporting the political left is their only real purpose. Like all large organizations, they do as little for their clients, in this case working people, as they can. They have other priorities.

As always, the capitalized word is nothing like the real thing. When the media speak of Labor, this has little to do with labor. When the Inquisition spoke of Mercy, it meant the opposite of mere mercy, which meant not torturing people. To the Inquisition, True Mercy was saving the soul from Hell. That required a slow burning at the stake. That gave the sinner a chance to feel the fire and repent. That was Mercy. There was no room for mercy.

Think about it. If Mercy meant mercy, you wouldn't capitalize it. If Labor meant labor, you wouldn't capitalize it, but Labor is implicitly capitalized in Mediaspeak.

Yes, Labor is taking a beating in the political arena today. But that is doing labor a lot of good.

John Kerry

Back in the old days, the labor vote, (note the small "l"), was one of the bases of Democratic strength. The other base was the Solid South, which guaranteed the Democrats its electoral votes. As liberal ideologues took over the Party, those bases of Democratic strength went away.

Now the Democrats depend on the slavish loyalty of minorities. Minority votes are increasing by leaps and bounds.

Democrats have lost their hold on labor, (small l). Sixty percent of Northern union people still vote Democratic, but Labor does not have the control over them that it used to have.

The Solid Republican South has kept the Democrats out of the White House for twenty-four of the last thirty-six years. Chris Matthews actually repeated a point I have made repeatedly in WhitakerOnline: The last time a Democrat who was not from the Old Confederacy won the White House was John Kennedy in 1960.

No Northern Democrat has occupied the White House since November 22, 1963.

Forty years.

Now the Democrats seem to be about to nominate another Massachusetts liberal, John Kerry.

The Democrats keep doing that. They had Dukakis and Mondale and they got trounced, but they keep nominating liberals from the far North.

I covered one reason for this on November 22, 2003 in the following articles:

For the Media, America Begins and Ends in the Northeast
For Old Liberals, Kennedy Was the Last AMERICAN President

After nominating another Northern Democrat and getting trounced, the Democrats ask themselves, "What were we THINKING?"

Well, I was wrong when I said that, based on history, Dean had the Democratic nomination sewed up. So maybe a Massachusetts Democrat will win this time.

I doubt it, though.

February 14, 2004 -- The Next Stage of Civilization Will not Come From Asia
February 14, 2004 -- Russia: First World Complexion, Third World Attitude
February 14, 2004 -- Heredity Sets the UPPER Limit on What You Can Do
February 14, 2004 -- We All Need Russia to Come Out of its Communist Stupor

Fun Quote:

The one thing no one does with a personal computer is compute.

The Next Stage of Civilization Will Not Come From Asia

When the average American thinks of Oriental Wisdom, three pictures flash through his mind.

One is the 1970s television series called "Kung Fu," where David Carradine took the great Chinese Wisdom and fighting ability he had learned as a child in a Kung Fu academy in China into the American West.

Actually, Kung Fu was introduced to China by a man whose BLUE EYES supposedly burned a hole through a wall, according to the legend. His name was Bodhidharma, and he is mentioned as "the blue-eyed devil" in the quote below.

Another thing we always see in the Orient is the Buddha, whose statues are all very Oriental-looking. Actually, Buddha was an Aryan who lived and died in India.

As one Buddhist puts it,

"We're all prepared to visualize the Buddha's blue eyes. He was an Aryan, of European descent, a nobleman in a societal caste system that did not 'officially' intermarry with native populations. The rigidity of the system can be seen even in further generations. Nearly a thousand years later, Bodhidharma, another Aryan descendant, was called The Blue Eyed Demon by the Chinese."

"Also, in recent years we've witnessed the startling discoveries of three thousand year-old blond and red haired Caucasian mummies in the Takla Makan area of western China."

<http://www.hsuyun.org/Dharma/zbohy/Literature/essays/czs/bluelotus.html>

A third thing we Americans know about Oriental Wisdom is medical treatments we think were invented there, like acupuncture. The Ice Man, the body of a white man found preserved in the Alps, is three thousand years old. He has tattoos on him that mark the spots for acupuncture .

Reading a history of the Orient is like reading a history of false starts. They invent a printing press and then lose it. They invent a mechanical clock and then lose it.

As a human being, I am interested in where the next generation of great advances will come from. New areas of the earth are being opened up with the fall of Communism. But I do not look for China to produce fundamental advances.

How about Russia and Eastern Europe?

Russia -- First World Complexion, Third World Attitude

In 1776, Adam Smith noted that while China was poor, India was desperate.

Two hundred years later, India was the example people used when they talked about places that were desperately poor. With all the world to choose from, India is where Mother Theresa went to help the poorest of the poor.

But today Indian workers often get paid better than Russian workers.

Too many Russians steal. People I know who live there are afraid to use the mail because anything worth having will get stolen. No one gets fired for this.

The old Communist attitude is deeply burned into the modern Russian. He is poorly paid, so he says that is somebody else's fault. If you want something done in Russia, you have to know who to pay. So nothing gets done easily. A modern economy cannot run that way.

In the Soviet Union, each task belonged to some particular person. The buyer was the servant. The buyer waited for whoever was providing the service to show up at his own convenience, scowl at them, and do it if he felt like it.

That economy finally collapsed.

But that economy is still in Russia. In a bank, if the one person who handles a particular task is not there that day, someone else cannot do it.

A modern economy cannot function like that.

Russian attitudes are very much like the attitudes in the more stagnant Latin American countries.

Russia can change. Some of it has changed. The people whose attitudes have changed are getting rich. Russia in general is poor to an extent the average American, even in the ghetto, cannot imagine.

Heredity Sets the UPPER Limit on What You Can Do

When someone argues that white people are just like everybody else, they usually point to places like Russia, where white people live worse than many brown people do in underdeveloped countries.

The critical point here is that heredity sets the UPPER limit on what a person can do. The smartest person on earth can be ruined. You can take a congenital idiot and a person born with a genius IQ and put them both side by side in a cellar at birth, and when they are ten years old, both will be totally ignorant and helpless.

While the rest of the world was advancing like never before, Russians spent seventy years in a Communist cellar.

If you want to do business in Russia or in the third world, you have to learn some of the stupidest, most childish rules imaginable. That is fine for you, you are just following the rules countries use that keep themselves mired in poverty. But as long as those countries do things their way, they will remain desperately poor.

But the parts of Russia that break free of this nonsense can contribute to our world in ways we cannot yet imagine. Japan adopted Western methods and rapidly reached our level, but there they stopped. I do not believe that Orientals are capable of finding AND KEEPING new levels, the way the white man does.

An ignorant white man is like any other ignorant man. But his UPPER limit is much, much higher than that of other peoples.

We All Need Russia to Come Out of Its Communist Stupor

We all know that if you want to be a college professor, you have to swear that race does not exist.

We also know that, like all required beliefs, the idea that race does not exist is silly.

We also know that if you want an academic job or academic grants or academic prizes, you not only have to swear that whites do not exist, you have to hate whites, too. See

September 20, 2003 -- If Hitler Hated Jews, Then All Our National Spokesmen Hate Whites

By demanding that third world populations pour into ALL white countries, and ONLY into white countries, the world has a program to eliminate whites completely.

But everyone wants the progress only whites have ever produced. That makes white populations like those behind the former Iron Curtain particularly important. Only a tiny proportion of the world is white, and a major portion of that remaining white population is in Russia and Eastern Europe.

A major portion of the earth's remaining white population wasted decades under a sterile Marxist system. It is important that they come out of the that Leninist stupor and help human progress as only whites can.

February 21, 2004 -- There is Nothing Simple About the Golden Rule

February 21, 2004 -- The Golden Rule in the Orient

February 21, 2004 -- Theology Requires Knowledge, the Golden Rule Requires a Conscience

Fun Quote:

"You're ugly, your feet stink, and you don't love Jesus."

--North Carolina saying

There is Nothing Simple About the Golden Rule

I was a discussant at an economics convention, and I was standing in front of a blackboard filled with highly complex calculus equations. As I looked at that board full of advanced math, it occurred to me once again that that entire mass of math was based on three words: "supply and demand."

Supply and demand is all that microeconomics is based on.

This computer I am working with does miracles. But the entire computer language is based on two things, the number 0 and the number 1.

The Wisdom of the Orient consists of Wise Men saying silly things that sound obscure but are actually meaningless. They sit around spouting Great Wisdom while children are dying a hundred feet away of worms and malnutrition.

In the West, we take simple truths and follow them like a bloodhound. We don't sit around trying to impress people by saying silly ass things. We impress the world by DOING things that no one else has ever imagined doing.

There is nothing simple about computer science, though it is based on 0 and 1. There is nothing simple about microeconomics, though it is just supply and demand.

And there is nothing simple about the Golden Rule. If you follow it ruthlessly, it is as complicated as a moon rocket.

The Golden Rule in the Orient

Our Golden Rule says, "Do unto other as you would have them do unto you."

Confucius said, "Do not do unto another what you would not have him do unto you."

Political Correctness uses this to prove that the Orient is just like the West.

Actually, these two statements are worlds apart.

I gave the example of an Oriental Wise Man sitting and saying obscure things while children around him were hungry and had worms in their guts. But from the point of view of Confucius, that is all right. The Oriental Wise Man is not doing anything TO those children. So he is doing nothing to them that he would not have them do unto him, as Confucius said.

But the Western version of the Golden Rule is entirely different. You must stop talking crap and use your mind to do something FOR those children. You must DO something.

This is a very practical matter. In Japan in earlier times, no one was required to save the life of someone in danger. The Japanese rule was that if you saved a person's life, you were responsible for what they did after that. Throughout the very different cultures of Asia, this attitude is very common.

In the West, you have to take action.

The Orient is passive. The West is active.

Please see

August 19, 2000 - WHEN THE WAGONS FIRST ROLLED WEST

Theology Requires Knowledge, the Golden Rule Requires a Conscience

Theologians never mention the fact that Jesus never condemned anybody for not reading the Bible enough.

He condemned many who were Biblical experts, like the scribes and the prideful high priests of the Temple.

There have always been many who substituted theology for a conscience.

At the end of the eighteenth century, Doctor Jenner came up with a means of ending the deadly scourge of smallpox. He found that if you gave a person a shot of cowpox, it would make them immune to the deadly smallpox.

Practically every preacher in London started screaming about how evil this man Jenner was. They quoted the Old Testament about how the human body was the temple of the soul. They said putting cow germs into humans was something no Christian would do.

As a direct result of that campaign against vaccinations by the preachers, thousands of people died of smallpox. Thousands more were horribly disfigured for life.

There is no record of any preacher ever feeling the slightest bit guilty for this. If you've got your nose stuck in the Old Testament, you don't need a conscience.

So theologians find everything easy. There are millions of people in wheelchairs for life. Maybe developing embryos and using them to replace cells could put those on their feet. If I were the embryo, I wouldn't mind at all. But if you can just quote the right theology, you can block it, and if you are a good theologian, the real people in the real wheelchairs won't bother you a bit.

No matter what happens no theologian will ever feel guilty about mere human beings. But if you are stuck with the Golden Rule, the world is a very complicated place. You can't stick your nose in the Old Testament and forget that people exist.

If you are stuck with the Golden Rule, you can't ignore anybody. If you are stuck with the Golden Rule, you have to try to realize exactly how others think and what other people want.

Life is much simpler if you can ignore the Golden Rule and look for a good quote in the Old Testament that saves you from having to think and feel.

February 28, 2004 -- The Book is Out and I'm Scared Half to Death

February 28, 2004 -- Bob's Written Books Before, Why Was This One So Hard to Get Published?

February 28, 2004 -- This is the Easiest Book to Read That Ever Was Written

February 28, 2004 -- Uncle Bob Needs YOU!!

Fun Quote:

"I am grateful for God's gift of human procreation. I only wish that He had given us a less ridiculous way to go about it."

--Martin Luther

Buy Bob's Book "Why Johnny Can't Think" from Amazon [here](#)!

The Book is Out and I'm Scared Half to Death

My book can also be ordered at any book store.

"Why Johnny Can't Think" is now ready. I need BUYERS and I need promotion, and need them BAD! Please contact your local talk show and ask if I can get an interview. I have done dozens of these on the phone.

Yes, Old Bob has stage fright. Humiliation scares me more than death does. I know one man who worked hard writing a good book and sold SEVEN copies!

I know you're busy. This book is dedicated "to the readers of WhitakerOnline.ORG.". The people who like Whitakeronline are busy and productive people who have lives of their own. Most of you are already doing your part in the fight. But I need your help anyway.

To give you an example of how busy the people are who help me, there are two men who started WhitakerOnline and who did the work on this book.

One is Rick Rowland, our webmaster and a highly successful businessman who is on duty 24-7 (I know, I've called him) and has a young family. The other is in security work day and night and is now being sent abroad and can't even afford to have his name mentioned here.

I am proud of our group, but it is times like this that I wish we were like leftists and neoconservatives. They are geniuses at getting grants and full-time jobs that pay them to push their causes full time. Every reader I have has a perfectly good reason for NOT helping me out on this book.

Bob's Written Books Before, Why Was This One So Hard to Publish?

I have published two books, one was put out by the third biggest publisher on earth. Both Publisher's Weekly and Kirkus, though they hated what I said, admitted that I as a damned good writer. The Library Journal even recommended both books for purchase!

William A. Rusher, the first publisher of National review who remained its publisher for over twenty years, wrote the Foreword to my first book. Not only did he do it free, but he gave me a lifetime subscription to National Review for writing it!

I even made some hard criticisms of National Review in that book, but Bill Rusher just took them in stride. He felt my message overrode all that.

As I bragged before, Joe Sobran did the Foreword for "Why Johnny Can't Think!"

People like that don't work for lightweights.

This book, "Why Johnny Can't Think," is no more politically radical than the other two. But the only publisher who accepted it came back a month later and said he not only was backing out on it, he was destroying all reference to it in his files!!

An Australian reader wrote and asked what was going on.

The answer is that "Why Johnny Can't Think" could RUIN a publisher.

There are two reasons that "Why Johnny Can't Think" would ruin a publisher.

First, this book is an attack on everybody who controls book-buying in this country.

And I don't mean some kind of giant, secret conspiracy.

"Why Johnny Can't Think" attacks not only liberals and leftists, it jumps on neoconservatives and respectable conservatives like National Review, and it absolutely crushes social science professors.

It makes leftist actors and "artists" look silly. Not just wrong. Silly.

That is also a list of the people who control book-buying in America, and everybody knows it.

But what really made this book almost impossible for a publisher is HOW I go after all the people who control publishing in this country.

My basic theme is that a liberal (or a neoconservative) is just a person who has not outgrown his freshman year in college.

Everything leftists say and that neoconservatives and respectable conservatives take seriously is just plain predictable and stupid. They don't mind being called names. But when somebody calls them the lightweights they are, it is unforgivable.

Have you ever seen a television discussion a conservative just laugh out loud at some ridiculous remark a liberal makes? Nobody laughs at them and gets invited back.

As Joe says in his Foreword, "Bob has long since stopped being invited back."

This is the Easiest Book to Read That Ever Was Written

About the longest chapter in "Why Johnny Can't Think" is Joe Sobran's Foreword, which is about three pages long and, like anything else by Joe, is fine work.

What I have to say is the simple truth. It took me TWELVE rewrites to do it, but I say what needs to be said and quit. One page or three pages, each chapter makes a point and quits.

If we can get this book to young people and to parents of college students, it will be devastating. The one thing an intelligent young person asks is not to be BORED. "Why Johnny Can't Think" moves fast, but it is understandable.

"Why Johnny Can't Think" is wonderful ammunition to use on campus. Professors will HATE it.

One thing I think young people might appreciate about "Why Johnny Can't Think" is that it is so obviously honest. It is not written to impress anybody, and it is not written down to anybody. If we could get "Why Johnny Can't Think" off the ground and selling, the result would be an intellectual revolution on campus. That is the home base of leftism.

I have never asked for your money before. But I can't do the buying. There is no substitute for your BUYING a copy.

You are also the only promotion I have.

I need you personally to help me out personally.

Uncle Bob Needs YOU!!

A lot of e-mails I get on the book start with, "Why don't you ..."

Let me explain why I don't ""

Now that I have no publisher who can get my interviews and do my publicity, I realize how many things an author cannot do for himself. If the author pushes his book himself, he is immediately ignored as unimportant small fry.

In fact, you can do things for me even a publisher cannot do. Nothing sounds as good as someone who has nothing to gain from a book but who pushes it because he thinks it's worthwhile.

I need readers to give "Why Johnny Can't Think" rave reviews on Amazon.com

I need you to call your local radio show to get me an interview.

I need you to buy copies and give them out, especially to parents of college students.

I need you to ask for reviews of "Why Johnny Can't Think" in local newspapers.

Gang, I have a "to do" list as long as my arm.

Getting a book off the ground is hard work. I need your persistence.

I need your help and I need for you to KEEP IT UP. "Why Johnny Can't Think" is a long-term project. Getting it off the ground will take time, but we are calling for a revolution here.

Please buy it, read it, and help me promote it.

If we get "Why Johnny Can't Think" off the ground, every leftist professor will hate you for it forever.

That's a goal worth working for.

**March 6, 2004 -- If You Say Anybody Ever Suffered but Jews, You're
Anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews**

March 6, 2004 -- When Troops Killed People on an American Campus

March 6, 2004 -- Did Clinton Destroy Dean?

March 6, 2004 -- Shooting at the Flag

Fun Quote:

You can fool anybody with statistics, but only if he is a fool to start with.

Buy Bob's Book "Why Johnny Can't Think" from Amazon [here](#)!

If You Say Anybody Ever Suffered But Jews, You are Anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews

Mel Gibson has committed the unforgivable sin.

Gibson got so sick of being attacked as an anti-Semite for his new movie about Christ's crucifixion that HE ACTUALLY POINTED OUT THAT JEWS WERE NOT THE ONLY PEOPLE IN HISTORY WHO EVER SUFFERED!

For the media, that is straight Nazism!

One thing Gibson pointed out was that, before Hitler took power in Germany, Stalin starved twenty million Ukrainians kulaks to death. Stalin stated that his aim was to destroy the kulak class. Kulaks were the more successful peasants in Russia.

Alan Colmes (the liberal on Fox's Hannity and Colmes) was talking to Billy Graham's son about this.

Colmes said it was pure anti-Semitism to compare the "accidental" famine under Stalin to the murder of Jews by Hitler!

Billy Graham's boy, since he is a good pet conservative for liberals, more or less agreed.

For the American left, saying Stalin's starving the kulaks to death was an accident is an improvement. They used to say it didn't happen at all. Liberal Intellectuals who went to Russia in the 1930s said flatly, "I saw no starving peasants."

Colmes admits they starved, but he says Comrade Stalin had nothing to do with it.

So Mel Gibson is now an official anti-Semite.

When Troops Killed People on an American Campus

No, I am not talking about Kent State. Kent State is the incident of troops firing on campus that the media are still screaming about. The Kent State incident was the last big campus riot against the Vietnam War. It happened in 1972.

At Kent State University students were shot by National Guard troops when the students were throwing rocks at terrified young National Guardsmen.

The media used to deny the students were throwing rocks. They admit it now, but they still call the troops a bunch of fascists.

I am talking about troops killing people on campus, but I am not talking about Kent State.

Now that many cities are openly defying Federal immigration law and protecting illegal immigrants openly, I am reminded of another campus shooting.

In 1962 the State of Mississippi openly defied Federal law and refused to integrate the University of Mississippi. The president at that time was Saint John of Kennedy. Saint John of Kennedy sent the 101st Airborne Division to occupy the University of Mississippi. In the process, those Federal troops shot three people down in cold blood on the University of Mississippi campus. Those people were not throwing rocks at them.

No liberal has ever complained about THAT campus killing.

You can defy Federal law if you are doing for the political left.

Hell, you can shoot people if you are doing it for the left.

No conservative will ever mention any of this.

Did Clinton Destroy Dean?

All the media agree that Howard Dean really lost it when he did all that shrieking right after the New Hampshire primary.

But weeks before that primary, National Review had a cover that showed Dean red-faced and shrieking in exactly the same way in an earlier speech. That was when Dean led in the polls.

The Dean who lost was the same man who was so far ahead previously.

So what really happened?

To most of us, all liberals tend to look alike. But to liberals who are fighting for power, the differences are crucial.

Bill Clinton took over the Democratic Party from the moderate side. His Democratic Study Committee wanted a less fanatical leftism, a bigger appeal to the South and West than to the Northeast liberals.

Howard Dean wanted the Democrats to become complete leftists again. I don't want to bore you to death with internal Democratic politics, but the fact is that Dean was taking the Party away from the Clintons.

The Clintons want the Democratic Party to lose in 2004 so Hillary can get the nomination in 2008. But at the same time they do not want someone nominated in 2004 who will take the Party away from them.

Howard Dean had a lot of weaknesses, but nobody seemed to notice them as he forged ahead as the leftist candidate. Then suddenly they were noticed and Dean was out.

William Jefferson Clinton is a political genius. If I had his access to the press, I could have destroyed Dean and left no traces of it. And I am nowhere near Clinton's genius in practical politics.

What the Democrats now have is exactly what the Clintons would want. They are once again nominating a Massachusetts liberal for president. The Democrats have not won with anybody but a Southerner since 1960.

What luck! The Clintons have exactly what they want!

And if you believe that was just luck, I have about a dozen bridges I want to sell you.

Shooting at the Flag

Wouldn't you love to be a general who discovered that your opposite number, the enemy general, only shot at your flag?

In other words, wherever you put your flag up, that is the only place the enemy directs his bombers, his artillery, and his ground assaults?

You could store your munitions in one place, have your air bases in another, mobilize your ground forces in another place, and put your flag miles away from all of them.

That is how the battle between the left and right is waged today. Conservatives send frantic newsletters to each other about how Clinton lies, about how Bush lies, about how the latest liberal demands are insane. They fire frantically at whatever the liberals put up.

Meanwhile, the liberal base is ignored. Their base is the universities. We give them our children and we give them our money to recruit and mobilize with on every campus. Every now and then somebody complains about how biased the universities are, but nobody fires directly at them.

"Why Johnny Can't Think" is a call for a total assault on the enemy BASE. It is not just a criticism, it is a call for revolution. It discredits all the present social sciences and calls for academia to be "defrocked and defunded."

"Why Johnny Can't Think" says that the cry of "academic freedom" is used by today's leftist professors in exactly the same way monopolists used "free enterprise" in 1900 to defend their right to fix prices.

One chapter is called, "And When Do We Want It? NOW!"

Not only must "social scientists" be fired, the universities must make reparations for their crimes.

No book has ever attacked the enemy base this way.

On the other hand, how would you like to be in the army where your general only fired at the flag?

You would be dead meat, right?

That's where those who oppose the left are today.

March 13, 2004 -- "We Report, You Forget"

March 13, 2004 -- To be Respectable, a Conservative Has to Forget

March 13, 2004 -- We Promise, You Forget

March 13, 2004 -- Memory Rules!

Fun Quote:

We will never know whether ignorance is really bliss. The only people who know the answer don't understand the question.

Buy Bob's Book "Why Johnny Can't Think" from Amazon [here](#)!

"We Report, You Forget"

On Tuesday, March 2, 2004 a number of states held their primaries to select the Democratic presidential nominee. That day there was enormous competition among the media to report every scrap of information that came along.

The problem is that as a primary vote is going on, everything is pretty predictable. That makes the news reports boring. Anything that is not routine is pure gold for the media. One unusual thing did happen: There was private telephone conversation between the two top contenders, Kerry and Edwards.

So the media reported that that talk took place.

Everything else was routine. Everybody knew that Kerry would win all the primaries with lopsided majorities. He did. Edwards was hanging in there despite the fact that he had lost all but one primary.

Then came a real shocker. Edwards suddenly withdrew his candidacy.

That night, the commentators said something like this:

Liberal: "That was a surprise! Edwards was hanging in there and suddenly he just quit. How could that have happened?"

Conservative Commentator: "Gee whiz, I don't know! It's just one of those things you can't explain, I guess."

Nobody I heard mentioned the unusual private talk Kerry had had with Edwards.

John Kerry is a Massachusetts liberal. He has an enormous immunity to press criticism.

But what if a Republican front-runner in the primaries had an unusual private talk with his only remaining rival as the primary results came in? And what if his opponent then suddenly dropped out?

Would anybody forget that that little talk took place? And would anybody have any doubt about what that little talk was about?

By the way, one successful presidential nominee was reported to have promised the vice-presidential slot to twenty-four different people.

To be Respectable, a Conservative Has to Forget

You may say, "Well, we all understand that the liberal media would forget that little talk between Kerry and Edwards that took place before Edwards suddenly withdrew. But surely conservatives would bring it up?"

No way. You have to understand how respectable conservatives act.

If you want to get paid to be conservative political commentator you have to religiously obey certain rules. Liberals decide which conservative gets the "respectable" label, and no conservative can be on the paid talk shows if he does not have that "respectable" stamp on him.

One rule everyone who wants to get paid to be a professional conservative talker has to obey is the "Don't be a damned fool" rule.

When a liberal says he is worried about prison overcrowding, you are not allowed to say, "Good God, man, you mean you want those animals out on the streets killing people because they don't have enough leg room?" You have to keep a straight face and argue with the liberal as if he had made a logical point that only his Idealism forces him to make.

You will never hear any conservative who gets paid to be on television say a liberal is a damned fool. No matter how ridiculous the statement a liberal makes is, no one is allowed to laugh at him.

What if a conservative said, "Look, Kerry had a private talk with Edwards and Edwards dropped out. What kind of idiot wouldn't know what the talk was about?"

That would violate the "Don't be a damned fool" rule. The conservative who said that would suddenly be labeled anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews. He would be condemned as "simplistic."

In short, he would be ruined.

We Promise, You Forget

I just pointed out that, at the climax of his political career, a presidential candidate will lie when he promises somebody the vice presidential nomination.

At this point the dumbest animal on the planet, a person who thinks he is being Shrewd and Realistic, will say, "Sure, politicians always lie."

Dead wrong.

Let me give you an example of why politicians in the big leagues don't lie. This is an experience I have had many times.

In the US House of Representatives, a bill your congressman has a huge interest in is up for a vote. He and a senior staffer like me start calling fifty or so congressmen whose votes are uncertain. On each call, you have a very few minutes to persuade and to trade.

The congressman you call will not be as interested as you are in this particular bill. That is one reason you don't know which way he'll vote. He will normally ask you what you are going to do about another bill he himself is more concerned about. When you tell him what you plan to do about his bill, your word had better be pure, 24 karat gold.

If you get a reputation for welching on political deals with other politicians, you are dead.

The reason your word in big-league politics has to be good is because major league politicians remember what you promised.

The Shrewd person who thinks he is wise because he says, "politicians lie" misses the truth. The Shrewd guy is so busy trying to show how Rough and Tough and Realistic he is that he misses the whole point completely.

The real question is, why do the people you elect lie to voters when they have to keep their promises to each other?

In the article above, I explained that the media reported that private conversation between Kerry and Edwards, but after Edwards suddenly withdrew, every commentator had a memory lapse.

Millions of voters heard the news about that private talk and then listened to the commentary that evening where both conservative and liberal analysts forgot the earlier Kerry-Edwards conversation.

I would be willing to bet that not twenty people in the whole country noticed this lapse. If conservative pundits and liberal pundits forget it, so does the public.

The public has the attention span of a five-year-old. How does a grownup treat a five-year-old? The adult tells the child whatever the child wants to hear right now, be it Santa Claus, tax cuts, or anything else.

Political pros treat each other as adults. They treat the public like children.

It works.

Memory Rules!

Politicians don't lie to other big-league politicians because they are dealing with adults. They will treat the public with contempt as long as the public keeps up its political amnesia.

And the proof of the pudding is that we keep electing them.

That's why the titles of so many WhitakerOnline articles start with "A Man With A Memory Looks at"

If you are sending frantic e-mails out about Iraq or the Ten Commandments or homosexual marriage or how Kerry's feet stink, you don't matter. Those issues were settled many years ago in quiet little precedents that were set while you were frantically forwarding e-mails about the Clinton scandals or whatever the big thing was at the moment.

Iraq may be as big a deal to you today as Vietnam was to conservatives in 1968. But the war that counts is not in Iraq and the issue that counts today is not the sellout in Iraq. The sellout in Iraq was being set up while conservatives were trying to show that Bill Clinton was a meanie and his feet stank.

Lots of people vote but very few matter. You would be astonished to learn who they are. They are the people with a memory. By the time conservatives start sending out their frantic e-mails, the pros have already set the precedents and moved on.

I know. Setting those precedents was my specialty. When I needed them to help me with these critical matters, all those conservative activists were frantically talking about whatever the buzz was at the moment.

My little first book alone, which only sold one or two thousand copies, had more long-term effect on public policy than most professional politicians have in their lifetimes. Within a month after it came out, the head of the staff of the Speaker of the House was placing bets based on it with the staff heads for the Republicans.

My first book got recommendations from the Library Journal, Publisher's Weekly, Kirkus and others. These left-wingers recommended that people buy and read it despite the fact that it was a worst seller.

Why on earth would the flagship publications of the left-wing publishing industry give so much attention to a hard right book that didn't sell? They did it because they are professionals. This book was important. What sounds to you like Bob Whitaker bragging was something they recognized instantly as a fact of real life in big-league politics.

I dedicated my life to having a real influence on public policy, not to fame or money or book sales. That book was an accomplishment. My new book is in the same vein. Help me a little on that and it will go a long way.

I personally saved the Hubble Telescope while other people were worrying about The Issue of the Day in 1977.

I have a memory. That makes me a power player.

If you don't have a memory, you are just one more baby rattle.

March 20, 2004 -- Shock Jocks: Should the Government Control Radio?

March 20, 2004 -- Making Your Living From Pure Dawgy Poop

March 20, 2004 -- Fattening Lawyers and Starving Justice

March 20, 2004 -- Legal Procedure is Pointless

March 20, 2004 -- Commentary on Recent Concerns That Both Democrats and Republicans Have Begun Attack Ads So Early in the Presidential Campaign

Fun Quote:

Some people say "anti-Semitism" is the wrong term for being against Jews because most Jews are not Semites. They are Ashkenazim.

Can you imagine trying to keep a straight face while you discuss "anti-Ashkenazimism?"

Shock Jocks: Should the Government Control Radio?

During all the talks about "shock jocks" like Howard Stern, people keep saying, "The government shouldn't be in the radio business." They say the government should keep its hands off because radio stations have rights.

Well, what about MY rights? I got my first amateur radio license over fifty years ago.* This gives me the right to use the airways, but I can operate only on amateur radio frequencies.

But I could just turn that old output dial around to a broadcast frequency and I would be a radio station. WhitakerOnline would be WOL, and I could easily broadcast to a population of a million people from right here.

Only one thing prevents WOL from going on the air today. That one thing is the fact that I would be arrested. Howard Stern would approve of my arrest. All the Free Speech advocates would cheer as I headed off to jail.

Commercial radio stations make billions of dollars each year using the broadcast frequencies. The government protects them by jailing anyone like me who tries to use those frequencies. Commercial radio owns them, courtesy of the government..

Isn't that government intrusion into the radio industry? I've never heard anyone complain about THAT.

Radio stations don't want the government to stay out of their business. They just want all the rights and none of the responsibilities.

* My call sign was K4ACV. Only another ham radio operator will realize how OLD a call sign like that is.

Making Your Living From Pure Dawgy Poop

A documentary on a cable channel showed the following real-life scene from a monastery in Tibet:

Some young monks come up, one by one, in front of a group of Older Wise Men. Each young monk shouts something like, "What is the meaning of humility?"

The Wise Old Sage shouts back something like, "the lotus grows in green pastures!"

Each young monk then shouts out, "Thank you for your valuable answer!"

This happens over and over.

Since these men are all Orientals, the documentary took all this seriously.

If the men had been white, we would have said, "Good Lord! I can't believe grown men are doing this!"

I find it all embarrassing. Just because these guys are Oriental does not make them animals to me. But that rule does not apply to the guys making the documentary.

And every person making the documentary says he is a complete anti-racist.

If a bunch of white people were doing this crap in California, we would all get a good laugh out of it.

There is another difference between this retarded behavior in Tibet and the same childish nonsense occurring among whites in California. In California it would be a fad. In Tibet this is a full-time job.

In California nutcase garbage like this is harmless. Whoever does it pays for it. Tibet is starving. These well-fed Great Wise Sages are eating food denied to hungry children, as do the young monks.

Fattening Lawyers and Starving Justice

The American justice system is exactly like that Tibetan monastery. Well-fed lawyers and judges trade pointless prattle while real justice starves.

For every underpaid cop who is out there protecting us, there is a judge and several lawyers who get good money to go through procedures that do nobody any good.

The dumbest creature on the Planet Earth is the guy who thinks he is Really Shrewd and Realistic.

One of the things a Shrewd and Realistic Guy loves to say is, "Justice is for sale in America."

Sounds realistic, doesn't it"

Sounds Tough, doesn't it.

Like about everything the Shrewd person says, it's childish.

The rich do not buy justice in America. The rich buy ACQUITTAL in America. If justice were the same thing as acquittal, we could all have justice just by abolishing the police force.

Justice does not mean more appeals or less appeals. Justice does not mean more acquittals or less.

Justice means balancing the safety of citizens against the legal rights of those being tried. Let the wrong one out, and somebody dies. Has the law ever executed an innocent person? You bet it has. Every time a violent criminal goes back out on the streets and kills somebody, the law has executed an innocent person.

I say a person who is killed by a released violent offenders is the same as if the state had executed an innocent man. Those who worship The Law say that the life of a crime victim is nothing compared to the life of an innocent person who is executed by The Law.

Legal Procedure is Pointless

As we follow the big trials, Lee Malvo, Martha Stewart, Kobe Bryant, and the Robert Blake murder trial, we hear legal experts talking about the complicated and expensive procedures and other legal experts criticizing what the first set of legal experts said.

Everybody involved gets good money.

But does justice get anything out of this, or is real justice being starved by these Wise Sages the way children are starving in Tibet?

The important point about all those experts is that they don't matter. They do nothing for justice.

In court, the same silly-ass nonsense we saw in that Tibetan monastery is played out by white people. They are not called Wise Sages. They are called judges.

A judge can have fifty years on the bench, but none of it makes any real difference.

There is no evidence whatever that legal experience does any good for justice.

There is no evidence whatever that anything in American precedents or all the Latin or all the procedures mean a damned thing. There is a myth that if you have an endless number of lawyers saying an endless number of legal things, more justice results.

No way.

All that talk in the courtroom, all that experience, all those motions, none of them mean any more than that silly-ass shouting in the Tibetan Monastery.

But when white people in California sit around saying "OOOOM!" or shout crap to each other in the Oriental Mystical Way, it's just silly. Nobody really gets hurt.

But all that crap we pay for in court is covering up a desperate situation. We need real solutions, and all we get is more lawyers using bigger words.

The lawyer shouts, "Your Honor, Your Lordship, Your Majesty, what is the True Meaning of the Law?"

And the judge shouts, "The precedent in Wilkins versus Wiley shows defendant gets ten appeals instead of nine."

"Thank you Your Honor for your valuable information!" the lawyer shouts back.

No lawyer knows or cares whether another appeal will free the innocent or get one more innocent person killed on the streets. Lawyers and judges just get paid to talk to each other, and nothing is supposed to come out of it but more pointless "precedents" and technical objections.

Commentary on Recent Concerns That Both Democrats and Republicans Have Begun Attack Ads So Early in the Presidential Campaign

Politics is a rough game.

Live with it.

March 27, 2004 -- E.T. Reports to His Home Planet on Human Races

March 27, 2004 -- Human Races Have Developed as One Would Expect

Fun Quote:

Hate is what rightists do. Righteous resentment is what leftists do.

E.T. Reports to His Home Planet on Human Races

I have spent some time studying earth and its various animal and vegetable inhabitants, among them the humans.

One aspect of human beings is that they are divided into various color groups, light, dark, and various mixes.

Like all beings, humans are adapted to the environment in which they live. Also, like all animals, each of humans lives in the areas which they are capable of conquering from competitors. Surviving animals 1) take the best land or 2) adapt to the best environment they are capable of holding.

As I pointed out in an earlier report, there was a giant animal called the mammoth which died out on earth over ten thousand years ago, with one exception. Some mammoths who lived on an island away from humans lived until three thousand years ago. In order to have a sufficient population to prevent inbreeding on that small island, this group of mammoths became midgets.

In order to survive, giant mammoths had to live on a small island and become small.

Humans follow a similar pattern. One group, called Eskimos or Inuits, followed the route that American Indians followed across the land bridge from Asia into America. They could not compete with the "Indians" who already occupied the warmer lands, so they adapted to the freezing climates that the Indians could not occupy.

Africa was occupied by a race which was black. They have another adaptation which is very harmful, but which allows them to occupy areas stronger races cannot take from them. They have a trait called "sickle cells" which helps protect them from tropical diseases. This trait leads in some cases to cycle cell anemia," a deadly disease among blacks.

The Mongoloid race has eyefolds which allowed to survive in areas that were so cold that, without these epicanthic eyefolds, their eyes would have frozen at night. They have horned skin, which is another adaptation that works much better than hair as a protection against cold.

There is a race which has no natural protection at all. It is called "white," though the coloring is usually pink (The Mongoloids are called "yellow" though their real coloring is usually a special shade of brown).

Since they have taken over the areas where they need no natural protection, this pink or "White" race is highly aggressive.

Each new phase of their written history is a period when another even pinker group invades settled areas from the north. Names recorded in history are Hittites, Ionic and Doric Greeks, Celts and Germans.

Not surprisingly, all these invasions and mass settlements come from the north and east, where pink peoples seem to originate. They never come from the darker-skinned south.

Human Races Developed As One Would Expect

What has resulted is exactly what you would expect to happen. The black race which has adapted to its unhealthy environment has generally remained primitive. The Oriental race makes advances, but it lacks an individualistic drive to leap forward and continue with technical advances. One Oriental genius developed a mechanical clock, but that invention was lost. They invented a printing press, but it made no big difference.

When the aggressive pink race got a printing press, it immediately caused enormous changes, including religious wars on a vast scale. When they got a mechanical clock, millions of them were made. Gunpowder, which had been in China for centuries, soon destroyed the entire feudal structure of society that had existed in white (pink) countries previously.

Gunpowder made no real difference to Oriental society at all, though they had had it for centuries. In the pink-skinned world, they went from gunpowder to rockets that could reach other planets.

None of this is mysterious, and it seems that any reasonably intelligent being would expect these results. But the same humans who are engaged in interplanetary travel still have no idea why different races do different things.

Humans understand midget mammoths, but they do not understand themselves.

April 3, 2004 -- Today's English is Tomorrow's Latin

April 3, 2004 -- Always Remember that Reporters are NOT Bright

April 3, 2004 -- The Media is Three Kinds of Shrewd

April 3, 2004 -- News You Can Use

Fun Quote:

We use the term "poor white trash," but it is not accurate.

Being poor certainly doesn't make you trash. Trash is not trash because it is poor. Most trash is poor because it is trash.

There is lots and lots of rich trash and any non-white person will tell you that all trash is not not white. They'll give you examples until you get tired of hearing them.

Buy Bob's Book "Why Johnny Can't Think" from Amazon here!

Today's English is Tomorrow's Latin

My nephew has just started medical school in Moscow. He was the only American in the class, not a new experience for a member of our family.

Other students asked him why American medical terms are in Latin. In Western Europe, prescriptions are still written in Latin. But the other students, most of whom are from the third world, said they did all their medical writing in English.

In the West, the traditional scholarly language was Latin. But Roman scholars did not write in Latin. The Roman upper class used Greek. The expression, "He has no Greek" is from old Rome, indicating a person of lower rank.

We look back to Rome. Rome looked back to Greece. The new world looks to America. An upper class Russian or Malaysian speaks English.

One instructor asked the students in my nephew's class to introduce themselves and say where they were from. When my nephew said he was from the United States, she said, "We are honored." If a student at a German university in 1200 AD had said he was from Rome, the instructor might have said, "We are honored."

The Roman Empire has been gone from Western Europe for over 1500 years, but prescriptions are still written in the Roman vernacular (not in Greek). That is because in the end Rome was not known for being loved, but for accomplishing mighty deeds.

No one will ever have that kind of respect for post-World War II Europe. Europe knows that and hates us for it. All of Europe's miserable little welfare politicians will be forgotten before they are buried. They do nothing anybody cares about.

No one is more critical of the misuse of American power than I am. But Old Europe makes me sick. Like most serious inferiority complexes, the European one is in a guise of feeling superior.

Nobody is fooled. These are little people doing little things who hate a giant for being a giant. It is accidental when I happen to agree with them, and they make me sick.

Right or wrong, we are the new Rome. We made the modern world.

Always Remember That Reporters are NOT Bright

I have been working with the media for well over forty years. I had a job with Voice of America when I was part of the media myself. I did a short stint as a University station broadcaster. But mostly I have had to deal with the media, in press conferences, on Capitol Hill, and as an Administration appointee. Almost everything I did involved the media.

First of all, bless their little hearts, reporters are NOT bright. Walter Cronkite is about as bright as Jerry Ford, and both of them got to the top the same way. They do not make anybody else feel inferior. They are non-threatening.

In "Why Johnny Can't Think, I describe a liberal as somebody who never outgrew his college education. A totally dependent person who makes it to national news anchor has to be noncreative and a good follower. Ford and Cronkite were perfect followers. So Cronkite is a liberal and Ford is a Republican moderate.

It couldn't be any other way..

For me, estimating press intelligent was one of the things I got paid for. Your press releases have to look smart to them if they are to get where you want them.

But not TOO smart.

So let us step back and see what a reporter actually is. Here is a person who spends his entire life trying to find five minutes ahead of everybody else what everybody on earth will know tomorrow morning. That's not much of life.

If you are not particularly bright, you will buy the idea that reporters see history in the making. Precisely the opposite is the case. To be a reporter, you have to be obsessed with the present. Reporters have no historical perspective at all. They write for other people who are obsessed with the present. They only mention any history that serves to make what they they are report sound like it's history.

The media not only doesn't know its history. It needs no memory at all. Its readers remember nothing.

See March 13, 2004 -- We Promise, You Forget

But reporters like to tell each other that they are reporting history as it happens. If you have to make your living dealing with them, you should make full use of this illusion. I often threw in a historical context that fit into a hundred words and made the present fad seem like a part of the Great Historical Context.

Most high-level media commentators do not know the difference between the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. To write history for them, you have to know that.

The Media Is Three Kinds of Shrewd

Reporters are hopeless provincials because they think they are sophisticated.

Reporters are hopelessly ignorant because they think they are highly knowledgeable.

Reporters think they are highly creative people so you have to do all their creative work for them.

In WhitakerOnline I keep emphasizing the power of the good old Southern expression "Shrewd." A Shrewd person is one who thinks he brilliant and who is actually a dolt.

Every Southerner in Washington knows that a Yankee will never get over the idea that a Southern accent means that one is naive. They keep getting run over by Clintons and Carters and Southern senators, but this idea is incurable.

And I LOVE it!

An ignorant Shrewd person differs from the ordinary ignorant person because his ignorance is incurable. I can explain things to a working man who never finished high school that no paid intellectual can understand. The working man does not think he knows it already.

The reporter who goes all around the world is absolutely convinced he is sophisticated. Actually he is among the most provincial people on earth. He lives inside the press culture. He is sitting in a bar in Baghdad with other reporters while history is being made a hundred miles away.

A famous example was the Patty Hearst kidnapping in the 1970s. All the regular reporters were out playing touch football on the lawn of the Hearst estate. They were waiting for news to come to them.

One reporter went out and got important stuff.

But today the reporters would still be playing out on the lawn with other reporters. They learn nothing because they think they are already great professionals. The other reporters tell them so.

And that is the kind of person an editor wants working for him. All the guys his reporter is playing touch football with know what the editor wants to hear. They will send him stories he can use. Scoops are really not all that valuable. What the editor wants is to fill up space with stuff that was like what his readers wanted to read about last week and the week before. A real go-getter wouldn't be able to give him that sort of thing consistently.

News You Can Use

So how can you use all this when you deal with the media?

First of all you must study the Baghdad Bar culture of the media with the same thoroughness that a cultural anthropologist would study a primitive culture in Papua-New Guinea.

You are going to do the reporter's writing for him, so it must fit into the Baghdad Bar Culture.

You give the reporter the history that fits, as I said, so he can make his story sound like history in the making. It will all be news to him, but you will both pretend he knows it and sees how it all fits the way you say it does.

More important, you write the words you can see in the newspaper. When you write a press release, you are doing the reporter's work for him.

I got on the front page of the New York Times by doing that. A reporter was doing a story on young Reagan appointees in 1981. He came to me and I gave him quotes he could not resist using. In fact, my quotes got his story on the front page. He had a picture of me with a file behind me that had a "Bureaucrat and proud of It" bumper sticker on it, exactly what you would not expect a Reagan appointee to have. My point was that with the right policies, bureaucrats can be proud of what they do.

The problem is that he was doing a report on YOUNG appointees and I was turning 40. But the stuff I gave him was just too good to exclude so he left my age out.

April 10, 2004 -- Conservative Blasphemy

April 10, 2004 -- Israel is the Beam in America's Eye

April 10, 2004 --Iraq and Vietnam: A Man With a Memory Takes a Look

April 10, 2004 -- Iraq and Vietnam: Moderation in Action

Fun Quote:

- 1) Jews are world famous as sharp businessmen. Even anti-Semites will grant them that.
- 2) The best-selling book in human history is the Bible.
- 3) Why didn't they copyright it?

Buy Bob's Book "Why Johnny Can't Think" from Amazon [here](#)!

Conservative Blasphemy

A WOL reader wrote me that the rise of religious bigotry frightened her. The two articles below were my reply to her.

Dear X,

Your question helps me formulate my writing. A lot of my articles come from questions like yours.

I would write you back in detail anyway. Readers who actually write me are very important to me. That's the whole point of WOL.

Speaking of religion, let me start with my own. What no preacher mentions is that many of Jesus' words that we hear the most about, were exactly what He was NOT talking about.

For example, we all hear "The poor we have always with us." But that was precisely the point Jesus was NOT making. He went on to say that what He was on earth about was not the perpetual problem of the poor, but the fact that Christ Himself was right there in front of the people trying to show them the path to salvation:

"I am the way, the truth, and the light. No man goes to the Father but by me."

He was talking to Jews. He told them to their faces that their Jewish Law would not save them any more than pagan worship would.

But fashionable preachers use "The poor we have always with us" to show that Jesus was really on earth as a political revolutionary.

A United Methodist preacher wrote me that Jesus died on the Cross so there would be no caste system on earth.

No way.

Jesus never even mentioned slavery, which lay at the base of his society. The Book of Titus (the shortest book in the Bible) says if you are a master be a good master, if you are a slave, be a good slave.

Sean Hannity says that Jesus died on the Cross for interracial dating.

The wedding Jesus blessed, the marriage at Cana, was rigidly limited by Jewish Law to the marriage of two Jews ONLY. This violated what Hannity says Jesus was all about.

Jesus did not mention the restriction on the marriage at Cana. Why should He? This had nothing to do with His mission.

So Hannity commits good old fashioned blasphemy without the slightest hint of a conscience. After all, he is being Politically Correct, so who cares about Jesus?

Israel is the Beam in America's Eye

Bear with me. I'll get to your point in a minute.

Conservative preachers endlessly quote Jesus as saying that he was here on earth to fulfill the Jewish Law, not to destroy it: "Not a jot or tittle." From there, preachers go on to prove Jesus was here to save the State of Israel. Actually Jesus went ahead and knocked down the whole basis of the Jewish Law, the Ten Commandments themselves, by reducing them to "Love God" and The Golden Rule. He worked on the Sabbath, and made it clear that was an example.

Jesus's point was that He was the fulfillment of ALL moral laws. This included the huge monotheistic religion of the Persians, of which the Magi were priests.

Jesus said, "My kingdom is not of this earth."

But on this earth people use Jesus for power and to push any issue they happen to like. This is straight, good old fashioned blasphemy. Jerry Falwell uses Christ to back Israel, and Arabs use their religion for the other side.

You are right, this is hideously dangerous. A third of Germany's entire population was wiped out in the Thirty Years' War between Protestants and Catholics. But the problem does not start with Arabs. It starts here. We gave Arab land to a group of people who are largely the descendants of CONVERTS to the religion of Judaism.

There are more genes of the actual old Jewish population of Palestine in the Palestinian Arabs than in the Jews to whom we gave the Palestinian homeland.

Now we are screaming about THEIR religious bigotry.

Jesus said that before we point out the mote in someone else's eye we should take care of the beam in our own.

Once again, you are right. Western history teaches us that there is nothing more dangerous than using religion for political purposes. That is what we did. That is what we are doing.

Iraq and Vietnam: A Man With a Memory Takes a Look

"With Washington's tacit approval, on November 1, 1963, Diem (the President of South Vietnam) and his brother were captured and later killed. Three weeks later, President Kennedy was assassinated on the streets of Dallas."

by Professor Robert K. Brigham, Vassar College:

<http://www.pbs.org/battlefieldvietnam/history/>

There is no such thing as "tacit approval" of cold-blooded murder. This is especially true of the Chief Executive of the United States, whose job is to enforce the laws. If you know a murder is about to be committed and you condone it, you are a murderer.

So President Kennedy ordered the assassination of the Chief Executive of South Vietnam exactly three weeks before he himself was assassinated.

This sounds like some kind of expose of a conspiracy. It's not. It is a matter of public record.

The reason this sounds like the exposure of a conspiracy is because history that liberals and respectable conservatives agree to forget is usually wildly outrageous. That's why they agree to forget it.

Diem, not to mince words, was dictator of South Vietnam. In 1963 he was defeating the Communists with relatively little American help. But a bunch of Buddhists didn't like him and they burned themselves alive in the streets in protest. This upset the New York Times, which had front page pictures of the burning monks.

To a Man With A Memory, the situation in Iraq is a replay of Vietnam in 1963. Diem was successfully resisting the Communists, but liberals didn't approve of him.

In 1963, as in Iraq today, it was just a matter of time before we could pull out of the South Vietnam ruled by Diem.

Then the liberals decided Diem was a bad man and we killed him. You know the rest.

Vietnam and Iraq: Moderation in Action

The details in Iraq are different, but the situation is the same. Bush wants to use force, and liberals say we are not being sweeties, so the Administration is "plotting a middle course."

I think the Iraq War was fought for Israel. But that has nothing to do with my attitude once American troops are actually there. Once our troops are there, I have the same attitude I had about Vietnam: Fight it or get the hell out.

But the bureaucrats in uniform (and anybody who gets promoted to general is just one more bureaucrat) look straight into the camera and repeat the old Vietnam slogan, "We must win the hearts and minds of the people."

This is the fatal disease we call "moderation." We have the right, we have the left, and so we take the "middle course" between them. So we have troops in Iraq, but we demand that they obey all the rules liberals worry about.

The United States has decided to occupy Iraq. Americans in uniform are there to enforce that occupation.

Do it or get the hell out.

In the early 1960s, when there were huge riots in American cities, Popular Opinion kept asking, "What can we do if mobs take over a major city?"

They finally asked me that. I replied, "Cut off the water."

They were stunned. My obvious solution did not fit into the Serious Discussion of an Intractable Problem that I was supposed to be engaged in.

If we have troops in Iraq, my concern is our troops. Screw Iraqi hearts and minds.

If a city is making trouble for the occupation, cut off their water. Then anyone who comes out of the city is picked up and questioned before they are let out.

Or get the hell out.

But the bureaucrats in uniform say this wouldn't be nice. Bush doesn't want to be an extremist.

If you don't want to be an extremist, then get our troops the hell out of Iraq.

Nothing liberals advocate ever works. But Rush Limbaugh says that the left is "a legitimate point of view." So our policy is a compromise with proven leftist nonsense, the holy "middle course."

We won't fight, and we won't get out.

The bureaucrats in uniform are saying, "We will have to stay in Vietnam, sorry, I mean Iraq, for a long, long time."

I've seen this movie before.

April 17, 2004 -- The Idea that the Law is Holy is a Costly Myth

April 17, 2004 -- The Holy Black Dress

April 17, 2004 -- Where Mythology Rules, Freedom Dies

April 17, 2004 -- The People Versus the People

Fun Quote:

"A sour face is the Devil's religion."

-- John Wesley

Buy Bob's Book "Why Johnny Can't Think" from Amazon here!

The Idea that the Law is Holy is a Costly Myth

The legal system is just one more bureaucracy. It is dangerous to trust any bureaucracy. But the legal bureaucracy decides life and death issues. To trust THAT bureaucracy is fatal.

We have over two million lawyers in the United States. They produce nothing.

All those lawyers and their employees and their lawsuits and all the paperwork that is required to avoid lawsuits has been estimated to cost the American economy about two trillion dollars a year.

I think that estimate is low.

I hear Shrewd people saying, "America should have a government of Laws, not of Men."

Nobody asks them what the hell they are talking about.

There is no law that is not made by men, enforced by men, and screwed up by men.

The Constitution of the United States is the only authority it rests on:

"We the People of the United States of America."

How can you say that and then turn around and say "We are a government of laws, not of men?"

DUHH!

The Holy Black Dress

Back when the Supreme Court was all male, I used to say, "The United States Supreme Court consists of nine lawyers who had enough political pull to get themselves made judges. They were just nine human lawyers before they went on the court, and they are nine lawyers now."

I would then add, "But because these nine guys now wear black dresses, they are supposed to be The Constitution of the United States. If they wore mascara and high heels, would they be the Bible, too?"

What kind of superstitious peasant could possibly believe that something called the Law is somehow something godlike and superhuman? What kind of retard could believe that a man has the right to be a dictator because he wears a black dress?

Judges today are, in fact, dictators. Here is what I said in the Introduction to my 1982 anthology for St. Martin's press, "The New Right Papers:"

"Several papers in this book deal, in one way or another, with the restoration of popular rule."

" Professor William A Stanmeyer's discussion of the imperial judiciary explains, from the point of view of a legal scholar, the steady erosion of the power of elected officials, and the increasing use of the Constitution as an excuse for, rather than as a source of, judicial decisions. Behind such decisions ranges the full power of the United States Government. A situation where one man's personal judgment is law has a name, and it is not democracy."

Where Mythology Rules, Freedom Dies

Freedom is based on a very unromantic idea. It says people should do what they want to.

The easiest way to destroy freedom is to trivialize it. You just say "We could avoid a lot of accidents if we did this, and the reason for not doing it is because somebody just WANTS to do something else, for no reason at all."

You go straight from there to the Marxist myth of Social Progress, which the term "progressive" is now based on, and from there you go to dictatorship. If we have a Higher Mission, there is no room for Freedom.

Every totalitarian society worships The Law.

When the Supreme Court overrules the will of the American people, it says it is "interpreting the Constitution." If you "interpret" the Constitution, you ARE the Constitution.

Barry Goldwater pointed out in his 1958 book, "The Conscience of a Conservative," that EVERY public official has to interpret the Constitution. He takes an oath to uphold the Constitution against all enemies, including an enemy in a black dress.

Who said the courts were supposed to be the Constitution? Certainly not the Constitution itself. If it meant that, it would have said it.

Who gave the Supreme Court the right to be the Constitution?

The Supreme Court did.

If one branch of government IS the Constitution, then the balance of powers between the different branches of government simply does not exist.

The People Versus the People

The Constitution says that its only source of authority is , "We the People of the United States of America."

So nine lawyers in black dresses overrule the popular will in the name of "We the People of the United States of America."

How far can you go if you say you are "interpreting" the Constitution? O'Reilly says the Founding Fathers demanded interracial high school dances because they called it the UNITED States of America.

He's serious.

Once you start "interpreting" the Constitution, there is no limit to how ridiculous you can get.

And you can kill anybody who gets in your way.

April 24, 2004 -- Damn It, Cut Off the Water!

April 24, 2004 -- The Subtle Approach to Making Intelligence Agencies Share Information

April 24, 2004 -- Another Reader Makes Me Think

April 24, 2004 -- A Man With A Memory Looks at Iraq

April 24, 2004 -- McCain and the "Christian" Right

Fun Quote:

A "street smart" person is a hothouse plant who thinks he's a cactus. He survives in the most artificial environment on earth, the streets, but he thinks he knows how to deal with reality. If he lives long enough he will die in a stinking cage.

"Street smart" is one variety of what I call Shrewd.

Buy Bob's Book "Why Johnny Can't Think" from Amazon [here](#)!

Damn it, Cut Off the Water!

I have never before used a curse word in WOL, and I don't plan to do it again. But this is an infuriated cry from the heart.

Both the pro-war neo-cons and the anti-war left are horrible people. Liberals are not anti-war. They are anti-American and therefore pro-UN and pro-France. I hope those two groups eat each other alive.

The real war is not in Iraq. It is here in America.

But when it comes to sending our troops to fight, I have a short fuse.

First, our soldiers are in there in combat but they are supposed to worry about mosques.

To hell with mosques or churches or Buddhist temples. On the battle ground, you fight everywhere. If the enemy is in there, you blow the place to Kingdom Come without hesitation.

Or you get the hell out.

There is a truce for some kind of negotiation going on about things like the mosques as sanctuaries. Only Americans are observing it because we think that will charm Iraqis.

But we are now being told by the bureaucrats in uniform that the minute the truce ends we are sending in American troops to take the cities the other side controls..

Troops will have to be sent to fight in the streets because we won't just cut off the water supply to the cities.

Why?

That wouldn't be nice.

So some American troops get killed. So what?

The bureaucrats with the stars on their shoulders tell us that cutting off the water would seriously inconvenience innocent Iraqis in those cities.

So cutting off the water would lose the real battle, which is for the hearts and minds of the Vietnamese.... sorry, I mean the Iraqi, people.

The Subtle Approach to Making Intelligence Agencies Share Information

I have spent many years knee deep in intelligence work.

On Capitol Hill, my boss was Ranking Member on the House Intelligence Committee. Under Reagan, one of my areas of responsibility was all civilian clearances in the entire Federal civil service.

Before I got to Capitol Hill, there are many blank spaces in my resume.

So let me address the Deep and Intractable Question everybody brings up when they discuss what happened on September 11, 2001:

"How can we get the FBI, the CIA, and other agencies to share information?"

Let me tell you how you do that.

The FBI knew the names of the terrorists who got on the planes to attack the Pentagon and the World Trade Center. They did not tell the Federal Aviation Administration about those people.

That got three thousand people killed.

That is criminal negligence.

Bureaucratic games got three thousand people killed.

The difference between stupidity and criminal negligence is luck. If you drive drunk and don't get caught at it, you did something stupid. But if you smash into another car and kill somebody, you go to prison for criminal negligence.

When the FBI and CIA don't share information, it is bureaucratic games as usual, stupid, childish, unprofessional and unpatriotic.

But when that business as usual, stupidity, childishness and lack of patriotism causes three thousand deaths, it is a criminal matter.

That is the rule every driver must live by. That is the rule intelligence agency bureaucrats must be made to live by.

Rule One: Someone has to go prison for that. The only question is who. The buddy system in intelligence would break down fast as went down the list of possibly responsible people: this is your area, so if you don't go to jail, who will? Believe me, once you declare that, bureaucrats inside the FBI will tell you all about what happened.

Someone goes to prison. From there on, you will get that cooperation everybody says is so complicated because of the "culture" of the agencies.

From the time that person goes to prison, you will be amazed how well all the agencies will be sharing information.

That is the only way to do get intelligence agencies to share information.

There is no other way to get intelligence agencies to share information.

Another Reader Makes Me Think

A WOL reader reminded me that the Iraqis look upon us as occupying their country.

He compared Iraq to the situation in the movie, "Red Dawn" when the Soviets were occupying America:

I watched "Red Dawn.". It was Patrick Swayze's first public exposure.

I was very upset that, in the movie, they kept playing "John Brown's Body" as the Resistance Song.

That is an anti-South hate song.

I was in DC when Reagan was inaugurated, and I wrote an article in the Southern Partisan bitching about that song being played at Reagan celebrations. Thurmond's office read my article and it stopped at once. I am a real SOB, but I am a very effective SOB.

Back to your point.

We ARE occupying Iraq.

Even on September 11, 2001, I made it clear that I understood a lot about the Arab's point of view:

September 11, 2001 - MY ARAB SYMPATHIES

If I were an Arab,

I would want the Americans out of my heartland.

So why don't we get out? Bush and Kerry agree we will be there for many years, all for the good of the Iraqis, of course.

The so-called Iraqi nation is a joke. It is cobbled-together province of the old British Empire. You know that.

Iraq is a multi-ethnic state. All multi-ethnic states end up with an authoritarian ruler to hold them together. Yugoslavia was doomed the minute Tito died. Iraq will have another Saddam or it will come apart.

America demands that Iraq be free and united. Where did this nutcase idea come from?

A Man With A Memory Looks at Iraq

Everybody has agreed to forget that a few years back, French judges on the Olympic Committee took bribes for their votes.

There was a UN-administered program which made an exception to the UN boycott on Iraq. The UN was to accept the sale of Iraqi oil in international markets if the money was used for food and medicine.. Saddam pocketed part of the money and the rest as used to bribe UN officials. The children in Iraq starved and went without medicine.

The UN is a third world government without any pretensions to respect from anybody.

The Security Council and NATO decided that Iraq was developing weapons of mass destruction. The Great Diplomat, Colin Powell had the Europeans lined up to take action when he went to Paris. They screwed him to the wall.

Colin Powell is a Rockefeller Republican who has never been right about anything. But he's black and he was a general, so respectable conservatives worship him.

So last year, with American troops on the ground to attack Iraq, Europeans played games. They are silly little people.

So the United States attacked, alleging weapons of mass destruction. The UN had said the same thing.

There are no weapons of mass destruction. Our job is over in Iraq.

So where did all this crap about giving Iraq a democracy come from?

We all know the answer to that, though nobody says it. We didn't find WMD's. Now Bush wants some reason for his invasion, so now we are there to impose democracy.

That's insane.

Liberals want to impose their form of "democracy" on everybody. So they can't laugh outright at the new Bush's new New World Order.

Liberals can't say we fought this war for the Israeli lobby. So they said we were fighting for cheap oil. Nothing liberals say ever works out. Oil prices are skyrocketing.

So will anybody ever ask where the hell this business of making the so-called "nation of Iraq" a democracy came from?

Of course not.

McCain and the "Christian" Right

When Republican Senator John McCain was mentioned as a possible vice presidential candidate with John Kerry he indicated he might accept it. That caused a some surprise among conservatives.

I can't see why. McCain was elected as a conservative Republican, but he carries liberal water for them all the time. He says he is against gun control, but he has joined with liberals in fighting for as much gun control as they can get right now.

"Christian" conservatives do the same thing for liberals. The British Broadcasting Company recently bragged that there would not be a single fair-haired, blue-eyed, fair skinned person on earth in two hundred years. But to achieve this goal, the left needs to get non-whites into areas which are at present almost impenetrable for them.

The mountains of East Tennessee and Western North Carolina contain huge pockets of white people. So "Christian" conservatives have begun a massive campaign to get families in those areas to adopt children from the third world. Like McCain, "Christian" conservatives can do things for the left that the left cannot do for itself.

If you want to make your living as a Conservative Spokesman, you must be declared "respectable" by the liberal-dominated media.

Respectability has a price, and the conservatives who call themselves Christians, like John McCain, are eager to pay it.

May 1, 2004 -- Liberals are the True Conservatives

May 1, 2004 -- Palestinians are Asking for Their Birth Right, not a "Right of Return"

May 1, 2004 -- My Blog

Fun Quote:

I sniffed coke, and I didn't like it. So I tried sniffing Pepsi, and it didn't do anything for me either.

If Royal Crown doesn't work, I'm giving up.

Liberals are the True Conservatives

Dru Sjodin was the lovely young blue-eyed blond who was kidnapped and murdered by the repeat, "Level Three" sex offender recently. He was able to kill her because lawyers and judges put him back on the street.

Radicals like me want people like that executed or at least locked up and not let back on the streets.

The biggest liberal lobby in America is the Trial Lawyers' Association, which wants to stop radicals like me from changing the legal game that killed Dru Sjodin. They make their living off of that legal game. They say I am a radical and an extremist.

So they call me a conservative.

The Soviet Empire never had better friends than American "liberals." But now those in Russia who want to bring Russia back to Communism, the Russian Communist Party, are called "the conservatives."

Respectable conservatives make their living by opposing the political left in ways that the political left approves of. If they are to appear on the media, conservatives must earn that "respectable" label, and they get it by pleasing liberals.

One of the rules every respectable conservative must obey is to say that a debate is fair if it includes someone called a conservative and a leftist. Jess Jackson says that is "Both Sides."

So if you are opposing a person who calls himself a "progressive," you are a "conservative."

But liberals are the ones who insist that things remain exactly as they are right now. They want the tax-deductible foundations they run to remain tax-exempt. They want no change in the legal system. They want colleges to keep their government-sponsored monopoly so university tuitions can go higher and higher and liberal professors can be paid to push their agenda in the name of "academic freedom."

Listen to the debates. You will notice that it is the liberals who are the conservatives, and anyone who wants to change things as they are is called a conservative.

Palestinians are Asking for Their Birth Right, not a "Right of Return"

President Bush has given more Palestinian land to Israel. He has recognized the right of some Israelis to settle in the West Bank. That is the first step. Eventually America under either party will recognize more and more Israeli rights to more and more of Palestine.

The United States has also firmly recognized the right of of any Jew from anywhere to settle in Israel and it has vetoed any right of Palestinians who were born on the land that the state of Israel has taken over to go back home.

Commentators are saying that Palestinians who were born in today's Israel are demanding a "Right of Return."

That is not true.

If you were born in Britain and many other countries, no matter what citizenship you now have, you have a "birthright" in Britain. A "birthright" means that you can always go and live in Britain, no matter what citizenship you now have.

A person's Birth Right to go back to the land where he was born is recognized all over the world, outside the United States. In this Nation of Immigrants, if your family has been here for over three hundred years, as is the case with most Southerners, you are lucky the government lets you live here at all.

In the United States the only difference between a person born here and an "undocumented worker" is documents, pieces of paper issued by the authorities. In a Nation of Immigrants, no one who is born here has any special right to be here at all.

It is no wonder that Americans do not understand the difference between a universally recognized 'birthright' and the purely Israeli term "Right of Return."

A birthright is entirely different from this "Right of Return" that Old Testament fanatics invented for Jews. The "Right of Return" means that if your family converted to Judaism before you were born, you are now a Jew, so you have a right to drive Palestinians off of land to which THEY have birthright.

Most of today's Jews probably are the descendants of a tribe in Russia called the Khazars and other converts over the past two thousand years. Even in the time of Jesus, most of the six million Jews in the Roman Empire were almost certainly converts.

So the real "Right of Return" has nothing to do with the return of the children of Israel to Israel, even if it WE'RE right to drive Arabs off the country they were born in in the name of religion. The facts of the Old Testament fanatics' argument for this "right of Return" are wrong.

More important, the "Right of Return" is entirely a matter of religious fanaticism. It has nothing to do with the Birth Right Palestinians are demanding.

My Blog

A "blog" is a personal web page where you just write down whatever you damned well please and put in public for people to see.

If you have an idea, you can put it on the public record by putting it on your blog.

If you have an invention, you can put it on the public record by writing it on your blog.

If you are like me and your best ideas cannot be published, you put them on record in your blog.

A blog is usually a kind of public diary of your thoughts.

My blog is more like a diary than it is like a web page.

My blog is not written for the reader, but you are welcome to read it until you get so bored you can't stand it.

DO NOT HOLD ME TO ANYTHING I SAY IN MY BLOG.

Do not expect the blog to be nearly as professional as my writing. I am talking to me, not to you.

You are listening to the meanderings of a person with Adult Attention Deficit Disorder. That makes real writing hard work. My blog is not going to be hard work, so it is going to be a bit scatterbrained.

You are welcome to tell me anything my blog makes you think of.

I have been confidential advisor to everything from mercenary soldiers to alcoholics and drug addicts to the President This list could go on a long, long way. I have learned to think like a host of people.

So my blog will be an exercise in writing from inside the skin of a lot of other people besides me.

I can try to think like a Klansman one day and like a Communist the next. I've known plenty of both, and I have given advice to both, free of charge. I respect and will give PERSONAL help to any honest person, wherever that honesty leads them.

That attitude is part of my own personal Bible Belt heritage, "Judge not that ye be not judged." But it has repaid my efforts many, many times over, not least because I can walk in a lot of people's shoes.

If this doesn't give you the warning you need, you need to go back to Kindergarten.

If you are the kind of person who permanently rejects someone because of one wrong thing he said, I don't want you near me anyway.

I warn you, that kind of person is not worth knowing. Get away from him!

I realize my blog is public. So I won't identify people in it or give information that would allow anybody to identify them. Trust me, I've had to do that all my life.

After I have said all this, if my blog infuriates somebody, that person is a fool.

And I am retired, I have all the money I want, and I have done enough in my life so that I need to impress nobody, so I don't give a damn.

If that sort of person reads my blog, he will reject me forever. That would be a favor to me. If the blog gets rid of people like that, that alone would make it worthwhile.

A blog never ends, so if you want to take a look now, do so. But it will be there a long time, and it will get longer and longer. But remember, WhitakerOnline is written for you, Bob's Blog is written for me.

Here's the link:

<http://www.whitakeronline.org/blog.htm>

May 8, 2004 -- This is the Day the "Greatest Generation" Saved the World!

May 8, 2004 -- The "Greatest Generation" Saved the COMMUNIST World!

May 8, 2004 -- Something Else the "Greatest Generation" Did

Fun Quote:

I have noticed that a lot fewer older folks are giving young people the standard lecture about how easy the kids have it these days. That's because us older folks have had to deal with computers. There is nothing that reminds one of how hard the learning process was like having to learn something yourself.

Buy Bob's Book "Why Johnny Can't Think" from Amazon [here](#)!

This is the Day the Greatest Generation "Saved the World!"

Today May 8, is V-E Day. On May 8, 1945, Nazi Germany surrendered. According to Tom Brokaw and others, when Germany fell to us and our Heroic Ally, Joseph Stalin, the world was saved. They tell us that the generation that saved Comrade Stalin was The Greatest Generation.

I loved my uncles who served in World War II, but what we are discussing here is not those people as individuals. We are talking about what that whole generation did.

So if my disagreement with this Greatest Generation nonsense makes you say "I am insulting your granddaddy or your Papa", please leave the room and let the grownups talk.

I don't like the World War II generation, as a generation, for exactly the same reason Tom Brokaw loves them dearly.

When the World War Generation came of age around 1940, the white male walked the world like a Colossus. When they ceased to be the dominant group, whites were groveling and begging the world for forgiveness.

By the time the World War II generation ceased to be the dominant group around 1980, anyone who was not fully committed to the end of the white race was a racist. Immigration and integration and miscegenation became the Final Solution to "the race problem." But this "race problem" existed ONLY in white countries and this "race problem" existed in ALL white countries.

No one says that "the race problem" will be solved by miscegenation in Asia or Africa. No one asks to massive third world immigration into Japan or Taiwan or the unpopulated areas of Africa or Brazil.

Only Brokaw's Greatest Generation would ever allowed such an idea to be accepted. As a liberal, Brokaw loves them dearly.

I don't.

The "Greatest Generation" Saved the COMMUNIST World!

When the World War II generation took the helm around 1938, there were only two truly totalitarian regimes on earth, Stalin's USSR and Hitler's Germany. They were deadly enemies.

After the Greatest Generation Saved the World and as they ceased to be the dominant group in the 1950's, a third of the world was under a single totalitarian rule, that of Communism. The Communists had killed more people in peacetime before Hitler did his killing in his concentration camps during the War, and the Communists killed more people in peacetime AFTER the War than Hitler did during wartime in camps or in battle.

That is what "Saving the World" meant.

The accomplishments of The Greatest Generation are beloved by Brokaw as they are by all liberals, neoconservatives and respectable conservatives. They couldn't care less if people get killed or oppressed, as long as the killing and oppression comes from the political left. For them, that is not Pure Evil Hate, like Hitler.

Communist killing and tyranny is merely Misguided Idealism.

I listened the other day while Bill O'Reilly and a leftist agreed that Communist slogans on tee-shirts in a high school were OK, but Nazi ones should get a student expelled.

The Supreme Court has ruled that an employer can fire a worker for being a Klan member, but not for being any kind of Communist.

This is the world that the World War II Generation made, and Brokaw loves it.

I don't.

Something Else the "Greatest Generation" Did

In the 1950s, when my whole family went to Main Street in Columbia to shop, I distinctly remember somebody saying, "You know, if we were Up North, we would LOCK the car door!" Everybody laughed because we knew it was true. We had read about locked doors in New York and seen it on TV.

But what is hard to convey to you is how ALIEN this idea was. Locking your house door or your car door in South Carolina was exactly like the story that Eskimos kissed by rubbing their noses together, and I mean EXACTLY that alien.

You locked prisons, not homes.

But I found out later that we were not the only ones who felt that only prisons had locked door. I was reading a black author who was raised in, of all places, HARLEM, New York, and he was the same way! He remembered that, when he was a boy in the 1930s, his family would sleep out on the fire escape on hot summer nights and families on the ground floor would sleep on the street.

In HARLEM!

He said he remembered that, but he honestly didn't recall whether the apartment he lived in HAD a lock on the door. He never remembered anybody using a key to get in.

Another book was by an affluent New Yorker who owned his apartment. He wrote in the early 1950s that he would never get used to the idea of having to unlock the door to his own home.

All this happened while the "Greatest Generation" was in control.

They Saved the World, you know.

May 15, 2004 -- Iraqi Prisoner Scandal, Oh Boy, Now We Can Tear the Grunts' Hearts Out!

May 15, 2004 -- Who Else Can You not Go After?

May 15, 2004 -- More People Who Are Above Criticism

Fun Quote:

I've been in politics all my life. That's why I want to go to heaven when I die.

I love meeting new people.

Iraqi Prisoner Scandal, Oh Boy, Now We Can Tear the Grunts' Hearts Out!

Finally we have a scandal we can deal with!

It's been years since the big scandal was the destruction of the life savings of thousands of small investors by big corporations. Nothing has been done about that because the guilty people are worth at least a hundred million dollars each.

The big corporate scandals are being handled exactly the same way the Clinton scandals were. His Attorney General kept saying she was investigating them, and nothing happened. Then Bush and his Attorney General came along and buried them completely.

The government is still "investigating" the corporate thieves. Gosh, it's complicated when you go after rich people!

And not just rich people. The next big scandal involved Catholic bishops. They convicted a few small-time priests of personally raping little boys, but no one will ever make any trouble for any of the bishops who caused far more such rapes by helping out the priests committing them than any single priest could have caused.

No decent person dares point out that any bishop who was not fully aware of little-boy-rapes in the 1970s was a complete idiot, and that you don't become a Catholic bishop if you're not smart.

No decent person will mention that obvious fact, so I will point it out.

But these guys are bishops! Going after them is worse than going after a billionaire!

Praise the Lord, those who were cruel to Iraqi prisoners are just Army grunts! Them you can kill!

Who Else Can You not Go after?

We all know that Simon Wiesenthal and the United States Government are still spending huge sums of money to go after every twenty-year-old German who was assigned to guard a Nazi concentration camp, even if they are eighty years old now.

What that German kid should have done was walk right up to the SS officers, the guys with the skulls on their hats and the guns at their hips, and tell them he was not going to follow their orders.

Tens of millions of people were killed in Stalin's Gulag in Siberia. Not one commandant or guard in any of THOSE camps has ever had his pension threatened, much less his life. Wiesenthal would never demand such a thing.

Jews were known to go to their deaths like sheep. They never defied the SS the way those German kids were supposed to. But like Catholic bishops versus Army grunts, that's a whole different matter.

More People Who are Above Criticism

One of my drinking buddies in college was a Jew who had spent his early childhood in a Nazi concentration camp. Often at about the third pitcher of beer he would tell me what a wimp I was because I wouldn't condemn certain Jews.

This is not a criticism I often encounter.

Ole Bob openly hates the Israeli domination of American Middle East policy. That alone makes me anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionsjews. Nobody denies a word I say is true, so "Nazi" is all they've got.

I declare that the present policy aimed at ridding the earth of whites is straight genocide. Nobody denies that, so they call me a SuperNazi.

I keep repeating the fact that Fox Cable News suddenly and without explanation spiked a major expose of Israeli spying in the United States. Certainly nobody is going to mention that, much less deny it, so they call me a SuperNazi squared.

December 29, 2001 - ISRAEL SPYING STORY SNATCHED OFF OF FOX

When you have been called such a wild anti-Semite that it would embarrass Uncle Adolf himself, being told you are a wimp about Jews is a memorable experience.

What my drinking buddy was bitching about was my reaction when he kept saying that Jews turned his family in. He also insisted that Jews turned almost everybody else in the concentration camps over to the Nazis.

According to him, the Nazis could have honestly said that some of their best friends were Jewish.

I said those Jews were few. He went ballistic. I said those Jews probably did it because they were threatened. He went "ballisticker".

Now that the World War II generation no longer controls information, we are beginning to hear what he meant. Jewish leaders at every level shamelessly cooperated with the Nazis.

But here is the point: I have never heard of one single Jew ever being criticized for this, much less pursued for the rest of their lives. If Wiesenthal were ever asked about this, and he won't be, he would say those Jews 1) were threatened, and 2) they "made a mistake."

No twenty-year-old German was ever threatened. No German ever "made a mistake."

The simple fact is that mentioning any of these Jews who were the Nazis' best helpers would pollute Wiesenthal's whole story of pure evil white gentiles persecuting helpless heroic Jews. The World War II generation might start being questioned about their protection of British and especially Communist war criminals and peace criminals. It would pollute their whole story of Saving the World.

So let's not talk about the tens of millions of Communist killings. Let's not discuss Jewish crimes against Jews or bishops who helped priests rape little boys or felonies by billionaires.

Let's just lynch the grunts.

May 22, 2004 -- Moral Courage

May 22, 2004 -- Once and for All, Gang, I KNOW the Sky is Blue!

May 22, 2004 -- Viva Tecate!

May 22, 2004 -- Message to the DEAF: WE TOLD YOU SO!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Fun Quote:

A human being is the only animal who laughs.

A human being is the only animal who knows he is going to die.

Don't ever let any one tell you, "That is too serious to make jokes about." Serious situations are exactly what we have a sense of humor for.

Moral Courage

The group that calls itself "The Greatest Generation" has completely screwed up what was once the American world view. If you weren't in the War, they said, you had no right to talk about anything. Only combat, real combat in the Real War, made a man's life worthwhile. Physical courage, the kind only the Greatest Generation had, is all that matters.

Meanwhile, back on Planet Earth and in real history, a hundred Medal Honor winners are small potatoes compared to the person who has the MORAL courage to say the right thing at the right time.

Any decent human being visiting Arlington National cemetery is supposed to feel sadness, inspiration, and above Gratitude, Gratitude, and more Gratitude. He is then supposed to ask himself, "How about some Gratitude for a change?"

So much for a decent human being. When I worked in Washington and visited the Arlington National Cemetery, my attitude was entirely different.

The veteran's lobby wants us all to feel Gratitude, Gratitude, Gratitude because their job is to get money out of us. "If you're Grateful, they say, show it by spending more money on veterans."

Meanwhile, the last thing those guys who died in combat need is my Gratitude.

My feeling is this: Most religious people feel that the dead are in Heaven or Hell or Nirvana or have been reborn into another life on this earth with no memory of the old one. Most non-religious people are convinced that the dead are just plain dead.

But one thing NOBODY believes is that the guys under those crosses at Arlington are worrying about how much Gratitude you are feeling. But . . .

I thought, "Every combat veteran who is lying here is here because people who worked exactly where I work today screwed up. They had to face bullets and high explosive because somebody in my position didn't have the courage to face being embarrassed, to be all alone doing what needed to be done while everybody else squawked about the Great Issue of the Day."

I am right at home today, hitting on what counts while everybody else is frantically e-mailing each other about how Bush lies about Iraq. That's the story of my career.

The Iraq War is a policy that was determined while all the frantic e-mails were squawking about Clinton's sex scandals and a balanced budget. The job of a reasonably intelligent, decent person is to prevent the NEXT war.

They didn't prevent this one because they were too busy sending each other frantic e-mails about the Clinton scandals. They are doing the same thing now. Meanwhile, I have an real, serious obligation to those who died.

We've all heard the term "The Silent Majority." That term was coined by Mark Twain in 1868 when he was describing the giant cemeteries in, around, and under the City of Paris. At that time the living population of Paris was in the hundreds of thousands, but those cemeteries held at least a million. So in one line Twain referred to those million dead as "Paris's silent majority."

At the end of World War II, the veterans' lobbies represented twelve million people, at least a fifth of the entire voting population if you ignore their families. They were young and active, and all anybody talked about was the debt we owed them.

While everybody is showering gratitude on the veterans' who vote and their families, there should be one person who represents a silent population out there across the Potomac River. I do that by taking a cold, hard look at the real world and trying to prevent more heroes from lying under those crosses.

Once and for All, Gang, I KNOW the Sky is Blue!

A WOL reader wrote me about my references to "Jews," "the World War II generation," and other generalizations. He began his note with:

"Bob, there are always exceptions to the rule."

This is what I wrote him back:

"You are too intelligent to tell me that."

"The sky is also blue, but you are too intelligent to explain that to me, too."

"We got a lot to do. Let's get real."

"Bob (Whitaker)"

Viva Tecate!

Tecate is a Mexican beer company that recently made an ad for the California market.

The usual "Hispanic advocates" screamed bloody murder. They said the ad "furthered the stereotyping of Mexicans."

Tecate answered, "The ad was made for adults with an adult sense of humor."

I am sure the California Tecate advertisers will soon confess their ideological error, apologize, grovel around on the floor, and give those full-time professional "Hispanic advocates" money.

But in the meantime, I LOVE Tecate!

A professional black or Hispanic activist is usually a pencil-neck who can't get any attention or earn a living by doing anything else. A professional minority "activist" is a person whose only means of livelihood depends on his being completely humorless and hair-trigger touchy.

A professional black activist is a person who makes his living screaming wildly about the Confederate flag while blacks die by the hundreds of thousands of drug addiction in America and tens of millions of blacks die of AIDS and malnutrition in Africa.

Meanwhile, a stone-hearted white racist named Bob Whitaker went to Africa and created a few jobs for blacks.

This same stone-hearted white racist took his life in his hands, went straight into ghettos and helped black addicts in recovery. He also conducted recovery meetings in prisons for more blacks than whites. I never got a dime for it.

Mean while, professional black "activists" make a fat living by attacking the Confederate flag from very comfortable offices.

They do that with a grim hard look on their faces. They attack grinning white Southerners who get a kick out of waving Confederate flags. They get paid to scowl and say, "They're after me!"

Meanwhile, Native American activists have also discovered that there is fortune in being humorless. They make a living attacking the Atlanta Braves and the Cleveland Indians. The name of a

professional sports team is not the main problem American Indians face today, but for "activists," it's a living.

A sense of humor is a sense of proportion, and "activists" can only make a living by having no sense of proportion, no sense of human priorities, whatsoever.

If we ever started laughing at these "activists," it would be like the kid who saw the Emperor was buck naked.

Tecate demands that these pencil-necks have an adult sense of humor, an adult sense of proportion. That would ruin their whole racket.

If we ever started laughing at these "activists," they would have to go out and find honest jobs.

Message to the Deaf: WE TOLD YOU SO!!!!!!

This week liberals are celebrating the fiftieth anniversary Supreme Court's decision in Brown versus the Board of Education, when the Supreme Court took over the power to shove integration down the throat of every Southern State. Every respectable conservative is praising that decision even louder, trying desperately to impress liberals.

Also this week, Massachusetts became the first state to legalize gay marriage, following the orders of the Massachusetts Supreme Court. Gays are now demanding that the United States Supreme Court declare gay marriage legal in every state.

Conservatives are moaning about the Massachusetts Supreme Court and asking loudly where a court got the power to legislate like that..

If you can't understand the connection between these two events, you would make a good respectable conservative commentator.

You also need to check into a home for the mentally retired.

May 29, 2004 -- Why I am Going to New Orleans

May 29, 2004 -- David Duke got Railroaded to Prison

May 29, 2004 -- From my New Orleans Speech: Tomorrow's Leaders Will Have to be Spokesmen for White People

Fun Quote:

When Davy Crockett lost his congressional seat, he told his constituents:

"You can go to hell and I will go to Texas."

Why I am Going to New Orleans

When David Duke was railroaded off to prison by the Feds, I was infuriated, and you had better be, too. If they can do it to him, they can do it to you.

I met David Duke in Moscow a couple of years back. The "expat community" – those Americans living in Russia is very small. So even if we had nothing in common politically, Dave and I were Southerners and political professionals, so we would have gotten together on that basis.

But David Duke wants to save my race. Anyone who wants to do that has a lot in common with me. I am so pro-white that I am too bigoted even to be anti-Semitic.

Then Dave went to prison. I helped him out while he was there and he read some of my stuff and asked me to speak at a huge gathering in New Orleans this weekend to celebrate his release.

Dave is not the only person I have ever helped in prison.

While professional black spokesmen sat in fine offices and drew a good salary to attack the Confederate flag, I have conducted many recovery sessions in prison, often when there were only black people at them.

I have taken my life in my hands and gone into the ghettos to help out addicts while professional black spokesmen were worrying about the use of the N word.

Old stone-hearted racist Bob never got a dime for any of this.

I went to Africa and helped create jobs while professional black spokesmen here were ignoring African starvation and attacking South Africa.

Black people would be a hell of a lot better heart if there were more Evil Racists like Bob Whitaker and less paid black spokesmen.

I was proud that David Duke asked me to be one of his speakers and I am happy to do it.

David Duke got Railroaded to Prison

Everybody knows that David Duke got sent to a prison where he stood an excellent chance of being murdered because he earned it. The Federal Government wanted him dead.

The Federal Government wanted David Duke dead because he scared the hell out of them. Everybody thought they had beaten the South into total submission to race mixing, and then Dave came with a fraction of a percent of becoming of Louisiana.

I have been in hardball politics for half a century. Anybody who doesn't know that Dave actually won that election is not just naive, he is a damned fool.

I was a poll-watcher during the 1968 election in Chicago. I saw the Dailey Machine up front and personal. Absolutely everybody who was in real Chicago politics when the Daily Machine was at its height has any doubt at all that Mayor Dailey personally made sure that John Kennedy won the 1960 election for John Kennedy over Richard Nixon. Kennedy needed a few votes in Chicago to in with the state of Illinois, and that was what gave him his tiny majority over Nixon in the Electoral College.

It took all night, but Kennedy needed those Chicago votes and sure enough he got them.

Let me tell you something. When it comes to enforcing its racial policies, the Feds and the Louisiana political establishment make the Daily Machine look a bunch of pansies. They needed a few votes to beat David Duke and they sure as hell got them.

If you think that those votes were real, you are a damned fool.

Let us look at what Dave's experience teaches us about the Department of Justice and the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Over seventy years, the Federal Government did one thing right. They got Al Capone on income tax charges. It was the last creative idea the United States Government ever came up with, and that was seventy years ago. It is pathetic that when the Feds are out to get somebody, the only arrow they have in their quiver is still the same one they came up with a human lifetime ago.

That is really pathetic.

From My New Orleans Speech: Future Leaders Will Have to be Spokesmen for White People

Liberals have no place in the future. They have produced one policy after another, and every one of them has not just been a failure, it has been a disastrous.

By now liberalism has become known as a failure. But what is worse for liberals is that liberalism has become known as a laughable failure. They are terrified of being laughed at precisely because they know that in the modern world they are laughable.

The only people who are not laughable today are the people who can talk about race.

California already has a white minority. By the middle of this century America will have a white minority. The future of America will be Hispanic leaders demanding things for Hispanics and black leaders demanding things for their minority group.

The white race has a much better chance to survive as a threatened minority than it does as a majority that thinks it rules the world. In a society of minorities, whites will be biggest minority. In a nation of minorities, whites will have to have spokesmen who speak for white people as white people. That is why both liberals and conservatives are both panicking about the multi-racial future they themselves created.

Tomorrow's white leaders will have to say, up front and personal, "We are white and we are ready to make deals for the good of our own race."

Any liberal who says that is committing political heresy. Any conservative who says that is committing political heresy. But anybody who thinks you can be part of the future political leadership without dealing in race is a fool, and more and more people are beginning to see that fact.

I was watching a main line television discussion a few days ago in which they were discussing the fact that Europe will have a Moslem majority by the middle of this century. I was astonished to hear them agree that it is a major problem white people simply do not have children.

If they had said that ten years ago, every one of them would have been ruined. This racial talk is now becoming mainstream. But while they are despairing of the future, I look forward to it. To repeat, I think a white race that sees itself as a threatened minority stands a far better chance of survival than a white race that thinks it rules the world.

I remember when Patrick J. Buchanan announced on national television twenty-five years ago that the reason Americans died at Normandy was to make Europe into a multiracial society.

Recently Buchanan produced the best-selling book he ever wrote. That book is about how the white race is committing suicide. He says this multi-racial society he fought for is destroying the white race and Western Culture.

Buchanan's best-selling book is called "Suicide of the West."

The title of that book ought to be "Well, DUHH!"

It is time for us to stop taking liberals and conservatives seriously. No one who does not think racially has any place in the politics of the future. We are all used to thinking of ourselves as a small group sounding the alarm to a deaf white race. That age is coming to an end. The danger warned about is here, and everybody is beginning to realize it.

Anyone who does not think racially has to be laughed at, not debated with.

We must go from racial theory to practical politics. And we must do it immediately.

There is no place in America's future for any white person who does not think of himself as a spokesman for the powerful white minority. You simply cannot waste your time debating with those who are still trying to live in a non-racial world, whether they call themselves liberals or socialists or libertarians or Buckley conservatives or religious conservatives.

When we are called haters and enemies of other races because we want to represent white people, we need to laugh at the people who say that.

We need to say we are too bigoted to be anti-Semitic. We are too bigoted to be anti-black. We are too bigoted to be anti-Hispanic. The only group we are interested in is white people, and as white leaders, we want to make some deals.

This sounds like a joke. But behind it is a deadly serious and realistic set of ideas that will make us white leaders when the liberals and conservatives are ancient history.

As Joe Sobran said in his Foreword to "Why Johnny Can't Think," all we can do for those out-of-date liberals and conservatives is to quote, "Give them the horselaugh they deserve" unquote.

The future of politics is entirely racial. In the meantime, you can help me laugh the old fogies out of the way.

June 5, 2004 NOTHING

July June 12, 2004 -- Do I Have Anything Useful to Say About Reagan?
July June 12, 2004 -- You Have to be Genius to be a Village Idiot in Washington

Fun Quote:

I am going to a convention in Pigeon Forge, Tennessee this weekend. I was really worried about finding a hotel room.

That's Dollywood, and when that woman takes a deep breath there ain't a hell of a lot of room left in Pigeon Forge.

Do I Have Anything Useful to Say About Reagan?

Someone said that since I was a Reagan appointee I should say something about Reagan.

The problem is that asking me about the Reagan Administration is like asking a minnow to give you a General Theory of Ocean Currents.

But after thinking about it, I came up with one thing I can talk about that relates to Reagan as a man and my personal experience. I played the Naive Southerner. Reagan played the Dumb Irishman.

When I saw high officials in Washington, the only boss I ever had who understood why he dragged me along was John Ashbrook. One of my bosses would always say, "Bob's doing good work, he deserves to come along."

The idea being that since Bobby had been a good boy, he couldn't take him to see an elephant but he could take him to see a Secretary of Defense.

So how did I react to this?

I was playing a kind of village idiot. There is a smart guy who would always show people how dumb the village idiot was. He would take people to watch while he offered the village idiot the choice between a great big nickel and a tiny dime. The idiot would always choose the big old nickel and the guy would get a good laugh.

Finally someone took pity on the poor village idiot and explained him that the tiny dime was worth twice as much as the big, shiny nickel.

The village idiot replied, "But if I ever take the dime, he won't offer me any more nickels."

I got a lot of nickels. I chuckled all the way to the back.

When comic characters made fun of Reagan by portraying him as dumb and kind of harmless and helpless, nobody laughed harder at them than Ronald Reagan did.

You see, he was laughing at them from his residence inside the White House.

That's one hell of a nickel.

You Have to be Genius to be the Village Idiot in Washington

If you think it is easy to play the Naive Irishman or Southerner in a murderous environment like the world's greatest center of power in Washington, look at how easily professionals make fools of themselves in public. Look at how enormously costly television ads portray Youth, for instance.

In one huge national real estate ad, the Young People is a young white man of around eighteen. When he talks, he moves his hands like a rap singer. They portray Youth by having a white kid be black.

In the real world, everybody knows that any white kid who tries to be black is a laughable loser.

The guy on the computer ads is the only one who managed to be white youth. He acts very young but without a trace of black. He was a huge success.

If you try to be Dumb Irishman, in DC, you had better be very, very, VERY good at it. Getting caught in an act like that makes you, at best, a laughing stock, and at worst, you are exposed as shallow trickster and you are out, out, out. And that's just on Capitol Hill.

Try it in the Oval Office and you had better be damned good.

Reagan was damned good.

He started with the liberal idea that they are smart. There is nothing dumber than a dumb man who thinks he's smart. But there is also nothing nastier than a dumb man who sees that he is being made fun of.

So Reagan threw the sitting Democratic president out of office in 1980 and took the Senate away from them for the first time in a quarter century. And the liberals told each other how dumb Reagan was. He destroyed the Soviet Empire and lowered taxes, and liberal comedians made fun of him on liberal-run networks.

Reagan knew more about real history and practical international affairs than any five Harvard professors combined. But he just sat there and listened while people who wanted to be big-time advisors made complete asses of themselves saying things he knew weren't true or were hopelessly muddled.

He picked people who were not fools. So liberals said, "Reagan is dumb. He just has smart advisors."

So Washington's Village Idiot just sat there in the White House and laughed.

June 19, 2004 -- Kerry's Two Fatal Problems

June 19, 2004 -- Beasley Vote Exposes Fake South Carolina "Christians"

June 19, 2004 -- From Bob's Blog: Religious Leaders Routinely Sell You Out

Check out the latest on Bob's Blog.

Fun Quote:

For a guy Bob's age to be chasing young women is exactly like a dog chasing a truck.

The chase would make him feel good, but if he caught her, it would kill him.

Kerry's Two Fatal Problems

I explained to you before how Bill Clinton sunk Howard Dean:

March 6, 2004 -- Did Clinton Destroy Dean?

You will read that NOWHERE else.

Now let me explain to you the real reason Kerry was so desperate to get John McCain to be his vice presidential nominee.

Kerry knows that it will be a miracle if he is elected in November. First of all, trying to convince people that anyone with the title "Massachusetts Democrat" is not a bug-eyed leftist is like trying to explain that a person who is an active member of the Nazi Party and the Ku Klux Klan will appoint a Jewish Secretary of State.

Everybody knows that. But that is not Kerry's biggest problem. If Bush stumbles so badly that Kerry leads in October, he faces more dangerous difficulties.

Kerry has two other factors that will kill him if he is leading in the polls in October, and both of those factors have the same last name. To give you a hint what that last name is, I'll tell you that their first names are Bill and Hillary.

If Kerry is leading in October Bill and Hillary will be up there arm in arm with him, smiling and speaking his praises. In the background, Bill will destroy him.

Bill and Hillary wouldn't mind so much if Kerry himself won in 2004. Hillary can wait until 2012, and the extra four years would give her a more solid reputation for political experience on her own. What the Clintons are worried about is having a vice president elected with Kerry in 2004 who will get the Democratic nomination in 2012..

The vice president elected in 2004 will be heir-apparent for the Democratic nomination in 2012 whether Kerry wins or loses in 2008. The last person the Clintons want Hillary to battle against for the Democratic nomination in 2012 is John Edwards. Edwards is a young Bill Clinton -- Southerner, moderate, optimism and all.

John McCain would have been the perfect vice presidential running mate to save Kerry from the two fatal problems named Clinton. The Democrats would not nominate him for president in 2012 and he would be too old anyway.

If Kerry didn't get McCain as his vice presidential running mate, John Edwards would be the obvious choice. He has the geographical appeal Kerry needs, he has the light-hearted humor and optimism and personal appeal Kerry lacks. And every one of those advantages is exactly what will make the Clintons destroy him and Kerry if they run together.

Now that Kerry can't get McCain, he may still not choose Edwards because he knows the Clintons will fight to the death to prevent their election. If he does choose someone besides Edwards, the press will wonder loudly about why he didn't.

Now you know.

You won't see this anywhere but on whitakeronline.ORG because damned few people know it but Bob Whitaker.

Professional political analysts in the media get their jobs because they say the right thing, not because they know anything about real politics.

Beasley Vote Exposes Fake South Carolina "Christians"

David Beasley is leading in the race for the Republican nomination for United States Senate from South Carolina. He got 36% of the vote in the primary and is shooting for a majority in the runoff.

Beasley's plurality shows that the South Carolina Republican Party is beyond redemption. And I mean that literally.

In 1998 Beasley won the governorship by a narrow margin because he demanded that the Confederate flag that flew over the capitol building since 1963 be allowed to stay there. There was a big movement to take it down, and a huge movement to keep it up.

But even before he was elected in 1998 there was talk about his getting a cabinet post if Republicans won the presidency in 2000, and even getting the vice presidential nomination.

It was generally felt Beasley could not get a national post if he did not denounce the Confederate flag. But he had to have that Confederate flag vote to win the governorship in November of 1998.

Everybody always says to Republicans that "Conservatives have nowhere else to go," so it was taken for granted that if Beasley dropped his support of the flag as soon as possible after he was elected governor in November of 1998, he would be in a position to get a national post if Republicans won in 2000.

Since "conservatives have nowhere else to go," it was assumed that by his reelection bid in 2002, flag supporters would have forgotten that he had abandoned them, and they would have nowhere else to go anyway.

But if flag supporters were to forget Beasley sold them out by 2002, he had to do the sellout as fast as possible after he got their vote in November of 1998.

To be considered for a national post if Republicans won in 2000, Beasley also had to abandon the Confederate flag as soon as possible after his election in November of 1998.

So in December of 1998, governor-elect David Beasley announced that he had spent the entire night on his knees, and God had told him to switch sides on the Confederate flag. Bill Schneider, the political analyst on CNN, gave Beasley "The Political Play of the Week" for this perfectly timed switch.

Not "The Religious Play of the Week." The POLITICAL Play of the Week.

Schneider did not mention that God Almighty had been the political advisor who dictated this Political Play of the Week. It never even occurred to him to believe that.

I was the only person in the State of South Carolina who even mentioned that this was blasphemy. Pro-flaggers thought Beasley was great. Anti-flaggers thought he was awful. But only I discussed this blasphemy in whitakeronline.ORG.

South Carolina is chock full of people who scream that their politics were "Of the Lord", that they speak only "Of The Lord" and they speak only "For the Lord". Yet I, who never says he speaks for the Lord, was the ONLY one who mentioned Beasley's open blasphemy.

Bob Jones, the Fourth or the Eleventh, or whoever it is who owns the Bob Jones religion business now, had never thought the flag had offended anybody until all the business leaders and Republicans went against it. When that happened Bob Jones, the Whatever, decided the flag offended blacks and switched with the tide. He never mentioned Beasley's convenient blasphemy.

He never will.

From Bob's Blog: Religious Leaders Routinely Sell You Out

June 18, 2004

One reader asked me how I could be so optimistic about a future in which whites are a threatened minority when the Afrikaners have made no resistance at all to black violence when they lost power in and are now a whiny subject people.

Here is my reply:

To start with, we South Carolinians DID toss out the black majority backed by Federal troops under Reconstruction after we lost power in the Civil War.

We South Carolinians did not follow our leaders like lambs to the slaughter. Afrikaners VOTED to turn their country over to the blacks! I was there, warning them. They are followers. Their Calvinist Leaders told them to give in, so they did. Now their Calvinist Leaders are getting Nobel Prizes, Board of Directors jobs, and getting the hell out of South Africa. Their followers are getting what all blind followers get in the end.

Preachers and politicians will always sell you out the minute they smell a profit in it.

Afrikaners now see themselves as Damsels in Distress, pure as the driven snow types who trusted in promises and were betrayed.

You can either learn from this that All Is Lost, or you can learn that we must dump our trust in leaders right now.

And, to be frank, they sound a lot like you, "Oh, God, it's all HOPELESS! You can't prove to me there's any hope. All us tough, practical types can do is surrender!"

For me, the Boers (even the ones who live in Johannesburg call themselves that) present white optimists like me the same problem that the Chernobyl disaster did for the American nuclear power industry. It is simply not the same thing, but that is very hard to explain.

<http://www.whitakeronline.org/blog.htm>

June 26, 2004 -- How to Help "Why Johnny Can't Think"

June 26, 2004 -- E-Mail Exchange With a Black Whitakerlone.ORG Reader

Fun Quote:

Conservatives demand religion in politics.

Liberals demand politics in religion.

How to Help "Why Johnny Can't Think"

If you would like to really help the cause of promoting Why Johnny Can't Think: America's Professor-Priesthood we have a tremendous opportunity, but you must act quickly. You can order 100 copies for only \$200, including shipping in the continental US. But we have to have your commitment this week. The book is going to press, and we can only maintain this price (which is still below cost) if we have the books shipped directly to you from the printer. Everything you need to know can be found at <http://www.readbob.com/> which also has a downloadable preview copy of Why Johnny Can't Think: America's Professor-Priesthood.

E-Mail Exchange With a Black Whitakeronline.ORG Reader

From Bob:

Subject: This is What I Wrote in a White Racist Discussion Group:

It will not be long before all national spokesmen will be spokesmen for their racial groups, and that includes whites. Nobody seems to take enough time out of their sobbing and crying over how all is lost to look at this simple fact.

My press man in Washington used to dine regularly with Stokeley Carmichel, the founder of the Black Panthers, at an Ethiopian restaurant. He and we were racial separatists, so we kept in contact and talked about the interests of our respective groups.

That was just a good idea then, but it is practical politics now, and it is becoming more and more practical politics every day.

Every day, as minorities grow in power, they are becoming tired of their role as Tonto to the liberal Lone Ranger, faithful non-white companions to their White Heroes. That crap is as out-of-date as the word "Negro" that Stokeley Carmichael got rid of.

A "Negro" was a Little White Man, a Jackie Robinson or Harry Belafonte type that a Nelson Rockefeller or some other rich liberal got a self-righteous thrill out of because they let the "Negroes" eat dinner with the Great Liberal Himself and the Great Liberal Himself told the "Negro" magnanimously that he would be happy to let a "Negro" date his daughter.

Them days is gone forever and they get gonier by the hour.

The future belongs to the whites who stop whining and start talking in terms of hard, friendly, RACIAL bargaining.

If you want to be part of the leadership in the age that we are actually living in, stop being a second-string conservative and talking about fighting gay marriage or sending out frantic e-mails about the Iraq War, pro- or anti-.

Talk about what we want as whites, which is to save our race.

Jews have been viciously anti-white. That is the beginning of my interest in Jews, and that is the end of my interest in Jews. David Duke's "Jewish Supremacism" is dead on target. EVERYBODY is sick of Jewish self-righteousness and self-pity, not just whites.

Jews have been stupid. They have now made it inevitable that Europe will have a Moslem majority, a majority that hates Jews more than Hitler ever did.

But today Jews are no more anti-white than the Methodist Church or National Review. We have other fish to fry.

BIG fish.

Today worrying yourself sick about liberals and conservatives is just as stupid as worrying yourself sick over the leadership of the Whig Party would have been in 1853. In 1853 the Whig Party actually had a president sitting in the White House. That president's name was Millard Fillmore.

Remember Millard Fillmore?

Neither does anybody else, and that's my point.

The Whig Party could not deal with a racial problem called slavery, and three years after Millard Fillmore left office, the Whig Party ceases to exist.

Stop talking about Millard Fillmore Bush and position yourself to be the racial spokesmen of the new age.

REPLY by black man who reads WOL and who is originally from South Carolina:

Do you think a lot of people will understand your message? Like the old adage goes, "You can lead a horse to water, but you can't make him drink." You know I have analyzed that and, "If you ride him hard enough, when you get to the water you won't have to make him drink."

MY REPLY to the above was:

I like the way you think. What makes you valuable to me is the fact that you DO think.

I LOVE that last sentence. It is pure South Carolina.

You are right, and I had never thought of it. Why the hell should you make a horse drink? He knows if he is thirsty.

As always with my messages, damned few will understand it, but they will remember it when things get serious. Right now everybody wants to hear about the Latest Thing from Iraq and the latest news about Millard Fillmore Bush.

That doesn't matter to me in the slightest. When they need it, some version of my advice will occur to people. It has happened many times before. You would be astonished how many of my ideas have influenced national policy for the good long after I gave it, and nobody knew it but me.

I'm the one I have to live with, so I am very, very glad I gave the right advice long before anybody remembered it when it counted. A conscience is an awful burden, and I deeply regret the times I concentrated on the moment, mostly to make a living, and I didn't plant the seed I could have planted.

People died because I didn't do that. Millions of people are suffering right now because I didn't do that when I could have.

Power like this is a hell of a burden. It doesn't matter whether others know I have it or not. I am the one I have to answer to.

HIS REPLY TO THE ABOVE:

Quote from the above,

"That doesn't matter to me in the slightest. When they need it, some version of my advice will occur to people. It has happened many times before. You would be astonished how many of my ideas have influenced national policy for the good long after I gave it, and nobody knew it but me."

No, Bob, I wouldn't be astonished. I can imagine how many original thoughts you have mustered. It takes someone like you to whisper in someone's ear. Then they can't give you credit, so at the next meeting, it just happens to come out of there mouth. Afterwards comes the onset of amnesia, and they can't remember where they heard it.

Then they can't give you credit, so at the next meeting, it just happens to come out of there mouth. Afterwards comes the onset of amnesia, and they can't remember where they heard it.

MY FINAL REPLY:

You have it exactly. That is conscious trade I made. That is real power.

While someone else gets one idea and fights to get it accepted, I put it in the right places and, to use your excellent, analogy, just let the horse get thirsty on his own.

My wife used to go ballistic about this. She would see someone in Washington or New York, once again, "come up" with what I said years before and get credit for it, and she would fume at it.

I could never explain to her that I lived to have my ideas "stolen."

I played the Southern dolt to get what I wanted done. I put my ideas out there to get "stolen" to get my way. I just threw away the last shred of my decades-long reputation for distancing myself from extremists to get my word where it can now do the most good.

Many a professional soldier will take any physical risk, but he will back down at any threat to his career. Many brave men cannot face embarrassment. I have said things that needed to be said when no one else will say it.

I made my choice a long time ago. I fought for our people, yours and my own much more.

I consider myself a real hero. As I move into old age, there is greater reward in the world than to consider myself a hero.

I want readers of WOL to see what real power is and what the real reward is. Can I quote your words to lead into it?

He agreed.

LAST NOTE TO WOL READERS:

Can you imagine how much better off American blacks would be today if they chose leaders like my friend here rather than the liberal talking-heads they do?

July 3, 2004 -- Great News on "Why Johnny Can't Think!"

July 3, 2004 -- OK, Gang, It's Time to Get Serious!

Fun Quote:

They say that the road to Hell is paved with good intentions.

How can the Devil pave with good intentions when he doesn't have any?

Great News on "Why Johnny Can't Think!"

All about my book is at

readbob.com and whyJohnny.com

We have a TEAM!

A lot of people look at the list o things I have done in my life and wonder how how one man could do all that.

One many DIDN'T do all that. I am good at team play.

When I find competent, dedicated, intelligent people I don't just "delegate" authority to them, I DUMP authority ON them.

This requires something which is a theme of whitakeronline.ORG. When you delegated authority you are taking a risk. To take that risk requires MORAL courage.

In my case the moral courage is somewhat less because I know that the chances are better that I will screw things up than that the people I delegate authority. But let's ignore that and say Old Bob is just very, very brave.

I told you before that I did two books before for major publishers, one of which was used as a textbook in private schools. But a month after a publisher had signed up to take "Why Johnny Can't Think: America's Professor-Priesthood," they said that not only were they backing out of the contract, they were destroying all correspondence relating to it!

Straight out of George Orwell!

I have never had such a thing happen to me. In fact, I have never even HEARD of such a thing happening to any writer.

So there was only me and my editor-agent to do the book ourselves.

The my editor-agent got sent to Iraq!

I was tired and I was alone.

Please see

February 28, 2004 -- The Book is Out and I'm Scared Half to Death

February 28, 2004 -- Bob's Written Books Before, Why Was This One So Hard to Get Published?

February 28, 2004 -- This is the Easiest Book to Read That Ever Was Written

February 28, 2004 -- Uncle Bob Needs YOU!!

But the book has sold a few copies on Amazon.com and on special order from book stores and a team of intelligent people has taken it over for me, every one of them an unpaid volunteer.

We now have the final proofs in and a new printing of 3,000 copies is on schedule for July 15 or thereabouts. Then we can really offer some good deals on the book. The copy-by-copy publishing we had to resort to before was very expensive, but now we can really get started, offering 100 copies for \$200, including shipping AT FIRST so groups can sell it at a profit.

If groups make money selling "Why Johnny Can't Think: America's Professor-Priesthood," which costs about \$12 right now including shipping, I would be delighted.

Whitakeronline readers are spending a lot more than \$200 a year right now in taxes on the professor-priesthood that I am trying to destroy, much less on the social programs they cause, so you could do me a big favor by buying a hundred and handing them out. There is more on this below.

Private schoolers and home schoolers face a serious problem when they leave home and are subject to the leftist professors at the universities. This book was written to solve that problem. If they read it they can not only deal with leftist professors and students, they can make life a living hell for them by laughing them out of existence.

I WAS a professor. All students love to ridicule professors, and after reading "Why Johnny Can't Thin," a student can lead the laughter in the dormitories.

For home schoolers, this little book is not just a defense. It is a WEAPON..

readbob.com and whyJohnny.com

OK, Gang, It's Time to Get Serious !

"Why Johnny Can't Think: America's Professor-Priesthood" is dedicated to "the readers of whitakeronline.ORG

Let's get this straight once and for all. I am the writer and the talking head here. YOU are the team.

Here are our marching orders, straight from the man we are so lucky to have take on this job, not for money, but for the cause:

Bob,

As part of your WOL article this week, I'd like to suggest that you add the following list of suggested actions for your readers. Ask each reader to take on one or more tasks. Many will require NO outlay of money, so there is NO excuse for anyone who considers himself a WOL loyalist not to pitch in.

Deb will put up a webpage at www.whyjohnny.com that will have prices for buying the books in various quantities. Make sure that your webmaster includes that link in your article.

Deb will explain on that page that books are currently available from Amazon, and that WOL will be selling them directly, with orders shipping in mid-July. She will also put up some simple forms that will allow "volunteers" to let you know what they are going to do. All you need to do is ask them to respond so that we have an idea of who is actually out there and willing to help.

Feel free to clean this up however you think best, and add or take away as needed. Deb may want to chime in as well.

List of Actions:

Buy quantities of books to distribute/sell/give away.

Put an ad for the book in a local publication, school yearbook, college newspaper, community newspaper, etc. Just think how perfect an ad in a high school yearbook would be for this book. What a gift to all the students. WOL will provide the ad material.

Call a local radio station and mention the book and the website *Read Bob dot com*. Say it just like this: *Read Bob dot com* (put this in italics) Don't try to give out *Whitakeronline.org* because it is much harder to spell. Radio listeners must be able to remember the website name and spell it correctly without writing it down. If you can, ask the talk show host to interview the author.

Send us information on local talk shows in your area. We mean local, please don't tell us that Rush Limbaugh is on from noon to 3PM on WXYZ. Send us the call letters, name of the talk show host, time slot, and any other relevant information. They don't have to be favorable or agree with WOL, we need anyone who will talk about the book. Use the form on www.whyjohnny.com (put link in)

Send us information on any local publications you know of dealing that are conservative, or deal with home schooling, or that you think would be agreeable to having Bob write an article or might print something about the book. If possible, send us a copy of that publication to the mailing address on www.whyjohnny.com

Write a letter to the editor to your local paper, community paper, or anything else you think appropriate. We can help you put one together if you are not confident. Hey, the president has speech writers, so don't feel bad about it.

COLLEGE CAMPUSES: If you live near a college campus (which most people do) please let us know if you would be willing to put up flyers (which WOL will provide for you to download and print or copy). If you know any students on campus, we will assume that you have already told them about the book and WOL, so if they like it, have them get involved in promoting it on campus. Bob will even come and speak if they can get it set up. Please fill in the form on www.whyjohnny.com and let us know which campus you are willing to work with.

We are going to make a big splash on college campuses this fall. You don't want to miss the fun! But we need "feet on the street" to pull it off.

HOME SCHOOL NETWORKS: If you know anyone involved with home schooling, we assume you have already told them about the book. Ask them if they can share the information with their network (almost ALL home schoolers are tied in to a local network). Please let us know if you will do this.

CHURCH GROUPS: Put a book in your church library, tell your Sunday School class about it, if nothing else have them pray for poor ol Bob's soul.

Public Library: Go to your local library and ask them to buy the book and make it available. You can donate one to them if they will take it.

Reader Suggestions: Send us ideas you have for getting the word out, with the caveat that we have no more resources or time than anyone else.

July 10, 2004 -- Why Johnny Can't Think is Ready to Ship

July 10, 2004 -- Don't You DARE Forward Me Any More Crap About Pornography!

July 10, 2004 -- The Total Difference Between Nazism and Communism that Only Bob Whitaker Will Mention

July 10, 2004 -- Today's Leaders See Nothing Wrong With Killing People

Fun Quote:

I don't like to badmouth people when they're not there.

I hate to waste a perfectly good insult on somebody's back.

Why Johnny Can't Think is Ready to Ship

WOL readers are getting on board and buying copies of Why Johnny Can't Think to spread around. I wrote the book for you, and you are the ones who are making all the difference. The books will ship out from the printer next Tuesday, and once that happens, the fun really begins.

We are going to keep up the buy 100 copies for \$200 offer until the last possible moment. We have to finalize our shipment list by Monday morning. My volunteer staff will be up late to process these orders.

We are selling these books at dead cost to give everyone who wants to take part the chance to do so.

Go to ReadBob.com. As long as the online order form is still active there, we can take your order.

Don't You DARE Forward Me Any More Crap About Pornography!

True to its founder Bill Gates' shouted-out liberalism, Microsoft now has a special program called "mixed messages," promoting racially mixed couples

<http://www.msnmessenger-download.com/mixedmessages/>

Mixed couples produce ugly, unnatural children who have to live their whole lives looking like something their black daddy, who wants blonds, wouldn't look at.

So my readers keep worrying about pornography and homosexual marriage.

Homosexual couples are sterile. They are far, far more moral than the black-white heterosexual couple, no matter how many priests wave their arms over them and no matter how many holy words they babble. The Marriage at Cana was stringently limited to the marriage of two Jews. That was the one Jesus blessed.

Jesus did not criticize this stringent limitation on the marriage He blessed.

It never occurred to anybody that Jesus would comment on something like that...Marriage rules were not what He was here about.

But Sean Hannity says that Christ died on the cross for interracial dating. If it helps promote Political Correctness, what's wrong with a little blasphemy?

Bill O'Reilly has said repeatedly that the Founders meant for the government to require interracial dating because they called it "the UNITED States of America." He says it over and over and over. The government, he says, should SPONSOR interracial dances.

Alan Dershowitz is worried to death about Jews marrying non-Jews. There have been ads in the New York Times from organizations dedicated to getting Jews together for marriage:
"Jews, Be Jewish!"

Alan Dershowitz was on a talk show with Pat Buchanan during which he lambasted whites who objected to black guys kissing white girls on television. Buchanan sat there looking guilty. He agreed that such objections were just awful.

But our folks were not scared to object to a lesbian kiss. Conservatives gave them permission to object to that. This is the kind of moral courage the pathetic paper-hat crowd that calls itself The Greatest Generation showed..

See

June 5, 2004 -- D-Day, June 6, 1944

Conservatives and liberals push interracial pornography and the only person anybody complains to is me.

Nobody but me talks about this pornography publicly. But my readers always make me one of the mass of recipients they send forwarded messages to just to show they are part of the anti-pornography herd when it's safe.

I DESPISE people who send me that crap. I respect homos a LOT more.

The Total Difference Between Nazism and Communism

The big difference between Nazi dictatorships and Communist dictatorships is that there ARE no Nazi dictatorships. When leftists carried Viet Cong flags in the 1960s, they were supporting a country that was killing American troops.

The Love Generation called American troops "baby killers" and "hired killers." They called the families of Americans serving in Vietnam and told them falsely that their sons had been killed in action.

When Americans went to the Soviet Union to speak to captive audiences, they then jumped on a plane and left the Soviet Union. The people they were talking to would have been shot down in cold blood if they had tried to escape. No one who went to the Soviet Union "in the name of peace" ever mentioned that.

They never thought about it.

They never cared about it.

Today's Leaders See Nothing Wrong With Killing People

According to liberals, the only problem with Nazism is that it was racist.

Communism, on the other hand, is just misguided Idealism. They're just a bit too rough about it.

That is the ruling doctrine of our society. In their "Dear Commandante" letter, liberal congressmen made it clear that Fidel Castro was a man we could deal with. Above all, Castro and the Chinese Communists and the Vietnamese are people we should do lots and lots of business with.

At the same time, those same liberals are still chasing down every company that did business with Hitler over sixty years ago.

There is nothing wrong with doing business with totalitarians who kill people and have concentration camps. The only thing that matters is the IDEOLOGY those totalitarians follow.

I was watching a British documentary which showed film footage of the at least 200,000 children that Communist North Korea is systematically starving to death. If the Koreans carrying the hidden cameras had been caught, they would have been shot.

Ted Kennedy demands that we have direct negotiations with the North Korean Government. Why get all upset about a couple of hundred thousand kids?

Stalin starved millions of Ukrainians to death. When Mel Gibson compared Stalin's starvation of Ukrainian kulaks to Hitler killing Jews, Alan Colmes was terribly upset. He said there was no comparison between starving a bunch of Ukrainians in the name of Socialist Idealism and killing Jews in the name of racism.

Another observation only Bob Whitaker will make:

If the North Korean Government were systematically starving two hundred thousand JEWISH children to death, the United States Marines would be on their coast right now, atomic bombs be damned.

And Teddy Kennedy would demand that anyone who wanted to negotiate with North Korea be tried as a War Criminal.

The next time someone tells you all children are equally precious, try THAT out on them.

July 17, 2004 -- To Stop Terrorism, Start by Getting Religion Out of Politics

July 17, 2004 -- The Price of "Social Progress"

July 17, 2004 -- Another Result of Integration

July 17, 2004 -- The Integration Mania Distorts the Sciences

Fun Quote:

When they make me King, I will have the following people shot:

1) People who can eat all they want without gaining weight;

- 2) People who can sleep any time they want to;
- 3) People who are smarter than me. This will solve the population problem for at least a century.
- 4) People who are better looking than me. See point 3) and make that "centuries."
- 5) Anybody who thinks he would make a better King than me.

When all this is done the only people left will be me, the beautiful women I allow to survive, and whoever comes up with an improved kind of Viagra.

To Stop Terrorism, Start by Getting Religion Out of Politics

There is a lot of talk about how religion should not rule in political matters. But not one of the 535 members of congress ever objects to the fact that our entire Middle East policy is based on the idea that God gave the homeland of Arab Palestinians to the Jews.

There are lots of guns behind the idea that Israel has the right to exist. But underneath that is the simple fact that this is an evil, theocratic religious idea that the United States is forcing on the Middle East. They will never accept Israel because its existence is wrong.

We are forcing our religion on the Moslem world. All the shrieks that they are forcing their religion on others can't hide that.

The Price of "Social Progress"

Here's a baseball story you won't read anywhere else.

The Brooklyn Dodgers was the first team to hire a black man to play in the major league. That is well known. They fought the ridiculous idea that integration would have disastrous and unforeseen consequences.

Something else that is well known is that the Brooklyn Dodgers no longer exist. As Los Angeles tried to obtain the Dodgers team, Brooklyn faced a major problem: in order to keep the Dodgers, they would have to build a new stadium for them to play in.

You see, the old Brooklyn Dodgers stadium was smack in the middle of an area that had become a black ghetto. Fans were afraid to come there.

That is why the Brooklyn Dodgers no longer exist.

Back when I went to Columbia High School in South Carolina, my nickname was "Federal Troops." I was a well-known alarmist about integration. The World War II generation which calls itself The Greatest Generation said that their beloved Federal Government would never use troops against Americans. I said that the Feds would enforce integration at the point of a bayonet.

I remember coming back to school from lunch and somebody shouted, "Federal troops!."

Well, like the Brooklyn Dodgers, Columbia High School no longer exists. There is new school called Columbia High School a mile away. The brick building in which I was ridiculed for being an alarmist about integration became a black school, notoriously dangerous, so they tore it down.

It's a parking lot now.

Another Result of Integration Mania

If you don't know what the Sullivan Case was, you need to. Bill O'Reilly was bitching about it the other day. O'Reilly is upset that anyone can defame and lie about and even destroy a public figure without being sued.

The Supreme Court said that anybody could defame and destroy any public figure in a case called The New York Times versus Sullivan, 1962. Sullivan was a segregationist official in Birmingham Alabama, and under the law as it stood then, as it had always stood, Sullivan had the New York Times dead to rights. The New York Times had lied about him and he had been hurt so badly that he could have collected huge damages.

But the one thing liberals were not going to do, whatever the cost, was to stop any liberal media from saying anything that would damage a segregationist. Sullivan has the New York Times dead to rights under the law, so the law had to be changed.

In order to protect the right of the New York Times to make up any story it wanted to against any segregationist, the Supreme Court had to make it simply impossible for any public figure to win any suit against anything the media did. So that is what the Supreme did.

As Lenin said, "If you want to make an omelet you have to break some eggs." So in the Sullivan Case, the Supreme Court broke a lot of eggs.

Sure the Supreme Court ignored the Constitution in the Sullivan Case. But the last person on earth who has a right to object to that is the integrationist fanatic Bill O'Reilly. He has repeatedly said that the Founding Fathers wanted the government to sponsor interracial dances because they called this country "The UNITED States of America." He repeats that endlessly.

Compared to that craziness the Sullivan Case represents a strict constructionist reading of the Constitution.

The Sullivan Case was just twisted. O'Reilly's idea that the Founding Fathers insisted on interracial dances is actually insane.

The Integration Mania Distorts the Sciences

Neanderthal Man was built for frigid climates. His had a large, flat nose designed to heat the frigid air before it reached his lungs. His diet consisted exclusively of meat to give him the huge number of calories to keep his body warm in the freezing lands of the Ice Age. His body was square and compact to minimize the surface area exposed to subzero temperatures.

The Science Channel recently had a documentary on how “Modern Man” replaced the Neanderthals. It showed black Africans in loin cloths moving in on the Neanderthals. The documentary said that Modern Men Came from Africa, so they must have been black.

Until the 1920s blacks died like flies in the Northern United States because their dark skins did not let them get enough of the “sunshine vitamin.” Vitamin D. And compared to the area where “modern man” drove out Neanderthal, those Northern states were Miami Beach in the middle of summer.

And even if “modern man” did come from Africa, it took them thousands of years to reach Neanderthal territory. No one with black skin could have lived that long in Europe in the Ice Age, even if he did wear more than a loin cloth.

This Science Channel picture of naked blacks invading Neanderthal territory is in the category of Bill O'Reilly's insistence that the Founding Fathers wanted government-sponsored interracial dancing or Hannity's insistence that Jesus died on the Cross for interracial dating. It makes the Sullivan Decision look like a minor transgression.

You may have to be nuts to be an integrationist, but it obviously helps.

July 24, 2004 -- The Most Amazing Thing About Communism

July 24, 2004 -- The Communist Conspiracy Was a Mess

July 24, 2004 -- The Greatest Victory Ever Won in Political Warfare Will Never be Recorded

Fun Quote:

Almost every emergency is the result of some failure by those who have been in charge.

The first thing everybody does when an emergency develops is to call in the experts.

And who are the experts?

The experts are those who have been in charge.

The Most Amazing Thing About Communism

As always, nobody but me ever notices the most incredible thing about Communism. It is such an enormous elephant in history's living room that no one will ever notice it.

Communism never accomplished ANYTHING. In Russia, an average population of two hundred million people over a period of seventy years did not produce one single thing. After Five Year Plan after Five Year Plan, the Russian economy today is about half the size of the economy of the Netherlands. The Russian economy of 1913 could have competed better in the world than the one Russia was left with when Communism fell.

There is not one single consumer good that anybody wants that came out of seventy years of Communism. Every single one of their "scientific" accomplishments came from their spies in the West.

Liberals hate that. What happened is very simple: a bunch of "intellectuals" like Lenin and Trotsky took over Russia and ran the economy according to "plans" made by people exactly like the leftist professors who rule our campuses today. What happened was what exactly what any rational person would know would happen. It was laughable.

Conservatives hate this. They want Communism to have been a great threat. It was, but not for the reasons a conservative is allowed to talk about, as I will explain in the next article.

Conservatives need for Communism to have been a great ECONOMIC power. In the early 1950s I was studying economics, and all the CIA reports showed how enormous the Soviet economy and how it was growing. This was Allen Dulles' CIA, there was nothing leftist about it.

A tiny group of economists fought this nonsense. One of them was my professor of Russian economics grad school, Dr. Warren Nutter. When I was there the University of Virginia graduate school was one of the most famous on earth. It was a sanctuary for conservative economists, so they got the best. Nutter was not one of the two in my graduate faculty who later got Nobel Prizes, but he was world famous.

One major reason I did not finish my dissertation was that the new dean who took over when I went off to teach had sworn he would clean out that nest of right-wingers. He did, so my professors went and won their Nobel Prized elsewhere.

But the total, no, the predictable and hilarious failure of Communism, a bunch of dumbass leftist college professors trying to do something, was a secret only we knew.

The CIA error was repeated by everybody. As I explain in detail in *Why Johnny Can't Think: America's Professor-Priesthood*, the CIA distortion was what liberals wanted to believe, so there were ten thousand professors ready to line up to swear it was true. The left and the right were both solidly behind this nonsense.

The only thing stupider than the left is the middle of the road, and Communism's great economic achievements was truly the middle of the road.

But we slowly won the argument. Even the CIA finally backed down and admitted how laughable Communist "economics" was by 1980. Finally, when the Soviet empire collapsed overnight, we saw the pitiful results.

The Communist Conspiracy Was a Mess

At the end of World War I it looked as if Communism would very soon own Europe. The people were desperate, actual starvation was everywhere. In that insane War, every traditional institution in Europe had totally discredited itself. The Communist thugs owned the streets.

Then various kinds of fascists took back the streets. They were called "nihilistic" because they did not back any ideology. They were a pure reaction to the Reds. Remember, every institution in Europe, businessmen, the church and all the rest had backed this pointless and insane disaster. At base, the fascist groups were nothing but a nose-to-nose confrontation with the Reds on the streets.

But soon Mussolini and the Hitlers and Francos and the Salazars began to turn these anti-Communist reactions into ideologies.

According to conservative, a well-oiled machine called the Communist Conspiracy now wheeled into position to fight back the threat. With over forty years knee-deep in this kind of political warfare I can tell you that's not the way it worked.

The Communist Conspiracy was a mess. This fascist reaction caught the Communists totally by surprise. Professional Communist intellectuals said not to worry about it. It was just blip on the screen in the inevitable march of the proletarian revolution. No one did more than Russia to help the German military machine avoid the restriction of the Versailles Treaty and keep up Germany's military power. German forces trained in Russia.

If you think the Communist Conspiracy is a well-oiled ingenious machine, you really need to read the books written about the Soviet Union saved German military strength after World War I. We are dealing with a movement run by a bunch of dumbass college professors and bookish revolutionaries like Lenin and thugs like Stalin who never did a thing in their whole lives that would teach them about reality.

Once again, what you read in whitakeronline is not even on the same planet with what you are used to reading about the whole history of Communism. What you hear from the left is that there were no Communist agents inside the United States and all over Europe working for the Soviet Union. So there could have been no worldwide Communist movement to undermine those fighting Communism.

On the right, you hear that the Roosevelt Administration was heavily infiltrated with Communists. Conservatives say that the whole political left in America and Western Europe was almost entirely dedicated to aiding Moscow.

Lenin openly referred to his legions of "useful fools" in business, but he also referred to them throughout the political left. He used them like puppets. Some of them knew it, some of them didn't.

When the KGB files opened after the fall of the Soviet Union, we found that the conservatives were righter than even Senator Joseph McCarthy had imagined.

In fact, even in the 1960s hundreds of thousands of Americans announced publicly that they were Communists all through the highest levels of academia and all the places McCarthy had been denounced for saying there were Communists.

So were the conservatives proved right? No.

What the conservatives were wrong about was certainly not the legions of Communists and Communist Front groups and "useful fools." What they were wrong about was the perfect machine called the Communist Conspiracy which took direct orders from the political geniuses in Moscow.

The CIA thought those dumbass professors could run an economy. Conservative thought those dumbass professors could run a Conspiracy.

The Greatest Victory Ever Won in Political Warfare Will Never be Recorded

Fascism grew in Europe and the Communist reaction to it was exactly wrong. No historian will ever mention it, but Communists put Adolf Hitler into power. After the 1932 German elections, the Communists and the Nazis had a majority of the German Parliament, the Reichstag. No government could be formed without either the totalitarian Communists or the totalitarian Nazis.

In 1932 the German Communists could have prevented Germany from becoming a one-party anti-Soviet country if they had concentrated on that and not demanded power. They told Germany, "You must choose, Hitler or Communism."

The Communist "intellectuals" had struck again. So Germany became Nazi. Hitler announced his plans, again, of making Russia into German Lebensraum. He and Japan signed the anti-Comintern Pact.

And the brilliant, perfectly coordinated, ingenious, well-oiled International Communist Conspiracy STILL didn't get it.

God, I feel for the sane Communists of those days! They were looking straight at the destruction of their whole system and the Leftist Homeland, and their geniuses and experts didn't see a damned thing.

Remember, no one in the whole multibillion-dollar complex of Soviet Analysis had the slightest idea in 1985 that the entire Soviet Empire and the Soviet Union itself would disappear in five years, and no one has had the slightest criticism of that fact. You NEVER become an expert by being right.

But out in the sticks, some Bob Whitaker types on the far left were doing something about it. I cannot put a lifetime of experience into a book, let alone an article, so let me tell you in comic form what happened. One of these days, this is going to be how history records what happened.

All that stood between Hitler and Russia was Poland, a country which had been divided between different countries in Europe so many times they had lost count. It had been put back together by the Versailles Treaty in 1919, and it lay between Stalin's USSR and Hitler's German Reich. By 1938 the Versailles Treaty had fallen apart and everybody knew Poland was going to go back to being German territory or Soviet territory. After World War II it became Soviet territory.

Soviet survival hung by a thread. And what were revolutionary Geniuses in Moscow doing? They were still working with Hitler. There is a bizarre bit of Marxist theory that explains this, but we don't have time.

In that decisive moment, someone had been grooming Stalin's savior. There was a guy named Winston Churchill. He was a big name in Britain and had been personally responsible for the total insane disaster of Gallipoli in the First World War. His father had been a big man in the British Government and had ruined himself by quitting the Parliament because he was upset. They never asked him back and he lost all power and retired from politics.

Winston Churchill had just done the same thing. He was in retirement, his political career ruined.

Talk about a "useful fool" let me tell you about this Churchill guy. Everybody could see that America towered over the world to the west of Europe. International Communism was a major power in every country in Europe and the Soviet Union was ready to take over Eastern Europe if they could get Hitler out of the way.

So how did Churchill view the whole situation? Churchill was obsessed by the "Balance of power" in Europe. This "balance of power" was the theory Britain had adhered to when Europe was master of the world. It was why Britain spent twenty years defeating Napoleon. As far as Churchill was concerned, the only real problem was this new Napoleon over in Germany.

Churchill said, "I would ally myself with Satan Himself to defeat Napoleon, I mean Hitler."

This was the guy who could save the Leftist Homeland!

It was a VERY close call. If Churchill had not demanded war against Hitler, and Hitler alone, after Hitler and Stalin divided up Poland, the entire German Army would have been all the way to Siberia in a couple of years. The Japanese would have met them somewhere in Siberia.

There is much more to the story. Hitler's ambassador in Japan was a Stalinist, and he had more to do with destroying the Third Reich than any of the Moscow Geniuses. The daughter of the American ambassador to Berlin in the 1930s was a Stalinist. These two facts have been a matter of public record since the 1940s. Even the most liberal historian will not deny them.

With all this on their side, the Experts and Geniuses of the Communist Conspiracy not only didn't save the Soviet Union, they stood in the way the whole time. It's one hell of a story.

And it will never be told.

July 31, 2004 -- Faithful Colored Companions

July 31, 2004 -- Why Reagan Gave So Little Attention To Pro-Lifers

July 31, 2004 -- A Little Historical Note You Won't See Anywhere Else

Fun Quote:

When I was young and went out on a date, I only had one thing on my mind.

I wish I could remember what it was.

Faithful Colored Companions

Every year the Democratic Party spends millions to get out the black vote. They assume that one black skin equals one Democratic vote.

Blacks will sometimes give a heavy vote to a Republican when the Republican gets 70% of the rest of the vote. They joined the Eisenhower landslides in 1952 and 1956 and they joined in the last Bush landslide for governor of Texas. That's what makes Republican strategists throw away real votes to "appeal to the black vote."

But when blacks join in the landslide, it doesn't matter. The election would have been won without them.

Blacks never vote Republican when it counts. In every real electoral contest, a black skin means a Democratic vote.

Why Reagan Gave So Little Attention To Pro-Lifers

Pro-lifers were instrumental in Reagan's victory in 1980. Certainly Reagan was opposed to abortion, not only personally but politically. His door was always open to the Jerry Falwells and other activists. But Reagan didn't push their legislation, and he kept them at arm's length.

Let me tell you why.

Those of us who fought for the lives of unborn babies always worried about "Nelly Grey bunch." These were the pro-lifers who demanded that all abortions be banned regardless of the health of the mother or rape. You couldn't pass legislation like that, and none of us wanted to. A raped girl shouldn't have to have the rapist's child.

But the "Nelly Grey bunch" didn't care if all legislation was defeated and unborn babies would die as long as they could be ideologically pure.

That was the nastiest kind of callousness posing as Idealism. But no one in the pro-life movement would call them on it. That made them the kind of people you didn't want to be too close to.

Today the pro-life movement is once again being totally callous and cruel, and no one inside that group will say so.

A lot of people make a living off of the pro-life movement, just like a lot of people make a living from the NAACP. But the NAACP has no function any more, so it makes its money attacking Confederate flags. Those who profit from pro-life are in the same position.

Yes, they were successful in outlawing partial birth abortions. But the courts will knock that down.

Now that they are stymied on any real accomplishments, all the pro-life hangers-on can do is block medical research, and that is what they are doing. They started off trying to outlaw cloning, now they are fighting to outlaw all research that could kill any fertilized embryo.

While I was in Washington their big push was to ban in vitro fertilization. Over thirty thousand of today's Americans are the products of in vitro fertilization, and their parents could not have children otherwise. The pro-life movement never mentions its battle to ban in vitro fertilization.

I have been warned repeatedly to avoid criticizing any of this. I am told that anybody who is pro-life will go to pieces at any criticism.

I couldn't care less. I don't coddle nutcases.

As long as pro-lifers walk around with this "I am an a Nut" button on their lapels, the cause of unborn children is doomed.

The group that calls itself The Greatest Generation included a lot of people who strutted around in their ridiculous little paper army hats declaring that their comrades died to make Europe a multiracial society

and to impose racial integration. Not one member of this group that proclaimed itself Heroes and Patriots had the guts to call these clowns down.

Today pro-lifers sit there silent while kooks block serious medical research in their name.

The paper hat crowd has to admit that every single word I say about them is true. Their only defense is to throw a fit when I say it.

Pro-lifers today are nasty little moral cowards, just like the paper-hat crowd. Otherwise they would denounce these kooks. When they hear me say that, they will throw a fit and roll around on the floor and hold their breath until they turn blue.

But what they won't do is get on their feet and show some moral guts.

A Little Historical Note You Won't See Anywhere Else

After the Watergate incident, Nixon got into deep trouble over his White House tapes. The public was outraged to learn that Nixon had recorded everything said in the Oval Office.

By now it is common knowledge that every president did that, at least since Franklin Roosevelt took office.

One of the top members of Franklin Roosevelt's Brain Trust was Bernard Baruch, a wildly wealthy New York Jew. The press establishment was conservative back then and opposed the Roosevelt Administration, but Baruch was popular with the press. He was more conservative than the rest of Roosevelt's Brain Trust, but that was not the whole secret of his media popularity.

Baruch's real appeal to the press was his Southern accent and his eccentricity. By far the best known of his eccentricities was the charming fact that he gave all his heavy financial advice on a park bench. They were always snapping pictures of this wildly wealthy man on a park bench.

Those park benches humanized him.

It seemed hilarious that he would give the advice that determined the course of the entire American economy sitting out there on that bench instead of in a plush office. It was cute.

What everybody forgot was that most people would rather have heard what Baruch said out there on that bench than they would what the president was saying in the Oval Office. Baruch's words determined the fate of billions of dollars.

That park bench out in the open was not just cute.

Thirties technology was a bit cumbersome. You couldn't invisibly wire a park bench back then. And I bet the one Baruch used was carefully checked daily by an expert before the press got there.

Baruch was raised in Camden, South Carolina before he moved to New York. He said he discovered anti-Semitism for the first time the first day he lived in New York. His father was Deputy Surgeon General of the Confederacy and a member in good standing of the Kershaw County Ku Klux Klan.

When Bernie got to New York, he was not rich, but he used his Jewish connections. And he used that deep Southern accent. He showed everybody that he was just a guy from down there in the sticks, and he made a point of it.

Many a brilliant New Yorker, Jew and gentile, decided that Bernie was a nice Jewish boy from down South, very honest, very intelligent, but very naive.

Bernie was soon the richest man in New York.

Only another not-too-bright Southern boy has ever provided an explanation as to why Bernard Baruch used those park benches, and you are reading it now.

August 7, 2004 -- The National Guard Is A Red State Thing

August 7, 2004 -- John Kerry

August 7, 2004 -- Can the Clintons Stop Kerry in 2004?

Fun Quote:

If the Older Generation was all that Patriotic, if we were filled with Family Values and Bravery the way we say we were, why did all those things slip away during our watch?

The National Guard Is A Red State Thing

The first rule of Political Correctness is that you must worry yourself to death because some remark you made might offend left-handed mulatto lesbians who are Jehovah's Witnesses with bad teeth. Political Correctness dictates that no group has a sense of humor, and that each is touchy to the point of paranoia.

At the same time, liberals all agree that President Bush "dodged the draft" by joining the National Guard. They are not bothered in the slightest that there are millions of Americans who served in the National Guard to fulfill their military obligations when the draft was on. It never occurs to these self anointed guardians of sensitivity that those millions of people might not appreciate being labeled draft dodgers.

But Michael Moore, despite his "I'm a regular guy" baseball cap, doesn't know anybody who ever served in the National Guard. Jane Fonda, who has spent her entire life preaching that she is a Marxist champion of the working people, doesn't really know any regular working people.

Nobody who ever served in the National Guard gets invited to Hollywood cocktail parties or fashionable get-togethers in New York.

People who served in the National Guard are simply off the radar screen for those who preach Political Correctness. So for them an upper-income person like John Kerry served in the real military while Bush was off "dodging the draft" in the Texas National Guard.

The reason only Bob Whitaker points this out is because respectable conservatives occupy the same radar screen liberals do. If they didn't, the media wouldn't give them the "respectable" label each must have if he is to be a National Spokesman for anything.

I know hundreds of people who served in the National Guard, including one of my brothers. But I know this only as a matter of statistics, not because they told me so. We are talking about regular working people here, not the group that calls itself The Greatest Generation.

People like my uncle who served with the marines in the Pacific during World War II never brought it up. Their attitude was that this is their country and they fought for it, period. I do not owe them a free ride for the rest of their lives because of it. I am not a worm who does not know what Real Suffering and Real Sacrifice are because I dodged the draft by being four years old when the war ended.

I have known people for years before happening to find out that they won combat medals in Korea or Vietnam.

My brother-in-law "dodged the draft" by being in the Merchant Marine during World War II. He was never in combat because if he had been he would be dead now. He spent months on a ship being hunted by German and Japanese submarines. If he had been "in combat" it would have meant being hit by a torpedo and going down to a freezing death in the sea.

One of my Confederate ancestors "dodged the draft" because he spent his life as a railroad worker. The Confederacy had a desperate lack of troops, but it had an even greater shortage of men to run the railroads.

The death rate during the Vietnam War was higher among men who were being trained as jet pilots in the National Guard than for those who went to Vietnam. I don't like Bush, but I have to say that if he wanted to avoid the dangers of Real War, he picked a hell of a way to do it.

The bottom line is that neither liberals nor respectable conservatives actually know any railroad workers or Merchant Mariners or National Guardsmen. They don't know any regular people. Which should explain why they can promote such disastrous and destructive nonsense with a straight face.

John Kerry

In his speech at the Democratic Convention Bill Clinton hinted at what I have already said.

See June 19, 2004 -- Kerry's Two Fatal Problems.

In that article I predicted that Bill and Hillary would be right up there on the podium backing Kerry all the way. That has come to pass.

I also predicted that, if Kerry picked Edwards as his vice presidential running mate, Bill and Hillary would sabotage him.

Sure enough, in his speech Clinton talked about how young and optimistic and charismatic John Edwards is. Then he joked, "I'm kind of jealous." It is perfectly obvious to everybody that John Edwards is a young Bill Clinton.

Whether or not Kerry wins this year, John Edwards has the inside track to be the next Democratic presidential nominee after him. The next race will be between a young Bill Clinton and the wife of the old Bill Clinton, whether it takes place in 2008 or 2012.

So Kerry can lose in 2004 and Edwards could lose in 2008, which would give the nomination to Hillary in 2012.

Or Kerry could win in 2004 and not win reelection, which would put Edwards on the inside track for the 2012 nomination, the one Hillary needs. That would give Edwards four years of national exposure as Vice President. A young Bill Clinton would be running for the 2012 presidential nomination with four years under his belt as Vice President. By then, the Clintons will be past history.

If Kerry wins in 2004 and in 2008, Edwards will have the 2012 nomination sewn up.

In other words, if Kerry wins in the election, Hillary will be in the position of Teddy Kennedy after Chappaquiddick. Until Chappaquiddick, Teddy Kennedy had the next Democratic nomination sewn up. After Chappaquiddick, Kennedy became a Senate lifer and has-been on the national political stage. That is where Hillary will be if Kerry wins the election.

The Clintons cannot let Kerry win in 2004.

Can the Clintons Stop Kerry in 2004?

I don't know.

I pointed out months ago -- See March 6, 2004 Did Clinton Destroy Dean? -- that I am 99% sure that the Clintons derailed the Dean bandwagon when Dean was sailing toward the Democratic nomination. What I do not know is exactly HOW he did it.

When you read whitakeronline you get a lot. Bob Whitaker is a published and recognized political expert who made his living as an advisor at the top levels.

I once pointed out to you that a person like me had better not get into hard-knuckle power politics unless he knows himself and his capabilities.

You must know what you are.

You must also know what you're NOT.

I said that a person in the big leagues has to know what his mental equipment is. The reason was because I had to state, in the course of an article, that I was a brilliant man. That was a real assessment I had to make, not an idle boast. A dumb man who thinks he's smart is dead meat in a serious situation.

I ended the discussion by saying, "So I'm smart, OK?"

This cuts both ways. When things get serious, I have to know what I am. But I also have to know what I'm NOT.

I was a staffer. I was a very good staffer. But the league the Clintons play in is a different one altogether. Bill Clinton can call anybody on earth right now. He has been up there in the front office since he was elected the youngest governor in Arkansas history.

Clinton is a political genius. Not just a genius at political advising like me, but a genius at DOING. Clinton has a bunch of Bob Whitakers working for him, though I would naturally consider them inferior versions of the real Bob Whitaker. You don't survive in hardball politics if you have a weak ego.

Clinton was able to destroy Dean because Dean had many weaknesses the media had been ignoring. I don't know how he did it, but with his contacts I probably could have done it. But I could not have done it as surely or as smoothly or as secretly as he did.

Clinton has his limits. He cannot save Bush if Bush really screws up between now and election day. Clinton cannot save Bush if the minority vote Bush thinks he is going to get, and won't get, reaches critical mass this time. The Republicans are doomed by the minority vote and it is only a matter of time before they go down for the count.

Today's Democrats are doomed by the minority vote, too, but that is another story.

See May 29, 2004 -- From my New Orleans Speech: Tomorrow's Leaders Will Have to be Spokesmen for White People

All I know is that as a matter of political logic, the Clintons' main goal is to defeat Kerry in 2004. And I would be astonished if anybody caught them at it.

August 14, 2004 -- Broadcasting in the Middle Ages

August 14, 2004 -- Riding the Palefaces' Backs

August 14, 2004 -- Genocide in the Slave Days

Fun Quote:

During Reconstruction the Yankees who came South and used blacks and Federal troops to rule the South were called carpetbaggers, while the Southerners who joined them were called Scalawags.

Liberals are the new carpetbaggers. Respectable conservatives are today's Scalawags.

As one loyal Southerner put it, "Carpetbaggers are wolves. Scalawags are hyenas."

Broadcasting in the Middle Ages

One publisher has a logo that shows a peasant with a bag at his belt throwing seeds out on the fields. He looks like a fat, jolly fellow. He must be fat, since he can afford to throw wheat away like that.

That was the way peasants used to sow seeds in the Middle Ages. They just threw wheat out in the field and hoped some would grow. Most of the seeds fell in bunches so that only a few germinated. There were large empty patches. The peasants were not fat and jolly, many of them literally starved to death.

This method of planting is called "broadcasting." No modern farmer would even think of such a thing. But back when every bit of wheat lost meant going hungry, this was the only means of planting.

Modern farmers, who have plenty by that Middle Age peasant's standards, would consider this kind of planting insane. It was the hungry peasant who could not afford to waste a single grain of wheat who used that wasteful broadcasting method. This sounds strange until you turn it around. The modern farmer doesn't starve because he would never use such insane methods.

And the entire society, from the king to the nobles to the tradesmen to the church, all rested on what that peasant broadcasting in the fields produced. He had to have enough wheat to feed himself and his family and then give the rest to take care of everybody else.

Meanwhile, the church and the king and all the rest talked to each other in French and Latin and ran around in costumes and told each other how Holy or Royal they were.

Today we have much the same situation. Working people and inventors produce things while academia and minorities ride around on their backs, just as all those kings and bishops rode around on the peasant's back. The only difference is that today the peasant's back is broader, and more people can ride.

Riding the Palefaces' Backs

Ah, the Noble Indian! He and his Great Culture were driven from their land by the Evil White Man. So they want land and reparations. Now what are the reparations they want? Do they want more feathered bonnets that were part of the culture they were robbed of?

No? Well then perhaps the Noble Native Americans want stone axes of the type their ancestors used before the Evil Palefaces made them live this horrible modern life.

We all know that the Noble Native American lived WITH nature while sinful whites FOUGHT nature. The Native American loved Brother Buffalo, sobbing, when he had to kill one of them and using every bit of that noble animal before he would kill another for his family. He had to kill Brother Buffalo to feed his family, but he himself ate nothing but lettuce, you know.

Since no Native American would touch a hair of Beloved Nature's head, we could resettle them in the national parks. Surely if all we tell ourselves is true, the Noble Indian would be ecstatic to be back in his native habitat. And since he respects nature and the only thing he desires is to live with nature, he would not present a problem for the park.

If all we tell ourselves about these innocent idealistic people is true, putting them in the national parks would just be restoring what they were deprived of in the first place.

Meanwhile, back in reality, nobody wants what the Indians had before the white man got here, least of all the Indians. Real Indians just want to join the stack of people riding around on whitey's back with all the other minority groups. They want casinos and other goodies. They want to join the professors who ride around on whitey's back and peddle anything they choose to call Education. Indians want to join the two and a half million lawyers who ride around on whitey's back in the name of whatever they

choose to call Justice. The blacks call their ticket to ride affirmative action. And, as in the Middle Ages, there are still the bishops, the tycoons and the tax gatherers in that stack.

With modern technology the stack on the producer's back is much higher, but it's still the same old racket.

Genocide in the Slave Days

The Hottentots who inhabit the Desert in what was once called Southwest Africa, down at the end of the continent, are the remnants of a race that once covered almost all of Africa below the Sahara. They are now almost extinct. They would be extinct if the white man had not come when he did.

This tiny remnant is now called the Capoid race. Today's blacks, who took Africa from them only recently, are called Congoids.

Nobody cares. The Hottentots don't have any votes or money, so nobody mentions it.

The black race of today did not give the Capoid race reservations and reparations when they took their land the way we did for the Indians. No black man has ever felt the slightest tinge of guilt about driving the Capoid race off its land and out of existence.

None ever will.

In the days of slavery, that slavery we feel so guilty about, blacks were wiping out the Capoids and taking their land. When poor little Kunte Kinte was taken by blacks and sold to whites (no white man ever captured a black man the way the fictional television miniseries Roots depicted it), the poor little black race was committing full-scale genocide against the Capoids.

No black will ever feel the slightest tinge of guilt about this and no one will ever expect him to. There's no money in it.

August 21, 2004 -- New York City Provincialism

August 21, 2004 -- Time Provincialism

August 21, 2004 -- "All Is Lost"

August 21, 2004 -- College-Made Liberals on the Left, Whining Cowards on the Right

August 21, 2004 -- News Flash: Tomorrow is Coming Anyway

August 21, 2004 -- What is Our Big Advantage?

August 21, 2004 -- You Want to Talk Catastrophes? Lemme Tell You About a Catastrophe

Fun Quote:

They say the road to Hell is paved with good intentions.

I doubt it.

How can the Devil build a road with something he doesn't have?

New York City Provincialism

Today no one is surprised when you say, "He is a New York City provincial." But when I was growing up in the 50's New York was sophisticated and everyone else was provincial. To say that a New Yorker could be provincial was exactly like saying that the pope was a Methodist.

Today we all understand that the idea that New Yorkers had that New Yorkers are sophisticated and everybody else is a rube is the most extreme form of provincialism possible. All real rubes think everybody else is different from the real thing, and the real thing is them, just like the New Yorkers did. That's what provincialism IS. But back then all the television networks were based in New York, all the editorial outlets were based in New York, all the publishing was based in New York.

So all the Great Minds said New York was sophisticated and everybody else was a rube.

In the 1950's when a country boy went to New York he adopted a New York City attitude to show he was no longer a provincial.

You are thinking, "What could be more provincial than that attitude?" I said the same thing back then, but nobody understood what I was talking about.

Time Provincialism

Today I have exactly the same problem explaining time provincialism that I had in the 1950's explaining New York City provincialism. Today people talk about "Modern Ideas" as if that meant something special.

Today people will say, "This is the twenty-first century so what you say is wrong" in exactly the same way the pope told Galileo that his idea that the earth was not the center of the universe was wrong. The pope told Galileo, "You are going against Church dogma."

Today people tell anyone who thinks a social policy is just plain wrong that, "This is 2004. Your ideas are out of date."

Does that mean that, in the year 2004, we have the Absolute Truth at last? Well, if a person quotes the calendar as proof that his ideas are right, that is exactly what he means: This is right, not because it makes sense, but because it is Modern.

"All Is Lost"

The right wing version of Time Provincialism is, "I think America is doomed."

So what is that supposed to mean? The next generation is still going to be born. Tomorrow is going to come. I understand what people mean when they say, "You are going against Church dogma."

I even understand what people mean when they say, "The ideas of 2004 are the True Ideas." People said exactly the same thing in 1904. People said exactly the same thing in 1804.

But what does "All is lost" mean?

What is this "All" that is "lost"?

I don't see any "All" that we have that is worth keeping.

I am not a conservative because I don't see that there is a hell of a lot to conserve. But right wingers keep repeating that we have lost this wonderful "All" we have right now.

Is this wonderful "All" the Spirit of Self-Sacrifice and the Family Values and the Work Ethic we used to have?

Let me tell you a little secret: If the last generation had all that Spirit of Self-Sacrifice and Loyalty and Family Values you are wailing about, the new generation would have them too.

This Great America that had this "All" is being overrun by immigration. I didn't see any of the people who were supposed to have these wonderful values raise a finger to stop all that from happening.

I repeat: What is this "All" that is "lost"?

College-Made Liberals on the Left, Whining Cowards on the Right

We are experiencing catastrophe after catastrophe. This is the heritage of the moral cowardice of the group that calls itself the Greatest Generation.

That Greatest Generation backed down instantly at every movement that labeled itself civil rights or social progress or education. That Greatest Generation marched its children off to be indoctrinated by leftist faculties at public expense and did not raise a finger to stop it.

Why? Well, that leftist indoctrination called itself "Education" and the leftists shouted that you had better pay for a leftist indoctrination in the name of Education or you were against "academic freedom." It would have taken moral courage to refuse to obey them, and the group that calls itself the Greatest Generation never had an ounce of moral courage.

The group that calls itself the Greatest Generation produced legions of leftist kids, but they also produced the dyspeptic old right wingers who whine, "All is lost!" They are moral cowards in the same tradition. They are the legitimate descendants of the Greatest Generation just like the legions of college-indoctrinated leftists are.

In any catastrophe, there are people who stand and deal with it and there are people who run around in circles screaming "All is lost!" Those who run around screaming are not just pathetic cry-babies, they are dangerous.

We have a catastrophe here. Do we run around in a circle screaming "All is lost!" or do we deal with it.

News Flash: Tomorrow is Coming Anyway

During a catastrophe, a sane man thinks: 1) What do we have left? and 2) What can we do in this new situation?

During a catastrophe, what does a sane man do about the people running around in circles screaming, "All is lost!"? Does he sympathize with them? Does he say they are good folks and try to persuade them there is hope? Or does he go ahead and deal with the problem in front of him while he waits for the panicky people to stop wetting their pants and follow his example?

The only time a brave person has while the panickers are running around screaming is to do his job. When it comes to the people running around screaming, all he has time for is a quick slap in the face.

Whitaker Online is constant slap in the face to the "All is lost!" crowd. In the meantime, us grownups have work to do.

If we stop shrieking and start thinking, we will realize that a lot of the "Oh, God, all is lost!" problems will solve themselves.

For example, right wingers whine, "What about the growing minority vote? We are being OVERWHELMED! Oh, all is lost, all is lost!"

Votes are critical in a democracy. But there has never been a multiracial democracy in all of history and there never will be. In Iraq Saddam Hussein's minority took the helm. In Yugoslavia Tito's Serb minority took over.

We are being overwhelmed by minorities. So our future will not be democratic.

The group that called itself the Greatest Generation said it Saved the World and lost it. The group that calls itself the Greatest Generation declared that it saved democracy and lost it. That is the tomorrow their moral cowardice left us, and that is the world we will have to live in.

What is Our Big Advantage?

When minority groups get together, all they talk about is white people.

I remember an incident in Africa. It happened when the newly independent black countries decided they had to have black pilots for their airlines. So they put on a few black co-pilots as a start. Whites in Africa did not object. They knew there was a white pilot up there and the black man could land the plane in an emergency.

It was the black passengers who walked off the plane. Black equality was wonderful theory, but they were not about to go up in a plane that had a black man up front.

Black "leaders" were horribly embarrassed when, in the wake of 9/11, whites slavishly accepted the Politically Correct doctrine that Arabs should not be singled out for search when they got on the airline, but blacks said, "No way!" Blacks universally accepted the abstract idea that "profiling" was Evil when it applied to them, but they were eager to accept the Evil of profiling when it meant they would not be killed in a hijacked plane.

They were right. When things get serious, leftism is suicide. When things get serious, you talk turkey.

In a crisis, everybody looks around for someone who is tall and blond. That is reality.

In a crisis no one looks around for someone who is tall and blond and screaming, "All is lost!"

I was raised in a society that was an outpost of white supremacy and where the majority was black. It was a very rough society, the exact opposite of the Yuppie ideal we have today, the ideal of the moral cowards and the "All is lost!" right-wingers.

How will we reverse the catastrophe we have right now? Maybe we should look to people who dealt with this same situation in the past.

You Want to Talk Catastrophe? Lemme Tell You About a Catastrophe!

In 1865 we South Carolinians had lost the Civil War, big time. Our young manhood, a whole generation, had been decimated. Former Confederates were denied the right to vote. The majority of South Carolina's population was black and they had been given the vote.

"All is lost!"

On top of that we were occupied by the Federal Army under the Radical Republicans. That occupation lasted twelve years. Thousands of Yankee carpetbaggers came South with a license to steal and Federal bayonets and black votes to work with.

"All is lost!"

Seeing that all was lost for the South, thousands of Southern scalawags joined the majority black vote and the Federal occupation troops and the carpetbaggers.

"All is lost!"

Not only that, but we faced the majority of the ruling Yankee vote that was against us.

You see, the Yankees had their Greatest Generation, too. Millions of Yankees had Saved the Union just as the Greatest Generation Saved the World. They and their families hated us.

"All is lost!"

Looking at that situation, I would not see any hope either. But my grandfather, who later became a Methodist circuit riding preacher, joined the Redshirts anyway. The Redshirts took on the hopeless task of taking South Carolina back.

Not only did we take it back, but South Carolina became a bastion of white supremacy.

My heritage is NOT the heritage of whining the Greatest Generation left behind.

Maybe you should stop listening to the conservatives and the sophisticates and the Prophets of Doom.

Maybe you should start listening to Old Bob, a man who says, "This is familiar territory. We have been here before. Now let's get to work."

August 28, 2004 -- The CIA is a Junior Branch of the Keystone Cops
August 28, 2004 -- Let Me Remind You of Whitaker's Law of Experts
August 28, 2004 -- Ole Bob Screwed Up, Too
August 28, 2004 -- The KGB Swings into Action

Fun Quote:

You know you are dealing with a true sadist when he utters the following words:

"It's for your own good."

The CIA is a Junior Branch of the Keystone Cops

In 1960s every pencil necked hippie told me that the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) had him under constant surveillance.

Right-wingers tell me that the CIA knows all.

Every country in the world thinks the CIA is behind everything that happens, including thunderstorms. Everything that happens is a result some operation by the geniuses who run this superefficient, tightly-coordinated organization. Everything is a "CIA operation."

If you ever saw a real "CIA operation" all your illusions would disappear.

The CIA is a Top Secret organization. Every bureaucracy bungles. But Top Secret is a license to bungle. Every group of bureaucrats will use any excuse to cover up the fact that they have no idea what they are doing. With Top Secret, they don't have to look for an excuse. They just look Wise and Secretive and everybody goes away.

I'll let you in on a little secret: for every one time Top Secret keeps anybody from knowing something they ought not to know, there are a hundred times when it lets bumblers, toadies and incompetents climb up the ladder to the top.

You may think I am telling you that "top security experts" are a bunch of complete morons. If so, you understand the point I am making.

Let Me Remind You of Whitaker's Law of Experts

Whitaker's Law of Experts goes this way:

- 1.) When there is a crisis in a given area, it is almost invariably because the experts in that area failed to see something they should have seen or didn't prepare for it or caused the crisis by just plain screwing up;
- 2.) So who does the government call in to solve the crisis?
- 3.) It calls in the experts, the experts who caused the crisis or let it happen.

In 1870 France fought Germany. The French Army was bigger than the German Army, but the German Army used speed and outflanked the French and totally defeated them

In 1914 France fought Germany. Much of the German Army was occupied on the Eastern Front, so the French Army was bigger than the German Army. The German Army used speed and outflanked the French and totally defeated them. Paris was saved by using its taxicabs.

In 1940 France fought Germany. France had massive defense preparations, but the German Army used speed and outflanked the French and totally defeated them

All this time, each generation of French military experts were training and giving promotions to the next generation of French military experts.

When 9/11 occurred, experts were consulted. The security agencies were called in to give their expert advice. Not one single security bureaucrat was reprimanded, much less fired. They all got more money and many of them got promoted because we needed more security experts because of 9/11.

One thing every security expert agrees on is that we shouldn't "play the blame game."

Now if the French defeats in 1870, 1914 and 1940 and the disaster of 9/11 didn't break the solid front of experts protecting experts, what do you think happens when the ones in the security agencies get to protect each other with the magic words, Top Secret?

Ole Bob Screwed Up, Too

If you think Old Bob is applying for CIA Director, forget it. When I was a security expert, I was as bad as anybody. My boss was ranking Republican on the House Select Intelligence Committee and when he died President Reagan appointed me to the very top of the chain for approving every single security clearance for every single civilian employee of the Federal civil service. This included such highly sensitive groups as the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA).

One person who could find out any government secret was the head of Cuba desk of the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA). She is now in prison, having admitted that her entire career in the DIA was devoted to Fidel Castro and Communism.

During the Cold War our government was full of Soviet agents. This is now a matter of public record. Since the KGB files opened up some after the Soviet Union collapsed, so many Americans were found to have been working for the KGB that we stopped naming them out of boredom.

Besides, naming them would be "playing the blame game." No one should blame a person who worked for Stalin in the 1950s. But anybody who worked for Hitler in the early 40s must be tracked down anywhere on earth.

The glorious FBI and CIA found none of these Soviet agents back when it was a matter of life and death.

Nobody minded. They were experts.

In a recent television documentary a former employee of the Soviet Embassy in America was talking about the fact that nobody at the Embassy had much to do in the way of normal diplomatic work. Their job was recruiting agents in America.

He even named the groups they recruited among: "Liberals, ex-hippies" and so forth. The same people any right-winger used to suspect if he was looking for a pro-Communist. It stands to reason that if the Soviets didn't find a lot of agents that way, they wouldn't have spent so much time looking for them.

So the Soviet Union, with its giant web of spies, knew anything it wanted to know in the US, right?

Wrong. The reason Soviets didn't know everything they needed to know had nothing to do with Top Secret. It was because, if the CIA is a junior league of the Keystone Cops, the KGB was much, much worse.

The KGB Swings into Action

How can I show the KGB was even worse than the CIA?

Like the legions of Soviet spies US Government Top Secret positions, the evidence of Soviet incompetence is a matter of public record.

One after another, Americans who had information the Soviets couldn't get from all their agents had to walk to walk right into the Soviet Embassy in Washington and offer to sell it.

So why couldn't the network of Soviet spies get this stuff?

Each KGB agent had his own recruits. They were his stock in trade in the KGB. He would have been scared to death if some agent had reported to him that somebody had information to sell. He would have sat on it, trying out how to make the most of it for himself. He would have been afraid it was wrong and that would be blamed on him.

The complications were endless.

So the big spies had to go into the Soviet Embassy on their own.

The 9/11 catastrophe would have been avoided if the INS and FBI had shared information with the CIA. But that information was the stock in trade of the INS and the CIA. Their higher-ups have a system of trading information. If a lower-down gave that information to another agency he would be ruined.

So will we ever know who is responsible for the criminal failure to share information that led to 9/11?

Of course not.

It's Top Secret.

September 4, 2004 -- September 11, 2001 and the "It's not Israel" Campaign
September 4, 2004 -- The Six Million Jews Nobody Ever Mentions

September 4, 2004 -- Who Controls the Past Controls the Future. Who Controls the Present Controls the Past.

Fun Quote:

Back when I was born, the first thing the doctor did was hold me upside down by my feet and give me a hard slap on the backside.

Things have been going downhill ever since.

September 11, 2001 and the "It's not Israel" Campaign

In George Orwell's 1984, when Big Brother wanted to change the official government line on some matter of history or policy, functionaries in the Ministry of Truth worked to make historical facts that contradict the new "Party Line" disappear down the "memory hole." New facts were then invented to go along with "established" history.

In today's sound-byte society full of people who have all the memory of a poodle on crack, it doesn't take a whole lot of manipulation for people to forget things. That said, most people do remember 9-11. Most people remember where they were, what they were doing, who they were with, in the same way those who were alive then remember when Kennedy was shot.

Take a moment and consider what you remember about 9-11: the crisp, blue sky; the plane crashing into the first tower, then another plane into the second; the towers one by one crumbling to the ground; the horror of watching people jump from burning buildings; reading about the dead and the search for bodies amidst the twisted rubble; the yellow-clad soot-covered firefighters and the sudden way they became heroes.

But do you remember that, in the wake of 9/11, a poll showed the huge majority of Americans (over two to one) thought that we needed to reconsider our whole slavish devotion to Israel in our foreign policy?

Do you remember how every politician and "religious leader" rushed into the "It's not Israel" campaign?

Of course you don't.

Nobody does.

The Six Million Jews Nobody Ever Mentions

During the "It's not Israel" blitz right after 9/11, Arab leaders, both extremist and moderate, kept reminding us that it WAS Israel. So they were quietly dropped off the discussion programs for the duration of the "It's not Israel" campaign.

Our entire policy in the Middle East is based on the insane idea of "The Diaspora." This doctrine says that almost all the Jews were in Palestine until 69 AD, when the Romans destroyed the Temple in Jerusalem, and that all the Jews were driven out of Israel.

So this Diaspora nonsense states the Jews have a right to go back to the homeland they were driven out of. Remember, this is not just abstract theory. This Diaspora nonsense is the basis of America's entire Middle Eastern policy, the policy our troops are dying for right now in Iraq.

According to this Diaspora nonsense, all the Jews were driven out of Israel, you see, after the siege at Masada. You've heard of the siege of Masada in at least twenty documentaries. Every discussion of the Roman Empire includes a lengthy discussion of the Siege of Masada.

In fact, the only thing in history as tiresomely repeated as the story of the Siege of Masada is the six million Jews the Nazis killed. Every year it seems a new movie on the Holocaust comes out and gets every award Hollywood can bestow. We know that six million Jews were killed by the Nazis because it is a FELONY in Europe to say that 5,999,999 Jews were killed by the Nazis. You say six million or you face a prison term.

But there are another six million Jews in history that nobody ever mentions. Those six million Jews show how ridiculous this Diaspora horse poop (the horse poop our men are dying for right now) really is.

There were six million Jews in the Roman Empire when the Siege of Masada took place and the Temple at Jerusalem was destroyed. The entire population of Palestine at that time, including Jews and non-Jews, was at most a few hundred thousand. Even then the homeland of the overwhelming majority of Jews was not Israel.

And there is no evidence that the majority of Jews who were in Israel were actually driven out.

You have never heard anyone but me mention THOSE six million Jews.

And you're not going to.

Who Controls the Past Controls the future. Who Controls the Present Controls the Past.

"Who controls the past controls the future. Who controls the present controls the past."

That was the motto of the tyranny that ruled in George Orwell's prophetic book 1984.

In other words, if you lack a memory, you are a slave to those who do. They control your future. They are your masters.

If you forget this Diaspora nonsense that our Middle Eastern policy is based on, you are a slave.

All our media love to make fun of the idea of all the virgins in the Islamic Paradise, but nobody can prove whether there is a Paradise or what it is like. But it is a matter of provable historical record that this Diaspora nonsense is more laughable than any idea of a Paradise full of virgins.

But we are imposing our religious doctrine on the Middle East, and it is not religious doctrine that sounds silly, it is doctrine that is insane on the provable basis of real history.

Yet we keep complaining that Islamic fanatics are trying to impose THEIR religious doctrines on US!

So what did we come up with after the "It's not Israel" campaign had finished wiping our memories clean?

Do you remember the caricature "evil Arab," the turban-clad fanatic, chomping at the bit to destroy our great democracy for nothing more than the fact that we shop at Wal-Mart and let women vote?

If you think that's the real reason the Arabs hate us I've got a bridge to sell you in Brooklyn.

We are not allowed to talk about the real reason the Arabs hate us.

Or at least YOU are not allowed to talk about the real reason Arabs hate us. Until they put whitakeronline.org out of business, Ole Bob will be talking about it.

My father opposed President Roosevelt's getting the United States into World War II. Government officials kept telling him that if he didn't keep saying that if he didn't stop talking about that, they would shut his plant down.

My father replied, "You can shut me down, but you can't shut me up.

They might shut whitakeronline.org down, but they will never shut Bob Whitaker up.

September 11, 2004 -- That Regrettable Little 9/11 Thing

September 11, 2004 -- 9/11: The Spy Agency That Had No Spies

September 11, 2004 -- 9/11: Political Correctness has Consequences

Fun Quote:

"Moses led our people to the only place in the Middle East that had no oil."

-- Golda Meir

That Regrettable Little 9/11 Thing

In my articles on and right after September 11, 2001, I made several predictions.

First, I said no one in the intelligence community who let this happen would even be criticized for it. They would just be given bigger budgets and more power and promotions.

This is the third anniversary of 9/11. Everybody in the intelligence community has been given more money, more power - the Patriot Act, for instance - and the commission on 9/11 seriously criticized nobody. All the experts who let 9/11 happen, ALL of them, have been living in Fat City ever since.

The INS, FBI, and CIA committed criminal neglect, not to mention treason, when they withheld information from each other that could have prevented 9/11. Well, we are told, that is just a regrettable little drawback of "the culture of the intelligence community."

I guess we can all kick back and say 9/11 was a regrettable little drawback of "the culture of some Moslem groups."

Do we all feel better now?

I don't. The INS people who let the mass murderer John Malvo immigrate into the United States illegally should be in prison. The INS or FBI agents who did not communicate to the CIA or other agencies that they had the 9/11 terrorists under surveillance should be in prison. But I am willing to bet most of them have been promoted by now.

If you want to end those "regrettable little drawbacks of the intelligence culture," put some people in the slammer. If agents were afraid to share information because their higher-ups wouldn't let them, put their higher-ups in prison. This is not a "regrettable incident." This is criminal negligence.

The point is, somebody goes to jail for a long stretch. We can let the courts sort out who goes to prison.

If you do something driving your car that gets somebody killed, nobody will tell you it was "a regrettable incident." You will be in court and you will be in deep, deep trouble.

But when someone in government gets 3,000 people killed, they say "Let's not play the blame game."

Try that line the next time you are in court on a charge of vehicular homicide.

9/11: The Spy Agency That Had No Spies

There was another funny little thing that happened on the way to 9/11. The CIA pointed out that in the Middle East where the 9/11 attack came from and where American troops were sent to fight, they didn't have any spies.

Having accomplished this feat, they got promotions.

You see, Senator Torricelli of New Jersey had gotten legislation passed restricting American intelligence agents from using any contacts that weren't squeaky clean. That is exactly like saying policemen can't use any informants who have a police record.

I have no idea what Yuppie, Old Hippy, Politically Correct fad Torricelli's insanity came out of, but it crippled any attempts to get informer networks going. Any agent who wanted to deal with anybody who wasn't squeaky clean had to give his informant's name and all the particulars to bureaucrats in Washington, DC and get permission.

Since nobody out in the field was certifiably insane, no one did that.

The fact that we had no intelligence at all on the ground was largely the personal responsibility of Senator Torricelli and his Yuppie fad. This was mentioned once or twice and then totally forgotten.

I haven't forgotten. It helped get three thousand Americans killed in the Twin Towers and many more in the field later on.

This assault on the CIA hit its peak in the 1970s with the hearings held by Senator Church of Idaho. So Jimmy Carter's CIA Director, Stansfield Turner, decided to move from dirty old informants to high tech.

Turner had been an admiral, so Reagan and Bush and Clinton and the second Bush and all the guys who later let 9/11 happen thought he was great. So this business of going from grubby old informants to high tech went right on.

After 9/11, everybody suddenly discovered that the CIA, America's spy agency, had no spies on the ground.

Isn't that cute?

If you don't think that's cute, then you may get mad about it.

And getting mad about it would be "playing the blame game," right?

9/11: Political Correctness has Consequences

Leftists have gone virtually unchallenged for forty years. They have mercilessly attacked whites, Christians, Southerners, and anyone else who was in their way. This attack has been openly promoted and encouraged by the major media, Hollywood, and the Democratic Party, and with the silent acquiescence of the Republican Party and respectable conservatives.

This is not news. Every American with half a brain knows it. Even Europeans know this, whether or not they will admit it. Every one on earth that matters knows it.

Guess what gang - "Everyone on earth" includes the perpetrators of the 9/11 attacks.

Do you think that outsiders watching the left tear at the heart and soul of America, the white Christian majority that founded the country and keeps it running, don't see the opportunities this leftist assault presents them?

Any cop can tell you that muggers can spot a victim a block away. They will tell you that a criminal can sense a victim the same way that a horse can sense fear in a rider.

Does it take a CIA agent to tell you that people sharp enough to pull off the 9/11 attacks can sense these things as well?

Do you think that when a liberal makes another standard "hate whitey" appeal and has respectable conservatives climbing on top of each other to talk about what a patriotic, well meaning American he is, that others may get a different message?

Do you think that intelligence agents don't know who signs their checks? That when the liberals and respectable conservatives who pay their salaries rail endlessly about "evil whitey", that these agencies don't know they can score brownie points by telling scary stories about "religious nuts" in Waco, Texas, or "dangerous white separatists" in the middle nowhere in Idaho?

Since these threats are made up to appease liberal fantasies and avoid real work, it looks like these agencies are doing their jobs. Look how safe we have been kept from white American Christians!

9/11 caught these agencies with their pants down. No one seemed to think about what might be going on in the real world. Political Correctness does have its consequences. But don't expect to hear about them from a respectable conservative. "We don't want to play the blame game."

Only Ole Bob will play the blame game.

September 18, 2004 -- One America, Two Europes

September 18, 2004 -- I TOLD You So!

September 18, 2004 -- The White Shift Right

September 18, 2004 -- There'll Come a Time

Fun Quote:

The black comedian George Wallace (Yes, that's his name!) once said:

"Oh, yeah, I heard about slavery. That's the last time all the black people had jobs."

One America, Two Europes

John Kerry has been saying there are two Americas. According to the 2000 electoral map, it certainly looked that way. There it was for all to see, the "red" states, which ironically were the ones that voted Republican, and the "blue" states, the ones that supported the Democrats.

The red states were a picture of old, Middle America. It included the South, the Midwest, and the West. The blue states were New England, New York, California; in other words, the Northeast and the trendy West.

But this does not represent two Americas. The electorate of the blue states have exactly the same opinions of almost every issue that Canadians have. And Canadian politics is not the slightest bit different from any other European politics.

The blue states and Europeans agree on foreign policy, they agree on gun control, they agree on socialized medicine. Is there one single item of social or political outlook in which John Kerry and his voters are not entirely European?

John Kennedy had far more personal connections in Europe than he did in the United States. If it weren't for the accent, it would be difficult to tell the difference between a professor at Oxford or a professor at Harvard.

Canada is Little Europe on the American continent. So are the blue states.

There are two Europes, not two Americas.

I TOLD You So!

I doubt seriously whether the Kerry campaign will recover. Democratic Senator Zell Miller, a keynote speaker at the Republican convention, probably single-handedly derailed the Kerry campaign.

There is something fatal about nominating a liberal Democrat from Massachusetts and then having him campaign nationally for weeks. With the Bush Administration in so much trouble, the Democrats might have elected Edwards of North Carolina.

And Clinton wouldn't have minded Edwards as the presidential candidate in 2004. Whatever happened, if Edwards had a less Clinton-like Northerner as his VP nominee, the Clintons might not have stabbed him in the back.

I may be paranoid, but I know power politics. I know Bill Clinton does NOT want Kerry to win. I know that the media doesn't subtly turn against Kerry this way, leaving him lone and shouting and looking like it, entirely by accident.

So the star of the Republican show was a Southern Democrat. Damn, he was GOOD!

You may have thought that Republicans had a monopoly on stupidity. As long as they keep nominating presidential candidates from Massachusetts, stupidity remains safely duopolistic.

The White Shift Right

It has been noticed that many states have become totally controlled by the Democrats because of their growing minority populations. What is amazing is that the Republican Party still exists at all.

As I point out in *Why Johnny Can't Think: America's Professor-Priesthood* we pay our universities to produce whole generations of liberals at public expense. At the same time we are importing liberal votes by the millions.

The serious polls show that universities are doing their job. They are not turning out a solid group of liberal youth the way we pay them to, but young college graduates are well to the left of the general population.

Before you recite the tired old line that youth is radical, let me remind you that there is nothing radical about liberalism. In the real world the college-educated population has generally been to the RIGHT of the general population. In 1896 students at Yale rioted to prevent the economically left-wing William Jennings Bryan from speaking on campus, just as they would riot to prevent a conservative from speaking today.

But despite manufacturing liberals at public expense and importing them by the millions, there is a Republican president and a Republican majority in both Houses of Congress. That can only be because the population of non-imported people, of people who did not recently graduate from college, and of college graduates who have outgrown their college indoctrination must have grown stupendously.

There'll Come a Time

The white population is moving right and giving Republicans all their victories. Meanwhile the Republican Party is desperately trying to prove it isn't "racist" by knocking itself out to get some non-white votes it will never get.

The Whig Party tried to do the same thing in the middle of the last century as the issue of the expansion of slavery into the Western territories became central. The Whigs avoided the issue. They held the White House in 1853 and they were not even on the national ballot in 1856.

It won't happen that fast this time. But this time, it is happening to BOTH parties. When the Whig Party disappeared, the Democrats survived.

But if you look at "the white shift right," you begin to see that the white Democratic leadership depends more and more on the abject obedience of their faithful colored companions. If the Democratic Party wins a majority in Congress again, its leadership will be heavily black on the committees. And those Tontos might not forever settle for a white face at the top.

Can a party that is really run by minorities hold together? The NAACP has been taken over by blacks -- the NAACP never had a BLACK president until the 1970s! -- and it has not exactly thrived. The NAACP is out fighting Confederate flags while even blacks admit they have far more pressing problems that organization is not in any way dealing with.

So let's face it. Soon there will be a white party and a party for the OTHER minorities. Republicans scream this cannot be true. Democrats scream that Republicans are not "appealing to" minorities, so they're racists.

In the real world our system becomes more racial every day. In the world that is coming, neither Republicans nor Democrats have any place.

September 25, 2004 – The Ordained
September 25, 2004 – Ordination is Only as Good as the Ordainers
September 25, 2004 – The "Conspiracy" Dodge
September 25, 2004 – Every Self-Selected Group is Liberal Today
September 25, 2004 – Conspiracy Theory or Common Sense?

Fun Quote:

Trust is freedom's worst enemy.

The Ordained

Everybody knows Dan Rather and every other big-time anchor man and television executive is hard left politically. When he was called "The most trusted man in America," Walter Cronkite regularly made statements so partisan that, if anyone else had made them, his claim to be non-partisan would be laughed at.

The one statement I remember (roughly) was in the 1970s, when Cronkite said publicly, "There are stories about the military having shortages. We don't report those."

ALL of the major media are a solid bloc of liberal anchors and liberal executives. But when someone says Dan Rather lets his biases run his reporting, everyone goes into shock as if the Pope had been accused of being a Methodist.

Only a saint is capable of talking in public for hours each week and not allowing his biases to influence what he says. Yet everybody takes it for granted that big-time "journalists" are, in fact, saints.

We are back to comparing anchor men and television executives to saints. How did the title "journalist" give a person the same status in the press that a priest gets in the church?

In other words, who canonized these saints? Who ordained our national priests who are called "journalists?"

Ordination is Only as Good as the Ordainers

We know how priests and preachers get ordained. They get ordained by other priests – a bishop is also a priest – or by other ministers of their particular religion. But does that make them right or objective?

Of course not. Tens of hundreds of thousands of little boys got raped by priests because people had the idea that a backwards collar automatically makes a man as pure of heart as Dan Rather.

Let me tell you a little secret about human beings. If you give any group a cover like Top Secret or a backwards collar or a title like Professor or "journalist" they will use that against the public.

The Bible of Free Enterprise is Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations. But the man businessmen regard as their patron saint said in that book that businessmen are simply incapable of getting together without their meeting becoming a conspiracy to fix prices or otherwise cheat the public.

Nobody in the press would say that about the press. Nobody in the intelligence service ever says that about Top Secret. No professor says that about "academic freedom" at public expense.

So who made everybody but businessmen saints?

The "Conspiracy" Dodge

Where did this ridiculous idea that newsmen can be trusted or professors can be trusted or priests can be trusted come from? No group of people on earth can be trusted if they are allowed to judge each other, with no outside interferences.

Somehow we have gotten the idea that if we say newsmen and professors and preachers hide each other's errors, we are saying there is some kind of Giant Conspiracy.

In other words, if I say Dan Rather is not a saint, I am saying there is some kind of Media Conspiracy.

In other words, if I assume that media bigwigs act like human beings, I am a Conspiracy Theorist.

In order to make his living in the media, every conservative has to pass the "respectability" test. He must be sure that no liberal can call him one of the Fatal Names like racist or Conspiracy Theorist.

If a conservative had said exactly the same words Hillary Clinton did, "vast right-wing conspiracy," but had said "a vast LEFT-wing conspiracy" he would be excluded as a serious newsman or commentator from all the national media.

Every conservative says that Hollywood is hard left politically. But that same conservative has to hurry and say there is no discrimination in Hollywood against rightists. Every conservative has to agree that Saint Dan the Rather is a Great Journalist who just "made an honest mistake."

Every Self-Selected Group is Liberal Today

You will be accused of being a "Conspiracy Theorist" if you ask the following question:

What are the statistical odds that between 90 and 100% of the people who are qualified to be college professors are liberals?

What are the statistical odds that 90% of the people qualified to be Episcopal priests, Methodist ministers, Hollywood actors and every other group of self-selected people are political liberals?

The other answer is the one we see on every college campus: liberals exclude all non-liberals.

If anybody puts this statistical question into plain English, it is devastating. That's why anybody who puts this question into plain English has the words, "Conspiracy Theorist!" shouted at him.

Conspiracy Theory or Common Sense?

If normal human bias is a conspiracy, then I admit to being a conspiracy theorist.

Remember that the entire anti-trust law in America is based on this kind of "conspiracy theory."

My father was in the brick business. If he went to a brick business convention and even MENTIONED the price of brick there, he would be subject to imprisonment under the anti-trust law.

Remember the best friend businessmen ever had, Adam Smith, said that they could not even gather without forming quote, "a conspiracy," unquote, to fix prices. Would any of the people who insist that Hollywood, television networks, actors and producers, Episcopal and other mainline religious seminaries, and all the universities are totally unbiased also say we should get rid of anti-trust laws on business?

But anti-trust law is based 100% and without reservation on a conspiracy theory.

October 2, 2004 – Which Book Makes You a Patriot?

October 2, 2004 – America Became Wordist in 1863

October 2, 2004 – The Constitution Versus Patriotism

October 2, 2004 – Conserve WHAT?

Fun Quote:

Conservative Catholics say that some of their best friends are priests, but they wouldn't want their daughter to marry one.

Which Book Makes You a Patriot?

I opposed the Patriot Act from the day I heard the name. It sounds like something out of George Orwell's novel 1984. The Bushes talk like something out of 1984. Bush Senior came up with a New World Order. If you read 1984 that will chill you to the bone.

Besides, in my opinion anyone who leaves the borders open has no right to talk about patriotism.

But that is MY opinion. Someone who believes America is "a nation of immigrants" would call me unpatriotic.

National Review took my old talk about Wordism and changed it into "a propositional state." I have said for decades that a state can be based on race or it can be Wordist. That is, patriotism in a Wordist state is based on what WORDS you are loyal to. So to a person who believes in "a nation of immigrants" I have no more right to be here than anyone else on earth who believes in the right words.

See May 15, 1999 WORDISM

They don't say it outright, but if you believe in the Catholic doctrine as it was in 1935, National Review considers you a patriotic American.

They don't say it outright, but if you believe in the Catholic doctrine as it was in 1935, National Review considers you a patriotic German.

And Brazilian.

And Japanese.

You get the picture?

If you watched the movie Reds you saw old American Communists declaring they had a right to believe in Communism because they were AMERICANS!

Communists believe that if you believe the words of Marx and Lenin, you are a patriotic American. Also a patriotic Canadian. Also a patriotic Samoan.

You get the picture?

America Became Wordist in 1863

In his Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln declared America a Wordist country. He said that America was "dedicated to the PROPOSITION that all men are created equal." That is where National Review got the word "propositional state." National Review worships Lincoln. Their only problem with him was that he was not a Catholic.

Communists love Lincoln, too. Like National Review, they believe the only problem with Lincoln was that he believed in the True Proposition, the True Wordism.

During the Spanish Civil War a group of American Communists formed the Lincoln Brigade to fight on the side of the Glorious Soviet Union against the Hitler-supported Franco regime. They became American heroes when the United States fought on the side of our Glorious Hero and the Organizer of Victory Joseph Stalin against Hitler in 1941.

The Lincoln Brigade was a bunch of patriots because they believed in the words of Lenin and Marx.

But one thing National Review and Communists agree on absolutely is that American citizenship has nothing to do with who you are or where you were born. If a Mexican believes the right words, the right proposition, he has more right to be here than you do.

That is the proposition you agree to when you recite the Gettysburg Address. That is the proposition you agree when you declare the Declaration of Independence to be America's founding document. That is the proposition you agree to when you say, "a nation of immigrants."

The Constitution Versus Patriotism

The opposite of Wordism is contained in the only official statement of what America is all about that has ever been adopted. The Constitution begins by declaring that America exists entirely, repeat ENTIRELY, for "We the People of the United States ... for ourselves and OUR posterity."

How nativist, how racist, how downright unpatriotic can you get in "a nation of immigrants?"

By the way, everybody will tell you that there were more immigrants in America in 1789 when the Constitution was adopted than there are today.

By now, you know what everybody says about this is wrong, too.

There was a huge influx of immigration to America during the 1600's. There was very little immigration in the 1700s. Our population grew because families were huge and there was plenty for all. In 1789, the American white population contained a higher percentage of native-born Americans than at any before or after!

Let me repeat that, because you will never see the words anywhere outside of WhitakerOnline.org: In 1789, the American white population contained a higher percentage of native-born Americans than at any time before or after! That was the "We the People" to which America was dedicated in the only official statement of America's purpose that was ever adopted by the actual United States in a time of peace.

Conserve WHAT?

So when someone says he is a "conservative" it means he wants to declare Catholicism or Presbyterianism or Libertarianism America's Official Proposition. A "liberal" wants to declare his words to be America's Official Proposition. A Communist wants Marx and Lenin to be our Official Proposition.

But they are united against people who oppose Wordism or what National Review now calls a "propositional state."

When you say, "I don't mind Mexicans here if they WORK" you are declaring for a wordist state. When you say, "the enemy is SOCIALISM" you are declaring for a propositional state. When your grandfather said Lincoln was a fine man, he was declaring for a propositional state.

If you declare that an American is somebody who works right or believes right, you are saying that you have no special right to be here. The only reason you can live here is because the authorities gave you some papers. That is why there are no "illegal aliens" in National Review's "propositional state." There are only people who do not have the right documents given them by the government, "undocumented aliens."

Under the Lincoln Doctrine, you have no right to be here unless the authorities want you here. Almost every American has agreed to that proposition a thousand times.

In the country National Review and the John Birch Society and the Communist Party and the Republican Party and the Democratic Party and every person who is allowed to be in the national media has agreed to, the Patriot Act decides who is a patriot and who should be deported.

Get used to that or be ready to be called a nativist and a racist.

October 9, 2004 – Repetition
October 9, 2004 – Repetition
October 9, 2004 – Repetition
October 9, 2004 – Repetition
October 9, 2004 – Repetition

Fun Quote:

In every civil war, the winners are the patriots and the losers are the rebels.

No one on the winning side has ever committed a war crime.

Repetition

The presidential debates are a study in repetition.

That's boring. But the two people doing all this boring are in the biggest league on earth. There may just be a reason they use repetition.

The reason political campaigns are so boring is because repetition works.

Let me give you an example. The Carter Administration came up with a shrewd move. Instead of registering guns, they would register ammunition.

So, at the instigation of one of his staff who shall remain nameless, Congressman John Ashbrook called the spokesmen for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (BATF) before the House Subcommittee on Crime, of which he was ranking member, and asked them a question:

"Is this a first step in the registration of firearms?"

They gave a long, learned answer full of references.

John Ashbrook replied with this, and only with this:

"Is this a first step in the registration of firearms?"

The next answer was a bit shorter.

John Ashbrook then asked,

"Is this a first step in the registration of firearms?"

This happened six times.

Then Ashbrook said, "Okay, we've got your answer six times. Now we will put you under oath."

We got them under oath for the next questioning. Under oath means you commit perjury if you lie.

Their answers changed completely. Yes, obviously, this had been a trick to implement the first step in the registration of all private firearms.

Please note: If Ashbrook had changed his question one iota each time, those BATF officials would not have been put in such an impossible position. The fact that he asked exactly the same question over and over and over made it clearer and clearer what the question was. It also made it clearer and clearer what its answer was.

If he had varied the question at all, no one would have remembered it.

It worked.

Repetition

Repetition takes incredible discipline. A politician would much rather show you how smart he is and how many things he knows. He doesn't like to look like a party hack. But if he doesn't repeat and repeat and repeat, he will not win.

So do you want to look good or do you want to influence national affairs?

Someone once asked Senator Fulbright what it took to be a great senator. Fulbright replied, "First, you have to be a senator."

So if you want to be a great senator, you have to repeat your message over and over and over.

As a matter of fact this is the lifeblood of all political professionalism.

It is called "Staying on message."

If you want to influence world affairs you have to make your point. You have to use every possible opening to make your point. You have to be sure nobody is able to avoid your point.

A professor friend of mine was overwhelmed by my ability to make Communists look like idiots. The minute a person said he was a Communist, I would say, "Why is it that every Communist country has to kill people who try to escape and America has to keep people out?"

There would be a long diatribe on the Evil West or something similar.

My response?

You guessed it:

"Well, that doesn't quite deal with my point. My question was why is it that every Communist country has to kill people who try to escape and America has to keep people out?"

I remember once saying, "This is the eighteenth time I have asked this, but why is it that every Communist country has to kill people who try to escape and America has to keep people out?"

It always worked. The one thing everybody listening to that conversation remembered was that every Communist country has to kill people to keep them there, and America has to keep them out. There was no answer to that.

Please note people did not go away from that thinking Bob Whitaker was a genius. They went away thinking Communism is a horror when it comes to human beings.

That was my purpose and I accomplished it.

Repetition

My professor friend was impressed. He said that that simple approach could destroy Communist arguments everywhere. I agreed.

He asked why it wasn't used.

I told him it wasn't used because anti-Communists do not have that kind of discipline. I could only do this alone because, about the fifth time I repeated the point, the pea head arguing on my side would have to show off his knowledge and argue some other point the Communist had made, which was exactly what the Communist needed to save him.

President Ronald Reagan had to overrule his own staff three times to get the words, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall!" into his speech in Berlin. They kept worrying that it sounded too provincial. They were worried it made Reagan look like the cliché-repeating rube his enemies had portrayed him as.

In other words, they were worried about everything but getting the point across.

No one else used this tactic against the Reds, but it worked every single time.

Repetition

I learned this repetition technique before I got into politics, and I got into politics at the age of thirteen. Before that I had read a book about a dog, I think it was White Fang. White Fang was a hell of a fighter and he learned to whip anything on four feet.

Until he ran into a bulldog.

The bulldog grabbed some skin at White Fang's throat and went for a rise as White Fang used every technique he knew. The bulldog had only one concern. Every time he got a chance, he grabbed a little more throat skin in his mouth.

The bulldog was about to rip out White Fang's jugular vein when White Fang's owner called off the fight.

The fact is that that bulldog didn't look too smart. The audience had come to see two dogs fight it out in an exciting way, and here was one real fighter against some stupid, funny-looking animal that just hung on and got tossed around all over the place.

I decided I could either look good or make my point. I could change the world only if I made my point.

Repetition

So here is the point I want to make to you.

Whenever someone dares to express a politically incorrect opinion invariably someone on the left will call that person a "racist," "anti-Semite," or "anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews."

Instead of nailing them, our people do exactly what they do everywhere else. They skate around the original slander. For example, they will go into prolix explanations about the difference between Nazis and pro-whites.

Try calling a liberal a Communist or a friend of Stalin. They won't LET you get away with it.

One person I know has taken me up on this suggestion. Whenever the term Nazi comes up in the argument, he jumps on it and will not, repeat, will not let it go:

"You say I want to kill millions of people? How DARE you say that I want to commit mass murder!"

It works for him. It doesn't work for those who say, "Well, I mentioned that." It is not enough just to mention it. You have to hammer the point home. You have to have the discipline to do this all the way or you can forget it.

When they call you names like "racist" don't just let it go. It doesn't matter whether you are a racist or not, nobody gets to call you that unless he DEFINES the charge he just made.

It is a great opportunity.

Someone who puts a label on you has just given you a license to make your entire argument. As soon as someone says racist or Nazi, he has given you the opportunity to say:

There is a professor at Harvard named Noel Ignatiev who says, "The goal of abolishing the white race is on its face so desirable that some may find it hard to believe that it could incur any opposition other than from committed white supremacists."

You then go on to say that everybody who says he is an anti-racist agrees with that. They say they want to "solve the race problem" by pushing immigration and integration on EVERY white country on earth and ONLY on white countries.

They say intermarriage is the solution to the RACE problem. But this so-called RACE problem doesn't exist in Asia or Africa. As Ignatiev said, they demand a final solution to the WHITE problem in exactly the same way that Hitler demanded a final solution to the Jewish problem.

You call that anti-racism. I call that genocide. Does that make me a racist?

And for God's sake, DON'T LET GO!

We could drive ALL these bastards back into their slime pits if we forced them to answer our basic points before we listen to any of their standard arguments.

If you keep behaving like someone who has called you a name deserves an answer before he stops calling you names, you are the serf and he is the knight.

If you keep behaving like someone who has accused you of being a potential criminal deserves an answer before he stops calling you names, you are the serf and he is the knight.

October 16, 2004 – Age, Elections and War

October 16, 2004 – Political Strategy, Elections and War

October 16, 2004 – Living in History

October 16, 2004 – Who This Time?

Fun Quote:

Any native-born citizen who will stand for someone calling his country "a nation of immigrants" has surrendered his birthright.

Age, Elections and War

I wonder how many readers have the same general attitude to this election that I do? I HATE liberals, so I always find myself rooting for Bush and his partisans when I am watching talks on television.

On the other hand, my attitude is different because I have been through so MANY presidential elections, not to mention all the other ones.

I was just counting the number of presidential elections I remember well. I was counting them on my fingers, and I ended up taking off my shoes. I have been through fourteen so far. This is the fifteenth.

The same thing goes for Iraq. I remember sitting in school during the Korean War wondering if we would ever get out of it. Then there was Vietnam. Now there's Iraq.

Most people alive today have some vague memories of Vietnam, but Korea is just flat forgotten.

So Iraq is a big deal to people younger than me, and damn near everybody is younger than me. The 2004 election is a big deal to most people who are interested in politics. I often forget it is going on.

When the news gets to Iraq, I change channels.

Political Strategy, Elections and War

In 2000, I certainly hated just about everything Gore said, but when they first announced he had won the 2000 election, I cheered. The economy was going down, but the Clinton Administration was going out on a record of pure prosperity.

In terms of political strategy I felt it would have been better if Gore won and he took charge of what he had inherited from Clinton's Magic Four Years. He would have made an incredible mess of September 11. I didn't know about 9/11 but I knew something was coming.

There is an article in the WhitakerOnline archives called "Superterrorism." It was reprinted almost three years later on September 11, 2001.

Superterrorism - Originally published November 21, 1998

Clinton's whole approach was visibly falling apart. I felt that four more years of a Clinton successor was just what was needed to sink the liberals.

But if this is the first election you vote in, it is very hard to have that sort of view. For a younger person, four years is a long, long time.

Most of my discussion of this election has concerned what Bill and Hillary Clinton are thinking. Their only interest in 2004 is how it affects 2012, when Hillary will make her big run. If you're in the business, you look at elections in a very different way.

Living in History

So the fact that I forget there is a presidential campaign going on is because I am in the business of politics and have been through so many.

Chances are, if you read WhitakerOnline you are among the 1% of Americans who are most interested in politics. You are far more in the category of those of us who made a living at it than you are a part of the general population.

Another reason I forget there is a presidential campaign going on is because I live IN history.

Please notice I did not say I was interested in history or that I know a lot of history. I said I LIVE IN HISTORY.

If you keep saying, "This is 2004" as if that were some kind of magic year, you live in a different world from the one I do.

Once again, I think you who read WhitakerOnline are more in my category. You tend to look at 2004 as one more year, but you are familiar with 1924 and 1984.

When I said I wanted Gore to win the 2000 election, I think in terms of Calvin Coolidge and Herbert Hoover. If the Democrats had won the 1928 election, they would have been blamed for the Depression even though they would have been in office less than eight months when the stock market crashed.

My readers know what I am talking about. The average American would be mystified.

So a Republican who felt things were coming apart in 1928, and many did, would have rooted for the Democrat Al Smith the way I rooted for Gore.

Who This Time?

A vote is a signal. Contrary to what the establishment tells you, a third party vote has more weight than a major party vote.

You are told that if you don't vote for Bush or Gore you are "throwing your vote away."

We have to start with the reality that you are not going to elect the president personally. It is more likely that the world will be wiped out by a meteor than that your vote will determine the election.

Almost every major national policy started with a third party vote. Like a lot of people, I thought of voting for Nader because that vote says, "Get the hell out of Israel's War in Iraq." That's a message.

If you vote for a national party, you vote for the status quo. In fact, if you cast a vote at all, keep in mind that you are endorsing the so-called "choices" we have. That's why the establishment wants a huge turnout. That's why there is this myth that somebody who votes is doing us all a favor. When you vote, you do the ruling establishment a favor.

But on balance, a third party vote is far better than no vote. I am seriously considering Peroutka on the Constitution Party ticket. You might have to write him in.

October 23, 2004 – Catfight

October 23, 2004 – Why the Toilet is a Liberal Adventure

October 23, 2004 – Jewish Intellectuals: Another Whitaker Heresy

Fun Quote:

University politics are vicious precisely because the stakes are so small.

--Henry A. Kissinger

Catfight

Gore Vidal is an interesting person. He was raised in a privileged, very blond WASP family. He became a homosexual and a far leftist.

But in his biography of Lincoln, the last sentence of the book is staggering. He said Lincoln knew that the South had a right to secede.

William Buckley is the founder of Respectable Conservatism. He never says anything unkind to liberals. But Vidal once upset Buckley so much that Buckley called him, on national television, "a queer."

At a cocktail party in New York, Vidal told Norman Mailer that he looked like "a typical Jewish Intellectual." Mailer then BUTTED him. Vidal ended up with a bloody nose. It was the kind of catfight you would expect when New York writers get together.

Norman Mailer sees himself as a Tough Guy. One sitcom had a girl calling Norman Mailer and she kept saying things like, "Yes, you are a tough guy, GRR!" "Yes, you can whip me."

The way Mailer shows he is tough is by talking about dung. He wrote a book called Ancient Evenings about the smell of dung, the TASTE of dung in bread, dung, dung, dung.

Even in New York, the reviewers of Ancient Evenings were offended by that monomaniacal talk about dung.

Bathroom talk is the trademark of a New York Jewish writer. I have noticed that when you talk with a Northeastern Jew, the conversation very quickly goes, literally, into the toilet.

Portnoy's Complaint was a hilarious book about a New York Jew talking to his psychiatrist. It was a best-seller written by a New York Jew. When I refer to it I am anaziwhowantstokillsixmillionjews.

In one scene Portnoy talks about when he was a boy and he was on the toilet. His mother is worried he is sick. She is banging on the door and demanding to look at his feces.

When you watch programs on cable television or movies, you are puzzled by the constant use of the s*** word. You wonder, "Why offend people like that so pointlessly?"

Why the Toilet is a Liberal Adventure

Every child has to go through the pulling out of his "baby" teeth, but we consider it a childish problem. If an adult had to go through that, he would demand anesthetics.

Remember Mister Rogers? He was a wonderful man who had a program for preschoolers. He was actually an ordained minister of the Presbyterian Church. One of his little songs was about, "You won't go down the drain." He was telling three-year-olds that when they took a bath and all that water fell into the drain, they wouldn't go down the drain. Tiny children are afraid of that drain.

Who else would think of that?

Another traumatic problem little children have is the "stinky" in their diapers. At first, all the attention they get from their Mommy when the diaper is changed is just fun.

Then they find that "the stinky" is a disgusting thing.

Then they find out, to their horror, that even Mommy and Daddy "go stinky." Then they get to the first grade and they tell each other jokes about "go stinky." It makes them feel grownup to make those jokes.

I think New York writers are stuck right there. I can't get inside their minds, so this is a guess: I think their obsession with the toilet that puzzles and irritates the rest of us is that, being raised by Jewish Mothers, they are still at the first-grade stage. They are still bragging about their familiarity with the fact that everybody goes to the stinky. For them, this is a symbol of macho adulthood.

New York Intellectuals are still six-year-olds in many ways.

Jewish Intellectuals: Another Whitaker Heresy

The last thing anybody but Whitaker could imagine calling a Jewish Intellectual is "immature."

In America, the New York Intellectual is regarded, even by his enemies, as the height of creative genius. So saying that New York writers are obsessed with dung because they are still mentally in the first grade hits people sideways.

Let me hit you sideways with another line: Jewish Intellectuals are not all that creative.

Contrary to what half-educated people tell you, Albert Einstein did not invent the Theory of Relativity. He would be the first to tell you that. He invented the Theory of SPECIAL Relativity. He extended the theory of relativity, which had been invented by a European gentile, to use light-speed as the basis of his theory of the universe. It was undeniably great work, but it was not his invention.

One thing that has been erased by history is the fact that Albert Einstein spent the last part of his life fighting Quantum Theory, developed by another European gentile. Quantum Theory is essential to modern science, but Einstein said it couldn't be true because, "God does not play dice with the universe."

Norman Mailer condemned the Moon Landing in 1969 as "Faustian." In other words, America was selling its soul to go into space. Today every person with a pacemaker keeping him alive owes it to the "Faustian" space program. Silicon Valley came from that space program. The benefits were endless. But Mailer's mind did not extend that far.

Another thing that has been erased from history is the Mule Train. When the space launch was about to begin, the entire civil rights movement and all its leaders had a Mule Train March to Cape Kennedy. Like Mailer they protested sending a man to the moon because the money should go to poor blacks.

Mailer could not understand that the basic research that went into the moon landing was enormously valuable to humanity in general. His idea of being humane was limited to taking from the rich and giving to the poor.

I loved Robin Hood, too.

But I grew out of it.

October 30, 2004 – A Man With A Memory Looks at "Critical Elections"

October 30, 2004 – Deckchair Science

October 30, 2004 – 2004 is Another Titanic Election

October 30, 2004 – Meanwhile, Back at the Titanic...

Fun Quote:

There are many roads to Hell.

One is to replace the worship of the Golden Calf with the worship of the Holy Land and call it Christianity.

A Man With A Memory Looks at "Critical Elections"

This is the fifteenth presidential election I personally remember. Every single one of them was "the most critical election of our generation." We always heard that line at party conventions. The whole point of a presidential convention is to make its candidate look important.

On Tuesday, October 26, the Fox News Network announced that the 2004 election is "the most important election of our generation."

Last week in our Fun Quote I repeated the following Henry Kissinger statement:

"University politics are vicious precisely because the stakes are so small."

For most of us who inhabit Planet Earth, that is the problem with the 2004 election. As Gertrude Stein said about Los Angeles, "There is no THERE there."

The 2004 election? WHAT election?

Deckchair Science

Someone might say that the worrying about Bush or Kerry is like rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic. When you say that, you are underestimating the detailed expertise of our paid political experts.

A political expert would not be rearranging chairs on the deck of the Titanic. He would discuss each chair in detail. A professional would not just let you go ahead and move the chairs around. He would perform detailed studies of each deck chair.

What exactly do YOU know about deck chairs? Do you really know what a deck chair looks like? Most people have never seen one, except when they were being sat on by someone on a television show.

There are people who devote their entire lives to the production of deck chairs. Yet here you are talking about moving them around as if you knew all about them.

Some people who make deck chairs have arthritis. They SUFFER to produce those deck chairs. How dare you talk about deck chairs when you have never SUFFERED?

The people who arrange deck chairs spend YEARS at sea. They know what they are doing.

How DARE you discuss rearranging deck chairs!

You may try to say that you weren't really talking about deck chairs. People who have SUFFERED making deck chairs, professional crewmen who have spent years conducting cruises will ask you, "Then why did you bring up deck chairs like you were some sort of expert?"

If you didn't mean to talk about deck chairs you should never have insulted the people who make them and the people who have spent their lives conducting cruises.

This might give you a pretty good idea of politics as I know it.

Don't worry about the Titanic.

Worry about the people who make the deck chairs. You might offend them.

2004 Is Another Titanic Election

The first article here was one of my "Man With A Memory..." pieces.

In every other "Man With A Memory" article I have started by quoting what people are saying and then ridiculing it by talking about real history. This time I repeated the usual line, "This is the most important election in our generation."

Regular readers would naturally expect me to make fun of this statement.

But there is nothing ridiculous about it. I have been through fifteen presidential elections, and not one of the close ones was any more important than this one.

Let me repeat Henry Kissinger's statement in this context: "Presidential politics are so vicious precisely because the stakes are so small."

If someone says that X's rearrangement of the deck chairs on the Titanic was more important than the other fourteen times those deck chairs were rearranged, who has the right to laugh at him?

Political professionals have every right to say that their rearrangement of the deck chairs is the most important, as long as they do not insult anybody who makes deck chairs.

They must also recognize the importance of those whose expertise and hard work made those deck chairs possible. They must also recognize the expertise of those who arranged those deck chairs in the first place.

Meanwhile, Back at the Titanic...

Fifteen elections in my lifetime and what has changed? Can anyone besides a leftist or a respectable conservative name ONE THING that our government has done to better our lot as a people?

Think of the millions of hours of work spent by everyday Americans on these campaigns, the billions of dollars spent. And for what? More of the above.

To rearrange the deck chairs while the ship goes down. And to "appeal to voters" who might be insulted if you say anything bad about deck chairs or silly political platforms.

Once again people will work and vote for Bush because he is "better than the alternative." In other words, his deck chair arrangement is cuter.

If a fraction of the time and effort spent by well-meaning Americans on these presidential campaigns was directed at the soft underbelly of our enemies in the universities, the public schools, the Chamber of Commerce, the liberal churches, etc., the effects wouldn't show up right away, but they would make an enormous difference in the future.

The Political Professionals will keep doing what they do. We can continue to act like trained seals, or get down to work.

READBOB.COM

November 6, 2004 – Bush Should Thank Europe

November 6, 2004 – The Clinton Factor

November 6, 2004 – Slapping the Red States in the Face

November 6, 2004 – How Did the Democrats Get So MANY Votes?

November 6, 2004 – Liberal Seminaries Nominate, Minorities Elect

November 6, 2004 – America is Not Lost, But Democracy Is

Fun Quote:

The only way to be perfectly wrong is never to doubt that you are perfectly right.

Bush Should Thank Europe

If Americans were whooping and stomping for a French president to be thrown out of office, he would win by a landslide. But no one has even mentioned the fact that our media was constantly full of European attacks on Bush, European polls where everybody over there said they wanted Kerry, and American celebrities being cheered when they insulted Bush.

To make matters worse, Kerry kept talking about appealing to "our allies" and everybody knew he meant France and Germany. Then Kerry talked about how America needed to pass a "world test" to go to war.

It's a wonder Kerry didn't get beaten worse.

See September 18, "One America, Two Europes"

The Clinton Factor

I said that Kerry had danger in his lines in the form of the Clintons. I wrote about that on August 7.

See "Can the Clintons Stop Kerry in 2004?"

Hillary was mostly out of sight the whole time. Bill had heart surgery at just the right time. It may have been legitimate. It may have been something he could have put off. I am still trying to get the story on that.

Slapping the Red States in the Face

Looking back, we all see that the Republicans had a fit of insanity when they nominated Bob Dole for president in 1996.

In 2000 everyone looked at the political map in which there were "red states" and "blue states." The northeast and the far west were hard-left "blue states."

No one has mentioned why they didn't make the leftist states the "red states." But I think we all know.

Heartland America, what the liberals condescendingly call "flyover country," was a solid mass in favor of Bush, and they were colored red. That map was everywhere right after the 2000 election. Political pundits have talked about "red states" and "blue states" for the last four years.

Obviously if the Democrats were going to win in 2004, they had to get some "red states," heartland America.

So in 2004 they nominated a liberal from Massachusetts.

Now take a look at The REAL Reds.

How Did the Democrats Get So MANY Votes?

The Democrats made themselves the Party of Europe. Faced with a map of red and blue states, they nominated a liberal from Massachusetts. If there was anything the Democrats didn't do to lose the 2004 election, it isn't because they didn't try.

The question is not why the Democrats lost. The question is why the results were so close.

There is a very simple answer to that question: The minority vote.

Any Democrat presidential candidate starts out with two places in his pocket, Washington, D.C. and California. A brown skin is a Democrat vote.

No one is allowed to say that so bluntly. If you say a brown skin is a Democrat vote, you are called a "bigot."

But in every election the Democrat Party bets tens of millions of dollars on the fact that brown skin is a Democrat vote. "Getting out the minority vote" is a Democrat theme. That is not philanthropy, and nobody thinks it is.

The Democrats put their money where the "bigot's" mouth is.

And every year the publically-financed liberal seminaries we call colleges put out leftists.

READBOB.COM

Liberal Seminaries Nominate, Minorities Elect

So while Old America, the heartland, went for Bush, hard-left liberals who were indoctrinated at our universities are moving farther left. The college-indoctrinated leftists control the Democrat Party and the media. They nominated Kerry.

Meanwhile, their faithful colored companions are dominating more and more states. The story of this election is not that Bush won, but that the Democrats came so close.

In 2008 there will be a LOT more brown skins in America, and we will have financed the indoctrination of millions more young people at our colleges and universities.

And until we begin to look at

READBOB.COM

you can scream and yell and stomp and talk about another wonderful conservative or conspiracy book all you want, but until you get to

READBOB.COM

and chop out the root of the problem, you are not accomplishing a thing.

America is Not Lost, But Democracy Is

No multi-racial country is a democracy, and no multi-racial country ever will be a democracy.

The future is pretty obvious. If we stay obsessed with today's news and don't attack the enemy bases like the universities, the left will use minorities to run the country into the ground.

Leftists are good at taking power, but everything they do is ridiculous. The same thing happened with Reconstruction after the Civil War. The same thing happened in Germany after World War I. The same thing happened in the Soviet Empire.

The worse things get the more extreme the reaction will eventually be. Insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results.

What will happen, as usual, is that the left will take power, make life intolerable, and cause a rightist reaction.

This election showed the white vote, especially in the South, moving steadily to the right. There is no longer such an animal as the "Southern Democrat." The last one was Zell Miller. Whites are no longer feeling guilty about being on the opposite side of the minorities. They are beginning to see that there is much more at stake here than polite disagreement.

Eventually they will begin to understand that their very SURVIVAL is at stake. But for now, the fact that they are beginning to vote as a bloc and moving to the right is a positive sign.

We could eventually end up with a white nationalist system like the segregated South. I was raised there, and it was a lot better for me and my descendants than the present situation, much less what is coming in the near future.

We may have to go through a period of outright dictatorship. It depends on how far we allow the left to go before we FINALLY go after their power base. Without their university power base, the left would collapse. Like the Reconstruction carpetbaggers, university-trained leftists have their foot on the neck of America. They march their minority vote to the polls the same way the carpetbaggers did.

We must destroy the liberal factories of leftism.

READBOB.COM

November 13, 2004 – How to be an Original Thinker

November 13, 2004 – Clinton's Very Suspicious Heart Condition

November 13, 2004 – Cheap Tricks

November 13, 2004 – The Excuse Masters

November 13, 2004 – It's Got to WORK

Fun Quote:

Why do they call them waiters when we do all the waiting?

How to be an Original Thinker

Bill Clinton is far and away the greatest fund-raiser the Democrats have. He could have given the Massachusetts liberal Kerry a big boost by being a visible Southerner.

Bill got heart trouble. Hillary disappeared.

If you spent your life in politics as I did, you tend to be a bit suspicious. If you insist, as I did, that the last thing Bill and Hillary wanted was the election of Kerry and especially of his running-mate John Edwards. I was astonished that the Augusta Chronicle published two of my Op-Eds on this subject.

This astonished me. I lost count of the number of big-time Op-Eds I wrote for others that got published, but nobody publishes one under my name.

For some reason, I'm not considered respectable.

But this one was so unique and so obviously true that the Augusta Chronicle had the guts to publish it under my name. I thank them and I congratulate them. I am surprised they are still in business.

As soon as the election was over, I heard a commentator announce the exact same point. Like so many people who repeat what I said long before, he got credit for a novel and ingenious idea.

My wife used to get terribly upset at this, bless her. But I told her, "My ideas were made to be stolen. That's the only way to get them out."

Clinton's Very Suspicious Heart Condition

I said last week I would look into the reality of Bill Clinton's heart condition. This quote represents the consensus of the medical opinion I got:

"It just seems odd to me that Clinton had no chest pain at all, and was leisurely transferred to NYC after several days in Chappaqua area."

"After this several days' delay, then the operation was done after some days of preparation."

"All this can be standard medical practice, but it doesn't fit the story of a heart attack requiring urgent surgery (a contradiction in terms). It does make possible a contrived story that excuses the leader of the Democrat Party from campaigning for the presidential candidate of the Party."

"It might also provide a cover for explaining why he might not have been asked to campaign for the ticket."

"Incidentally, it is said to be possible to have a heart attack without chest pain, but in a healthy young man, it is not something I have seen in 50 years of practice."

I have some personal experience with this. My last heart stint was elective. They were going to go into my heart anyway, so I said, "I'm going to need another stint eventually, so stick it on in."

Don't confuse a heart condition with a heart attack. Clinton's heart procedure was absolutely perfectly timed. It took him right out of the campaign.

On the other side, Bill Clinton would look you straight in the eye and say, "I did not have an elective heart procedure with that doctor."

No doctor can tell the public the truth without Clinton's agreement. That's why you have to sign all those papers to get your medical records released from one doctor to another. Nor would a doctor do it anyway if he had a major-league client like an ex-president.

Cheap Tricks

Speaking of Clinton reminds me of the whole subject of fraud.

So let me explain to you what "is" is.

Fraud may cost you millions of dollars, but it is still a cheap trick. It is called a cheap trick, not because a lot of money is not involved, but because it makes THE PERSON WHO DOES IT cheap.

All cheap tricksters are equal. He can be called "Guru Macadamian" and wear jewels, or he can be a shabby tramp who robs the man who gives him a free meal. He can be a Pope or a Great Theologian. He is routinely a full professor at a major university.

He is still a cheap person, a LITTLE person.

You notice I said a cheap trickster professor is as small a person as a tramp who steals from somebody who gives him a free meal. You may confuse the word hobo and tramp. What I am talking about was the exact difference between hobos and tramps. Hobos would not ask for a free meal. They would ask to WORK for a meal. They were as shabby as any tramp, but they prided themselves on the fact that they exploited nobody.

Old-fashioned Americans like me understood what a gigantic difference this was. Tramps were cheap little men. Hobos were honest men. How much money they had in their pockets or the clothes they wore had absolutely nothing to do with it. I would much rather trust the average old-fashioned hobo than I would the average modern clergyman.

The Excuse Masters

Today's cheap tricksters, like Clinton, depend on their big titles to make them not sound cheap.

I repeat, all cheap tricksters are equal.

When I say I would rather trust an old-fashioned, shabby hobo than I would a modern clergyman, I mean it. Modern clergymen all BELIEVE their cheap tricks are higher class than the same dodges by people who have no degree and no coat and tie.

If you believe that someone is not just one more cheap trickster because he wears a coat and tie or a bishop's robes, you are what the frauds call a sucker, a shill, a mark.

In other words, you're a stinkin' moron.

A cheap trickster takes and offers nothing in return.

You come to a doctor with a pain. If he deals with that pain, he is a doctor. Throughout history, people took their pain to cheap tricksters. The cheap tricksters would then tell them "pain we have always with

us, suffer, my son." And the guy with the pain would pay them money. The last sentence is the important one.

A friend who comforts you is a friend. A friend who comforts you for money is not a friend.

I make one critical reservation. If a person who offers you nothing for something actually BELIEVES that what he is offering you is worthwhile, it is not fraud and he is not a cheap trickster.

But I make one critical reservation to that reservation. If a person says he is a Wise Man, he is supposed to KNOW his nonsense is nonsense. In fact, most cheap tricksters get away with it precisely because they think they are being Wise. If you sell Wisdom and you can't face the fact that you are a fool, that is fraud and you are cheap -- robes, ordinations, titles, degrees and all.

If you SELL Wisdom, you have no right to be a fool.

It's Got to WORK

Modern religion HATES the idea that if you promise Wisdom and you are wrong, then you are a fraud. They do not take their religion as seriously as that. They believe all religions are equal. They believe all religions are worth paying for, so, while they don't really BELIEVE "all that stuff," they have a right to get paid for preaching it.

A Revelation is either a true revelation or it is fraud. That is exactly what the word "Revelation" means.

When your product is Wisdom, and people pay for it, you've given up your right to be wrong.

Every single claimant of Eastern Wisdom is a damned fool. He is babbling away and sometimes he says something smart. I have never met an old man of average intelligence who couldn't do a better job of that than the Great Oriental Philosophers.

The East talks. The West delivers. Nobody in the East wants to live the way the PEOPLE in the Great Civilizations they are blubbing about did.

Put up or shut up. That is Occidental Wisdom.

November 20, 2004 – Petty Tyrants

November 20, 2004 – Canada, The Other White People

November 20, 2004 – The Respectability Test

November 20, 2004 – Professors Are The Pettiest Tyrants

Fun Quote:

When a stupid man is doing something he is ashamed of, he always declares that it is his duty.

--George Bernard Shaw

Petty Tyrants

When I got word of my book being seized by Canadian customs agents, I was overjoyed. Banned in Canada! Wow! This really shows how desperate the left is to keep my message from the people! What could be a better confirmation of the message in the book.

But my book staff is honest to a fault. If you have noticed the very slick graphic on the home page, it shows the book cover stamped "CONFISCATED." Not "banned," not "seized," but "confiscated" by a pea-brained border guard.

You see, they didn't want to exaggerate what happened. They just put out the facts. Canada has not officially "banned" the book. While that would have made a big splash and garnered attention for the book, it didn't happen that way.

It then occurred to me that the real story makes an even better point about Why Johnny Can't Think. The real danger to us and our future is not Canada or America or anyone else banning a book. The real danger is that our people are being turned into a bunch of petty tyrants.

You see, a people can survive a top-down tyranny. They can endure untold hardship if they work together and care about each other. They can unite against a top-down tyranny. The South overthrew the tyranny of Reconstruction. But when they start to turn on one another, and the most small-minded among them become petty tyrants, then there is big trouble.

Canada, The Other White People

The copies of my book were confiscated by a petty tyrant because of who was taking them into Canada. Paul Fromm has been battling the left in Canada for years as a defender of free speech. Mr. Fromm is harassed every time he crosses the border because he has stood up to the PC Police.

Mr. Fromm is especially persona non grata because he has been defending political prisoner Ernst Zundel. Yes, there are political criminals in Canada. Mr. Zundel, a 65-year-old man with no criminal record is being held in solitary confinement as a threat to "national security" because he is a so-called "holocaust denier." You can read about him at www.zundelsite.org.

Canada is like Europe. See September 18, 2004 One America, Two Europes.

They are hyper-respectable and all puffed up on themselves, while giving free reign to petty tyrants.

If it weren't for being on our border, they would likely be openly Communist by now.

The Respectability Test

The Zundel case is the perfect test of respectability. Where are the Libertarians who demand "freedom of speech" and "open borders" when someone is arrested in the U.S. for an immigration technicality, given no trial, and shipped to Canada to be locked in solitary when he has NO criminal record?

Where are the "limited government" conservatives? Have you even heard a word of this on American TV or radio? A respectable conservative wouldn't be caught dead on this one.

Jesus talked about visiting prisoners, and he meant those put in prison for standing up for what was right. Where are the preachers on this one? Too busy promoting third world adoption and interracial marriage? Where do they find that in the Bible?

Professors Are The Pettiest Tyrants

Professors are mean, nasty little tyrants. They foist lies on young people put under their charge because they are accountable to no one but themselves. They are addicted to OPM (Other People's Money) which allows them to carry on in the fantasyland of leftism.

These petty tyrants are turning our young people into petty tyrants like themselves in the tyrant factories we call Universities. This is not front page news. It is so commonplace that most folks just accept it as a fact of life. But the effects are cumulative, and they are now out in the open in Canada, which is just a few steps ahead of us.

We can fight tyranny from the top. But when our friends and neighbors and our young people become petty tyrants, the battle is much, much tougher. We don't have time to waste.

www.ReadBob.com

November 27, 2004 – Robert Redford's America Left Him

November 27, 2004 – I Was Born Here

November 27, 2004 – Mexicans Were Born There

Fun Quote:

If Jews believe in "a Nation of Immigrants" why didn't Israel belong to the Arabs who moved in there

Robert Redford's America Left Him

If you watched the movie Reds you saw old Communists talking about how they were Americans and THEY had the right to free speech and how they spoke out for Comrade Stalin.

Stalin's name was never mentioned, of course.

By the way, can you imagine a movie having old Nazis bragging about their glory days? Do you think the word "Hitler" would have been forgotten?

So Hollywood considers old Stalinists perfectly respectable. No Hate Laws can apply to Idealists like that.

If you ask a Hollywood leftist like Robert Redford or an old Stalinist whether or not he loves America, he will reply "Yes!" and he will believe it.

He will go on to say, "I am loyal to the America that..." and then he will go on to tell you that "what America is all about" is diversity and equality, "including economic equality."

To Robert Redford, America has deserted him by voting for Bush. He is loyal to the "the real America."

Robert Redford is a Wordist. For him, "America" has nothing to do with the land or the people who are within the meaningless borders of a meaningless piece of ground. America is a set of words, and everybody has a different set of words. When they say they are "loyal to America," they mean they are loyal to a set of words.

Robert Redford is loyal to a leftist set of words. The Wall Street Journal is loyal to a free market set of words. The Wall Street Journal officially demands an amendment to the United States Constitution that says, "There shall be no borders." The "real America" they are loyal to exists in Mexico City and New Delhi. It has nothing to do with "We the People of the United States ... for ourselves and OUR Posterity."

I Was Born Here

I am not an American because I embrace a set of words. I am an American because I was born here.

Those who criticize Robert Redford for saying he wants to leave America had better take a look at their own behavior.

The World War II generation said it fought for "America." Then, when people told them America is just "a nation of immigrants," they did what the World War II Greatest Generation always did. They said, "DUUH!" and all nodded yes.

According to our Constitution, according to the very first words of the Constitution, anybody who comes here is allowed to do so at the convenience of "We the People" who were here in 1789 and "OUR Posterity."

In THAT America, nobody has the right to be here or to any rights under our Constitution except "We the People." The Glorious, Wonderful, Heroic World War II Greatest Generation gave that away.

They say America is a nation of immigrants. People born here have no more right to be here than anybody else on earth. America is just a set of words. If people of Chinese descent believe those words better than the people inside America's borders, then those Chinese have more right to be here than the ones who were born here.

And the Greatest Generation looked the guy who had just taken their country away from them straight in the eye and said, "Yes, Master."

I said above, "According to our Constitution, according to the very first words of our Constitution, anybody who comes here is allowed to do so at the convenience of 'We the People' who were here in 1789 and 'OUR Posterity.'"

Under the Constitution as written by the Wall Street Journal and Robert Redford, I am betraying their America. In Redford's America, every Mexican has as much right to be here as I do, PLUS affirmative action.

You know all those complicated procedures we have to go through to send Mexicans back to Mexico?

Mexico has no such procedures for anybody they don't want there.

Mexicans Were Born There

Let me repeat this for the third time:

"According our Constitution, according to the very first words of our Constitution, anybody who comes here is allowed to do so at the convenience of the 'We the People' who were here in 1789 and 'OUR Posterity.'"

Redford and the Wall Street Journal would go ballistic if our law said that.

But that is EXACTLY what MEXICAN law says!

Mexican law says that "if authorities determine that a foreign resident's presence is INCONVENIENT to Mexico, he must leave."

I put this in the Congressional Record in 1977. Someone else put it in the Congressional Record ten years later. The Congressional Research Service confirmed my translation.

Every country on earth is a nation of immigrants. Nobody EVOLVED in the land they live in. American Indians were immigrants.

Every nation begins by immigration. Every nation is destroyed by immigration.

Every people has the choice of giving their country away or demanding their rights. The World War II Generation, which had no moral courage at all, gave their country away.

Mexicans are not about to give their country away.

December 4, 2004 – Bushwhacked

December 4, 2004 – The Lesser of Two Evils

December 4, 2004 – Two Sides of the Same Coin

December 4, 2004 – Don't Feed the Bears

Fun Quote:

"Those are my principles. If you don't like them, I have others."

--Groucho Marx

Bushwhacked

On November 2nd the respectable conservatives won a big election. The so-called "religious right" turned out in droves to support their man. For the first time white people in "flyover country" began voting as a bloc, even if they didn't see it that way or understand it at the time.

Bush has said he wants to take advantage of the political capital he gained in the election. So of course, he completely ignores the people who put him in office. Actually, he spits right in their faces. He is now DEMANDING amnesty for 10 million illegals. He is appointing a cabinet that "looks like Mexico."

Bush is rewarding the people who voted for him by DEMANDING their displacement. In the mind of a "respectable conservative" like Bush, Hispanics and other non-white immigrants are the same as whites, only with darker skin and an accent.

Of course, if you are a regular WhitakerOnline reader, you know that whatever is "in the mind of a respectable conservative" has no relation to honor, decency, or loyalty. It has no concept of actually doing something FOR its own constituents.

The Lesser of Two Evils

Many people voted for Bush because they couldn't stand the thought of Kerry getting in, which is an understandable reaction. But if every election comes down to a choice between the lesser of two evils (which is the way it has been in America for the past several decades), what separates us from the Communists?

No more democratic constitution was ever written than Stalin's Soviet Constitution of 1936. Every Soviet Republic was given the right to secede. Freedom of speech was guaranteed. Everybody voted in every election. In all the thousands of elections held in Communist countries there was not one case in which less than 99% of the voters turned out.

North Korea once had an election in which it claimed a 100% turnout!

In the Communist systems, people were allowed to choose between two candidates, two APPROVED candidates.

Did they really have a choice?

Two Sides of the Same Coin

Did the Communists hold REAL elections?

Absolutely. An election gives the voter two sides, BOTH sides, to choose from. The voter was given a ballot with a list of candidates put forward by the Communist Party. You could: 1) not mark the ballot and drop it into the ballot box; or 2) mark out any names you didn't like.

If a candidate didn't get fifty percent of the vote, the Party had to come up with a new nominee.

That never happened. But you had TWO choices. You could choose between "both sides."

And, it was a secret ballot. You could take the list behind a curtain and mark off any names you didn't approve of.

Going behind this curtain presented a minor problem. You were in a room where Communist Party members were sitting. If you wanted to approve the entire Communist Party ticket you simply took the

ballot and dropped it into the ballot box. Almost everybody did not go behind the curtain and loyally dropped the list straight into the box.

If you took the ballot behind the curtain to mark some names off, several Party members saw you do it. Oddly enough, not only did over 99% of voters turn out, but over 99% of them voted a straight Communist ticket.

But "both sides" were represented.

In America we have free speech because "both sides" are represented. Both leftism and respectable conservatism are supposed to be given equal time. But what if you aren't a leftist, a respectable conservative, or somewhere in between?

If you are not one of the "both" sides, then you go behind that curtain.

And people see you do it.

Don't Feed the Bears

There is a reason that wildlife parks ask people not to feed the bears. And it isn't because they will become fat and lazy like the squirrels around Washington, D.C. parks (not to mention most of the bipeds in that city). No, it is because they will come to expect being fed, and become very hostile and violent and kill or maim some unsuspecting tourist.

Bears do that because that is how bears are. Respectable Conservatives betray their constituents because that's how they are. When Bob Dole said during the 1996 Republican Convention that "whether your ancestors were here before the Revolutionary War or you just crossed the Rio Grande, you're just as much an American," it didn't mean that he had a high view of Mexicans or other non-whites. It means that he thinks of YOU as just another wetback.

When George Bush DEMANDS amnesty for 10 million illegals because "we need concessions from Mexico" that is like me saying that I ask my dog for advice. It takes complete contempt for one's audience to say that.

What on earth do we need from Mexico? The only reason Vicente Fox should ever come near the White House is to rake leaves.

So the next time you encounter a Bush zombie, or a drooling "Hannitized" moron, realize that they aren't just slightly mistaken. They aren't just picking the "lesser of two evils." They are feeding the bears.

December 11, 2004 – Big Lies and Final Solutions

December 11, 2004 – Fighting the Experts

December 11, 2004 – Taking It From The Little People

Fun Quote:

Everybody is somebody's extremist.

Big Lies and Final Solutions

The Big Lie is that America is "a land of immigrants."

Both sides of my family got here in the seventeenth century, and not one of them was an immigrant. America was here and we took it.

The "English" name Whitaker comes from the Saxon name Weissaker. Back about the sixth century we took England from the Celts.

We did not request a visa. We were not immigrants. Then the Normans conquered us. That's how history works.

My family did to the Indians what the Congoids, ancestors of today's African and American blacks, did to the Capoids, ancestors of today's Hottentots and Cape Coloreds:

We wiped them out.

The Final Solution was in practice a thousand years before Hitler was born. Blacks did it. In fact, blacks were still wiping out the Capoids and taking their land while they were selling us other blacks to use as slaves.

So we owe them reparations.

Now back to this "nation of immigrants" crap:

Anyone who lets someone call the country he was born in "a nation of immigrants" has given away his birthright.

Fighting the Experts

We are told that as soon as non-whites become a majority in America, the world will end.

As I just explained, my ancestors took this continent from non-whites. Centuries later, my South Carolina ancestors, who had just been decimated in the Civil War, fought the same combination: a voting black majority, white traitors, Federal occupation and alien Yankees we called carpetbaggers who were the liberals and anti-white Jews of their time.

We beat them. When I was coming up, everybody assumed the Soviet Empire would last forever.

We beat them.

So once again we are in a war that is being fought on many fronts.

I spent forty years or so in the Cold War against the Soviet Empire. I made mistakes that I will never live down. I took risks on my own that the Greatest Generation brags about all the time, but they took those risks on order from others who took responsibility.

Some of those mistakes, particularly early on, consisted of telling people on the front line what I thought they should do where THEY were.

So what is the point of this besides telling you how great this pompous ass thinks he is?

My point is that we are in a war that is very much like the Cold War. The Soviet Empire's greatest allies were right here in the United States Government. You took that for granted or you ended up dead.

In the Defense Intelligence Agency, the head of the Cuba desk got sent to prison because they finally discovered that she had been totally dedicated to Castro throughout her thirty-year career.

This was routine. There were (are) a lot more like her. And back then you had better know it, and never say it, if you are a loyal American and you wanted yourself and your operatives to stay alive.

Maybe I am trying to be too much of an expert, but I don't think many people know that we loyal white gentiles are in a war, a worldwide war. They say it, but they don't really understand what that means.

I see the enemy we must attack right now:

READBOB.COM

Reagan had to declare the Soviet Union an Evil Empire and use the Trojan Horse of the Strategic Defense Initiative to bring down the Soviet Union. We fought so long and so hard to get to say that, and even when it happened, the White House staff kept trying to thwart us.

All that time, all the paid experts fought us every inch of the way. Not one of those paid experts ever predicted the fall of the Soviet Empire.

We will win because a few of us realize this is a war, not something someone's instant formula will take care of, not something the exposure of an Evil Conspiracy will deal with.

All that crap is in the way.

But we will not quit and we WILL win.

Taking It From The Little People

I get unfriendly mail from READERS of WhitakerOnline.org

As long as you are a READER, bring it on. I love it.

We are having a ball on my blog. Every day I look forward to reading the READER comments there. They are GOOD. And believe me, not all of them agree with what I say.

It is such a relief to slug it out with someone I respect.

Every time I get into a battle with somebody on my blog or on Stormfront, there is one thing I never forget for a moment. The person I am battling with is someone who matters.

Many times I have refused to back down in a discussion on the subject of race while a roomful of people were screaming at me. Blacks and liberals were yelling and most of the respectable conservatives in the room were trying to shout even louder to prove they were even more anti-racist (anti-white) than the liberals and, therefore, truly Respectable.

The rest of the respectable conservatives were silently showing the cowardice that is the true sign of respectability.

When I am arguing with someone on the blog or on Stormfront, I keep in mind how relieved I would have been if one of you were to walk through the door while I was being viciously attacked from all sides.

You would NOT have kept your mouth shut. And when a person is fighting it out all alone, as I have had to do so many times, one person on my side would have made all the difference.

So taking criticisms or even attacks from you is no problem at all for that reason.

There is another reason I don't mind taking it from you.

You're worth it.

One of the great pains of political life is that you have to sit there and take it from people who are definitely NOT worth it. They are what I call "the little people."

Consider that roomful of shrieking morons. Here you have the white liberals, repeating what their professors and the other clowns told them. They think they thought of what they're saying, but every one of them says the same things in the same words.

It reminds me of an old priest who just heard his fifty thousandth confession. I am sure he is thinking to himself, "This is an awful thing to say, but I would give anything if somebody would come up with just ONE NEW SIN."

And then there are the respectable conservatives I have spent all these years having to work with. How LITTLE can you get? Their every word is predictable. They point to real problems, and then they give the same old answer that will pass liberal inspection.

And the screaming blacks! A black man I correspond with had the same lament I do. When you are watching some black "spokesman" talk, you can see that his frontal lobe has been turned off. It's like he's hypnotized. His eyes go blank and his mouth rattles off the same old crap, without pausing for a breath.

For me that guy is just one more of the Little People. But if you ARE black and you have a brain and ideas of your own, it must be torture watching those black-skinned mental midgets rattle on mindlessly.

It's even worse because those "black spokesmen" get what I call a Monkey Pass. The whites there assume that blacks have nothing to say, and that no matter how stupid what they say is, it is racist to confront them the way you would a white man.

It always used to be said that racists looked upon blacks as monkeys. Nobody treats a "black spokesman" as much like a talking monkey as a liberal or a respectable conservative moderator does.

And the black man with a brain has to take that, and he knows there is no way on earth he can object to it. For me, the Little People are a major irritation. For him, HIS Little People must cause him to wake up at night in a cold sweat.

So I have no problem taking it from you.

December 18, 2004 – Painted into a Corner

December 18, 2004 – Loyal Opponents Make it a Game

December 18, 2004 – Adult Entertainment

Fun Quote:

The entire political left is based on nothing but pretense.

Ridicule, ridicule, and more ridicule, a barrage without letup, would destroy it.

Painted into a Corner

This week's arrest of British National Party leader Nick Griffin by local police for saying in a private meeting that Islam is a "wicked, vicious faith" that "has expanded through a handful of cranky lunatics" and "is now sweeping country after country" is just the latest in a string of such incidents in Europe. John Tyndale, the former party head, was arrested last week, and the Belgian Vlam's Bloc was recently disbanded by court order. Griffin was released later in the day, but the message was loud and clear. No dissent on immigration and multi-culturalism will be tolerated by Western governments.

Of course, you won't hear about any of this from Rush Limbaugh, Sean Hannity, or Bill O'Reilly.

You might be saying, "What do you expect from Europe?" But we aren't much different. David Duke recently served over a year in prison for supposedly misusing campaign money, but everyone knows that wasn't the reason. Can anyone imagine holding Jesse Jackson up to the same standards? Ernst Zundel is in solitary confinement in Canada for almost two years with absolutely no criminal charge against him.

Western governments are being painted into the corner by their anti-white programs. They are failing so badly that they have to resort to picking on anyone who stands up to them. But they don't want to appear to be dictatorships. They need to present "both sides."

Now do you understand what makes respectable conservatives "respectable?"

Loyal Opponents Make it a Game

The Harlem Globetrotters were once widely popular, often playing on national TV. Now they are hardly heard from. They have even relocated to Arizona. They offered an unabashedly black style of play back

before it became the norm for most major league sports. They had to have opponents to play. But they wouldn't just play anyone. They had to create their own opponents.

I remember when they would play a team of short white men named the Washington Generals. The Generals weren't there to make it a real game. They were there to make the Globetrotters look good. They would turn the ball over on purpose to set up the Globetrotters for their stunts. The Globetrotters could make spectacular plays and were entertaining to watch, but most of their stunts couldn't be pulled off in a real game. They needed special set ups. Grownups understood that back then.

Western governments have been disasters for most of the last 150 years or so. Until recently, they had enough real enemies, more or less, to make it look like they were doing their jobs. At least they had mutually beneficial enemies that each could use to keep their subjects in line. But the compound interest on their idiotic and self-destructive policies has mounted to the degree that they must try to shut up even the slightest opposition.

Of course, because Western countries are still "free," they need to keep reminding us of that fact. They need to have a real game, more or less. They need to have spokesmen for "both" sides that agree that Nick Griffin, John Tyndale, David Duke, Ernst Zundel and the Vlaams Bloc are "dangerous threats."

Now do you understand what makes respectable conservatives "respectable?"

Adult Entertainment

Is it any coincidence that while there are fewer and fewer "grownups" around, the "adult entertainment" industry is booming? Before blacks became firmly in charge of city governments in places like Atlanta, local officials made attempts to keep "adult entertainment" places under control. Now they are everywhere, even in small country towns. As one of the featured characters in the documentary American Pimp explained, "When the brothers run the show, anything goes!"

Of course, grownups have always associated what is called "adult entertainment" with the lowest elements of society. They also knew what would happen, which is why they didn't want the "brothers running the show." Now it is becoming a criminal offense to bring this up.

As Western governments have become completely promiscuous in their duties, letting third world immigration run unchecked and turning once prosperous and safe areas into blighted hellholes, it is not suprising that "adult entertainment" has become mainstream.

Real love requires loyalty, commitment, sacrifice, and moral courage. Real leadership requires the same. "Adult entertainment" is a cheap substitute for love. Western governments are a cheap substitute for leadership.

Real love occurs between a real man and a real woman who are committed to each other and to the offspring of that union, for generations to come. "Adult entertainment" involves cheap and phony substitutes for one's selfish indulgence, without regarding the consequences to anyone else.

Real men want real women. Devotees of "adult entertainment" want blowup dolls.

Now do you understand what makes respectable conservatives "respectable?"

December 25, 2004 – Doing Jobs Americans Won't

December 25, 2004 – A Modest Proposal

December 25, 2004 – The Dark Age

December 25, 2004 – The Light of the World

Fun Quote:

Some people say they're not what they used to be.

I never was.

Doing Jobs Americans Won't

Respectable Conservatives must have been the model for those talking dolls that were so popular at Christmas a few years back. Wind them up or pull the string, and they repeat the same phrases. This behavior is delightful to small children. What can you say when most adults seem just as spellbound by it?

Four years ago, John McCain kept repeating, "I'm a reformer, a reformer!" endlessly. He was doing this to destroy the Reform Party, which Pat Buchanan proved more than capable of destroying on his own. Pat didn't need to repeat anything. Just getting his picture on the front page of every newspaper in America with his Negro female typing teacher Vice President was enough. You didn't have to be able to read to get the message.

George Bush was re-elected in spite of his inability to repeat much of anything coherently. But when it comes to Mexico and immigration, he seems to perk up. He repeats "compassion" and "they do the jobs Americans won't" every chance he gets. Of course his compassion doesn't cover those who actually belong on this side of the Rio Grande, especially those who worked with religious zeal to keep him in office.

How many of those wind-up dolls have you heard spouting the "doing jobs Americans won't" mantra?

You don't need Mexicans to "do the jobs Americans won't." You just need Ole Bob. That's what Whitaker Online is for.

What is the job that "Americans won't do?"

Think.

A Modest Proposal

Why not let third world immigrants "do the jobs Americans won't?" If we really would treat them the way leftists and respectable conservatives demand, "like real Americans" (read real WHITE Americans), I would be all for it.

Has ole Bob been in the egg nog again, you ask? Is he going soft? Not at all.

Why not let them do the jobs "that Americans won't do?" I mean the ones like cleaning up nuclear waste, or asbestos removal, or the other very dangerous jobs that have become priced sky high due to OSHA and all the other regulatory bureaucracies. Why not have Three Mile Island crews pick them up at the day labor stand to scrub some reactors down? So what if they don't last very long. You never get the same ones anyway, and the supply is endless. Think of the money we would save!

But it will never happen, because leftists and respectables won't treat them like real Americans, in spite of what they say. You see, real Americans are disposable. White people are disposable to leftists and respectables. Third worlders are not.

The Dark Age

Only college professors still cling to the fully discredited "Dark Age" nonsense. Not only were vitally important scientific advances made, but ideals of chivalry and nobility were established. Even Sherman and Lincoln couldn't burn them out in the old South.

The story of Excalibur in the legend of King Arthur made a profound point. Only one worthy of real leadership could pull it from the stone. "Smoke filled rooms," spin doctors, and focus groups weren't imaginable. The young Arthur had to grow into the role, but the material was there.

That same sort of character still existed in Lee, Jackson, and Davis. They didn't realize the extent of depravity in the Yankee leaders, and it cost us dearly. Who do the liberals and respectables hold up as models of great leadership? What more needs to be said.

We have been heading into a real "Dark Age" for a long time. From the very highest office on down, our "leaders" are DEMANDING an end to our race. Respectables are cheering them on.

Opposing them is a job only real Americans can do.

The Light of the World

Today, we celebrate the birth of Jesus Christ, the Light of the World. God sent His only Son to come and save us from ourselves and our enemies. What a contrast to what passes for leadership today.

It seems blasphemous to compare Bush and his cronies to Christ. Yet how many so-called Christians seemed to believe that only Bush could save us?

The Bible warns us to "put no confidence in princes," and how much less in the jumped-up white trash that inhabits the top spot today.

Jesus told the "respectables" of his day that they had their reward. He came to bring not peace, but a sword. He didn't come to send us into battles halfway around the world while he hid safely in his oval office. He didn't come to DEMAND the end of our race and heritage, but to show us the way to life. He told us to take up our cross and follow Him.

That is the job only we can do.

Merry Christmas.

January 1, 2005 – New Year's: Critical for Them, Meaningless to Me

January 1, 2005 – So Who is the Conservative?

January 1, 2005 – Nobody Has A Memory

January 1, 2005 – The Communist Empire Has Not Collapsed

Fun Quote:

"The meek will inherit the earth."

From what I see, that's the only way they can get it.

New Year's: Critical for Them, Meaningless to Me

When the ball reached the bottom in New York City on January 1, 2005, liberal and respectable conservative dialogue changed. Nothing they have done works, so they justify all their horrors, their weakness, and above all, their inability to think, with the words:

"This is 2005."

When the question of interracial marriage came up, John McCain said, "This is 2000, not 1900."

Profound, eh?

And just yesterday every liberal and respectable conservative would have sung in unison, "This is 2004!"

What a difference a day makes.

So Who is the Conservative?

When a "liberal" says, "This is the year 2005," as justification for something, he is being profoundly, DEFINITIONALLY conservative. He is saying, "This is the way things are and they cannot change."

I remember a popular British history book in the 1950's that said some old philosopher's ideas were "as topical today as the welfare state, as modern as Marx."

To 1950s writers, the left was modernism; the Soviet Union was modernism. That's just the way things ARE, and whether you like it or not, you can't change it. This is a profoundly conservative outlook.

It is also a profoundly foolish outlook.

Nobody Has A Memory

I have repeated this fact many times, and it fits right here.

"Should Old Acquaintance Be Forgotten?" I don't know about acquaintances, but every "inevitable" and "unchangeable reality" of last month has been forgotten for the last three weeks.

No professional Sovietologist could even imagine the total collapse of the Soviet Empire. Yes, I know you heard from somebody that somebody predicted it, but I hear that from everybody else. It didn't happen.

AT ALL.

It's like those identical twin tests that show that many identical twins are very different. They don't exist, but otherwise truthful people would say they saw them.

I remember when private transportation was going to be in helicopters instead of cars. And every year, for decades, those who predicted the future were always WRONG, LAUGHABLY wrong, TRAGICALLY wrong.

That seems to be the one "historical inevitable" that nobody but me has ever noticed.

The Communist Empire Has Not Collapsed

The SOVIET Empire has collapsed. Most of the human beings living under Communist dictatorships in 1980 are under Communist dictatorships today.

China is not white. Cuba is not white. In fact, almost down to the last one, the white Cubans have left.

Viet Nam is not white.

So it is often said that Communism has collapsed. That is because, at a gut level, nobody cares about non-whites.

Including non-whites.

White countries which were Communist are no longer Communist. Colored countries which call themselves Communist may soon have a system very much like America's monopolies in 1900. They can exploit the people all they want to and nobody can protest.

China will not rule the world because China doesn't WANT to rule the world. The emperors never even wanted to take over the highlands of their own country.

Whites want to rule everything. That's the way we are. So we cannot understand Mongoloids who simply don't want to rule everything.

That is a RACIAL matter. It is a reality no one is allowed to grasp.

But it is a reality.

Historically all that has ever mattered is what color the people are. That is the only historical inevitable I have ever seen.

And this fact did not change with the New Year.

January 8, 2005 – Political Football

January 8, 2005 – Twisting and Turning

January 8, 2005 – Affirmative Action

Fun Quote:

Susan Sonntag, who said, "The white race is the cancer of history," finally did something I approve of.

RIP, Susan.

Political Football

America is becoming one big indoctrination camp. Nothing can be allowed that doesn't reinforce the party line. Kids' games are no exception. Liberals want to take the fun out of everything. They are doing a good job of it.

Southerners in particular spend way too much time and energy on college football. No doubt it is an escape from the dreariness of politics and the future we seem headed for. But the sports media is highly politicized. You can't escape politics by indulging in sports any more.

P.T. Barnum said nobody ever went broke underestimating the intelligence of the American public. That is certainly true of the television networks in their sports programming. They assume that the average sports viewer is a moron.

It is easy to see how this is so. Just watch the beer commercials. But even more telling is the fact that the sports media doesn't even allow token opposition to the liberal party line. There are no respectable conservatives commenting on sports. Rush Limbaugh had a brief shot as an announcer, and was run out on a rail for stating the obvious, that the media promotes blacks over whites.

You see, the political media needs to make it appear that there are two sides, and that they present both sides, so they need the stooges called respectable conservatives to play the role of opposition. But the sports media figures the average fan is so dumb that he might be confused by a two-sided argument, even if both sides are really the same. Sports fans just get the pure, unadulterated leftist line.

Twisting and Turning

Another reason that the sports media doesn't allow respectable conservatives is that blacks are successful in sports. This success creates a dilemma for the left. Because blacks in sports are so prominent and successful, keeping up the fiction that they are just like everyone else is much harder.

O.J. Simpson is the perfect argument against welfare. Here was a ghetto black given every advantage in life, and he ended up, well, a typical ghetto black. It made no difference. Can you imagine a respectable conservative trying to make an anti-welfare pro-black argument that the average sports fan could understand? Of course not.

Two football players died last week in Tennessee. One was a ghetto kid on scholarship at Vanderbilt University. He went home to the hood for Christmas, and got shot. Everyone interviewed seemed stunned that this could have happened.

Without a scholarship, Vanderbilt University costs about \$40,000 a year to attend. When prospective parents take their child there for a presentation on the school, they are told that one of the classes that will be required is "Hip Hop Appreciation."

Parents practically grovel before the administrators at Vanderbilt, to have the "privilege" of sending their child there for \$40,000 a year. Can you imagine a respectable conservative trying to make the argument that spending \$40,000 a year to go to a school that REQUIRES a course in Hip Hop appreciation and whose leaders seemed stunned that ghetto blacks routinely shoot each other is no reason to object to those same ghetto blacks being mixed in with your precious little child that you are investing so much in?

Reggie White was a black all-star football player who could do no wrong until he made a speech and said that the races had different abilities and that being queer wasn't something good. He died at age 43, and even though it has been several years since that speech, the sports media had to temper their praise for him. Oh, it was wonderful that he was one of the first great black players to sign to play in Green Bay, but he had said those truly terrible things, and that couldn't be forgotten.

If he had been white, like John Rocker, he would have been hounded out of the sport. I'm sure a respectable conservative could justify all this, but who would want to hear it?

Affirmative Action

With the ending of the football season, it is time for the annual handwringing over the lack of black football coaches at the college and professional level. Every sports talking head has to go on and on about how shameful it is that we don't have more black head coaches.

College presidents get real concerned when the football team isn't winning. They try to hire the most successful coach they can find. They know that success on the field translates into donations from the alumni. These alumni can and do hold them accountable for the team's performance.

College social sciences teach that the races are equal. College administrators require courses in Hip Hop appreciation of students paying \$40,000 a year to attend their school. They favor any and every race for scholarships ahead of white students.

Vanderbilt University recently had a black faculty member who advocated in print that the entire army of the Confederacy should have been exterminated. He was not reprimanded by the school administration.

I wrote Why Johnny Can't Think to DEMAND that colleges be held accountable for teaching things that WORK! They don't have to teach you anything useful, but you have to jump through their hoops to get them to sign that paper that says you have a degree. They are not held accountable, so they can teach complete, utter, destructive nonsense. As long as people are willing to pay these outrageous tuitions and all of us pay taxes to fund these schools, this is what we will get.

But when the schools MUST perform, by fielding a winning football team, we see what they really believe. When they are held accountable for the results they produce, who do they hire to run the team? That is why there are so few black coaches.

You won't hear that from the sports media. No respectable conservative will spell it out. Only Ole Bob will tell it like it is.

January 15, 2005 – Out With the Old, In With the New

January 15, 2005 – Happy Ho-beating Days?

January 15, 2005 – In Spirit and in Truth

January 15, 2005 – Just Because

Fun Quote:

What would Martin Luther King have made of Condoleezza Rice?

An unwed mother?

-- Badonicus

Out With the Old, In With the New

Now that the "holidays" are over, we can get down to the true Holy Day of America's state religion. Yes, today is the orthodox Martin Luther King birthday. Martin Luther King is the god of America's state religion.

Now those of you who have read Why Johnny Can't Think may recall that in my chapter Who Is The God Of America's Established Religion? I explained that it was Hitler. See for yourself by downloading the free sample eBook at ReadBob.com. Is ole Bob contradicting himself? Not at all.

In order to get Christians and those shaped by Christian values in America to change their religion, the left couldn't immediately take them away from the worship of the good Christian God to the evil leftist god Hitler. No, they needed a "good" leftist god. That god is Martin Luther King.

Happy Ho-beating Days?

The drive to wipe out the name of Christmas because of its Christian origins has become so obvious that some Jews were mentioning it in the media. Even a few respectable conservatives were allowed a mild protest. "Happy Holidays" is the mantra of the PC crowd. Of course, everyone is expected to give Hanukkah equal billing with Christmas. Hanukkah was historically a minor Jewish holiday, but because they wanted "equal time" with Christians, it has been inflated all out of proportion.

Kwanzaa is completely ridiculous, but that doesn't prevent it from being shoved down our throats.

But what about Martin Luther King Day? Is there any move afoot to tone it down for those who might be offended, as Jews and Blacks supposedly are by Christmas? Or to allow those of "other faiths" to choose their own holiday?

How about "Great Leaders Day" where everyone can celebrate great leaders of their own people? So Southerners could go back to their Lee - Jackson celebrations.

Right.

In Spirit and in Truth

The Bible recounts a time in ancient Babylon when everyone was required to bow and worship the king, Nebuchadnezzar, as their god.

Today, Martin Luther King is the "king," the god of the new "America." There will be no toning down Martin Luther King Day. At his name, every knee must bow.

Jesus taught that we were to worship God not in word, but in deed. The little Sunday school song that says, "and they'll know we are Christians by our love" is a way of pointing this out.

It is a very simple concept. What a man believes is made plain by what he does. Theologians seem to have trouble explaining this in simple terms, but it is easy enough for a child to understand. Jesus did what He taught, He "practiced what He preached." He was a living example of His teachings.

Martin Luther King was also a living example of his teachings. Namely, that it doesn't matter what you do, if you articulate the right ideology.

See May 15, 1999 - WORDISM

The Pharisees worked tirelessly to catch Jesus in one little contradiction so they could destroy Him. The friends and promoters of MLK write openly about his sordid life. FBI and other government files on MLK's private life were so embarrassing that they were officially sealed for fifty years and will probably never be released.

But I have worked on the inside and have reliable word that one of the most embarrassing facts contained in those files is that MLK was like OJ Simpson. That is, after he got into the big-time, Martin Luther King would not touch a woman who wasn't all white, and that included his wife.

It doesn't make any difference to his legacy. But there is a reason they won't open those files and it can't be good. It certainly isn't fitting for a "god."

Just Because

When little children are asked why they did something, they will often answer, "Just because." No adult would take that for a serious answer.

When the left demanded "equality" and "civil rights" in the name of Martin Luther King, they didn't have to give a serious reason. They said, "Just because!"

Booker T. Washington said that Blacks should improve themselves and work to become so valuable to Whites that they would become indispensable. Martin Luther King said, "Just because!"

The apostle Paul taught the early Christians that they should lead lives of such good example that they would be accepted by those around them. Martin Luther King said, "Just because!"

Conservatives are constantly whining, "Why are they promoting queer marriage? Why won't Bush stop this massive immigration?"

I tell them to go ask a three-year-old.

January 22, 2005 – If You Are Professional You Cannot Be Objective

January 22, 2005 – "In Your Professional Judgement..."

January 22, 2005 – Professional Objectivity Is An Oxymoron

January 22, 2005 – "Professional Objectivity" Is Man's Most Dangerous Myth

Fun Quote:

Your average decent citizen gets very, very frustrated when he is playing golf.

So he can't say what he is thinking out loud.

That is why he has to "address the ball."

If You Are Professional You Cannot Be Objective

The definition of the word "professional" is that you get paid for what you do. If you get paid for what you do your professionalism is ALWAYS biased.

A lot of bias comes from wanting to get paid more for what you do. Professional electricians and carpenters will naturally prefer union shop rules that keep people who are not union certified from being electricians or carpenters, because this decreases the number of people who can compete with them and keep their wages down.

This rule holds for working folks and it holds for highly educated professionals like doctors. Whatever reduces the power and income of doctors will be opposed by most doctors, and every one of those doctors will think he is being purely objective.

The fact is that doctors know more about medicine than the rest of us do. So why don't we just let doctors decide all public policy on medicine?

We don't turn public medical policy entirely over to doctors because we know doctors have biases. We also know that doctors don't even know they have those biases. But they're there, or we could let a panel of doctors take over Medicare, no questions asked.

Generals know more about the military than we do. So would you be willing to turn all questions of military expenditures and when and where to go to war over to generals?

Anybody who wanted to do that would be provided with a free visit to the funny farm.

"In Your Professional Judgement..."

We always hear the phrase, "in your professional judgement," and we think that means we are talking to a person who is trained to look at the facts objectively, coolly, and without taking sides.

That NEVER happens.

The person you are asking to be "a professional judge" in a particular specialty has earned his status as a professional precisely by being part of a very narrow group. You cannot spend four years in pre-medicine, four years in medical school, two years in internship, two to five years in specialization, all among professionals in the same field, and come out of all that without at least a lot of the attitudes of all the people who have trained you, worked with you and, above all, decided that you are the kind of person they want in their profession.

Professional Objectivity Is An Oxymoron

The Supreme Court just got rid of all the minimum sentencing laws that Congress passed to keep professional judges from letting career criminals back on the streets.

What else would you expect? Professional judges will naturally feel that the only people who should sentence criminals are other professional judges.

The United States Supreme Court is one of the three branches of the Federal Government. So when it comes to a conflict between state and Federal authority, the Supreme Court will consistently favor Federal power.

Everybody but me agrees that the United States Supreme Court IS the Constitution of the United States. Now if the Supreme Court IS the Constitution, and we are a country which is under the Constitution, then the Supreme Court, meaning the Constitution, is above the other two branches of government.

George McGovern declared that anybody who opposed racial busing was an enemy of the United States Constitution, because the Supreme Court had made its decision. I ran into this totally uncompromising argument in busing debates in congress.

In one press discussion for my congressman boss, I said the question on busing was whether the balance of powers between the executive, the legislature and the judiciary actually existed.

It does not.

The courts rule absolutely.

"Professional Objectivity" Is Man's Most Dangerous Myth

My last book, Why Johnny Can't Think,

READBOB.COM

is about a similar disaster caused by this "professional objectivity" nonsense.

Our universities and colleges have gotten themselves a monopoly and they are exploiting it exactly as any rational person should have said they would sixty years ago when the GI Bill of Rights dumped billions of dollars into sending World War II "veterans" (most of whom had never heard a shot fired) for a free college indoctrination.

This Greatest Generation was ideal to absorb the idea that professors should rule the world.

The whole Greatest Generation had been beaten into dog-like obedience in the Obedience Training courses called Basic Training. They were a total break with earlier Americans, who thought in terms of individual action and personal judgement.

They worshipped government. And their professors told them that leftist professors were the Objective Professionals who could provide an objective assessment of reality to them. Businessmen were greedy. Military men wanted money that should go into social action.

In class, no student ever asked whether the professional professor might have some biases of his own.

As happens in many cases, the minute the discussion began in class the important point was already agreed on. Everybody assumed that, while military men and doctors and businessmen were all biased, professors were discussing things objectively.

And all the discussion tended to reinforce the conclusion that military men and businessmen were not to be trusted (which is true), and professors and their big government plans were objectivity itself.

Professional objectivity, you know.

Professorial objectivity, you know.

January 29, 2005 – Bob Goes to The Movies

January 29, 2005 – Those Who Can, Do. Those Who Can't, Teach

January 29, 2005 – When Everybody's Somebody, Nobody's Anybody

January 29, 2005 – Cracking The Whip

January 29, 2005 – The Never-Ending Story

Fun Quote:

Bush said he wants to eradicate tyranny throughout the entire world.

Is he really going to invade Israel?

Bob Goes to The Movies

Brainwashing 101 is an online video that provides some compelling evidence of just how deeply the religion called Political Correctness is embedded in our campuses.

Note that I didn't say Political Correctness was like a religion. It IS a religion. This film doesn't specifically bring out that point, but shows it clearly enough.

The students featured in the documentary are treated as heretics for expressing contrary opinions. Police are called because someone wants to post a flyer advertising a guest speaker. Could one imagine any worse treatment being accorded to a member who questioned a key doctrine in a fundamentalist church?

Professors are the priesthood of Political Correctness. They alone can dispense blessings. The blessing bestowed is called a diploma. Academia is a completely isolated and inbred system that increasingly becomes farther and farther removed from reality. That is because professors are not held accountable by anyone. No one demands that what they teach actually work in the real world.

I would have liked to see the film address these key issues. Hopefully, the full-length feature they are working on will. But I encourage everyone to watch the film and let others know about it.

Those Who Can, Do. Those Who Can't, Teach

Most people pay thousands of dollars to attend a college in order to learn what works, what can be proven, not leftist nonsense. A university should not be a place for merely expressing all opinions, but for measuring opinions and ideas against the simple test, "Do they work in the real world?"

The fact that college administrators would call in police to deal with law-abiding students and the non-student filmmakers is simply outrageous. These campuses are PUBLIC institutions. They are paid for by US, the public, through our taxes. Students are paying tuition to be there.

It would be great to see this or another documentary actually show people standing up and ridiculing these ridiculous professors. Laughing at their nonsense. Not just documenting, but DEMANDING an end to the teaching of the religion of Political Correctness NOW.

My book Why Johnny Can't Think: America's Professor-Priesthood provides the blueprint for doing just this.

When Everybody's Somebody, Nobody's Anybody

The website for Brainwashing 101 has a discussion forum. It gives a glimpse of how completely the professors have destroyed critical thinking. The self-styled "conservatives" rail at the self-styled "liberals" by calling them "racists" and accusing them of not fully embracing Martin Luther King, Jr. The liberals reply with incoherent Marxist gibberish.

One of the "liberals" wrote, "On being a racist, we're all inherently and subconsciously racist deep down. Don't you think?" I replied that if everybody is something, i.e. "racist," then the term is meaningless.

"Racism" is not a meaningful construct, but a religious epithet. It is akin to "heretic" in the Christian religion, except that a heresy (which means to choose between) can be defined against a fixed creed or dogma. A heretic is one who picks and chooses which of the doctrines he will accept and abide by. "Racism" has such a wide range of use and meaning that it is impossible to know what the standard is.

The creed or doctrine of the religion of Political Correctness is made up on the fly by its priesthood. That is why we have the ever-growing list of "hate crimes," speech codes, and "institutional biases," etc., etc.

It might be better related to the caste "Untouchable" in the Hindu religion. But one is born into a Hindu caste. A "racist" becomes "Untouchable" by decree of the priesthood.

If one is declared a "racist" then he does not have to be addressed as a human being, i.e. with reason, logic, and what Christians would call forbearance, but is worse than a leper in ancient times.

When "racism" entails everything from whistling Dixie (which even Lincoln had played at the formal surrender of the Confederacy) to discussing different physical or intellectual traits between races (i.e. "White men can't jump," etc.) to non-white on white crime (the FBI formally classifies Hispanics only as victims in crime statistics - when they commit crimes they are then classified as white), to "institutional racism" to "unconscious racism" to who knows what else, how can the concept be meaningful?

Cracking The Whip

One doesn't reason with animals because they aren't capable of reason. Human beings are. That is why words are important. Words must have fixed meanings if rational communication is to occur.

How could you ever build a bridge or even bake a cake if the number 4 sometimes meant 17, sometimes 3? How can you have a rational conversation with words used as weapons to bludgeon people as if they were animals?

Real Christians are bound to live by the same standard they apply to everyone else. Jesus summed it up in the "Golden Rule."

The religion called Political Correctness has no fixed standard. It grows at the whim of its priesthood, just as the Roman Caesars claimed godhood and unlimited authority, and created laws on a whim. The Christians were persecuted because they disputed the right of the Caesars to do so. The Romans didn't care what gods anyone worshipped in private, as long as they recognized Caesar's godlike authority in temporal matters.

The professor-priesthood of the religion of Political Correctness doesn't even stop at that. They want to dig into everyone's private thoughts. Where are they willing to draw the line?

They have created a monster, which feeds off the innocence of college students and the enormous taxes and tuitions siphoned out of the public. They use words as mere weapons to beat down any opposition.

Look at how fearful one of the students in the documentary was of being branded a "racist" in his permanent record. Look at what the school administration was calling racist. He was posting fliers with the title of a Black author's book. He didn't make it up.

"Conservatives" try to be respectable, ingratiating themselves to the left. They praise MLK, condemn "racism," and talk about "real diversity." When you accept the premises of Political Correctness by accepting their language and morality, you are on a very slippery slope. In fact, you've already lost the battle.

The Never-Ending Story

The leftist actually made a conservative point in saying, "On being a racist, we're all inherently and subconsciously racist deep down. Don't you think?"

What he is saying here is that what is called "racism" is a fixed part of human nature, in other words, is normal.

The very goal of the left is to change human nature, which shows that the left is anti-human.

The social sciences have created an enormous power base in the universities by fighting "problems" which are not problems at all, but merely human nature.

A wise sage once said that problems, by definition, have solutions. If something doesn't have a solution, then it isn't a problem.

Since there is no solution to the "problems" of human nature, any attempt to create one is by definition inhuman.

Of course, phony, insolvable "problems" lead to unlimited budgets, campaigns, "War on [fill in the blank]" and opportunities for the worst psychopaths to get on their soapboxes. The social sciences get a blank check for whatever idiocy they can come up with. Vague words like "racism" are just weapons they can use to beat submission out of cowering students and everyone who dares oppose them.

Now do you see why Political Correctness is nothing less than tyranny?

February 5, 2005 – Fly Like An Eagle

February 5, 2005 – Sound the Trumpet

February 5, 2005 – Birds of a Different Feather

February 5, 2005 – The Brown Rule

February 5, 2005 – Appendix

Fun Quote:

"The only thing more phony than liberal compassion is conservative patriotism."

Critical Factors newsletter

Fly Like An Eagle

Those who have seen the sanctuary of an old, traditional Presbyterian or Episcopal church may recall that the pulpit is elevated, and embellished with a large eagle. This was to symbolize the elevated status of the Word of God, going forth from that pulpit like an eagle in flight.

Preachers were expected to live up to the high standard symbolized by that elevated pulpit. They were expected to preach the Word faithfully. Here is an example from Robert L. Dabney, chaplain to Stonewall Jackson, after the War to Keep the South:

The satanic artificers of our subjugation well knew the work which they designed to perpetrate: it is so to mingle that blood which flowed in the veins of our Washingtons, Lees, and Jacksons, and which consecrated the battle fields of the Confederacy, with this sordid alien taint, that the bastard stream shall never again throb with independence enough to make the tyrant tremble.

Compare that with the following, from John Piper, a currently popular preacher and author. Unfortunately, he is a South Carolina native, but at least he fled to Minnesota, where he could feel more at home.

My aim today is to argue from Scripture and experience that interracial marriage is not only permitted by God but is a positive good in our day. That is, it is not just to be tolerated, but celebrated. This is extremely controversial since it is opposed by people from all sides.

(See more on this here).

Now Ole Bob is not a theologian, but anyone can see that these two quotes cannot represent preachers of the same religion. Both would have been considered "conservative" in their time. That is why I don't consider myself a conservative.

Sound the Trumpet

The preacher is often compared to a trumpet in the Bible: "For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?" This is a well-known quote. Men like Robert L. Dabney were certain trumpets, unwavering in their devotion to the Word and their people.

This Piper nut is certainly a Pied Piper. He is more like a kazoo, or a comb with a piece of toilet paper like we played with as kids.

"Respectable" conservatives are not just found in politics. People in all walks of life crave respectability. Especially those in the public eye, those who want to sell books, or get on TV and radio. The same principles apply.

Ole Bob is certainly relying on grace to make it past the Pearly Gates. But one thing I believe - just like those businesses that won't take American Express, "Respectability" won't be accepted there.

Birds of a Different Feather

"Respectable" preachers don't often preach out of raised pulpits with eagles anymore. They must sense that even their stupefied congregations would notice that irony. They usually run around on a platform, or even out into the congregation. Like respectable conservatives, they don't want to be held down or compared to a real standard.

A modern "respectable" pulpit should be designed like a canary cage. Canaries were used by miners to detect the presence of dangerous gases down in mine shafts. The slightest presence of carbon monoxide would cause the canary to sway on its perch before falling.

Modern day "respectable" preachers don't sound the trumpet. But they do sway and faint at the slightest hint of distress. This is just like the respectable conservative. You can't learn anything by what they say, but by watching them closely, you can learn a lot.

The Brown Rule

Jesus taught the Golden Rule, that we should do to others as we would want them to do to us. Leftists and respectables of all stripes teach us the "Brown Rule." That is that we should turn the world brown.

Our parents and their parents and so on back thousands of years practiced the Golden Rule. They did to us as they would have done to them. They did to us as was done to them. We were born white because our parents practiced the Golden Rule. Anywhere along the line in the thousands of years leading up to now, our ancestors could have taken a "left" turn and sent us into a world of brownness. But they didn't.

Now, after every single prediction made by the segregationists has turned out to be an understatement, we have our "respectable" preachers and politicians demanding that we make that left turn. After being able to see firsthand in every city in the country the result of this, and on TV the squalor all around the world, at a time no one in the west has any excuse for being ignorant of the consequences, we are being led and forced down this path.

If that doesn't tell you everything you need to know about "respectables," then I give up.

Appendix

Say a prayer for my good friend Sam Francis, who is recovering from a heart attack. He is not respectable, and has paid the price.

For another example of religious respectability at work. See this article.

Pastor Pete Peters has interviewed me and promoted my book *Why Johnny Can't Think: America's Professor-Priesthood*. Here is a message he gave recently as part of his "Save a Preacher" campaign. Download MP3 file to your computer. Right-click and choose the "Save As" option.

Other formats are available by going to this page and scrolling to January 28th.

February 12, 2005 – If You Are Unarmed, Don't Advertise It

February 12, 2005 – A Civil Libertarian Suppresses Freedom of Speech

February 12, 2005 – Incident in Moscow

February 12, 2005 – My World, and Welcome to It

February 12, 2005 – Dershowitz Defines the Yuppie Fashionable Opinion

Fun Quote:

If we spent half the time fighting our enemies that we do correcting our friends, we would win.

If You Are Unarmed, Don't Advertise It

One of my sisters got very rich and moved into a very high income neighborhood. She then got the fashion from her neighbors that having a gun in the house was a veddy veddy lower class attitude.

I pointed out to her that I had worked in prisons and prisoners talked about areas that had guns and places that did not have guns with exactly the same professional detachment that insurance salesmen talk about sales prospects.

A rich neighborhood that was proud it had no weapons was exactly what they were looking for. My sister told me she knew better because her neighbors had told her so.

One day two black thugs walked into her house, beat the hell out of her and her husband, and robbed the place.

Her attitude about guns has changed.

A Civil Libertarian Suppresses Freedom of Speech

Alan Dershowitz is a famous "civil libertarian" lawyer and a professor at Harvard. On one program a man pointed out that Dershowitz had dedicated his life to getting professional criminals back on the streets, which is true.

Dershowitz, the Great Civil Libertarian and Protector of Freedom of Speech, replied, "If you say that you had better put your house in your wife's name."

The guy backed down. Dershowitz had said that if he exercised his freedom of speech, Dershowitz would ruin him.

Dershowitz could initiate a lawsuit against him for defamation and force the man to hire lawyers he couldn't afford. Win or lose, the man would be ruined.

No one mentioned that this Great Civil Libertarian had just threatened someone who was exercising his freedom of speech.

As always, no one noticed it but me.

Incident in Moscow

Some years back I was walking with my nephew in Moscow when we came across a dead man lying in the street who had been shot by the Russian Mafia.

I pointed out to my nephew what a professional job it was. The man was dead before he hit the ground, which took a calm shot.

Obviously the world I was familiar with was not the world of my sister or Alan Dershowitz.

My World, and Welcome to It

I went to a lot of very bad places. People like Alan Dershowitz and my sister's wealthy Fashionable Attitude neighbors are bringing those places here.

My sister has changed her attitude about guns. She now realizes that for people to say, "We are a very rich part of town with lots to steal, and we have no guns" is not a smart thing to say. But I think she regards most of my other common sense ideas as rather lowah clahss.

Dershowitz considers professional criminals to be his allies against the white gentiles. He keeps warning Jews that we are out to destroy them.

So he defends professional criminals and, like all three of the major Jewish Conventions, Reformed, Orthodox and Conservative, he demands that America's borders be opened to the third world so we white gentiles can't be united to destroy Jews.

I am not joking. Read their official statements. Go read them.

I have been in those prisons. I have been in the third world.

A lot.

Enough so I know what a professional kill looks like.

No one dares say what I just said. So now that world is coming here.

I'll be right at home.

Dershowitz Defines the Yuppie Fashionable Opinion

Now here is the connection between my sister's attitudes and Dershowitz's.

All the people my sister associates with got their opinions of what an educated person should think in college. Their parents got their ideas of what an educated person should think in college.

But all the professors who told them what to think were at Podunk U. To their professors, the ones who told them what to think, a Professor at Harvard like Dershowitz was one step above God.

All the Fashionable Opinion my sister listens to comes from the sheep who were the sheep of Dershowitz's sheep.

I remember some of these Fashionable Opinion Sheep were astounded that "some people in the 29204 area" – the Fashionable Area – by which they meant Lake High and me, were leading in the fight for the Confederate flag!

NOBODY in that nouveau riche area was for the Confederate flag! That was TACKY! Harvard professors said so, their Podunk U. professors said so, and The State newspaper said so because the New York Times said so.

And it is tacky to say those hard-working third worlders should be kept out because the masters of their Podunk U. professors said so.

Dershowitz and the Fashionable Opinion Sheep said that opposing immigration was lowah clahss. To them, for someone to say, "We do not need those hard-working third worlders here," is retarded.

Meanwhile, you have to be a real retard to say, "This is a rich place with no guns. Come and get it."

You have to be a real retard to say, "We need those hard-working third worlders here."

In other words, these people are retards.

And they're going to pay for it, big time.

February 19, 2005 – Behind Every Successful Man...

February 19, 2005 – NOW What Was I Talking About?

February 19, 2005 – NOW Who Are the REAL Birdbrains?

February 19, 2005 – Now I've Learned My ABC's....

February 19, 2005 – Learning to Read the Signs of the Times

Fun Quote:

Some people have accused WhitakerOnline of being on the lunatic fringe, and this is very offensive.

Fringe, hell! We are at Lunatic Central.

Behind Every Successful Man...

It bothers me, though I can't tell them, that so few of the men fighting for our cause have a female anchor at the TOP LEVEL.

They've got good men, but men are theorists. A woman who cares about you takes care of things IN DEPTH, and I can see as plain as day that the "disconnects" in most organizations are the direct result of not having the right woman in the right place.

This is where my extreme disabilities have given me an understanding of something basic.

My first two books were dedicated to my now ex-wife. They could not have gotten done without her. One could make up a theory about how I was Progressive enough to understand the special place of a brilliant woman who cares.

Sorry. I thought this way long, long before Women's Liberation came up with Female Appreciation. I didn't THINK about this at all. I can't do without this kind of in-depth backing.

It goes like this:

"Bob, you are WONDERFUL. I am (sincerely) very proud of you."

"Now, Bob, has X and Y been taken care of? Bob, you answered his point very well, but you didn't deal with his question."

Backup in detail. Deal with the question.

Generally, men are scatterbrained. Some are pretty good at this type of detail, but are no substitute for a woman.

Most men can get by on their own. I can't function without it.

NOW What Was I Talking About?

If one doesn't have Progressive Ideas about Female Appreciation, I recommend Attention Deficit Disorder as a far better guide to the subject.

That is, if you're smart.

And I am very, very smart.

As my woman anchor said some time ago, this is called symbiosis. A Women's Libber would say that I am "using" her and that I "used" my wife and that I "used" the woman I appointed as my Assistant Director of Oversight on Capitol Hill.

You're damn right. I used the hell out of them.

What Women's Libbers don't realize is that my woman anchor sees me as "her man." She is "using" me in exactly the way I was born to be "used."

Repeat: that's called symbiosis. As she explained, women have a design function and men have a design function. We don't "use" each other. Nature uses both of us.

NOW Who Are the REAL Birdbrains?

Do you notice how, as usual, my entire life has been devoted to over-explaining what any sane person should see as basic to a healthy mind?

Most of our right-wingers tend to see the world in exactly the same way Women's Libbers do.

I am NOT criticizing them. Liberals see the world in exactly the same way, only sicker.

Look, gang, think about peacocks. The male peacock has to grow and constantly preen this huge fan of useless feathers. He has to fight to claim his strutting ground.

Meanwhile, what are the females doing?

They are standing there quietly judging which one of these fighters and strutters wins the only prize that matters.

Women's Libbers say the male peacocks are using the female peacocks. Male peacocks get to do all the strutting, so they are putting female peacocks in a humiliating, subservient position.

According to Women's Libbers, peacock nature puts the female in a humiliating position. The Women's Libbers say women should be out there on the strutting ground, sticking on feathers and strutting.

Do you have any idea how a healthy-minded female peacock would react to that?

A healthy-minded female peacock would react to a female peacock who wants to get out on the strutting ground exactly the same way a South Carolina redneck would react to a guy in San Francisco who feels he has a right to put on makeup and walk around in high heels.

By some strange coincidence, NOW is crammed full of lesbians.

What a surprise.

So who is using whom? There's no point to all those multicolored feathers and all that fighting for a strutting ground if the females don't like it. From one end of nature to the other, we males are battling for power and territory while the females are doing the choosing.

We are USING them.

Yes, I use the hell out of my anchor.

And her response is, "Sure you do. What's your point?"

Now I've Learned My ABC's....

If everybody responded to Whitaker's points that way, we could get on to more interesting and, Lord knows, more productive discussion.

Males have a function. Females have a function. It is scary to me that I have to explain anything this obvious. In fact, it makes me feel a little nuts when I have explain these basics over and over and over and over and over.

The Chinese had movable print before whites did. But they didn't DO anything with it. The very fact that scholars have to dig to find out that the Chinese historically did have movable type or gunpowder or a mechanical clock sometime in history shows how DIFFERENT Orientals are.

You don't have to dig to find out whites had gunpowder. You don't have to dig to find out that whites had movable print. You don't have to dig to discover that men use women for their purposes and women use men for theirs.

And while I'm at it, let me also explain that you are carrying around two pounds of various symbiotic beings in your body that you feed and keep warm and provide a home for. These are microbes in your stomach and intestines that are absolutely essential to digestion. They are symbiotic. We need them and they need us. They use us to survive. We use them to survive. They are USING you.

But you can't live without them.

All my life I have wanted to take all these basics and MOVE ON. I want to do some THINKING, something creative in real social sciences.

Instead my whole life has been "Oh, my God, they got it wrong AGAIN. OK, let's get back to A. We will get to B and C later."

It's like trying to explain basic arithmetic all your life. "Every man leads a life of quiet desperation." I am DESPERATE to talk about calculus, but my whole intellectual life is dedicated to finding ways to explain $2 + 2$ equals 4 over and over and over.

Learning to Read the Signs of the Times

There is no better way to measure the health and vitality of a family, an organization, society, or nation than by its women. Look at the teachings of Jesus Christ on this, compare medieval and Southern chivalry, and our Germanic "barbarian" ancestors who conquered Rome to the present situation.

Here is what Alexis de Tocqueville wrote in a chapter titled "How Americans Understand the Equality of the Sexes" in Democracy in America:

As for myself, I do not hesitate to avow that although the women of the United States are confined within the narrow circle of domestic life, and their situation is in some respects one of extreme dependence, I have nowhere seen woman occupying a loftier position; and if I were asked, now that I am drawing to the close of this work, in which I have spoken of so many important things done by the Americans, to what the singular prosperity and growing strength of that people ought mainly to be attributed, I should reply: To the superiority of their women.

This was written in the 1830's. College professors, NOW harridans, and Respectable Conservatives would all rush in to tell us about all the bad side that de Tocqueville swept under the rug, and how much better off today's women are.

They will tell us this with a straight face, while trying to turn every one of our young girls into aggressive, tattooed, race-mixing, doped-up whores, and DEMANDING that they be "allowed" to serve in combat.

One look at their ideal woman will tell you everything you need to know about the kind of world they are working for. One that fits them just fine.

In religious parlance, it is called HELL.

February 26, 2005 – See No Evil, Hear No Evil, Speak No Evil

February 26, 2005 – Like Lambs Led to Slaughter

February 26, 2005 – Out of Africa

February 26, 2005 – From Brown vs. Topeka to a Brown World

Fun Quote:

If you agree that homosexuality is a "legitimate alternative life style" how can you object to teachers pushing the gay and lesbian agenda in class?

See No Evil, Hear No Evil, Speak No Evil

Respectable Conservatives are keeping very mum on the breaking scandal in the White House over male prostitute/news reporter, Jeff Gannon. Of course, this shouldn't be a surprise, because that is what Respectable Conservatives always do.

It doesn't seem to strike any of them as odd that someone who runs publicly accessible, X-rated websites selling himself by the hour should be able to get White House credentials under a false name. All this at a time when the Republicans are DEMANDING that we give up what is left of our liberties for the security that ONLY they can provide us.

We have come to expect Respectable Conservatives to cover up and make excuses for liberal failures and Republican duplicity. So of course they will try and make everyone believe that Republicans are the ONLY ones who can provide us "security" from "terror."

But why do they seem to find nothing strange about this male prostitute having easy access to high places in the Republican establishment?

Probably because they can't tell much difference between what he does for a living and what they do.

And to be honest with you, neither can I.

Like Lambs Led to Slaughter

Most media pundits credit Bush's narrow victory over Kerry to the "traditional values" crowd who were opposed to the "gay marriage" agenda. They are probably correct.

But even though Bush has given only lip service to their concerns, these folks seem to worship the ground he walks on. He can do no wrong in their eyes.

Of course, it is this kind of blind, stupid obedience that has brought us to where we are today. It is what causes sheep to follow the "Judas goat" down to the slaughtering pens.

Of course, sheep have a bit more of an excuse than do white American human beings. As they say about sheep, "If you aren't in the lead, the view never changes."

Funny thing is, the words coming from Respectable Conservatives never change either.

Probably because they can't tell much difference between the average white American and a dumb sheep.

And to be honest with you, neither can I.

Out of Africa

I've spent a lot of time in Africa, and working in American prisons. Both are a lot alike in several ways. These ways are not ways that I would wish on any human being - especially my own people.

There is a "love that dare not speak its name" that goes on in Africa and in prisons. Of course, it has nothing to do with love, and seems to be talked about all the time now. It has become all but "respectable" behavior in America.

I've written many times about how this is the logical outcome of accepting the Supreme Court's ruling throwing out ALL the states' anti-miscegenation laws. It is the logical outcome of the "Civil Rights" movement, which had as its basic premise, "Regardless of how we behave, you HAVE to receive us and treat us as EQUALS!"

There is nothing "respectable" about being on the receiving end of this behavior. It is well known that it is used to show dominance and to degrade the victim. That is why Africans do it to conquered tribesmen. That is why prison inmates do it to one another (mostly black on white, which is another reason it is never brought up anywhere).

The Apostle Paul referred to sodomites as dogs, and to their behavior as the "burning out of mankind." It was practiced as part of some of the pagan religions in his time. Now it is a sacred part of our state religion, Political Correctness.

Most preachers and ALL Respectable Conservatives refuse to make the connection between Civil Rights, racial integration, and "Gay Rights." They would rather attack people like Ole Bob for being a "racist" because I care about my people.

Why do they have such utter contempt for their flocks of sheep? Why such chutzpah?

Probably because they don't expect the average white American to figure it out for himself.

And to be honest with you, neither do I.

From Brown vs. Topeka to a Brown World

Truth is stranger than fiction, and there is a lot in a name. It is interesting that the Brown vs. Topeka decision is named as it is. It was the first major, open assault in the war to turn America brown.

The Supreme Court decision that threw out the anti-miscegenation laws in every state was Loving vs. Virginia. That name shows that the case was a set-up.

The offspring of race-mixing is always brown. That is another reason why there is no such thing as equality. Brown + white ALWAYS equals BROWN.

The offspring of sodomites is always brown as well. Fortunately, that offspring isn't living. It doesn't have to live with the fact that it is not lovely enough for one of its parents.

My point is not to be gross. My point is to make you think about something very unpleasant, but essential to your future, and that of your children and grandchildren.

Does it really surprise you that the top echelons of the Republican party, and the White House could be filled with perverts? DOES it surprise you? WHY should it?

They are the very people who forced white children to be bussed into black ghettos for decades. They are the very people who have thrown open wide our nation's borders to third worlders. They are the very people who DEMAND that we concede to GENOCIDE!

Could it be that they are motivated in the same way as the conquering African tribesman or the black prison "daddy," to degrade and humiliate us! To dominate, control and tear every shred of decency from us?

Could it be because they hate us with a blind hatred that we can never fathom?

A healthy man wants to have offspring that looks like him. He imagines a line extending hundreds of generations out into the future. This is summed up in God's first command, to be fruitful and multiply and take dominion over the earth. This is what has driven whites to create civilizations and reach for the stars.

"All who hate God love death" sums up our leaders in Washington. They too want to build a world that fits their souls. Dead, inert, and brown.

March 5, 2005 – What We're All About **March 5, 2005 – Upon the Birth of My Son**

3/7/05

I looked at this week's WOL again for inspiration. It's becoming a healthy addiction.

I have asked Peter to write a continuing series of articles chronicling his experiences and thoughts.

What We're All About

A trusted member of my book team just became a father.

In the end, future generations of white people is what we're all about, so I asked him to write what it feels like to be a warrior for our race's future and to have the whole meaning of that battle reinforced by the birth of a son.

He came through beautifully.

It seemed appropriate to make it the centerpiece of this week's WOL. More from the crabby old man next week.

Bob

Upon the Birth of My Son

Last week I had the awesome experience of witnessing the birth of my firstborn. Words can hardly describe the depth and breadth of the emotions I felt as I saw my son for the first time. Before I became a parent, other parents always told me that watching a child being born is unlike any experience on earth, that there is no way to describe the intensity of the love you feel for that brand-new person, inextricably bound in blood to you. I always thought I understood what they meant, but I never really did, until now.

What an amazing feeling, to look into your child's face and see a part of your own. But he is so much more than that. He is a product of a long line of his kind, a grand heritage of culture forged by those with the courage to live, love, sacrifice, and pass their genes on to the next generation, each line joining in an intricate, wonderful web to produce, at the end to this point, my son.

I see in his tiny face the Nelson line of my mother, hardy folk who inhabited the coastal areas of Alabama, enduring hurricanes, humidity, and even Sherman's march to make a life there. I see the noble line of Sir Thomas Greene, passing from his mother to him. I see his great and great great-grandfathers, both Southwest Virginia coal miners who scraped to make a living and died of lung disease from the work they did, not because they loved it, but because it was a living for their families. I see the Jacksons of Tennessee, the Couches of Virginia, the Esteps of North Carolina, and countless other people and families long gone but still alive in their progeny.

I see knights and warrior-priests, peasants, philosophers and kings, a heritage of high culture produced by a people with the genetic capacity to split the atom, invent virtually everything worth inventing, and send a man to the moon and back again.

But tragically, today, my son has been born into a world where his people have lost their identity, their very souls. They have been brainwashed into thinking their accomplishments have come not because of their God-given genetic capability, but by the exploitation of others. They have been guilt-ridden into accepting today's politically correct multicultural dogma, even to the point of the destruction, the genocide, of their own race through immigration and miscegenation.

When I look at my son I am reminded of just how important this struggle for the survival of our people is. After all, that crying little bundle of joy is what this thing is all about, because when our people cease to produce people of like genetic characteristics, our people, our race, will die, and the world will be the worse for it.

I want him to live in a world that's worth living in. I want him, as his ancestors did, to rise above the decadence that will surround him and be proud of who he is and who his ancestors are, to continue to forge, bit by bit, a little piece of the world they created, a world that is slowly but surely being destroyed. It will start by such a fundamental act of nature that were it not for the political correctness of this evil day it wouldn't seem such a revolutionary thing: the birth of a child like himself.

I am proud of his race, my race. I want to see our people survive. I want HIM to want to see our people survive. The day after my son was born I had the honor of handing to my father, his grandfather, a grandson who looked like him. All of my adult life I have dreamed of that moment, the moment when I could show him that his line would continue. I didn't say much, just held the back of his head and carefully handed him to my Dad, but my eyes welled and I couldn't help but get a little lump in my throat.

Our mission at its core boils down to two fundamental things, changing individual hearts and minds and producing offspring to ensure our survival. I thought of many things in that moment, the past, the present, but especially the future, perhaps twenty or thirty years from now when my son will hand me a little bundle of miracle, potential and promise. Then, if I have taught him well, he will truly understand that his people, his race will, in part, live or die depending on the choices he makes.

He will tell me with the little bundle he hands me that he has chosen right, that his people will live on, will continue.

Peter Anthony

March 12, 2005 – PC Jihad

March 12, 2005 – Sissies On The Warpath

March 12, 2005 – Desperate Respectables

March 12, 2005 – The Friend of My Enemy Is My Enemy

Fun Quote:

If a person uses labels to make good sound evil, anyone who respects those labels will someday meet Satan up close and personal.

PC Jihad

Most of my readers know that I constantly repeat the point that Political Correctness is not LIKE a religion, it IS a religion.

Well, what sort of religion is it? It seems to me that it is a lot like Islam with its jihad. Why do I say that?

Islam teaches that everyone is either a Muslim or an infidel. Islam requires complete devotion. The term "secular Islam" makes about as much sense as "Judeo-Christian."

Political Correctness DEMANDS total obedience from everyone. There is no middle ground. Everyone is either Politically Correct or a "hater."

Islam recognizes no distinction among adherents, racial, ethnic, cultural, or otherwise. You either are a Muslim or you are an infidel. If you recognize any other distinction, you are not true to Islam.

Political Correctness recognizes no distinction among adherents, racial, ethnic, cultural, or otherwise. You either are Politically Correct or you are a hater. If you recognize any other distinction, you are a hater. Unless, of course, you are a non-white.

In spite of its bloody beginnings and history, we are told by the White House and the media that Islam is a religion of "peace."

In like manner, everyone who opposes the ABSOLUTE demands of Political Correctness is INTOLERANT. So Political Correctness is a religion of "tolerance" in the same way that Islam is a religion of "peace."

"Spiritual" jihad in Islam is the inner battle to rid oneself of anything that hinders one from perfect obedience to Islam. Physical jihad is the war to subdue and convert or destroy infidels.

"Spiritual" Political Correctness is the inner battle against recognizing any differences among people, against "institutional racism," "patriarchal vestiges," etc. Physical Political Correctness is the war to subdue and eliminate the white race.

Faithful Islamic young people must memorize and recite large passages of the Koran by rote. They do this to be deemed worthy adherents and gain the approval of the Imam.

Young people living under Political Correctness are expected to memorize and recite large amounts of leftist nonsense to be blessed by its priesthood with a diploma.

Sissies On The Warpath

The comparison between Political Correctness and Islam is not perfect. There are some differences. Obviously, the substance of both teachings is different. But the major difference is in their method of "jihad."

Mohammed began Islam by good, old-fashioned murder and pillage. You either joined him or went on to the next life. It was a gruesome, but successful formula.

Political Correctness does not take a direct, masculine approach. It is feminine in its approach. All sweetness and light on the surface, but ruthless in its behind the scenes manipulations.

A Mohammedan would meet you head-on with a sword. That was his argument.

A Politically Correct "warrior" is an oxymoron. One can't imagine such a being.

Anyone who has seen the machinations of a group of women who are at odds with one another has a glimpse of how the Politically Correct "fight."

It takes men to meet men in battle. It takes men to keep women from each other's throats.

It takes men to stop Political Correctness.

Desperate Respectables

Respectable Conservatives are like feminine, secular Muslims. They are an oxymoron. They like to talk big and look tough, but are whimpering cowards.

Respectables are like the Tom turkey I saw recently. He is a well-fed, domesticated pet. When spring approaches, he begins to puff up to show off his plumage to the non-existent female turkeys. He can't help himself.

He usually gets a special treat at feeding time, a few nuggets of dog food. But this time of year, when the tasty bits are thrown down, he starts to puff out his feathers before he can bend down to get the food. The chickens then swoop in to grab them.

When the time comes for someone to make a tough political stand, respectables puff up like Tom turkey to show off their "colors." They do this to show off for some imaginary audience. They can't help themselves.

Of course, they never achieve anything, and allow the neocon chicken hawks to swoop in and grab the initiative away from them.

That is why the neocons are running the country and the respectables are, as usual, acting like a bunch of turkeys.

The Friend of My Enemy Is My Enemy

One of the tactics of war is concealment. Everyone is familiar with the camouflage worn by soldiers and painted on military vehicles. The enemy can't strike what he can't see.

Modern warfare has evolved more advanced forms of concealment. Instead of trying to hide troops and vehicles and weapons from the enemy with camouflage, armies create fake targets, making it much harder for the enemy to find the real ones. The plan is to get them to use up ammunition on non-existent targets, while keeping the real targets hidden.

Respectables play this role for the left and the neocons. They create all sorts of false issues to take up the time and resources of the little guy who actually wants to do something. Before these people can find the real targets, respectables have worn them out and exhausted them with incidental issues.

As long as a respectable can perform this function, he is important to the left. Of course, they have no use for him once he is no longer able to perform this function effectively. That is why the respectable must work so hard to keep up appearances.

In real war, such behavior is called "aiding and abetting the enemy." Such people are called traitors.

One can bet that the Mohammedans knew what to do with traitors.

Maybe we can learn a bit from diversity after all.

March 19, 2005 – Loyalty to "American Principles" Is Treason

March 19, 2005 – What the American Flag Means Today

March 19, 2005 – A Stark Choice

Fun Quote:

Cowards run in packs.

Loyalty to "American Principles" Is Treason

Leftists hate white gentiles. But every one of them will tell you he is a loyal American. He says he is loyal to "the principles America is based on."

The Constitution tells us the only principle America is based on:

"To secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and OUR Posterity."

We the people are the only authority the Constitution is based on. OUR well-being is the ONLY purpose of America.

"We the People" – NOT illegal aliens. Legal aliens only have the rights they need to HELP US.

Respectable conservatives always respect this, "Loyalty to principles." Many conservatives say they are loyal to Israel first.

This is treason.

Period.

If you are more loyal to other Catholics or other Jews or other evangelicals than you are to US, then you are a traitor. You don't belong here.

What the American Flag Means Today

African-Americans have overwhelmingly said in polls that they are about equally African and American in their loyalties. The first concern of most blacks is blacks.

Every political expert now agrees that it is stupid to expect Hispanics to be loyal to America. California Republicans lost the state by trying to take benefits away from illegal aliens. Hispanics voted overwhelmingly in favor of their brother Hispanics and against Americans.

Nobody puts it that way, because no one can be a respectable conservative and get on the national media if he says it that way. But nobody can deny that is the way Hispanic voters vote.

Only white gentiles are still droolingly loyal to the United States. So while we drool over giving freedom to Iraqis and proving to minorities we are goodies, our race faces genocide.

We are giving our loyalty away.

So white gentiles get exactly what they are asking for. They ask for nothing for themselves. They ask only to sacrifice to give to others. So they get nothing. They lose everything.

So far, so good. You get what you ask for when you declare your loyalty to a flag no matter what it does. But what upsets me is that, when white gentiles get exactly what they keep asking for, they get upset.

Your country is being overrun by the third world. Well, you keep saying you believe in a "melting pot" and a "nation of immigrants," so they have as much right here as you do. In fact, they have MORE right to be here than you do.

You agree that America was stolen from the Indians. You agree that every attempt by earlier Americans to protect their race by segregation or to avoid rule by minorities by denying minorities the vote was wrong.

So now you celebrate those "victories." Those are "civil rights triumphs" every conservative spokesman and conservative preacher raves about to prove he is anti-racist.

Your precious minority vote is exactly what those who tried to prevent minorities from getting suffrage said it would be. It is slavish bloc for leftism and anything that can hurt America and white gentiles. It is a slavish bloc for robbing productive people. And it is growing geometrically.

You got what you asked for.

A Stark Choice

I am tired to death of dealing with "conservatives" who say their first loyalty is to Christ, by which they mean their version of Christianity. I am sick to death of soldiers who will kill Americans to enforce anything the court decides is the Constitution this week.

That is what media conservatives and preachers say the American flag stands for.

You know as well as I do that not one of the Founding Fathers would disagree with me. They had just gotten rid of blind loyalty of that same kind to their King and Country in Britain. The one thing they agreed to was that a blind loyalty to a flag was treason.

It still is.

Are you loyal to everything Jerry Falwell or Professor Nitwit or Judge Goldberg says your flag stands for or are you loyal to your own race, your own interests?

Loyalty to the United States is NOT loyalty to abstract principles like a melting pot or diversity. As I pointed out many years ago:

"By definition, a melting pot is nothing specific. Anybody who is deeply loyal to nothing specific is in desperate need of psychiatric help."

Loyalty to "We the people of the United States of America and OUR posterity" is the exact opposite of loyalty to these manufactured "abstract principles."

Faithfulness to "We the People" is loyalty to your OWN interests, your OWN preferences, your OWN beliefs.

And your OWN, your WHITE prejudices.

I am proud that our Founding Fathers dedicated a country to its people, and nothing else.

No Divine Right. No King in robes. No all-powerful judges in robes who can tell every state and every other branch of the Federal government what to do.

America was founded to be a nation which is made up of its people. No claims to perfection. No "rule by law, not by mere men." No excuses.

That's America.

Anything else is treason.

March 26, 2005 – Pimping Pain and Suffering

March 26, 2005 – Real People Suffer

March 26, 2005 – Deadening Diversions

Fun Quote:

"Everything you add to the truth subtracts from the truth."

-- Alexander Solzhenitsyn

Pimping Pain and Suffering

Respectable Conservatives are on cloud nine. The Terry Schiavo case in Florida is something they live for. They can have a play fight with the left, and both come out ahead.

The left and the Respectable Conservatives love to sink their fangs into an issue like the Schiavo case. They could care less about the people involved, but each gets an enormous opportunity to grandstand. The left sees it as another chance to destroy common decency while the respectables can talk big and raise money on an issue that is emotionally touching and splashy but peripheral to the main issues.

Respectables and their unwitting followers get all worked up over this type of issue because it's safe. No one can be called a racist or bigot or hater for siding with Schiavo. Common pity and sympathy are natural in such an individual case. The poor, beleaguered working man with a sense of decency can give full vent to his emotions in this type of case without harming the left in any way.

Real leadership requires tough decision-making, detachment, and dedication to the big picture. Most people are incapable of this, especially with issues outside their immediate purview. That is why Jesus was so condemning of the scribes and Pharisees. They were the leaders of their day, and were living off of the people, "making merchandise" of them.

This is why Jesus told his disciples that the "greatest is the servant of all." He was talking about LEADERSHIP. A real leader serves his people by doing what is best for them, regardless of the cost to himself.

A Respectable helps himself to a big serving of his people.

Real People Suffer

The Schiavo case is a real tragedy for the families involved. It is shameful that their personal suffering is made into a political and media circus act.

Few people relate to abstract ideas. People relate to other people, and that is why these personal cases create such attraction.

The influence of TV and other media has warped this very human trait all out of perspective. That is why Congress and the Supreme Court and the President must all weigh in on this case and "do something!"

Anyone who believes a country can be governed adequately in this manner is out of his mind. It takes someone like Ole Bob to point this out.

When there is a natural disaster like the Florida hurricanes last year, the Governor and the President must immediately get on a helicopter and rush to the scene. Why? What good can they accomplish? They are wasting thousands of dollars and impeding the efforts to alleviate REAL suffering by REAL people. All for a dog and pony show.

Meanwhile back on planet earth, in fact in the same state of Florida, a little girl is brutally raped and murdered by a repeat "sex offender." The life of a family is torn apart because the left has succeeded in keeping these animals out of the electric chair and putting them back into REAL neighborhoods where they can prey on REAL people.

Oh, you'll hear Respectable Conservatives pound their fists about bringing back the death penalty and keeping these people locked up. But will you ever hear one remind a leftist who got them back on the streets in the first place?

Here is a well-written description of what REAL people suffer. It is part of an account of a young female "whigger" that is worth reading.

Notice how this young girl acts just like a "Respectable Conservative." Think about how many REAL little girls are ending up like this, because "Respectable Conservatives" have let the left lead us down this path.

Deadening Diversions

Cases that are novel and shocking grab the media headlines. People are drawn to them like moths to a flame. That is part of our nature. It is easily exploited.

It is horrible when a child is murdered. It is heart-rending to see a case like the Schiavo one.

But what can we say when we have thousands and thousands of our young people slowly destroyed right under our noses? Having Daddy's little girl become a wretched little whore over a ten year period is not a headline grabber. Yet we all see these works in progress every single day.

So while we have Respectable Conservatives and leftists and everybody else screaming and wailing over a brain-dead woman, we have thousands and thousands of our little girls being turned into brain-dead little tramps, and thousands and thousands of our little boys being turned into brain-dead animals.

Think about this when you watch Sean Hannity or Bill O'Reilly or your favorite respectable rail about the latest circus act. What are they saying about the little girls you see every day?

When the dust settles on the Schiavo case, and before the next one arrives, take some time to think about what is really being accomplished.

April 2, 2005 – A Man With A Memory Looks at Less Than Two Weeks Ago

April 2, 2005 – The Pope's Selective Morality

April 2, 2005 – The ONLY Anti-Liberal Who Will Offend Them

Fun Quote:

"The fat Russian agent was cornering all the foreign refugees in turn and explaining plausibly that this whole affair was an Anarchist plot. I watched him with some interest, for it was the first time that I had seen a person whose profession was telling lies — unless one counts journalists."

--George Orwell, Homage to Catalonia (1938)

A Man With A Memory Looks at Less Than Two Weeks Ago

Less than two weeks ago a little nine-year-old girl was raped and murdered by a repeat sex offender.

Again.

Her father, obviously a regular working man, choked back his tears and begged the country to PLEASE, at long last, get these perverts off the streets before more little girls were killed.

It was national news less than two weeks ago.

Remember?

The man said he was going to the state capitol to BEG the legislators to do something about these child molesters. The whole country was with him. Geraldo Rivera was interviewing him and said he would be there, too.

Remember?

But then the right-to-life bureaucracy got itself a big, juicy cause. A brain-dead woman was ordered off of life support. They marched and picketed and grabbed all the publicity.

I complained in my blog that this big, juicy right-to-life story was going to hog all the publicity thousands of molested children and thousands more children who are going to be molested and murdered desperately needed.

I pointed out that, thanks to the pro-life industry, thousands more children will have their lives ruined and many will be murdered before anything is done. This week hundreds of children will be molested. But the pro-life industry can't be bothered with that.

Have you heard anything about that murdered little girl on the news since right-to-life hogged all the coverage?

I haven't.

The Pope's Selective Morality

The Pope had nothing to say about repeat child molesters, except that he wants to protect them from the death penalty.

After all, this is the same Pope who refuses to take action against all the bishops who caused thousands of little boys to be raped by moving boy-raping priests around. Like the professional pro-life movement, what bothers him is what it is fashionable to care about.

The Pope has never said a word about child molesters except that they should not get the death penalty. He has never apologized at all for the decades in which his Church took the fashionable line that boy-raping priests should be "rehabilitated."

But when this nice juicy case of the brain-dead woman came up, the Pope had plenty to say. He said that life is infinitely precious. Like the pro-life movement in general, the Pope started off saying life is endlessly precious. No matter how ruinous to a family it may be, a person should be kept on life support forever.

Life is infinitely precious, they all said. Pain is not important. Even if a person is crippled from the neck down and desperately wants to die, he shouldn't be allowed to.

But that was DAYS ago. Nobody remembers them saying that.

Now suddenly pain is everything. They are saying Schiavo is dying in agony, and that is why she should be put back on life support.

Oh, there was another line they used. They said that medicine should not intervene when it comes to ending a human life. Of course, if it were not for medical "interference" Schiavo would have died years ago.

But who cares? It all sounds good, it all sounds SO nice.

And it is making piles of money for the pro-life bureaucracy.

The ONLY Anti-Liberal Who Will Offend Them

I am the only anti-liberal who will offend other anti-liberals by having a memory and a non-selective conscience.

Nobody but Bob Whitaker is going to raise hell about the pro-life movement going psychopathic.

The media used to laugh at pro-lifers. By now they have been kicked in the teeth enough to learn how powerful it is. The media is a bunch of cowards. They beat their chests about how bravely they back fashionable causes, but they instantly coward-out when the object of their cowardly attacks actually bites back.

Years ago, the Pope took a brave stand against Communism when it was not fashionable to do so. But the senile old man he has become is defending fashionable causes only.

I have a memory. I will never forget the brave man Pope John Paul once was. But that is because I have a memory.

I will never forget the heroism of the early pro-lifers before the professionals turned the movement into something monomaniacal and psychopathic. They were the first anti-liberals to back the national media down.

But that is not how history will remember this Pope or the pro-life movement.

I have a memory. History doesn't.

April 9, 2005 – Lions and Tigers and Vigilantes, Oh No!

April 9, 2005 – Will There Be Trouble At The Border?

April 9, 2005 – What Are CIVILIANS Doing Protecting the Border?

April 9, 2005 – Everybody knows Who the Hispanic- "Americans" Are Loyal To

Fun Quote:

If you ever get the feeling that everybody hates you, let Uncle Bob offer you this reassurance:

Most people don't even KNOW you.

Feel better now?

Lions and Tigers and Vigilantes, Oh No!

Bush and the media are attempting to smear the Minutemen by calling them "vigilantes." Do you think the average American has any idea where the term comes from? Bush and the media are counting on the fact that the average American has no idea what the word means. They are counting on the fact that the average American will recoil in horror at the term.

A "vigilante" was a member of a "vigilance committee." What is a "vigilance committee" you might ask, if you are braver than the average American?

Break down the phrase into two words to make it easy. Everyone knows what a committee is.

What about "vigilance?" It means "alert watchfulness" according to the dictionary.

A "vigilance committee" is a group of men assembled to maintain watchful alertness.

In the old west, they were citizens who had to keep watch against lawlessness. There was no government to protect them. They had to do it themselves. Of course in that sense they were a government, and they were freely elected.

So why are George Bush and the media so afraid of "vigilantes?"

Maybe the last thing they want from Americans is "alert watchfulness."

After all, isn't that the job Americans expect from Bush and the media?

Will There Be Trouble At The Border?

For decades millions of Mexicans have been coming across the border every year in violation of the law.

The prisons of our two biggest states, California and Texas are overcrowded largely because of Mexicans who came across that border illegally and committed crimes here.

Every year a huge number of those illegal aliens go back across that border so that Mexico can protect them against being punished for their crimes. A few of them have been photographed by American media walking the streets of Mexico City.

American media openly admits that's just the tip of the iceberg.

But now the media is in a frenzy about the fact that there could be trouble on the Mexican border.

That is because a few hundred Americans called the Minutemen have decided to go down to the Mexican border and report illegal aliens to the Border Patrol.

What Are CIVILIANS Doing Protecting the Border?

Many in the media are demanding to know why CIVILIANS are down there helping protect the American border?

The answer to this is very simple. America is the first country in world history to declare that our armed forces have no right to defend their country's borders. What if you had told the Founding Fathers that the American armed forces had no right to defend our borders?

They would have put you in the madhouse where you belonged.

The military is prohibited from protecting the border. Civilians are prohibited from protecting their border.

Decades of experience make one thing clear: the so-called Border Patrol is totally ineffective.

The media is terribly worried that the Minutemen may cause the wonderful situation at the border and Mexico will be upset by these nasty Minutemen. President Bush never even mentions any of the murders and rapes committed by illegal aliens who are protected by the Mexican Government. But he is denouncing those "vigilantes" who are reporting illegal aliens to the Border Patrol.

Everybody knows Who the Hispanic- "Americans" Are Loyal To

Hispanic-Americans have no loyalty to the United States, and Bush and the media are loyal only to them.

Everybody knows that any politician who tries to do anything about illegal aliens will lose if he has Hispanic voters. The media agree that California Republicans cut their own throats politically when they tried to keep Americans from paying for benefits to known illegal aliens.

Hispanic voters who call themselves Americans have no loyalty at all to Americans. Their only loyalty is to other Hispanics.

If they want me to stop saying that, they will have to stop voting that way.

We all know that the reason Bush opposes protecting the US border is precisely because Hispanic voters are loyal only to other Hispanics, America be damned.

That is the rule Bush lives by. But nobody is allowed to state the rule Bush lives by in plain English.

I just did.

April 16, 2005 – Minutemen, the Media and the Border: A Sense of Humor Is a Sense of Proportion

April 16, 2005 – Stepping On The Toes That COUNT

April 16, 2005 – Cases Where It Wasn't "Real Trouble"

April 16, 2005 – Real Trouble Is Sedition

Fun Quote:

Repeat:

A sense of humor is a sense of proportion.

Minutemen, the Media and the Border: A Sense of Humor Is a Sense of Proportion

Let us say that you are in Britain in 1916. Across the English Channel, men are being killed in numbers never even imagined in history before. On the front in France a whole generation is dying in poison gas, on barbed wire, by charging into machine guns, by being bitten by huge rats in the trenches.

This has been going on for two years.

Then someone goes from Britain across the Channel for a soccer game, and the press suddenly announces, "There is trouble in France." All the media go down to see, besides this routine World War I, what might happen in this soccer game to cause REAL trouble in Europe.

Wouldn't that be sad? Wouldn't that be insane?

Wouldn't that be so nuts it would be hard to comment on?

What do you do when everybody loses all sense of proportion?

Our prisons in the two largest states, Texas and California, are burgeoning with murderers and rapists who have crossed the border illegally. Mexico routinely protects Mexican rapists and murderers who go back to their homeland after child molesting, murder and more against American citizens.

But the Minutemen went down to the border and the media were suddenly galvanized. Suddenly, without the slightest awareness of how ridiculous they were being, they all announced that there might be real trouble on the Mexican border.

After decades of massive slaughter by those crossing the border, we are suddenly faced with "real" trouble.

And what is this "real" trouble? Some Americans, the Minutemen, are going down to the border and reporting illegals to the border patrol.

Like a soccer team crossing the Channel in 1916, these Minutemen are about to cause "real" trouble on the Rio Grande.

And nobody cracks a smile.

Stepping On The Toes That COUNT

There is a certain insane logic to the press declaring that Minutemen could cause "REAL trouble on the border."

The same insane logic applies to that soccer team, in the middle of World War I, that might cause REAL trouble in France.

You see, millions of young men were dying in France, but that was not REAL trouble.

Why? Because the Authorities were getting those young men killed. Sure they were dying in horrible agony, but the Proper Authorities were doing it. Prime Ministers and generals have every right to kill a few million young people if they feel like it. That's why they are generals. That's why they are Prime Ministers.

But the soccer team is not the Proper Authorities. There could be a riot at that soccer game, a riot which the Proper Authorities did not authorize.

Sure a few hundred Americans will be attacked this week by illegal immigrants the Proper Authorities, meaning the Border Patrol, let get into the United States.

So what?

The Border Patrol is the Proper Authority. It is doing its job. That's not REAL trouble.

The Minutemen are going to cause REAL trouble on the border because they are just American citizens, not Proper Authorities. And that is exactly what the media are talking about.

What would happen to the media if just anybody were allowed to report the news? They wouldn't be "the media" anymore.

What would happen if just any American were allowed to protect his nation's border? What would happen if a bunch of people who called themselves "The Sons of Liberty" started taking action against the Proper Authorities appointed by His Majesty King George III?

It could cause a revolution.

It DID cause a revolution. So the "real trouble" on the border has nothing to do with murderers or rapists or child molesters being protected in Mexico.

The media are saying that "real trouble" has nothing to do with death or destruction happening to human beings. "Real trouble" is not when the rights of the people are violated. "Real trouble" means that the rights of the BORDER PATROL are being violated.

Cases Where It Wasn't "Real Trouble"

One average citizen was financially ruined because he made a joking remark about terrorism in an airport. He said something like, "You better look in my luggage. There might be bomb in there."

He spent years spending all his money trying to stay out of prison for his remark.

Then an ex-governor of South Carolina was caught with a pistol in his carry-on luggage.

But the ex-governor was a Proper Authority. The press reported it, it was an embarrassment to him, but everybody laughed it off.

The media were outraged when Teddy Kennedy ended up on one of those Potential Terrorist lists. If YOU end up as one of those computer glitches naming YOU as a former terrorist, nobody in the media will be outraged about it.

If somebody executes a repeat child-killer, the media will be outraged. If you are killed on the street tomorrow by a repeat criminal, no one will care.

You are NOT a "Proper Authority." What happens to you is of no importance to the media. The media are Proper Authorities, too. The media have FCC licenses. The Border Patrol have badges.

You don't matter. Proper Authority is what matters.

If you carry a gun to protect yourself, you are a trouble-maker.

This year, a few hundred nurses and other hospital workers will be assaulted and crippled or killed on their way to the hospital because they are not allowed to have any means of self-defense. They can't carry weapons on the way to the hospital because weapons are forbidden IN the hospital.

You see, having a gun in a hospital is just "asking for trouble."

Why?

Because hospital workers don't have badges. Hospital workers are not Proper Authorities.

Sure, you could call it "trouble" if a health care worker gets shot on the street by an armed thug. But that is not REAL trouble.

The Minutemen are REAL trouble because they are infringing on the rights of people with badges, the Border Patrol, the Proper Authorities. Health care workers being killed on the street is not REAL trouble. It is only REAL trouble if they defend themselves, because that is the monopoly of the Proper Authorities.

If health care workers protect themselves, they are infringing on the rights of the guys with badges, the only Proper Authorities who have the right to carry guns.

Real Trouble Is Sedition

History says that the media are right about what REAL TROUBLE is.

History says that if the Proper Authorities don't protect other Proper Authorities, it can lead straight to revolution.

First the people start challenging the rights of the Proper Authorities to govern them, just because they feel that the Proper Authorities don't give a damn what happens to them. Pretty soon the people will start to say that the people, "We the People of the United States of America," should actually RUN things.

And if the people start running things for their own benefit, what will happen to the Proper Authorities?

No, the media tell us, "We the People" have no right to take over. This is a country of Laws, not of mere men.

The media are dead right about this. The lawyers are right about this. The police are right about this.

When the people begin to think in terms of their own rights instead of the rights of the police and the lawyers and the media, it will not just be "real trouble."

It will be a revolution.

An American Revolution!

How subversive can you get?

April 23, 2005 – Was Lenin A Communist?

April 23, 2005 – The Truth Is No Excuse

April 23, 2005 – What Political Correctness Outlaws Is Plain English

Fun Quote:

"Everything that can be invented has been invented."

-- Charles H. Duell, Commissioner, U.S. Office of Patents, 1899.

Was Lenin A Communist?

In order for a case to reach the courts, a judge has to be willing to accept that it makes some sense.

In the 1970s a woman constantly referred to herself as a "Marxist-Leninist." Someone called her a "Communist" and she sued him. I don't know whether she won or not, but it went to court in a serious civil case.

Marx, author of "The Communist Manifesto," would have been astonished to hear that he was not a Communist. Lenin would also have considered anyone who did not consider him to be a Communist to be a lunatic.

I repeat, the judge took the case.

There was no doubt in anybody's mind that a Marxist-Leninist was a Communist. The suit was about the right of a person to say so.

There was a TV movie some years ago about Robert Oppenheimer. Robert Oppenheimer was a leftist who was in on the development of the atomic bomb during World War II from the get-go. The whole point of the movie was to show that, while practically everybody Oppenheimer associated with was openly a Communist, Oppenheimer himself was not.

One scene showed a friend of Oppenheimer's going to a picnic with his fellow Communists in a bus marked, "Communist Jewish League." Some people stopped the bus and started shouting. Finally someone said something that started the fight. He called them "Commie Jews!"

This bigot was the villain of the piece.

Everybody watching the movie understood that a group of Communist Jews had the right to ride in a bus with the words "Communist-Jewish League" emblazoned on both sides, but no non-Communist gentile had any right calling them Communist Jews.

Those were fighting words. Please remember, EVERYBODY watching the movie was expected to understand that.

For many years it was considered extreme right-wing propaganda to call Fidel Castro a Communist. In 1957, while Castro was still a little-known guerilla in the Cuban hills, National Review announced he was an avowed Communist, from his own words.

The media, Republican moderates and many conservatives not only denied this statement, they ridiculed it.

In 1958, before Castro took power on January 1, 1959, the John Birch Society announced he was a Communist. For a couple of years after Castro took power in Cuba, saying he was a Communist was a strictly right-wing thing.

Then, in 1960, Castro announced that he was and always had been a Marxist-Leninist. Most of the media did what they always do. When the truth came out, they simply forgot that they had ever denied it and so did any conservative who ever wanted to be part of the national media.

But some in the liberal media held out. They insisted that when Castro said he had always been a "Marxist-Leninist" it did not mean they had been wrong. They argued at some length that a Marxist-Leninist was not necessarily a Communist.

The Truth Is No Excuse

The following is something I wrote in Bob's Blog:

Denying The Holocaust

In Germany or France anyone who says that less than six million Jews were killed by the Nazis is given an automatic sentence of one or two years in prison. Any witness for them receives the same sentence, so they are allowed no defense based on evidence.

I know very little about the subject, but I know the Holocaust deniers are right.

Why?

Because I am a freeborn American. I know that anything the government **REQUIRES** you to believe is not true.

I also know that anyone who cannot face debate and needs the government to outlaw all dispute is, and I use this word rarely and specifically, a liar.

Denying the Holocaust is the duty of every decent person.

One of the invaluable commenters on Bob's Blog reminded me that anyone who denied that four million Jews were thrown into gas ovens at Auschwitz was automatically sentenced to a year in prison. Then the authorities admitted that the gas ovens there had been built by them after the war.

The camps in Germany, where Andy Rooney announced on national television that he had SEEN the Holocaust, have now been proven and admitted not to have been death camps. Every single "death camp" was safely behind the Iron Curtain, where the truthful Soviet authorities had control of them and all information had to come from them.

But none of this was allowed to be used as a defense by anyone who questioned the NUMBERS, not the existence, that the Holocaust religion requires by law.

What Political Correctness Outlaws Is Plain English

Norman Mineta, Bush's Secretary of Transportation, has officially announced that the fact that a person is an Arab Muslim does not mean that he is more likely to be terrorist than a grandmother from Minneapolis.

The NAACP is in court saying that the fact that a person is a non-English-speaking Mexican crossing the Rio Grande is no more reason to think that he is an illegal immigrant than that same grandmother from Minneapolis.

No one believes any of this. In fact, the NAACP was deeply embarrassed when polls showed that a higher percentage of black people believed an Arab Muslim was more likely to be a terrorist than a grandmother from Minneapolis than white people did.

Whites are more used to telling pollsters what they want to hear. Blacks have not been terrorized into that yet.

If a conservative wants to be respectable he is never allowed to say to a liberal what Ronald Reagan said to Jimmy Carter, "There you go again." To be respectable a conservative must treat each new repetition of the same old silliness as the result of thought and honesty.

No one is allowed to laugh at a funeral. No one is allowed to laugh at Political Correctness.

April 30, 2005 – America's Nationalist Revolution

April 30, 2005 – The Nationalist South

April 30, 2005 – America's Foreign President

April 30, 2005 – Yankee Colonialism Continues

Fun Quote:

When a member of a minority group feels resentment it is called Righteous Indignation.

When a white gentile feels resentment it is called Hate.

America's Nationalist Revolution

The reason the American Revolution occurred has nothing to do with tea or stamp taxes. The American Revolution was the result of one single cause: it was time for it.

A new nation had grown up across the Atlantic from Britain. Almost all white Americans in 1776 had been born in America, their fathers had been born in America, their grandfathers had been born in America, and their GREAT grandfathers had been born in America.

In fact, the Americans who fought the Revolution and wrote the Constitution had the highest percentage of native-born Americans there have ever been in this country, before or since. The last of the big waves of immigration to America ended by 1710, and most of occurred long before that.

Americans had huge families and plenty of food and healthy places to live. The population doubled every twenty to twenty-five years naturally, without immigration.

One of the last debates Benjamin Franklin had in Britain before the Revolution ended suddenly when, for once, he had no reply. Franklin had been delegated to represent the interests of several colonies in London. In the middle of the debate, Franklin clammed up completely.

He was asked what silenced him, and he said that one man on the English side had said, "This man is not a Briton, this man is an AMERICAN."

Franklin suddenly realized that the Briton was right.

Franklin suddenly realized that all the talk of Taxation Without Representation and the Stamp Tax were utterly meaningless. The problem was that America was under the control of another nation.

All this is heresy today. Liberals and, therefore, respectable conservatives have to agree that America is not a group of people, it is a group of principles. They cannot admit that when the Constitution stated as its sole authority, "We the people of the United States and OUR posterity," they meant it.

When those who wrote Constitution dedicated it ENTIRELY, one hundred percent to nothing but the interests of ourselves and our posterity, they MEANT it.

The Nationalist South

By 1860 the South was an altogether separate nation from the North. The Civil War occurred for exactly the same reason the Revolutionary War occurred: those two peoples did not belong under the same government.

Only a tiny percentage of Southerners owned slaves, but Southerners insisted that as many western states as possible be slave states. The reason for that had nothing to do with their wanting to settle the west with their own slaves. Southerners identified the slave-holding states as THEIR nation.

By exactly the same token, Northerners, who couldn't care less about slaves, considered the free states as the expansion of THEIR nation. There were two nations existing under the same government, and the situation was untenable.

In 1776 the question was whether the British Empire would crush the Americans and truly make them part of the British nation. In 1861 the question was whether the North would crush the South and make it a part of the Yankee Nation.

The Deep South had seceded before Fort Sumter was fired on. Once the war began, the upper South and Texas seceded. They seceded because the two nations were now at war, and their nation was the South. There was a plebiscite in Tennessee and the population there voted three to one to join the Southern Nation. The percentage of slave owners in this overwhelming majority was minuscule.

They voted the way they did because they identified themselves with the Southern Nation.

General Grant made it clear that he was fighting for his nation, not against slavery.

Grant said, "If I thought this war was being fought to abolish slavery, I would offer my sword to the other side."

America's Foreign President

In 1865, Republicans knew exactly what the war had been about.

In 1865 the President of the United States was Andrew Johnson of Tennessee. Republicans pointed out that Johnson was "a foreigner." They denied any Southerners the right to sit in congress. They declared that the Yankee Nation had conquered the Southern Nation.

They were right. From that day forward, the South was a colony of the Yankee Nation in a much more genuine sense than American was ever British colony. The federal government ran huge surpluses because of the high tariffs the North imposed.

Southerners paid those tariffs twice. If they bought foreign goods, Southerners paid tariffs on them to such an extent that it not only financed the entire Federal budget, it caused embarrassing surpluses. In order to avoid paying the huge tariffs, Southerners had to buy much more expensive industrial products from New England. New England pocketed all of it, and that is why tariffs were kept so high.

That has been forgotten. And that was not the worst of it.

New England protected its industrial monopoly in America because New Englanders also owned the railroads. Any Southern company that wanted to ship industrial products north had to pay up to ten times as much as New England had to pay to send products south. It was impossible for the South to develop any major industries in the age when the only key to prosperity was industrialization. By the time of World War II tariffs had faded in importance.

With the New Deal, the federal government ceased to rely on tariffs for its main income. It was now supported by corporate taxes, excise taxes, and corporate income taxes.

If you ever wonder why so many conservative Southerners supported those new taxes, now you know the reason.

Yankee Colonialism Continues

In 1945 the group that calls itself The Greatest Generation came home. The Southern branch of that group insisted that "We are One Nation now." They took over the Sons of Confederate Veterans (SCV) and made it obedient to the Yankee nation.

In fact, I was at a SCV convention not long ago, and one speaker said, "We can openly support our flag now. The World War II generation isn't in control anymore."

In 1945, the railroad rates that had made the South a region of poverty were still in full force. But after four years of Obedience Training, Southerners were Yankee Nationalists. The same thing happened to Korean vets and Vietnam vets. They were almost all transformed into Yankee nationalists.

Most of the new generation has not been in the service.

They did not get their Obedience Training.

They are not what the Greatest Generation proudly called themselves, "dog-faces."

Thank God!

When the discriminatory rail rates, and the Old Reconstruction, ended in 1951, the New Reconstruction was under way. It was called "Civil Rights."

The propaganda explained "Civil Rights" as just a love of blacks. It was a campaign of hatred against white Southerners. Southerners were forced to use the word "Nee-grows" for blacks. Yankees loved that word because it is so unnatural for Southerners to pronounce. A Southerner saying "Nee-grow" was like him falling on his face before Political Correctness.

It was the founder of the Black Panthers who introduced using the word "black." He made it clear that the word "Nee-grow" was not natural for blacks either. The Yankee Nation had never thought about that. Their only intent was to make Southerners crawl. How blacks talked was not their problem.

In 1861 the war was about the Southern Nation against the Yankee Nation. In 1960 the war was between the Southern Nation and the Yankee Nation. Blacks were irrelevant to both sides.

Another great history lesson, "Washington's Klan" has facts you've probably never heard.

May 7, 2005 – News Flash! Religious Bias On Campus!

May 7, 2005 – A Mind Is A Terrible Thing To Waste

May 7, 2005 – Being Liberal Means Never Having To Face The Facts

May 7, 2005 – Making The World Safe For Democracy

Fun Quote:

The crisis continues.

In every category, almost 50% of the American population is below average.

News Flash! Religious Bias On Campus!

Air Force Academy Wrestles with Alleged Religious Bias was the headline this week. Do you think that ole Bob's message is starting to get across?

Well, no.

You see, there is Christian bias at the Air Force Academy. It is so bad that a group called Americans United for Separation of Church and State has gotten involved.

The Left has groups to combat even the most imaginary of problems. We have trouble even recognizing really big problems. As G.K. Chesterton said, "Men can always be blind to a thing so long as it is big enough." This article provides a case in point.

The "religious climate" at the Academy includes "allegations of anti-Semitism, favoritism for born-again Christian cadets and conversion attempts by evangelicals on the Colorado Springs campus."

Do you think that there is anti-white bias at the Academy? Do you think non-whites are favored over whites? Do you think the professors there promote leftist nonsense in class?

The article states that the Pentagon is taking these allegations "very seriously."

Do you think the Pentagon would ever even consider our complaints, except as perhaps signs of sedition?

A Mind Is A Terrible Thing To Waste

How stupid does one have to be to take the USA Today seriously? Look at the list of offenses that have the Pentagon up in arms.

They include "proselytizing by Christians, use of Bible quotes in official e-mail and an ad promoting Jesus in the base newspaper, signed by 200 academy leaders."

Also, the Leftist watchdogs for Separation of Church and State allege that "non-Christian cadets were harassed by seniors and that Christians were allowed to display crosses in the dorms while cadets were barred from hanging non-religious items."

By the way, did the Pentagon ever figure out why they were unable to stop three hijacked airliners from hitting the WTC and their own building on September 11th, 2001? Or has this issue got a higher priority level?

Perhaps this is so important because, as the article states, it grew out of a survey of students and staff following a "2003 scandal in which nearly 150 female cadets alleged that they had been sexually assaulted by fellow cadets in the previous decade."

Are we supposed to consider these two events related? Are we to believe that increasing Christian evangelism correlates to increasing numbers of sexual assaults? That emailing Bible quotes and hanging crosses in dorm rooms produces the same result as integrating neighborhoods?

Being Liberal Means Never Having To Face The Facts

Can you imagine a Respectable Conservative pointing out to a liberal that "nearly 150 female cadets" being sexually assaulted completely destroys the left's arguments for women in combat?

Everyone knows that conquering armies rape the women of the losers. It is understood that the aggressiveness required for waging war spills over into other behaviors.

So if women were the equals of men in combat, they would sexually assault men at roughly the same rate as men assault women.

"Nearly 150" to zero does not bode well for the combat readiness of women. Only someone as insensitive as ole Bob will point this out.

Of course, it would be really insensitive for ole Bob to point out that none of the traditional religions allow women in combat. Only the religion of Political Correctness insists on this.

The article has several other figures that aren't meant to be studied closely. For example, "55 instances of religious bias in the past five years" translates to 11 per year. For a school with 4,000 cadets, that translates to less than one quarter of one percent. Since the school is 1% Jewish, less than 1% Muslim, and roughly 8% other, does that sound like such a big deal?

Do you think that out of a group of 40 Jews, 30 something Muslims (at a military school in the midst of a war in the middle east) and 350 assorted non-Christians you could find 11 who might not like Bible verses in emails or crosses in dorm rooms?

Making The World Safe For Democracy

Air Force cadets are being trained to enter into combat to bring "democracy" to the unenlightened nations. Of course, don't expect them to be allowed to practice it at home.

You see, just because 90% of the student body is Christian, that doesn't mean that the 0.275% who have some sort of minor complaint about that shouldn't be allowed to overrule them.

The beautiful chapel at the Academy is the "most recognizable" building on campus, which is another grave cause for concern. You see, the main floor is given to the Protestants, with only 60% of the cadet population. The Catholics have to settle for a downstairs room, coming in at only 30%. The Jews get a synagogue at 1%, and the Muslims have a prayer room.

The "Others" get rooms as well.

It is all soooooo unfair!

It is all soooooo confusing!

Our ancestors would have understood why the chapel is the "most recognizable" building on campus. They built it that way. They understood that the military was meant to serve a higher purpose. It was meant to serve and protect a workable and recognizable order based on eternal principles.

They sure were a bunch of hate filled bigots.

May 14, 2005 – "It's Very Simple, Bob."

May 14, 2005 – A Comedy of Errors

May 14, 2005 – Intro and Guests

May 14, 2005 – The Dull Cutting Edge

Fun Quote:

Just before I hosted my first Internet radio show this week, someone wrote me:

"Break a leg, Bob!"

My reply was:

"Gladly. Whose?"

"It's Very Simple, Bob."

I now have a Saturday Internet broadcast, 6 pm EDT for an hour or so. You can find it at:

WhitakerOnline Townhall Archive: "THE UNTRAINED EYE"

or at: Stormfront Townhall Saturdays

David Duke's outfit set it up. James Kelso there said it was "very simple."

I am going to get him for that.

Let me describe this "simple" setup.

I have a headset on. In the 1960s, a "headset" meant an entirely different thing which included a bong and some marijuana. The headset I mean here is a combination earphone and microphone. You adjust the sound and turn the headset off and on with a button on the headset.

But you ALSO do the program through Shoutcast, software which sends whatever you do on the headset to the central office of Dukeradio, which then puts it on the Internet. So you have to look at the "output" box on the Shoutcast diagram that is on your desktop.

Meanwhile, you have to keep the AIM monitor open. AIM is a direct link, just like Instant Messages on AOL, to Kelso and Company, so they can tell you if you are doing something wrong. If you are, you get a bell on your earphone.

I got a lot of bells.

For one thing, I accidentally turned off my headset.

Then you also monitor the Stormfront Townhall for comments. I thought I wasn't getting any, BECAUSE:

You also have to hit the refresh button regularly.

All this time you are supposed to be doing the talking.

I have been a ham radio operator for decades, and I did a short stint as a radio announcer "doing my own board," so I know I will catch up on this, but there is nothing simple about it.

I am going to get Kelso for this.

A Comedy of Errors

I turned the mike off in the middle of the program. Kelso notified me, and I finally found out what this "technical" problem was.

One person said I sounded like I was on "downers," meaning tranquillizers like Valium. Unfortunately, I was perfectly clean and sober. What happens is that, with all you have to say, when that mike is suddenly open and under your nose, even the pros speak haltingly.

That is why professional announcers are so energetic. When you listen to the replay, you keep telling yourself, "For Heaven's sake, get to the POINT!" The words don't come to you, and every break for thought sounds very, very long on the listener's end.

It also doesn't help if you turn off the mike in the middle of the program.

When I didn't see any comments on Stormfront and my blog was dead in the water, I closed out the program at 6:58 instead of 7.

The reason I had none of the many comments on Stormfront was because I had not hit the "Refresh" button.

When, once again, I found out what this complicated technical problem was, I got back on the show and dealt with the comments on Stormfront.

The blog stayed dead. Whitakeronline.org has the least responsive audience on Planet Earth, but the ideas get out, which is what I am after.

Also, I am not used to a headset. In ham radio and back when I did my stint as a radio announcer, there was a separate set of earphones and a separate microphone (or a code key, or tom-toms -- this was a LONG time ago). Any motion you make with this microphone attached to the headphones can result in a sound like an explosion.

Intro and Guests

I have no intro for my show yet. The intro is where music comes on and someone announces, "This is the Bob Whitaker Show" and so forth. A young professional announcer has volunteered to do my intro and I plan to take him up on it.

But that will require another piece of equipment. I need to learn to use what I've got first.

I would also love to have guests. They could talk while I am trying to turn my mike back on.

When I was guest on James Edwards's "The Political Cesspool" a couple of times, I seem to have done well. James is another young pro who has his own radio station in Memphis and his show is on the internet at Listen to the Political Cesspool live.

James tells me he had his second best audience with Bay Buchanan. But his audience when I was his guest the second time doubled even her numbers.

James has volunteered to be a guest on my show anytime I want him, and I will want him a lot.

So what's holding me up?

The intro requires more equipment. Having a guest requires even more equipment, all of which I must learn to handle during the show. New equipment will have to wait until I learn to handle this stuff.

Add to all that James Kelso tells me having a guest on is "very simple."

That statement alone scares the hell out of me.

The Dull Cutting Edge

My staff told me that WOL readers want information, not my life story. They have also told me in the past that radio interviewers have had to pull information about my life out of me like they were pulling my teeth.

I guess some folks are never satisfied.

But my point here, besides getting you to listen to the program, is to outline how much simpler it is becoming to get out information. ANYONE can do what I'm doing technically.

Not just anyone can say what I have to say like I can say it.

The left has maintained control by restricting access to the media. When you had the "big three" TV networks and local radio, there wasn't much chance of hearing anything they didn't want you to. The growth of cable TV created more channels, which resulted in a bigger market for Respectable Conservatives to try and appease the "unwashed yahoos" as the New York liberals call us.

Now we have satellite radio, cable and satellite TV, and the internet. Soon local radio stations will be digital, allowing several program streams over a single frequency. The information channels are opening up exponentially. There is no way they can keep them filled with the same narrow spectrum of crap we have today.

The radio industry sees the future as centering on what they call "podcasting." That is, people like me running programs that can be downloaded into an "iPod" or similar device and listened to any time and anywhere. An almost infinite variety of programming will be available -- at virtually no cost -- and almost as easy as sending email.

This will kill the left. As much as they rant about "freedom of speech," everybody knows that is the last thing they want. They want to be in control. Since their ideas never work, they can't allow alternative views and ever survive.

No one recognizes the import of something when it is just in its infancy. It is just a curiosity or fad. When, and it is a matter of when, not if, the left is destroyed, it will be because people finally got to hear something different. Something that makes sense.

Something that works.

May 21, 2005 – V-E Day, May 8, 1945

May 21, 2005 – The Churchill Clown

May 21, 2005 – Heroism Cannot Trump Stupidity

May 21, 2005 – Gee, Guys, What Happened?

Fun Quote:

For you martial arts fans, I would like to point out my favorite tactic when I am faced with a fight.

When faced with hand-to-hand fighting, the French have a method of hitting with their legs that is called Savate.

I use my legs too. My method is called the Sprint.

V-E Day, May 8, 1945

May 8, 1945 was V-E Day, the day Nazi Germany surrendered.

On April 30, 1945, Hitler committed suicide in his Berlin Bunker.

There was some question about whether the other Allies would take Berlin along with the Soviets. Stalin explained to Roosevelt that May Day, May 1st, was a big day for the Soviet Revolution, so the Soviets alone should take the German capital.

So Roosevelt gave Berlin to Stalin.

All this bothered Churchill. He was worried about the fact that Russia was being given what it had always wanted, a foothold in the very center of Europe. He was suddenly worried that, once Russia got Berlin, it would claim half of the continent.

Within five years, the Soviet Empire did indeed include half of Europe.

What Churchill did not realize was that both Roosevelt and Stalin understood that he was a has-been, a funny little out-of-date joke.

The Churchill Clown

It is almost impossible today for us to understand the world Churchill's sick little mind lived in.

In 1814 Britain defeated Napoleon and reestablished its traditional policy of a Balance of Power in Europe. When Hitler came along, he threatened the Balance of Power in Europe. When Hitler conquered France in 1940, Churchill's only concern was restoring the Balance of Power in Europe.

This is not a joke. This was Churchill's policy.

In 1939, when both Hitler and Stalin, by agreement, invaded Poland, Britain only declared war against Hitler. Hitler was threatening the Balance of Power in Europe. To Churchill, only Germany was threatening the Balance of Power in Europe.

I hope I haven't lost you here. I am NOT overstating this. That was REALLY Churchill's World View.

This is NOT a joke.

So France joined Britain in declaring war ONLY against Germany. Germany proceeded, as usual, to beat the hell out of France.

Germany then said, "OK. We conquered France again. Now would you please get out of the way and let us conquer the Soviet Union as Hitler said he wanted to do in Mein Kampf?"

Churchill refused to make any peace with Germany. Churchill was still living in the days of Napoleon, when Britain stood alone against the Enemy of the Balance of Power in Europe and refused to make peace with the Corsican tyrant.

No, I am NOT joking here.

So, in 1940, Churchill sat there and kept the war going.

One day a German airplane dropped a couple of bombs which landed, specifically against orders, in a civilian area. Germany officially apologized.

This was the break Churchill was looking for. He launched a retaliatory raid against civilian targets in Berlin. That is how the London Blitz began. Germany did not like Britain attacking its civilians, so it hit back, HARD.

Edward R. Murrow, the god of American broadcasting, began his series of broadcasts by describing how mean the Germans were.

Recently the History Channel had a program entitled, "Roosevelt: He Brought Light to America By Keeping It in the Dark." The program refers to the joint efforts of Roosevelt and other American liberals like Edward R. Murrow to get America in the war.

Germany never understood why France and Britain only declared war against them and not against Stalin, who also invaded Poland. The Germans understood even less that Churchill was chomping at the bit to join Stalin and Roosevelt in a joint destruction of Germany.

Germany never understood that Churchill had no idea that Europe's time of total world domination had passed. Hitler saw the Soviet power and the American power, and he wanted to join with the British

Empire as a European balance to those powers. He praised the British Empire in Mein Kampf. He never understood that Churchill was rooted in 1814.

He simply never understood how dumb Churchill was.

Heroism Cannot Trump Stupidity

Germany and the Soviet Union were buddies until June 22, 1941. That was the day Germany, which shared Poland with the USSR, attacked the USSR on the common front they shared in Poland.

So the Germans thought, "OK, now you know what we were really after all this time was the Soviet Union."

Wrong.

Right after Germany invaded the USSR something incredible happened. Rudolf Hess, the Number Three man in the entire Nazi Government, flew straight to Britain to arrange for a peace settlement with Britain and the freeing of France so Germany could take care of Stalin.

Hess was a World War I hero as a combat pilot. This was a heroic mission that was typical of Hess.

I knew someone who served with him in World War I. He called my friend before he left. Hitler knew all about it.

The number three man in the United States Government is the Speaker of the House. Can you imagine, in the middle of a war, the Speaker of the House flying unprotected into an enemy country and trying to make peace?

That's what happened. Germany simply could not understand that Churchill lived in 1814. Edward R. Murrow and Roosevelt said Hess was nuts. Hess spent the rest of his life in prison.

Gee, Guys, What Happened?

Back to May 8, 1945. Roosevelt gave Stalin Berlin and half of Europe.

And, gee whiz, something else happened. Stalin and Roosevelt, with Churchill invited as a formality, met at Yalta to divide up Europe.

Churchill found that his old friend and worshiper, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, completely ignored him. He was terribly upset. What happened to the praise and glory his bosom buddy FDR had given him when he was the front guy for destroying Germany?

When two great powers are dividing up a silly-ass continent that just destroyed itself, they don't have time for a clown who is living in 1814. Churchill never figured that out.

Edward R. Murrow and the liberals gave Winnie Churchill one more shot at being a Great Prophet. After all, he had done his part for the leftist cause and he deserved a little praise.

So in 1948 Winnie said in a speech that "an Iron Curtain has fallen over Eastern Europe." Stalin, his buddy, his ally, his Hero, had taken his half of Europe and turned it into some kind of - well let's say it - some kind of a DICTATORSHIP!

Only a genius and a prophet could have figured THAT out!

I am NOT joking.

May 28, 2005 – Guest Worker Programs NEVER Work

May 28, 2005 – Communist North Vietnam's Boy in DC

May 28, 2005 – McCain to the Rescue!

Fun Quote:

Moderation in all things is an extreme position.

Guest Worker Programs NEVER Work

I was working on a brick plant in Germany in 1959. There was a huge worker shortage in the booming German economy, so they decided to start the original "guest worker" program. The idea was that they would allow workers from "poor" countries to come in and work until the post-war boom ended, then send them home.

As soon as GERMAN workers started to be unemployed, they would just send the guest workers (Gastarbeiter) home.

I was eighteen years old. I told them, "Once they get here, you'll NEVER get rid of them." I was told I was too young to understand the subtleties of the brilliant European Mind. I was a provincial racist from the South.

And so on and so forth.

That was back when I was also saying that after schools were integrated whites would drop to the level of blacks. Drug addiction and illegitimacy, largely black problems at the time, would skyrocket among whites.

I said school standards would collapse.

I said schools would become violent.

I was told I was a provincial racist. I did not understand the subtle brilliance of the Academic Mind.

Germany never got rid of its guest workers. White drug addiction is as high as black rates were in 1954, and black rates are now even worse. School standards have collapsed. Schools now routinely have to run weapons checks.

So Bill O'Reilly and all the conservatives agree that what is needed in America to take care of Mexican immigration is a Guest Worker Plan.

Communist North Vietnam's Boy in DC

So who is taking the lead on a guest worker program?

John McCain, of course.

John McCain has the silver star for bravery as a prisoner of war in Vietnam.

In order to get the silver star you have to be seen performing a heroic deed by a superior officer. McCain, according to John McCain, resisted torture by the North Vietnamese.

Well, sort of. He has said repeatedly and publically that in other wars one could resist and survive, but in North Vietnam he knew some who resisted that way and they are all dead. So he admits he gave information.

So they gave him a silver star for being a prisoner of war. No one saw his "bravery" when the Communists questioned him. His open admission that he gave information is a good defense preparation if his file ever emerges from the Vietnamese Communists.

He told US News and World Report (I looked it up) that his first words to the Communists when he was captured were, "I am injured. You give me medicine and I'll give you information."

Move over, Jane Fonda.

To repeat, the Vietnamese are the only ones who have access to McCain's interrogation file. No American has ever seen it. But McCain was the son of an admiral, so they gave him a silver star.

It so happens that John McCain is the best friend Communist Vietnam has in congress. Even far left liberals don't bow and scrape to them the way McCain does. He has helped block all attempts to find missing Vietnam POW's. The families of missing Americans in Vietnam hate him.

This is very relevant, because John McCain is doing the same thing for the left today that he did when was a POW in Vietnam.

McCain to the Rescue!

In Vietnam John McCain wore the American uniform and he admits he helped the Viet Cong. He is invaluable to Communist Vietnam today. If a liberal says he thinks all the POWs are accounted for, no one believes him. But when John McCain, the ex-POW and Official Hero, says that North Vietnam has done all they can do to locate missing POWs, everybody agrees.

If John McCain loves North Vietnam and wants to leave "all that" behind him, people listen. He is a Hero. He has Suffered and Forgiven.

So when liberals realize they can't get hard gun control yet, they get McCain to lead a charge to get whatever gun control they CAN get. When the Senate gets ready to get rid of the filibuster on a presidential appointment, McCain heads up a group of senators to save them.

On the guest worker program, McCain is in there getting everything he can for open border liberals.

This is how it works. On one side there are those few sane people who want to simply enforce our immigration laws. On the other side there are those who want a huge amnesty program which will begin with the cover-name "guest workers." The middle of the road would be between these two groups.

In steps McCain, who offers a "conservative" guest workers' program. His has become the conservative, the right-wing position. So the middle of the road is between McCain, who wants a guest worker program that will soon be total amnesty for all illegal invaders, and those who want completely open borders.

McCain is the best thing that ever happened to the left. He carries more of their water than any five liberal senators ever could.

In America, McCain is far more useful to the left as a "conservative" senator than any five liberal senators could ever be.

June 4, 2005 – The Tide of History

June 4, 2005 – Hitler's Revolution

June 4, 2005 – Other Revolutions

June 4, 2005 – Riding the Tide of History

Fun Quote:

You make friends by laughing WITH them.

You destroy enemies by laughing AT them.

The Tide of History

This Saturday on my radio show I will talk about "The Tide of History."

This comes from Shakespeare's Julius Caesar:

"There is a tide in the affairs of men which, taken at the crest, leads on to fortune."

That is the story of revolution throughout history...

It makes no difference whatever what the revolution is about. It makes no difference whether the revolution is good or bad. They all depend on riding the tide.

A revolutionary is exactly like a surfer waiting for his wave. A hundred other surfers are waiting for the big wave. None of them can CREATE the wave. If the wave does not come, they will all be left standing there with their surfboards in their hands looking a little silly.

But there WILL be a wave. That is the nature of the ocean.

There WILL be a wave.

That is the nature of men.

Hitler's Revolution

The reason that there are so many books about Hitler, not just the Nazis, but about Adolf Hitler himself, is because he stands out in history as a one-man show. Historians know that the Nazi Revolution could not have occurred without this unique personality.

So historians and Nazis keep asking, "What was there about Hitler that made this revolution?"

What, to use the colloquial phrase, did Hitler have going for him?

He certainly had talent. Even Churchill wryly admitted, "he was great man, if evil can be called great."

Concentrating on Hitler personally it is easy to miss what Hitler "had going for him."

Hitler had Germany's defeat in World War I and the Allies insane drive to destroy Germany out of spite and greed. He had the wild German inflation in 1923. In 1933 he had the greatest and deepest Depression the world had ever experienced, with Germany suffering most because of the impossibly high reparations imposed upon them.

He had a stupid Communist Party. In 1933 the Nazis and the Communists between them held a majority in the Reichstag. No government could be formed which did not include either the Communists or the Nazis. If they had been reasonable, the Communists might have prevented the Nazi takeover. But they demanded power, so Hindenburg had no choice but to make Hitler chancellor.

The Nazi Party almost disappeared in the late 1920s. But when the tide of history rolled in, Hitler was ready for it.

Other Revolutions

In 1776 America was a separate country from Britain. Almost every American had been born here, his father had been born here, his grandfather had been born here. The tea tax had nothing to do with it. A nation had grown up here that had no stake in the British Empire and it was time to separate. That was the tide of history.

If they had not been here at the crest of that tide, the Founding Fathers would have remained a group of talented gentlemen, nothing more.

If Robespierre and Napoleon had lived at any other time, history would have passed them over.

You can analyze Lenin all you want to, but he did not create World War I and a weak and stupid Czar and a Russian history of totalitarian rule.

A surfer who thinks he created the wave is insane.

But a revolutionary must, like a surfer, concentrate on being ready for the wave.

A person who is preparing for the Big Wave is entirely different from a swimmer who waits for nothing, but makes do with the water as it is and makes all his motions in a calm sea...

By exactly the same token, a revolutionary is entirely different from a politician, who makes his own motions.

Riding the Tide of History

After the Battles of Lexington and Concord many patriots made impassioned speeches.

Some demanded peace. Some demanded war.

George Washington spoke very little. He just took his seat in the legislature wearing a uniform.

His message was, "There's a war on. When you clowns get around to facing the facts, I'm ready to take over."

In the Soviet Assembly in 1917, all was confusion. The chairman of the soviet, of which the Communist Party held only a few seats, asked, "Is there any party here that would be willing to assume complete control of the country at this time?"

Lenin stood up and said, "There is such a party."

He was not playing politics. He was playing Revolution.

At this moment, everybody is trying to play politics. But there is a tide rising. The reason Europe and Canada have laws against discussing race is precisely because race is the huge wave inevitably making its way to the shore.

In the next age, someone will speak for the black race, someone will speak for the Asians, someone will speak for Hispanics.

And someone will speak for whites.

That is the tide of history.

While mealy-mouths are playing politics, whites are soon going to have to take on spokesmen. Not spokesmen for protecting the border and a melting pot. Spokesmen for WHITES.

Like Lenin and Hitler and, oddly enough, Washington, someone is going to have to see the wave and ride it. All regular politics will, quite simply, drown.

June 11, 2005 – Routine Racism

June 11, 2005 – How Respectable Conservatives Save Racist Liberals

June 11, 2005 – Don't Embarrass Poor Little Jesse

June 11, 2005 – Interrogator

Fun Quote:

I walked twenty miles a day to school when I was young.

I know all the other old-timers tell you that, but they lived in Minnesota or New York.

I was raised in South Carolina, and walking twenty miles in the snow in South Carolina is MUCH more difficult.

Routine Racism

One of the main jobs of a political advisor is to analyze attitudes everybody has, but nobody realizes they have. I will be discussing one of these attitudes on this week's internet radio broadcast. You can listen to the main program at any time:

Go To: [The Untrained Eye](#)

I call it routine racism.

When a liberal and I discuss race, we are both being very racist.

We both consider black people to be pathetic. The only disagreement we have is how to deal with the pathetic black folks.

So when blacks say whites are all racists, they are perfectly correct. But what they NEVER want to talk about is what that MEANS.

Let me give you an example of what I am talking about.

There are many black men like O.J. Simpson who make it very, very clear that they would never date a black woman. I remember watching a roast of Sammy Davis, Jr. on television. A black singer was thanking him for his help early in her career, and said:

"I couldn't figure out why he was helping me. I wasn't anybody special. I wasn't white."

Sammy Davis gritted his teeth and laughed. She was talking about his younger days when he married Mai Brit, a very blond Swedish actress. Brit had worn a revealing wedding dress that made her look like a whore. Davis would never date anybody with discernable Negroid blood in them.

In other words, O.J. Simpson would never date a woman who looked like his daughter with a white woman, and Sammy Davis would never date someone with the obvious Negroid blood in her that Davis's son with Mai Brit has.

Every liberal understands why a black man would want a blond. Every liberal will fight for the black man's right to have a blond.

Everybody understands a black man who is obsessed with blond beauty. That is the opposite of racism to a liberal. What the black man wants to do with that blond beauty is destroy it. He wants to produce children he would reject as a mate.

I love blond beauty. But I am a racist because I want to preserve it.

If you watch anything produced in Canada, you will see that they only have blond girls walking with very black guys or making whoopee with very dark and greasy-looking Middle Easterners. They have to pay their dues to Political Correctness.

Look at Swedish ads. The blond girls are always with very, very dark Middle Easterners or blacks.

This is required anti-racism. Liberals agree that blonds are more beautiful, and dark guys have a right to them.

How Respectable Conservatives Save Racist Liberals

Back when Bob Jones University had its tax deductible status revoked because it did not allow interracial dating, a reporter interviewed three Bob Jones students, one black and two whites.

The liberal reporter asked the black student, "Don't you resent being discriminated against?" The black student replied, "I can only date black women. I WANT to date black women. White students can only date whites. Why am I being discriminated against?"

That answer put the reporter in an AWFUL position.

If the other students had backed the black student up, he could have forced the reporter to admit that the reason he asked the black student that was because he looks upon black females as inferior.

Fortunately the reporter had the white students to talk to. As good respectable conservatives, they acted as if the black guy wasn't there, and got the reporter off the hook by going into nice abstract arguments.

Liberals all agree that a black man who is denied blond beauty is being discriminated against.

Liberal or conservative or Communist, all white folks assume that non-whites are inferior. We only argue about what to do about it.

Liberals support the underdog. They take it for granted that blacks are the eternal and incurable underdogs.

So do I.

But I am the racist.

Black "leaders" live on liberal handouts. They leave it to heroes like Stokely Carmichael to go to Africa and die there working to help out black people.

Black "leaders" stay in the Maryland suburbs and make a good living attacking the Confederate flag.

They say whites are racist. We all know that. But black "leaders" never explain exactly what "racist" means. It would ruin their whole gig.

Don't Embarrass Poor Little Jesse

Back when Jesse Jackson first ran for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1984, of all years, the media reported a problem the white candidates had. As the first debate approached, the media reported a concern other liberal Democrats had that they understood perfectly.

They were afraid of making Jesse Jackson look like a dumb (N word).

Jesse Jackson has never said anything in a debate that anyone could not have written for him. It was hard for even the most devoted liberal to convince people that Jackson was saying something interesting.

We all know why. If you look at any so-called black leader on television, you see what is obvious to everybody. He never says anything that doesn't go straight from his parietal lobe to his mouth.

The human brain has a frontal lobe, where new information is processed, a parietal lobe behind it from which remembered information comes, and the occipital and temporal lobes which were there from early evolution. A black "leader" spouts. He never comes up with anything that he has not perfectly memorized from endless repetition.

What I have said is far too blunt. I need to say it more diplomatically. My bluntness is the result of my peculiar experience. Let me explain that to you.

Interrogator

I have been a professional interrogator for decades. If you want to know what that does to you, listen to a routine conversation any experienced cop will have with another experienced cop:

"He's lying. What do you think he's lying ABOUT?"

They know a person is lying. It may be the fluid, unhesitating lying that anyone in prison learns to do, or it may be the opposite. A normally honest person hesitates and averts his eyes. There is no formula, there's simply experience.

My doctor brother said to me, "It is incredible what people who take the Minnesota Personality Inventory (MPI) tell me." He went on, "if they knew what those harmless questions told me, they wouldn't do it even anonymously."

When you talk to me, I hear every word, or I make you repeat it. I know exactly when you didn't hear what I said.

I know where your statements are coming from, your memory or your thought.

When a black "leader" speaks and you watch his eyes, the lights go out. Watch him. Every word comes straight from the script he has repeated hundreds of times.

That was the problem the Democratic debaters faced with Jesse Jackson.

Every professional politician is an interrogator, and the liberals were worried about what they knew about Jesse Jackson.

They didn't embarrass little Jesse, and every word Jesse said was straight out of his memorized play book.

I remember a black man who was part of a public discussion of Thomas Jefferson's alleged relationship with Sally Hemings, the mulatto woman who was supposed to have borne his child. All the DNA tests proved about this was that Jefferson or a member of his family had fathered her child. It was probably one of his cousins.

But the black guy did not know a thing about this. When someone asked him if he had read the report, he was very indignant.

Of course he hadn't read the report. That was not why he was there.

He was there because he was black. He was there to make a point. He was there to make the point that when the child was fathered Hemings was underage so Jefferson was a child molester.

No one expected him to read the report. He was black. NO one expected him to read the report. At the end of the program he said Jefferson was a child molester. That's what he was there for and that's what he did.

If a white man had done exactly the same thing, he would have been ridiculed.

But black is not white. Everybody understood the Democrats' dilemma when Jesse Jackson showed up in the debate. They were dying to prove that the other white candidates were repeating the same old crap mindlessly. But they were terrified of even hinting that the black guy, the guy they knew was going to repeat the same old crap endlessly, was doing just that.

You know that. I know that. The media knew that. We also know no one is allowed to say it.

Except for me, of course.

June 18, 2005 – Using Time

June 18, 2005 – We Need A New Approach For A New World

June 18, 2005 – Who Are We?

Fun Quote:

Beware of marriage counselors who have been divorced and remarried several times.

Ex-spouses make good references.

Using Time

During my professor days, I often had to teach basic economics at 8 AM on Monday morning. It was a small nightmare.

First of all, basic economics is very, very boring. Secondly, a lot of students had to take it. Thirdly on Monday morning about everybody in the class, including me, was trying to recover from the weekend.

Spending fifty minutes talking about a notoriously boring subject when you and everybody else in the room feels like hell is a very, very unpleasant thing to have to do.

So I hit on a formula. I told the class that, if they listened to every word I said, my lecture would be over in half the time, twenty-five minutes. After twenty-five minutes, I kept the students who weren't listening in for the whole fifty minutes. I just sat there and felt bad and let the rest go.

Soon I didn't have to keep anybody.

And I found on tests that the class remembered what I said during that twenty-five minutes better than they remembered the material in any other class.

I could say it all twice in twenty-five minutes if everybody was listening.

No one was interested in this.

The job of a professor is to give fifty-minute lectures and sign a piece of paper that says a student took a course. It makes no difference whether the student learns anything. To get promoted a professor has to devote his life to pleasing other professors.

Other professors give him his degree.

Other professors decide whether he gets published.

Other professors vote on giving him tenure.

Other professors decide whether he gets promoted.

One published article is more important to a professor than a thousand students who learn the subject from him.

But the fact remains that twenty-five minutes well used is better than fifty minutes of routine lecture.

We Need A New Approach For A New World

My Saturday show this week at 2 pm at

The Untrained Eye

will be about how to discuss our issues.

You have heard a thousand debates between "both sides." You could write what the liberals are going to say and what the respectable conservatives are going to say. This way, the media says it has free speech and that it presents both sides.

This "discussion" consists mostly of conservatives trying to prove that they are less "racist" or "isolationist" or whatever than liberals say they are.

It is far, far worse than a waste of time. It is totalitarianism with a pretence of two sides.

Like a professor, a respectable conservative gets paid for filling a time slot. He could do it in his sleep. You could do it in your sleep.

The internet is breaking into this. But when an internet radio show goes on, it follows the old media rules.

Those of us talking on the internet spend most of our time trying to prove we are not who liberals say we are. We are called haters, so we use the useless old conservative tactic of quoting minority hate speech to prove we're not the haters.

You know the drill.

The other regular media habit we have inherited is slavishly filling up a time slot.

This is a new medium. We need to develop a new approach.

Who Are We?

Are those of who oppose Political Correctness just here to fight liberals?

Are we just here to provide "the other side" in the standard debate liberals set up?

No. We want to replace them completely. Destroying leftism completely is just a tiny first step.

That means the purpose of discussion is not to show we are not the "haters" or whatever other label the other side makes up.

Our job is to make OUR points.

Before you slide away and repeat the "they are the haters" crap, let me repeat what I just said:

That means that the purpose of discussion is not to show we are not the "haters" or whatever other label the other side makes up.

Our job is to make OUR points.

IF preventing the ongoing program of genocide against whites is racism, then we are racists. IF dedicating America to "ourselves and our posterity," and to NOTHING else, is isolationism, then we are isolationists.

Screw it.

Your job is to make YOUR point.

This is called "staying on message." No matter what they say, your job is to make the point that YOUR race is being subjected to genocide. Your job is not to make the other side stop saying mean things about you.

Your job is to make the point that we need to make a natural alliance with Russia to get out of using Middle East oil. Israel doesn't like that.

Your job is to explain why all major Jewish groups have declared war on white gentiles for a very human reason. Your job is NOT to give an entire obsessive history of Jews except where THEY hurt US.

Is this anti-Semitism? Every minute you spend trying to prove it isn't is a precious minute lost.

Your job is not to prove to every person who thinks he speaks for God how your ideas fit his.

Your job is to say what everybody knows and what almost everybody understands. Your job is to get the mainline back into power. Nut cases, right or left, are not your concern.

Stay on message. Tell the truth. Don't discuss THEIR obsessions or THEIR labels. If you do, you are FAR worse than useless.

June 25, 2005 – Castles in the Air

June 25, 2005 – One Castle Just Fell

June 25, 2005 – No Show

June 25, 2005 – Why the Whole Thing Looks Different to Me

Fun Quote:

"The concept is interesting and well-formed, but in order to earn better than a 'C' the idea must be feasible."

-- A Yale University management professor in response to Fred Smith's paper proposing reliable overnight delivery service.

Smith went on to found Federal Express Corp.

Castles in the Air

My internet radio program this week is about the fact that the Soviet castle in the sky fell, and the American castle in the sky is ready to go, too.

It is called "Idiocracy."

America's established religion, Political Correctness, is sitting on nothing. It is made up of mindless, bureaucratic fools who have promoted each other to titles that sound great, but mean nothing.

They are living on inertia, just like the Soviet Union did for so long. Only a cold-blooded murderer like Lenin or Trotsky or Stalin and finally Brezhnev could keep the system going by terror.

Nobody believed in any of that Marxist nonsense anymore than anybody really believes in Political Correctness today. All they have left is a more subtle form of terror. They can get you fired. They can withhold a college degree.

Outside the United States, this terror is less subtle. You say the wrong thing and you go to prison, though a much nicer prison than the Gulag. Under capitalism you are ruined professionally instead of being sent to Siberia.

Each system that is run by mindless go-alongs and which does not work must base its power on its own form of terror.

No one predicted the fall of the Soviet Empire.

No one is predicting the fall of Political Correctness.

That is because the people who get paid to do all the public predicting assume the system they are studying rests on something.

But the Soviet system rested on nothing.

The same is true of our present system.

One Castle Just Fell

The reason that the USSR fell is because it was sitting on nothing.

Not one single professional Sovietologist, not one, had any inkling that the USSR and its empire were about to collapse.

I have looked it up, and not one single "expert" had the slightest inkling that this was about to happen. Almost every time I mention this fact the person I am talking to says he heard about somebody who predicted it. I asked for a citation.

No citation.

I have searched.

Let me repeat this:

Not one single expert on the Soviet Union, who got paid the big bucks to know all about the Soviet Empire, had the slightest idea that the whole thing was about to go down.

What happens to a business consultant if he hasn't the slightest inclination that his client's competition is about to go under?

Every single one of those experts, inside and outside of government and the universities, cost thousands of dollars to "educate" and they all got paid good money.

They ALL failed.

Completely. Utterly. Inexcusably.

So what happened?

They all kept their jobs and most of them have been promoted since. All of them will get great pensions for the job they didn't do.

We have plenty of experts on every aspect of our ruling religion, just as the Soviets did. But what was clear to Yeltsin, that the system was built on nothing, was something no expert INSIDE the USSR would be allowed to hint at.

And our experts OUTSIDE the system were just as oblivious to the fact that the Soviet Emperor had no clothes.

No Show

In 1982, anyone who said the USSR was about to fall would have been laughed out of the room.

But what happened when the pressure was on was a game of dominoes:

- 1) Gorbachev renounced the terror that had kept the USSR going since Lenin's Red Terror in 1918.
- 2) Suddenly people started saying what everybody was thinking, "This system is silly, is childish, the dream of a bunch of professors who never did a day's work in their lives."
- 3) People began to QUESTION. And that was the end.

Suddenly the Republics like Estonia and Ukraine started saying, "Why SHOULDN'T we be independent?"

People started asking, "Why are all other WHITE countries rich and we live at a level a third-world country would consider embarrassing?" The Confederate flag started showing up.

We all remember the crisis when Gorbachev was arrested and Yeltsin took his stand on top of a tank.

We all remember waiting for the Soviet Army to show up.

It never showed up.

NOBODY believed in the System. The Emperor was as naked as plucked chicken and had been for years.

Why the Whole Thing Looks Different to Me

Everybody else sees Political Correctness as a giant, unbelievably powerful monolith. Which is exactly how the USSR looked in 1982.

I repeat, in 1982, anyone who said the USSR was about to fall would have been laughed out of the room.

You see a huge, totally dominant system built on unimaginable amounts of money and power.

Above all, you see Evil Geniuses at work backing that system with their lives and with genius and subtlety and endless ruthlessness.

Like Yeltsin, who was from the Russian version of Pontiac, South Carolina, I see a bunch of wimps and ignoramuses like the Soviet bureaucrats. Yeltsin saw a Potemkin Empire in Russia.

You are too much a product of our system to be able to see it as it is.

All those grim-faced Sovietologists were complete morons. They looked at the USSR as a power forever. Respectable conservatives perform the same service for our own Idiocracy.

Push it hard and it will fall to pieces. The universities are a wonderful place to start. Tens of millions of young people are paying off back-breaking student loans, and every one of them knows he was cheated.

Tens of millions of young people are trying to start families, and each child will require the payment of college costs that are skyrocketing and show no sign that there will be any limit to them when their children reach college age.

Everybody knows that. Only I SAY that.

Our Idiocracy is ready to fall.

Go to

READBOB.COM

and let's push it over the edge.

July 2, 2005 – The British Thought Police Take Action

July 2, 2005 – Me and John and Nick

July 2, 2005 – Nick Griffin Searches ME Out

July 2, 2005 – The Ultimate Sacrifice

Fun Quote:

Westerners would never pay back their Muslim enemies in kind for 9-11, because no one is about to commit suicide in defense of hedonism.

– The Last Ditch

The British Thought Police Take Action

The British Broadcasting Company (BBC) secretly filmed tape for a documentary about the British National Party (BNP) early last year. Since then the British police have been arresting BNP members and party leaders for what they said on that show.

You see, there is law in Britain against saying anything that might incite racial violence.

Please note that word "might."

There are laws in America against inciting violence. The classic example is shouting "Fire!" in a crowded theatre. But that law has a very important exception. You may shout "Fire!" in a crowded theatre if there IS a fire in a crowded theater.

When it comes to being convicted of inciting to violence, British law has no such exception. A man was sent to prison for inciting to violence when every word he said was true. In the case of *The Crown versus Pierce* (1986) the court ruled that, under the racial laws, "The truth is no excuse."

There is one more little difference between law in a free country and the British race laws against free speech. In order to be convicted for inciting violence in a free country you have to actually incite somebody.

The BBC documentary was made a year ago and there is no evidence that what the BNP members said during their private meeting incited anybody.

Oh, and one other little difference. If a TV station puts on a program that incites violence in a free country, the TV Company is as liable as the person who said the words. The question of condemning the BBC has not come up, and will never come up. They are being praised as apparatchniks of the British section of the World Politically Correct Thought Police.

Me and John and Nick

The two main arrestees in this Thought Police Raid were BNP leader Nick Griffin and former BNP leader John Tyndall. I know them both.

John Tyndall spoke at the 2004 New Orleans Euro Convention. He is the kind of rip-roaring speaker who brings the crowd to its feet again and again. He is a hell of an act to follow.

Well, SOMEBODY had to speak right after John Tyndall.

When John Tyndall stepped down from the podium to be mobbed by his ecstatic admirers, somebody had to go up and follow that act.

They needed a sacrificial lamb, someone who was dumb enough and loyal enough to be the anticlimax right after one of the high points of the Convention.

Guess who they picked?

Oh, well, I have taken embarrassment for the cause for lesser reasons.

A few years ago, there was a leadership change inside the BNP and Nick Griffin took over the chairmanship. Once again, both the new chairman of the BNP and I spoke.

At this year's Euro Convention, Nick Griffin searched me out. He was already having problems with the British Government and felt I might be able to help.

Nick Griffin Searches ME Out

The BNP gained some votes in the latest British election and, by some strange coincidence, they were denied the right to have a bank account in Britain. Many years ago I did a lot of work moving money from country to country to help fight terrorists. Since many of the places I worked for were former British colonies, all this was better known in Britain than in the US.

Once again, can you imagine a free country in which any party, no matter how radical, was banned by the authorities from having a bank account? That's one way they handle opposition in Britain.

Tony Blair wants to help Bush make Iraq a Land of Liberty like Britain.

Nick Griffin asked me about his banking problem, and I am going to try to set up a bank account the BNP can use here.

As soon as I got back from New Orleans I called a big-time lawyer friend of mine whom I last saw on Capitol Hill when he was setting up a bank. Our conversation was a little confused at first. Finally he got what I was talking about.

"You mean," He said, "They won't let them put their OWN money into their OWN bank account?" He had thought they were trying to set up a BANK. Even he, a right-wing activist for decades, was astonished at this.

My reply was, "They're living in 1984 over there, man."

The Ultimate Sacrifice

Right after the Convention, Griffin made the ultimate sacrifice: He actually READ my book, Why Johnny Can't Think: America's Professor-Priesthood cover to cover. He LOVED it. It is every bit as descriptive of the leftist professor tyranny of Britain as it is of the one in America.

And much of the humor in it is exactly the kind an Englishman would appreciate. It would cause a LOT of trouble over there. That is just the sort of thing this kind of government persecution is meant to stop.

Nick is ordering a couple of cases of the book for BNP distribution. He has plenty of serious matters to deal with, but finds my book important enough to add that to his plate. No matter whether they will soon be convicted or not, the British tyranny has crippled the BNP for some time.

I am proud to stand with men like Tyndall and Griffin. You will remember that when the head of the Canadian Free Speech Movement was caught with copies of my book at the Canadian border, the books were seized.

I am not in the same league as people like Tyndall and Griffin, but I am very proud to be on their side. My reason for writing the book and working to get it out there, is to try and stop the Inquisition of Political Correctness before it goes as far as it has in Britain.

Maybe we can keep some of our best men from having to face jail time for standing up for us.

July 9, 2005 – The Shrewd Problem

July 9, 2005 – It Is Not The Shrewd People Who Have The Shrewd Problem

July 9, 2005 – Please Listen!

Fun Quote:

Moron, imbecile and idiot are legal terms, not medical ones.

Under the law, an idiot has an IQ of 30 or less, while a moron has an IQ of between 50 and 70.

Under the law, the dumbest moron is twice as smart as the smartest idiot.

So it ridiculous to say there is no difference between a Republican and a Democrat.

The Shrewd Problem

Hitler talked about the Jewish Problem. Today's respectable conservatives and liberals talk about the White Problem, which they call the Race Problem, in exactly the same way. My focus is the Shrewd Problem. I will be talking about it on my Saturday Internet show:

The Untrained Eye

Oliver Hardy of Laurel and Hardy summed up the Shrewd Problem best when he said, "There is nothing dumber than a dumb man who thinks he's smart."

Hardy was from Augusta, Georgia, and he would understand what I mean by the Shrewd Problem because that is the way we used the word "shrewd" down here. It is somebody who thinks he's smart and isn't, and the consequences are disastrous.

The first person killed in a railway accident was a Shrewd Man in South Carolina. It has pretty well been expunged from history, but the first regular passenger rail line in America ran across South Carolina from Charleston to the Savannah River.

It was called "The Best Friend of Charleston."

When the railway first started, a guy who had just been hired to work in the engine, handling wood or something, was irritated by the whistling noise the engine was making. He decided to do something about it.

So he looked around and found the source of that irritating noise. It was the boiler which was right beside where he was working up in the engine. He didn't ask the engineer.

After all, he was a smart man so he knew how you deal with something that makes an irritating noise.

He tied down the steam pressure relief valve.

A couple of minutes later the clamped steam boiler exploded, literally blowing his head off. This is real history.

It is lucky that this Shrewd Man was on an early train. On later trains a real boiler explosion could kill hundreds of people. Since then, Shrewd People have been killing hundreds, thousands, millions of people.

It Is Not The Shrewd People Who Have The Shrewd Problem

If you ask a Jew what the Jewish Problem is, he would probably say it was anti-Semitism. If you asked the average white man what the white problem was, he might say it was sunburn. What Hitler had in mind when he referred to The Jewish Problem was not the problem of anti-Semitism. What respectable conservatives have in mind when they talk about The White Problem, which they call the "race problem," is not sunburn.

Those who put the "Problem" in caps are saying the very existence of Jews or white people is the problem for everybody else.

Hitler had several solutions in mind for the Jewish Problem, such as relocating all of them somewhere. Respectable conservatives have only a Final Solution to the White problem, and it is genocide.

They call it assimilation.

This "race" problem does not exist in Africa or Asia. The solution to the "race" problem is massive immigration and integration in EVERY white country and ONLY in white countries. All three large segments of the Jewish Community -- Reformed, Conservative and Orthodox -- have official statements of policy which state exactly that.

So when I talk about The Shrewd Problem, I mean they are a cause of catastrophe for the rest of us.

While things like massive immigration and real race problems are on the verge of destroying America, all the Shrewd people on television talk about a balanced budget or whether George Bush's feet stink.

Meanwhile the elephants are right there in our living room.

And they are growing restless.

Please Listen!

Please listen to my new installment of The Untrained Eye. I have been in the belly of the beast. I have seen how these Shrewd People are chosen for top positions. I have seen how they crowd out every person with rational common sense and a conscience and keep them from getting a hearing or exercising power.

When I discuss this situation, as when I discuss Political Correctness and the unending damage professors in their little publicly financed inbred world called academia do, nothing I say is mysterious or even complicated.

It's not a conspiracy. The people who get ahead in this process are not bright enough to conspire.

You think you are dealing with Giant Manipulations by Geniuses when your real problem is a bunch of clowns.

You are shooting at the wrong target while the enemy is coming up behind you.

You are guarding the outhouse while the enemy is walking through your front door.

July 16, 2005 – Sobsister History

July 16, 2005 – Emma Lazarus, Sobsister, Idealist, and Founding Mother

July 16, 2005 – Whomever America Belongs To, It's NOT to White Gentiles, Nothing Does

Fun Quote:

"I don't feel we did wrong in taking this great country away from them. There were great numbers of people who needed new land, and the Indians were selfishly trying to keep it for themselves."

-- John Wayne

Sobsister History

This week's internet radio show on Saturday at 2pm at THE UNTRAINED EYE will be called "Sobsister History."

Young people may not remember the term "sobsister."

A sobsister is some woman who sits around moaning and groaning about how bad things are for her. Older people may smile when they hear the term sobsister because all they remember is how silly sobsisters were.

What they DON'T remember is how VICIOUS sobsisters were.

Here is a woman whose family has probably been supporting and putting up with her for decades. All they get in return from her is being told how horrible they are. There was no rumor or smear too vicious for a sobsister to spread about her own long-suffering family to show how evil they were. Such smears helped her to prove they were the horrible people she said they were.

Our history today is entirely "Sobsister History." It is based on showing how white gentile Americans, who created America, are really just nasty, vicious, mean, and have no redeeming qualities.

Every respectable conservative and every liberal, those who represent what is "both sides" in our political debate, agree that to solve the "race" problem, the white race must go.

That would be ideal.

That is what passes for Idealism today. A white gentile who attacks his own race is considered an Idealist. For some reason he is not considered a traitor. He is considered an Idealist who is making some sort of great sacrifice by demanding the end of himself, and his own kind.

If that is regarded as IDEALISM in a society, you can imagine the depths to which such a society can plummet when it is not being "idealistic!"

Emma Lazarus, Sobsister, Idealist, and Founding Mother

When most people today talk about "what America is all about," they NEVER quote the Founding Fathers.

The Founding Fathers, in the Constitution we actually adopted, dedicated America to "ourselves and OUR posterity."

But when most people talk about the Purpose of America today they never quote Washington or Hamilton. They simply quote an inscription on a piece of artwork sent to America by Frenchmen, the Statue of Liberty.

The inscription on that piece of French artwork, the Statue of Liberty, was written by what is now considered America's Founding Mother, Emma Lazarus, and every word of it is totally opposed to the Constitution we adopted a century before Emma Lazarus got here. Emma Lazarus said that America was brought into existence for foreigners. Any foreigner, of course, had just as much right to it as its founders or their posterity did, as we and our posterity do.

It is fact that America's Founding Mother, Emma Lazarus, was a Zionist who had two very interesting ideas about America:

1) America belonged to every non-Jew on earth, and to every Jew on earth until Jews could get their own country from which they could exclude all gentiles;

2) White gentiles who founded America were evil, vicious people who took the homeland away from the innocent, idealistic Indians.

Now how can it make any sense that a land taken from its rightful owners has now become the property of every other person on earth (the new rightful owners)?

No one EVER asks how Founding Mother Lazarus came to that conclusion.

It all comes together in Sobsister history. The basis for Sobsister History is that gentiles are not human.

They are pure evil who do only evil things. They have no right to ANY land. They have no right to exist.

That is the foundational outlook you must have firmly in mind if you are a respectable conservative.

Whomever America Belongs To, It's NOT to White Gentiles, Nothing Does

The one consistent underlying theme of our modern Sobsister dogma is White Gentile Evil. If the white gentiles took America from the Indians, then it is the duty of the rest of mankind to take it from them.

If you read the statement on immigration which has been adopted by conventions of the Orthodox Jews, Conservative Jews and Reformed Jews, and you read what they actually say in plain English, you will see they are talking about white gentiles in the same terms as Hitler talked about Jews.

Here is what they say:

- 1) There are too many white gentiles in America, and they are a danger to Jews;
- 2) The third world must be imported and a mixed-race society imposed to get rid of those white gentiles who are a danger to the Jews,
- 3) In other words, a Final Solution to the White Gentile Problem must be found and implemented.

I am not writing those statements with all the code words they mix into them to disguise what they are plainly saying. I am reducing them to the cold, hard meaning in them. They say what our Modern Thought, based on Sobsister History, says in plain English:

White gentiles treat everybody like dirt.

White Gentiles are Evil.

White Gentiles must go.

July 23, 2005 – The Annotated Constitution

July 23, 2005 – "We the People"

July 23, 2005 – OUR Posterity

Fun Quote:

You know the place in the Post Office where they put up pictures of escaped felons and Public Enemies?

I saw my photo up there. Underneath it said,

"Least Wanted."

The Annotated Constitution

A book I will never write would be called The Annotated Constitution. It would go through the Constitution line by line and say what the courts have done with each clause.

I have studied constitutional law and I have instructed constitutional law. The entire course consists of opinions by various judges. What hits you first is how short the Constitution is and how endless the judicial opinions are. The books of them fill whole rooms.

When you comment that much on a short document the document itself gets completely lost.

So I thought it would be fun to go through the tiny Constitution itself and talk about what Judicial Opinion has made of it.

I am not about to write another book now. Nobody's interested.

But I do have an internet program and some points to make, so I decided to make a start at an Annotated Constitution there.

I did almost an hour on the Preamble to the Constitution alone. The link is at

THE UNTRAINED EYE

and is titled "Annotated Constitution – Preamble."

"We the People"

One thing everybody agrees on today is that America is a Principle. As National Review says, America is a Propositional State. According to the flag ship of respectable conservatism, you and I, whose families have been in this country for hundreds of years, have nothing to do with The Real Meaning of America.

Thailand may be the Thais, Japan is the Japanese, but America has nothing to do with the people who happen to inhabit it. America is based on a Proposition, a Set of Ideas. A Patriot is one who is loyal to those Ideas.

In other words, National Review agrees with liberals that you can be loyal to America without having any loyalty at all to the American people. Respectable conservatives feel Americans should be grateful because they do not actually HATE Americans the way liberals do.

Liberals feel they are being most loyal to the real America when they are blaming Americans for every evil in the world. Respectable conservatives want to give the little people who happen to be here a little

credit. They don't know Latin or Greek, but they do try to be loyal to the proposition, the principles, of America.

It never occurs to any conservative, much less any liberal, that it is not up to Americans to be loyal to THEIR principles. The idea that they can only be patriots if they are loyal to Americans never occurs to them.

At all.

Every Judicial Opinion agrees with this.

So it comes as a shock to read the Preamble to the United States Constitution.

It begins with "We the people of the United States of America," and conservatives don't mind that so much.

But it gets worse. And no conservative EVER quotes the rest. You see, "We the people of the United States in 1789 could have been very idealistic and they could have set down some ideals that America would follow after they died.

But the Founders added a fatal phrase, which no conservative EVER quotes:

"And OUR posterity."

OUR Posterity

"To secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." That is the purpose of the Constitution.

That is the ONLY purpose of the Constitution, that is the only authority it rests on. The Constitution says nothing about All Mankind. The writers of the Constitution were trying to get it adopted by Americans. So they only claimed the authority of the American people.

You see, those same Founding fathers had just had experience with people who insisted that THEY knew what all mankind should do. America had declared its independence of such people. The whole point of the Revolution was that AMERICANS ruled America.

It never occurred to the Founding Fathers that they were writing a Constitution that told the rest of the world what it should do.

Nothing could have been more alien to those who wrote the Constitution than the idea that they were writing abstract principles that All Mankind was required to follow.

About fifty years after the Constitution was adopted, John Quincy Adams stated this principle again. Someone was asking America to defend freedom around the world (sound familiar?) and John Quincy Adams replied:

"America is the friend of all people's freedom, but we are the defenders only of our own."

Loyalty to America is precisely what every liberal and every respectable conservative says it is not.

Loyalty to America is loyalty to "We the people of the United States of America... and OUR posterity."

July 30, 2005 – The Market Pros Pay Money For Nothing!

July 30, 2005 – Primitive Medicine And Primitive Social Science

July 30, 2005 – Dying For The Experts

July 30, 2005 – Our So-Called "Intellectuals" Are Nuts And We Obey Them

The Market Pros Pay Money For Nothing!

Some things are so stupid that you are left speechless.

For many years the Wall Street Journal has reported, one after another, scientific studies that show that the advice of highly-paid market analysts is utterly useless. The funniest ones are studies that have monkeys tossing darts at the stock list and six months later comparing how well the stocks the monkeys picked did compared to those selected by market analysts who take in staggering salaries.

The results are ALWAYS dead even.

Which would be hilarious if somebody actually caught on to what was going on. But in New York they keep PAYING those analysts.

In New York "Modern Artists" have been cracking commodes or welding together tin cans and getting a hundred thousand dollars for it. This has been going on for at least sixty years.

But people buy the stuff and sell it. And everybody has thought that surely someday somebody in New York would catch on.

But the art experts keep raving over a painting of Christ in urine (NOT Moses in urine!). The cracked commodes keep selling and the art experts write treatises on them.

How can one even comment on this

Primitive Medicine And Primitive Social Science

"Experts" is the title of today's internet radio show at:

THE UNTRAINED EYE

As I point out in my latest book, which you can find at READBOB.COM social scientists admit their fields are primitive compared to the hard sciences. But historians who are part of those social science departments never notice the most consistent facts in intellectual history:

Primitive sciences are always silly.

APPLIED primitive sciences are always not only silly, but their ideas cause disaster.

A little knowledge is a dangerous thing.

But when the person with that little knowledge thinks he is an expert and everybody else thinks he's an expert, that is a formula for disaster.

Medical history before the middle of the nineteenth century is one long horror.

As I explain on the program and in much, much more detail in my book, the bigger the title a medical expert had, the more horrible his advice was.

In December of 1799, when George Washington came down with pneumonia his doctors literally bled him to death.

As with the New York stock market analysis, nobody pays any attention to what works.

But people assume that someone sitting in a mahogany office in a New York skyscraper, in a huge corner office with a view, must know what he is doing.

For well over a thousand years, nobody questioned that Medical Authorities, with doctorates and a thorough knowledge of both Latin and Greek, knew what they were doing.

Social science is primitive. The diversity they preach IS insane. The rehabilitation they preach IS insane.

And the entire intellectual history of the last two thousand years tells us not only why it is insane, but that this insanity was inevitable.

People assume that somebody who sits in a university with the title "Professor" must know what he is doing, just as they assume that somebody sitting in a huge corner office with a view of Wall Street must know what he is doing. They took it for granted for over a thousand years that somebody with a big name who was a University Doctor and Professor of Medicine knew what he was doing.

Millions of people died operating under the latter assumption, including the Father of Our Country and millions of newborn children and their mothers.

Dying For The Experts

And we are dying for our assumptions today. Thousands of people will be killed on the streets of America this year because the Professors of Criminology insist that career felons are victims of society and need to be rehabilitated out in society, not imprisoned for life.

Diversity kills us wholesale. Prisons are full of illegal aliens, and every one of them has caused grievous harm to Americans. But if you want to be a respectable conservative, you have to praise Diversity and The Melting Pot and the phrase "a nation of immigrants."

All of this is simply the result of the fact that we dare not call our so-called "intellectuals" a bunch of damned fools.

As I talked about last week on my radio show, which you can listen to any time from the archive at THE UNTRAINED EYE everybody thinks we OWE the world the right to immigrate into the United States.

All the professors and respectable conservatives say so.

That program is about the Preamble to the United States Constitution. The Constitution says very specifically that our only purpose is "We the people of the United States ... and OUR posterity."

The Constitution did NOT set up a "nation of immigrants." Just the opposite. Like everything else, they expected the people of the United States to decide on immigration on the basis of whether those immigrants will be good for US and OUR posterity. Nobody has the slightest claim on the United States but our own citizens.

The generation of Americans who adopted the Constitution had the largest percentage of native-born Americans of any generation before or since.

Our So-Called "Intellectuals" Are Nuts And We Obey Them

Yet our so-called "liberal intellectuals" with their obedient little respectable conservatives in tow, insist that, 1) We are a "nation of immigrants" and we OWE third worlders the right to come here, and 2) the principle on which America was founded is The Melting Pot and we need lots of non-white immigrants here to increase Holy Diversity.

And nobody QUESTIONS that!

August 6, 2005 – What is Truth?

August 6, 2005 – Do You Say Something Because it is True?

August 6, 2005 – I Know What Truth Isn't

August 6, 2005 – The Truth Offends

What is Truth?

That is the question I discuss in this week's Saturday Internet radio program that can be linked at: [Townhall](#)

The reason Pontius Pilate asked this rhetorical question was because he wanted to get Jesus off His obsession with what Pilate thought was an impractical, theoretical, unimportant point. Jesus was talking about truth, and he was forcing Pontius Pilate to crucify him for it.

And here we can begin with a truth.

Who crucified Christ?

Christ used the bigotry of Jews and the Roman obsession with law and order, but in the end He knew precisely what He was doing.

People like to say that WE crucified Christ with our sins. That is a nice Politically Correct, Christian-sounding phrase that leaves the Jews out of it. But we could not force Jesus to go onto the Cross for our sins.

We were the REASON Christ died on the Cross. Jewish bigotry and Roman Law were the MEANS by which Christ was put on the Cross. But until the last minute Pontius Pilate asked that question, the TRUTH of the matter is that Pilate was trying desperately to keep Jesus off the Cross.

The truth of the matter is that only one person was capable of crucifying Jesus Christ.

We were the reason, Jews and Romans were the means.

But in the end it was Christ who crucified Christ. We were the cause, but we never had that kind of power.

Do You Say Something Because it is True?

Notice that I explained WHY people say, "We all crucified Christ." They say it because it is so Politically Correct.

They do NOT say it because it is TRUE.

If you have a reason to say anything then I have a reason not to believe you.

When people debate whether the Jews crucified Christ or the Romans crucified Christ or we all crucified Christ they are forgetting the most important point a Christian must keep in mind:

They are forgetting who is in charge here.

Each group has a reason to say what he says. Anti-Semites want the Jews to be responsible. Politically Correct people want the Romans or all of us to bear the responsibility.

If anybody has a reason to say what he says, then I don't believe what he says. So I came up with a very useful theological reminder, but not because I know theology. Every Bible Belt teenager knows all the facts I recited here.

I understand the situation because I understand people. I can identify with Pilate, I cannot identify with Christ. Pilate could not understand why Christ was going to the Cross on purpose, for something Pilate considered abstract and theoretical.

Going to the Cross was something that did Christ no good at all.

In other words, Pilate was in the exactly the same position I am.

As C. S. Lewis said, "Christ was God or He was a madman."

Jesus went to the Cross for no reason except that He chose to do so. He had nothing in mind but truth.

I Know What Truth Isn't

Old Bob has no insights to offer into the mind of Christ. But my experience has taught me very well what was in the mind of Pilate and the Jews. The Temple Jews were being challenged, their power, their wisdom, their entire reason for being was being attacked by a young fanatic.

The Temple Jews did not try to persuade Pilate they were right about the truth. They tried to make Pilate believe that his power and the power of Rome were being attacked just as theirs was. They did not concentrate on whether Jesus was right or wrong. They concentrated on explaining to Pilate why he should believe that Christ was wrong.

That is how truth is normally attacked.

In Europe you go to prison for attacking any aspect of the official version of the Holocaust, but not because the official version of the Holocaust cannot be wrong.

The official version of the Holocaust has changed repeatedly. Andy Rooney, who everybody now knows is a leftist fanatic, declared that he had seen the "death camps" in Germany.

Actually the officials have long since admitted there were no "death camps" in Germany. All of the officially designated death camps were safely behind the Iron Curtain, where the only information one got was from the government.

But a person who had said that in Germany there were no camps specifically dedicated to the extermination of Jews, the so-called "death camps," would have gone straight to prison. Until this was declared Gospel by today's Holy Inquisition of Political Correctness, you went to prison for telling the truth.

When the Holy Inquisition of Political Correctness admitted that, it admitted that it had sent people to prison for telling the truth.

And nobody noticed but me.

The Truth Offends

My program, "What is Truth?" only talks about Pilate and Christ for a few minutes. The overwhelming majority of it is dedicated to examining what truth is NOT.

Truth is not what you want to believe. And truth is not something that offends no one.

Free speech is not the right to say anything that doesn't offend anybody. Every slave in the Old South had the right to say anything he wanted to so long as it didn't offend anybody.

So the Modern Inquisition excuses its oppression by saying it only suppresses discussion that offends people. You can accuse American troops of routinely killing and raping people, but if you say that less than six million Jews died in the Holocaust or that races aren't equal, you are being offensive. You must go to prison in Europe or be professionally ruined here if you say the wrong thing.

Obviously that is the excuse but that is not the reason. We all know the REASON for punishing free speech. Political Correctness relies heavily on the Holocaust and on the evil of white people to empower its professor-priesthood extortion racket.

They have a reason to say what they say.

So I have a reason not to believe them.

August 13, 2005 – Our Established Religion

August 13, 2005 – O'Reilly the Retard

August 13, 2005 – The Collapse of the Communist Priesthood

Our Established Religion

The discussion in this week's Saturday Internet radio program that can be linked at: Townhall will be entitled, "America's Established Religion."

Our established religion is Political Correctness.

Let me repeat that:

America's established RELIGION is Political Correctness.

The reason they are able to get away with this is because of a myth pushed by respectable conservatives and preachers. This myth is that Political Correctness represents secularism and science.

Since the first amendment to the United States Constitution forbids the establishment of any RELIGION, the religion of Political Correctness is OK because it is not a religion. So every conservative goes into the debate saying that Political Correctness cannot violate the first amendment, whereas regular religion can.

Like all respectable conservatives, they have already surrendered before the debate begins.

O'Reilly the Retard

I was fighting what is called the secularist agenda thirty years ago. I was marching, organizing marches, and doing press conferences against anti-religious textbooks the NEA was pushing. That was a generation ago, and all the conservatives thought I was being unrespectable.

As usual, decades later everybody is now discovering what I was doing a generation ago, and declaring it is good.

Even that poor little retard Bill O'Reilly is now denouncing the "secularist agenda," which he discovered after everybody else had long since seen it.

But I didn't fight the education establishment's agenda because it was non-religious. I attacked it because I had infinitely more respect for the deep wisdom of the Bible Belt, with all its faults, than I did for the hair-brained kooks who called themselves "intellectuals."

When Bill O'Reilly says that Political Correctness is secular, he is handing the professor-priesthood the first amendment on a silver platter. No matter how you try to talk around it the first amendment does NOT ban the government establishment of any form of secularism. It bans RELIGION.

Religion is not a bunch of people sitting in a church or synagogue or mosque. Scientology has the status of a religion, but it has no god. When Catholic priests first reached Asia they were astounded to discover that Buddhism was a religion with out a god.

Religion is a set of beliefs based on faith.

Political Correctness is a set of beliefs based entirely on faith. Every university requires you to do homage to "diversity," though there is no evidence whatsoever that this "diversity" has any value at all. That is a belief enforced on the basis of faith, but the professor-priesthood is able to enforce its faith because conservatives insist that the religion of the professor-priesthood is some kind of science, not religion.

Tens of millions of young people spend their entire lives paying for the professor-priesthood. Right now tens of millions of young people are paying off the back-breaking student loans they had to take out to pay to go to college.

I do not know a single one of them who doesn't know he was cheated.

But that is just the beginning.

After wasting four years of their lives in college taking courses they scarcely remember and ten years paying off their student loans, some of them are in their mid-thirties hoping to have families. But every child they have is going to require their putting aside huge piles of money, not for a home or for retirement, but for tuition.

All this is backed by government. College degrees are required by government. Government enforces accreditation, which is the life-blood our professor-priesthood lives on.

A generation of young people will spend their entire lives in vassalage to the professor-priesthood.

A whole generation of young people is ripe for rebellion.

They are not interested in O'Reilly's drivings about secularism versus religion.

They want their FREEDOM.

The Collapse of the Communist Priesthood

When I went to a Communist country I crossed the dead line. There were land minds and guards with automatic weapons who would kill escapees. Inside the country there were long, long lines at any store that happened to have something for sale.

When I left the country, nobody outside seemed to notice those things, least of all the anti-Communists. They were busy theorizing about evil atheistic Communism versus their own religious values.

Everybody remembers Ronald Reagan's famous words, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall!"

What they do NOT remember is that Reagan's respectable conservative staff removed those words THREE TIMES from his speech and he has to reinsert them himself each time. They did not want him to talk about the Wall he was standing in front of. They wanted him to talk theory.

People in Communist countries wanted FREEDOM from an insane rule by the Communist religion. Nothing in the Communist faith WORKED, but no one was allowed to doubt it. So hundreds of millions of people were enslaved by it while conservatives dribbled theories to each other in National Review.

Today a generation of young people wants freedom from the unbelievably silly professor-priesthood. But National Review and O'Reilly want to dribble theories about a secularist agenda to each other.

It is time for us to tear down the wall in front of us. This insane priesthood must go, not because it is secular, but because it is a priesthood to which our government enslaves us.

It is time we remembered what the Constitution and especially the first amendment to the Constitution, really means.

August 20, 2005 – Lord Give Me Strength!

August 20, 2005 – "In Other Words" Is WRONG

August 20, 2005 – Other Examples of IN OTHER WORDS That Kill

August 20, 2005 – Try to Understand The Words I Use

Lord Give Me Strength!

I have pointed out to many people at many times that Political Correctness is a RELIGION, and if we attack it as a RELIGION we can destroy it.

And almost invariably the person I am talking with will say something like, "Well, it is LIKE a religion. It is a very rigid belief system."

And I say a little silent prayer, "Lord give me strength. Let me remember that this retard is trying to be sophisticated. He knows not what he does. And keep me from committing physical violence against him."

This dribbling moron, in his desperation to show he knows big words, has justified the entire Political Correctness establishment. He has completely destroyed the whole strategy I laid out.

So I take a deep, deep breath, clench my shaking hands together and pull apart my fingers that were set to deliver a karate chop to the bridge of his nose, and ask him what the difference between "a rigid belief system" and a "religion" IS.

He never has the foggiest idea. It just sounded real smart. But he has completely missed my point.

Under the Constitution, there is nothing necessarily illegal about government establishing "a rigid belief system." There is nothing necessarily unconstitutional about the government financing a group of professors who advance "a rigid belief system."

What the Constitution specifically forbids is an established RELIGION.

If you say something is "a rigid belief system" and not a RELIGION, you have legitimized the whole professor-priesthood.

That is one hell of a price to pay for sounding sophisticated.

I did NOT say, "Political Correctness is LIKE a religion because it is a rigid belief system." I said "Political Correctness IS a religion because it is a belief system based on FAITH."

Physics is not a religion because it helps send real rockets into real space. It WORKS. Political Correctness is a religion because it doesn't WORK. It is based on FAITH. Paying professors who teach a faith is ILLEGAL.

Telling dirty jokes in class is immoral but it is not illegal. Assaulting students is ILLEGAL.

Teaching a rigid belief system at public expense is immoral. Teaching a religion at public expense is ILLEGAL.

Is there any way on earth I can get past this moron's desperate desire to sound sophisticated to make him recognize the difference between immoral and illegal?

"In Other Words" Is WRONG

The blithering idiot who is trying to be sophisticated thinks he is just stating what I said "in other words." That's a great way to miss the whole point.

My Internet radio program this week can be linked at: Townhall - The Untrained Eye is entitled, "The Silly Ideas We Live By."

They are each ideas that have caused incalculable suffering, and every one of them started as a sophisticated interpretation of a real fact.

They all sounded harmless and even idealistic when they first came out.

Long ago Americans discovered that some intellectual tools are very useful. You need to learn to read. You need to learn arithmetic. Today no one just learns a skill and stays with it the rest of his life. He must keep learning the newest techniques.

Then came the fatal words, "IN OTHER WORDS, education pays."

As a direct result of those OTHER WORDS our young people are now serfs to the professor-priesthood. A young person must waste four years of his youth in a university, then he must spend ten years paying off a backbreaking student loan.

But that is only the beginning. After he has paid off the student loan and has spent fourteen years serving the professor-priesthood, this person now in his mid-thirties can begin to think about having a family. But every child he plans to have will be another serf to the professor-priesthood.

So this person in his mid-thirties must begin to save money, not for a home or anything he or his family can use, but for tuition for each of his children, which means he can't have more than one or two. Tuition is rising astronomically and it already represents a back-breaking burden.

All this happened because of "IN OTHER WORDS" education pays.

Other Examples of "IN OTHER WORDS" That Kill

The Constitution of the United States says that this country exists to provide "We the People and OUR posterity" with the blessings of liberty.

So we hear this line every day, "IN OTHER WORDS America is all about spreading Democracy around the world."

Take a look at the casualty list in Iraq this week if you want to see what that IN OTHER WORDS has cost us.

America was taken away from the several hundred thousand Indians who were still living in the Stone Age by the wave of Indo-European invaders who had earlier conquered Europe. It is now the richest country on earth and, for all the carping we do, the freest country on earth. We destroyed Communism, which enslaved a third of the human race.

And now comes the fatal slogan, "IN OTHER WORDS America is a Nation of Immigrants."

If I have to explain to you what THAT little IN OTHER WORDS is doing to us, you belong in a retarded home.

Whitakeronline is NOT devoted to "in other words."

I consider words to be vitally important. I have used weapons and I have used words, and the words have been infinitely more important.

No war hero ever made the slightest difference in real human history. Those who used words have MADE real history.

Try to Understand The Words I Use

I do not say things so that they can be translated into other words. I work very, very hard to write and rewrite and use words to express my exact meaning. You have every right to reject my advice, but you do NOT have the right to distort it.

Ole Bob am a very, very out-of-date sort of person. He means EXACTLY what he says.

If what I say is wrong, as it often is, you have every right to CORRECT me. Being corrected upsets other people. They called it being embarrassed.

Ole Bob has been wrong too often to be embarrassed by being wrong one more time. Others call it embarrassing, I call it learning something. Good solid corrections are genuinely appreciated and you don't have to be nice about it.

But I do NOT appreciate interpretations. If YOU believe something, put it in YOUR name. Do NOT say it is what I said unless you are quoting me in full.

As for quoting me in full, the easiest thing in the world is to get permission from me for reprints. You can't reprint my whole book because a lot of other people have put a lot of effort into it. But even when it comes to that, I am certain that, if you could get more copies out than we can, my team would not only be glad to have you do it, they would help you do it, all free of charge as usual.

My team would make just about any personal sacrifice to get a million copies of my book out there and READ. That fact makes me feel wonderful. It makes me feel great that my words, my own words, are that important to such admirable people. It keeps me going.

I spent two years and rewrote that little book sixteen times. "Rewrote" not "edited" it. I spent thousands of dollars on it.

All that work and a lifetime of experience produced a piece of work a handful of great people are willing to make enormous and unpaid effort to promote.

But remember that all that dedication is to MY words. It is NOT to IN OTHER WORDS.

The geniuses who wrote a far shorter and more important document, the United States Constitution, fought over every single word in it. They did NOT write it so that a bunch of Federal judges could say IN OTHER WORDS and substitute their own opinions for the Constitution.

What the founding fathers said was good enough.

I feel that what I say, over and over and over and over and over and over, things like "Political Correctness IS a religion" is exactly what you need to hear.

You are free to agree with me or disagree with my words. But you have no right to TWIST them.

August 27, 2005 – Criticism Is Not Hate

August 27, 2005 – Business As Usual

August 27, 2005 – Stalin's Fight for Freedom

August 27, 2005 – European Jews Have Set Up The Next Pogrom

Criticism Is Not Hate

That is the title of my program this week, Saturday 3pm at the The Untrained Eye. You can download these programs anytime you feel like it. The magic of the Internet.

One of the sure signs of a authoritarian state is the silencing of criticism.

Two rules:

- 1) Every authoritarian state always begins by silencing all criticism of its doctrine and
- 2) No authoritarian state ever says it is silencing criticism just to be mean. It ALWAYS gives a Reason.

Nationalist governments pass some kind of Patriot Act. The very name of that Act comes straight out of George Orwell. Anyone who criticizes the government is declared to be attacking National Unity.

Hitler, Mussolini and Franco are all spinning in their graves right now because they never thought of that wonderful title, The Patriot Act, for their policies.

After the defeat of the Axis in World War II it was as inevitable as the rain that the new authoritarian regimes would base their authoritarian regimes on being AGAINST Hitler and Mussolini.

Those who oppose Bush's Patriot Act are exactly the ones who want authoritarianism in the name of being ANTI-nationalism and ANTI-racism.

An old politico like me yawns and says, "So what else is new?"

Business As Usual

The United States is the only country on earth which has a first amendment protecting freedom of speech. The very concept of freedom of speech is alien to every culture outside the West, so multiculturalism is a good way to wipe out the whole idea.

But even in the West, Europeans have always taken it for granted that everything must be regulated, including speech. As I pointed out in "Two Europes, One America" the red (corrected) liberal states in the United States and Canada think exactly like Europeans. If Teddy Kennedy or the average American liberal sat down with the average European, they would not have a single point of serious disagreement.

Liberals and Europeans want to suppress diversity of opinion and they want to do it in the name of fighting racism and nationalism.

Of course.

This is as surprising to anyone who has the slightest grasp of political history as the sun coming up in the morning.

It is well known that generals are always fighting the last war. So France hunkered down in 1940 for another trench war like World War I behind its Maginot Line.

It is also true that civil libertarians are always fighting the last fight. When a "civil libertarian" talks about "dictatorship" he is looking for a German with a moustache talking about racism, nationalism and anti-Semitism. If we can just stop racism, nationalism and anti-Semitism, he says, we can be free.

And he is willing to go to any lengths in the name of freedom. So the state must use all of its power to suppress any mention of race or nationalism. In order to stop racism and nationalism and to preserve freedom, some freedoms will have to be sacrificed.

Stalin's Fight for Freedom

Stalin's 1936 Soviet Constitution guaranteed absolute freedom of speech. The Stalinist government also sent anyone to the Gulag for ten years, which was usually a death sentence, for saying anything anti-Semitic.

No one was ever acquitted.

In The First Circle Aleksander Solzhenitsyn recites from his own experience the case of a Jewish bureaucrat who used that law to his advantage. Anybody who said anything bad about him he denounced as anti-Semitic, and the police were at that person's door within a week.

This man's enemy was charged with anti-Semitism and, no one was every acquitted.

That's one of the reasons Stalin's Russia was such a model of freedom.

Many and many a liberal said so.

But for those of us who have our doubts that Stalin's Russia was a free country, the term Hate Laws is frightening.

European Jews Have Set Up The Next Pogrom

After World War II Jews in Europe pushed through Hate Laws in Europe which are exactly like Stalin's. If you even say in a restaurant that less than six million Jews died under the Nazis, you are given an automatic one-year sentence in prison.

Any other form of criticism about Jews gets you straight into prison. This law now applies to any white gentile criticism of any group that is not white and gentile.

The ironic thing about this is that Europe will be fifty percent Moslem by 2050. And the average European Moslem likes Jews less than Hitler did.

Once again what is happening is as surprising as the sun coming up in the morning. Jews are going to be sent to prison in droves under the Hate Law they passed.

This process has already begun in Russia. A display put on by a Jewish group in a Jewish building was declared to be insulting to the Orthodox Church. The Jews were convicted and sentenced to TWELVE YEARS in prison. Only a world outcry by World Jewry got this sentence commuted to a heavy fine.

Over five thousand very prominent Russians have petitioned to have Judaism declared to be a form of Hate Speech. They quote extensively from the Talmud and other official Jewish documents as evidence for this claim.

These statements are still an integral part of Jewish doctrine. If they were in the official documents of any other religion, a person preaching that religion would receive the automatic one-year sentence in Europe. If he remained a part of that faith, he would be given a second, longer sentence.

Do you really think the ever-growing Moslem vote in Europe is going to ignore this opportunity as their power grows?

And once this policy becomes firmly established in Eastern and Western Europe, do you think that every word the proponents of Hate Laws have said will not come back to destroy them here?

September 3, 2005 – I Am Taking A Year Off, Starting Now **September 3, 2005 – In The Meantime...**

I Am Taking A Year Off, Starting Now

Starting now, no ifs, ands, or buts.

I am not dying, at least physically. I had always thought that was the only thing that would take me out of action for so long.

I remember a line from one of the Godfather movies that went something like, "He's been dying of the same heart condition for thirty years. He'll be here forever."

In terms of what really matters to me, the fact that I am not dying has a downside. There is something about the smell of embalming fluid that makes people take a short break from chattering about Nixon or Bush or Coolidge and actually look at what a man said as he worked his heart out to try to get ideas across.

After over half a century in this fight, when I speak of the dead, I have very specific people in mind.

They were people I worked with and whom I loved. It is a constant source of anger to me that they got all those flowers and flowery tributes after they died.

They would have much preferred a tenth of that flower money as support for what they were doing, a tenth of that attention when they needed it, a tenth of the effort on their book sales THEN.

In a wild and hilarious science fiction comedy called A Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy, one of the characters could not be reached because, "He's taking a year off dead for tax purposes."

Well, I am taking a year off dead for urgent health purposes. Maybe that smell of embalming fluid will make me great for twelve months.

In any case, I definitely do not have a choice.

The world will be here a year from now. I have been fighting for fifty-one years, and every one of those years were wasted by the "It's now or never" crowd who should have been helping me lay the groundwork for the future.

I remember one woman who genuinely believed that if the Catholic Kennedy beat Nixon there would never be another election.

She said, "Forget everything but winning THIS election." She never planned for anything but the political equivalent of Judgement Day.

Bless her heart, she did much more harm than good for our cause.

In The Meantime...

Sometimes the best thing a writer can do is shut up and let those who are interested actually absorb his ideas.

WhitakerOnline has come out every week for exactly seven years.

We have scarcely missed a week in all that time, so there's plenty there.

The WhitakerOnline archive is longer than the New Testament or the Koran, though it hasn't caught up with the Old Testament or the Talmud.

WhitakerOnline Article Archive

My broadcast archive consist of only a few programs, but I hit the very important points first.

If you think I am worth listening to, then the programs there are worth hearing at least twice. They represent my major concepts.

WhitakerOnline Audio Archive

My blog archive is there, but the blog itself may lose its liveliness for the year.

Bob's Blog

We have about sold out the first edition of my book, Why Johnny Can't Think: America's Professor-Priesthood. It will still be available from ReadBob.com until they are sold out.

The ideas in it are planted.

But, a plea on behalf of the book's message:

Please, please, PLEASE never say, "Whitaker says Political Correctness is LIKE a religion."

Please do not say, "Political Correctness is a religion, ***OR*** at least a rigid belief system."

I wrote until my fingers were blue, over and over:

"Political Correctness IS a religion."

I proved it and showed you why it is so important that Political Correctness IS a religion.

This is absolutely critical to the whole message of my book. To say PC is LIKE a religion is worse than saying nothing at all.

Auf wieder sehen, "until we meet again."

Whitaker's World View

November 17, 2001 - SCIENTISTS AND SHAMAN

November 17, 2001 - THE CALENDAR WAS THE FIRST AND LAST ACCOMPLISHMENT OF ANCIENT WISE MEN

November 17, 2001 - FROM USEFUL KNOWLEDGE TO SHAMAN FAKERY, ALSO KNOWN AS 'ANCIENT WISDOM'

November 17, 2001 - THE HUCKSTEROCRATS, AKA "INTELLECTUALS"

SCIENTISTS AND SHAMAN

There is the way of scientist and the way of shaman. The scientist does things. Everybody else who claims authority but does nothing is a shaman.

Shaman come in many forms. A shaman may wear masks and do dances around a fire in the Congo. Other shamans have PhDs and everybody agrees to call them "Professors" and "Authorities" on a subject. For our purposes, these are precisely the same. Shaman substitute impressiveness for accomplishment.

At its beginning stage, a civilization must have scientists. They become shaman only later.

In the case of Egypt or the Mayans or the Incas or ancient China, history rushes through the development of real technology, to get to the mythology and art. In the case of Egypt, a popular book will explain briefly that the Egyptians learned to plant and harvest in harmony with the ebb and flood of the Nile each year, thereby increasing their production and population enormously.

Then a possibly mythical king Menes united Egypt so that it became one enormous and united power. So now Egypt had overwhelming money and power from these real accomplishments.

After breathlessly rushing through the basis of all the wealth and power, history turns with relief to the fun part, which is the Learned Nonsense that followed. From here until the collapse, the story of a Great Civilization becomes a history of shamans and exactly what kind of nonsense they indulged in.

To us, Egyptian history is battles between the god Amon and Aton, how the god Thoth brought man writing. We get detailed explanations about which god wore the head of which animal.

THE CALENDAR WAS THE FIRST AND LAST ACCOMPLISHMENT OF ANCIENT WISE MEN

It is easy for our kind of history to ignore the basics because the technological basics bore us. That is why what we call history is almost entirely nonsense.

For each civilization the beginning was a calendar. Whether it is the annual Nile flood or the coming of the rainy season an exact calendar became essential to survival as agriculture advanced.

The calendar is the titanic and critical ACCOMPLISHMENT PHASE of each civilization. It is the only time when the "intellectuals" who later become a shaman class actually do something useful.

Those first real intellectuals who made the accurate calendars were very special people. But they do not interest the historian and we know nothing about them. We have no interest in this group until they transform from intellectuals into shaman and start rolling out that fascinating nonsense we call Ancient Wisdom.

The first calendar was a work of precision never before accomplished.

After all, some kind of calendar existed before the dinosaurs. Many dinosaurs were herd animals and moved with the seasons. Their pig-like predecessors probably needed some ability to anticipate the seasons too. Homo erectus could tell that rain was coming on or that it was becoming fall.

What we call a calendar was new not because it told us that winter would come soon, for that knowledge is in our bones. The human calendar tells us far ahead from year to year when each season will come. A civilization can only plant and sow and rotate crops and avoid being washed out by rain if it has a dependable calendar.

Foresight, patience, and sticking to nothing but the facts were the essential characteristics of the first and last intellectual leaders Ancient Civilizations ever had, those who developed the calendar.

In early civilizations you might have to use a third of your grain just to plant the new crop. If it got washed out twice you would starve. And as agriculture advanced, hundreds lived on land that only a single hunter-gatherer could survive on before. There was no going back so life more and more depended on the calendar.

Those who developed the calendar over the years became powerful. But once it was developed, the knowledge they had was there for the learning. At this point those who ruled the calendar could just show everybody how to predict the seasons and go back to being like everybody else.

If they did this they would still be real, productive intellectual leaders. They would say, "We have developed a great piece of knowledge. It is now time for everyone to learn it and we can go on to searching for other knowledge."

That never happened in any of the Great Civilizations.

FROM USEFUL KNOWLEDGE TO SHAMAN FAKERY, ALSO KNOWN AS 'ANCIENT WISDOM'

But instead of giving the people their knowledge of the calendar and giving up total control over them, the first and last intellectual leaders in each Great Civilization became shamans. They wrapped up their knowledge in a cloak of mystery and mythology.

Historians marvel at the fact that Aztec priests developed a calendar which was endlessly complicated and gave dates for many millennia to come. As usual, historians are lost in awe at a trick that any country huckster would see through in a New York minute. One way to make basic knowledge seem mysterious is to make it seem that only a superspecialist can deal with it. So the only people allowed to dictate the calendar were those who devoted full time to it.

If any of the peasants supporting these full time priests thought he might be able to do the same thing, they brought out that hideously complicated "Aztec calendar" as one of the proofs that a full-time shaman class was essential.

Other shamans in Great Civilizations used other methods of making the facts they had learned mysterious. Since they were the experts on the seasons, Egyptian priests told the people that if they and the Pharaoh didn't spend full time performing the right ceremonies, the sun would stop coming up.

We all know the First Rule when it comes to discussing Ancient Civilizations. That First Rule is Show Respect For Ancient Wisdom. When we are told that ancient Egyptians actually believed they needed to support their shamans in grand style or the sun wouldn't come up in the morning we must Understand that behind this there was a Deep Wisdom.

What no decent person would ever do when he is told that the shamans maintained their life style by saying they wouldn't make the sun come up in the morning would be to laugh out loud. To find someone who would do that you would need a truly evil and uncouth person.

Which, dear reader, is exactly what makes me so useful to you.

The moment that the first and last intellectual leaders any Great Civilization ever had turned into fakes and shaman the pursuit of knowledge ended. All mental effort was wasted in inventing endless complications that all the young shaman had to learn.

There is nothing sillier than the Egyptian Book of the Dead. It absorbed all of everybody's intellectual life. You can only see it realistically if you see it as the shaman's trick it was. But we are not allowed to see it for what it really was.

It is literally true that no one can begin to understand history until they abandon the First Rule in dealing with Ancient Civilizations. A huckster and a fraud is a huckster and a fraud no matter how many priestly offices or PhDs he has. You cannot be realistic about history if you are not realistic about the world in general.

THE HUCKSTEROCRATS, AKA "INTELLECTUALS"

Rule One in dealing with Ancient Civilizations is essential to every kind of huckster. When Houdini went to seances to expose the frauds, every one of those frauds demanded that everyone be silent and respectful during the ceremony.

Laughing out loud at unbearable silliness is a sure sign of Heresy. I laughed out loud in class when I heard the professor read the preamble to the Soviet Constitution for the first time.

Let us remember who wrote that Constitution. The outstanding characteristic of Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Lenin, Trotsky and every other leader and theorist of the Workers' Revolution was that not one of them had ever done an hour's actual labor in their entire lives.

James Madison and Thomas Jefferson worked on their farms when they were boys. They were experts in real planting. And if George Washington didn't actually chop down the cherry tree it certainly wasn't because he didn't know how. Ben Franklin was a journeyman printer among many other things.

But no champion of the working class knew how to do anything useful.

Let me make it clear to you how silly this situation is. Let's say that you and I are listening to some children setting up a game. The child proposing this game says, "OK, here's how it goes. Jimmy will do all the digging in the dirt. Billy will do the heavy lifting. Tommy will do the fighting."

So Billy says, "So what are you going to do?"

The kid setting up the game says, "I'll do the thinking and I'll give all the orders."

We would laugh out loud because you and I know that no small child, smart or not, is going to fall for that.

So when the Leaders and Theorists of the Working Class sat down to write a preamble to the Soviet Constitution, how did they set it up? Here it is:

"The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is made up of farmers, workers, soldiers and intellectuals."

It said that these people would do all the farming, this group would work the factories, that group would do all the fighting. So the intellectuals do all the thinking and give all the orders and do nothing else.

I was only a teenager, but I laughed out loud at the obvious absurdity of the thing. No one else had ever laughed at this. If anyone had, it could have saved a hundred million lives.

The hucksters took over Russia. They also rule our universities today.

December 14, 2001 - SOME VERY IMPORTANT ADVICE ABOUT ADVICE

December 14, 2001 - HOW TO LOOK AT HISTORY COGENTLY

SOME VERY IMPORTANT ADVICE ABOUT ADVICE

All through your life you will be asking for advice. The advice you get will not be the advice you want.

But if you follow some simple rules you can generally sort out what you want from what you get.

For example, Thomas Edison is quoted all the time as saying that "Success is one percent inspiration and ninety-nine percent perspiration."

Generation after generation of Americans have gleefully repeated this piece of pure horsehockey as Great Wisdom.

First of all, what Edison did was what all advice-givers do: He thought, "What advice can I give that will make me look good?" He decided that he wanted to look like a Hard Worker.

But Hard Work was actually only a minor part of the reason for his success and a lot of poor people in his day worked a lot harder than Edison did.

Like all successes, Edison had a good brain, a lot of talent, and he was lucky enough to come on the scene at the right time. But he didn't mention any of that because he didn't earn any of it and so none of these things would make him look good.

Naturally, Edison's advice presents him as a man who earned everything he got so his success is the result of pure virtue. So he made himself look good and as a result what he said was perfect nonsense.

It was also not original.

Karl Marx said many years before Edison's great advice came out that all production was 100% labor. Edison was just repeating 99% Marxism.

By the way, when people give advice, they don't even tell themselves that, "I am going to say what makes me look good." What they say makes them look virtuous, but they tell themselves that they are just trying to promote virtue, not that they are trying to promote themselves.

So Edison gave nonsense advice that he told himself would promote Hard Work.

HOW TO LOOK AT HISTORY COGENTLY

Every few days another magazine article breathlessly reports that the Chinese had invented printing long before the West had it. Then someone else, for the thousandth time, informs us that China had explosive black powder long, long ago.

Apparently no matter how many times this is repeated it is big news.

Another piece of history which is at least not repeated so often that I cringe when I hear it is that the Incas did not have the wheel for their everyday life, but their children did have wheels on their toys.

All the stunning excitement that greets the zillionth repetition of these facts helps us to ignore the real point:

So what?

Having the wheel is a big deal to us, but it obviously meant nothing to the Incas. The Koreans had a phonetic alphabet and moveable type long before we did, but again, so what? The invention of printing

was a big deal in the West because the minute we got it we began a revolution with it. In Asia, it just laid there.

When the West got the printing press it made a revolution. When China got it they made some playing cards. That is the difference that matters.

We have recently found huge clockworks on sunken ships from the Mediterranean before the time of Christ, and we know the Greeks had a little steam engine. I just heard for the hundredth time that Babylonians probably had electroplating and maybe even ground a lens for a telescope.

All our pictures depicting the Cro-Magnon men who made the cave paintings 30,000 years ago in Europe show them in ragged caveman animal hides. It turns out they probably dressed very well and neatly. A form of textile weaving that was supposed to have been invented two thousand years ago was being worn by all the Caucasoid mummies found in China from over twice that long ago.

The vast slave empires of the Egyptians and the Chinese and other water empires built a lot of big stuff and we find things left behind in the rotted corpses those civilizations left behind that do not appear in living lands. So history long assumed that since the oldest wheels were in Egypt, the wheel must have been invented there. Now we know that Egypt got the wheel very late and built the pyramids without it.

Naturally we are going to find the oldest examples of many inventions in the ruins of dead slave empires. What is tragic about this is that it gives us the idea that slave empires are therefore the places where things are created.

Our accepted history literally thinks that the rotting-away process is the creative process.

December 22, 2001 - EVERY LEFTIST PROFESSOR'S HOMOSEXUAL FANTASY -- THE BIG BLACK CONVICT WHO WILL CHAMPION HIM

December 22, 2001 - LEFTIST PROFESSORS' BIG BLACK CONVICT FANTASY CAN BE FATAL FOR YOUNG PEOPLE

EVERY LEFTIST PROFESSOR'S HOMOSEXUAL FANTASY -- THE BIG BLACK CONVICT WHO WILL CHAMPION HIM

In a newsgroup I read, I recently saw a letter by a kid who is repeating the usual fantasy of the yuppie kid about prison life. He wants to impress and scare everybody, so he says says he is a black prisoner and that his "bro" is really mad at them.

In other words, he has the usual yuppie fantasy that real power lies in 1) being black and 2) being in prison.

A kid who is raised on these illusions can easily end up in prison himself before he knows the truth.

This Black Prison Power thing is a standard fantasy of social science professors. Liberal professor's illusions are where the yuppie version of "Reality Life" comes from.

Professors' big worry is that people will notice that they have no notion of what reality is. They are terrified that someone will notice that they have chosen an easy life and that they have never been exposed to reality.

But every liberal professor is comforted by this idea that his leftism speaks for a Real Man, a Real Man Who Lives in Reality. This Real Man is going to avenge the leftist professor on those who laugh at his pretensions about Reality.

That Real Man professors fantasize about is the big black muscular black guy who is doing exercises with weights on the prison yard. This big black guy is going to avenge the leftist against all those big rough hicks who make fun of the idea that criminals are basically nice guys and so forth.

His big black prisoner is going to get all those rightists who are successes out in the real world, the ones who make money and do things and laugh at a leftist professor who beats his chest and talks about how he knows everything to tomorrow's leftist yuppies.

This Big Black Prisoner Hero thing is half homosexual and half political, like so many things that the left talks about.

I have worked in prisons and I have been a college professor, so I have seen where this nonsense comes from and I have seen how silly it is in the real world.

LEFTIST PROFESSORS' BIG BLACK CONVICT FANTASY CAN BE FATAL FOR YOUNG PEOPLE

Leftists are right when they say that blacks are powerless in our society.

The liberal professor's homosexual-political fantasy is also right about one thing. Any little power blacks have will be used entirely to back the political left, and will never go to help your average black person.

You can believe me, because I am not one to repeat leftist propaganda. On the rare occasions when I vouch for something liberals say you can be pretty sure it's because it's Gospel.

So liberals are right when they say that blacks are powerless and that blacks use all of what pitiful little political power they have to back the left. In fact, these two things are closely interrelated.

Now anyone who says that blacks blindly vote for liberals is always accused of being anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews.

But everybody knows that blacks DO vote blindly for leftists. Every liberal Democrat knows it and every election year liberals put their money on it. Democrats devote enormous resources to getting out the minority vote. They assume, rightly, that about every black vote is one of theirs.

As usual, anyone speaks the obvious truth is silenced by being called anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews.

Every iota of what is called black political power is actually leftist political power. Liberals take blacks for granted, as they should. So there is no black political power.

Leftists hate white people, so their anti-white agenda is all that blacks ask of them. Liberals are pro-criminal, but most of those criminals prey on helpless blacks. This will never cause blacks to turn against them.

So leftists love criminals and they can count on blind black support. The natural result of this is the Big Black Prisoner Hero idea.

That big black sweaty prisoner in the prison yard is the dream of every liberal college professor. That big sweaty muscular black guy is going to come out and champion our poor, insulted white professor with the pencil neck and no life.

So the yuppie professor's fantasy is swallowed whole by the yuppie liberals of tomorrow in their college classrooms. And from there it goes on to the yuppies' kids.

In turn the yuppies kids start acting like they're black, because their mommy and daddy told them black is where the real power is.

Then the parents are wondering how their kid got into the drug culture. And the kid is where he thought the power was, in a prison cell getting gang raped.

And about that time, the kid finally realizes that his world should not be built on the homosexual fantasies of a social science professor.

But his yuppie liberal parents will never figure that out.

December 29, 2001 - CREATIVITY AND ROT ARE NOT THE SAME THING

December 29, 2001 - YOU'VE EITHER GOT TO DISCRIMINATE OR STRIP-SEARCH GRANDMA

CREATIVITY AND ROT ARE NOT THE SAME THING

This may seem an obvious thing to say, but most of history is based on the idea that creativity only took place where things were rotting away. The reason for this is that historians think that where they find something is the place where it was created.

A historian would go to Cuba and decide that the automobile was invented there. He would note that the average car on the streets of Havana was built decades ago, while cars in the United States are mostly from less than one decade ago.

The Middle East contains whole civilizations that have died out. You will find the oldest wheels in those areas. There is a major pagan center in Uppsala, Sweden, but we can't study it because it has half a dozen Christian churches built over it. If you want to study pagan sites you have to go to the Middle East, where everything is dead.

So paganism was invented in the Middle East.

Stonehenge is famous because it is still standing on land where there has been life throughout the ages. So until carbon dating was developed it was assumed that Stonehenge was built very late in the stone age.

There are stone henges of this type in the southern Mediterranean. They are from the same old culture that built Stonehenge. Henges from that ancient culture are in Spain and all over Europe, but it was assumed that the ones in the Middle East were the oldest, because history says everything came from the Middle East.

So historians were amazed when carbon dating showed that the oldest henge was Stonehenge and the one in the Middle East was actually the YOUNGEST. This surprised them but did not cause them to rethink anything.

Stonehenge was built in England and then that culture spread southwards to the Middle East. If you look at history you will see this is an old and repeated story. The history of the Middle East is a history of "northern invasions." The wheel came to Egypt because it rolled over the Egyptian armies from the north. The Hittites brought iron to Egypt in another northern invasion. Stonehenge culture came down to the Middle East after a millennium or two in the north.

So historians assume that everything began in the Middle East. And every time the origin of anything is traced, historians are astounded, once again, to find it didn't come from the Middle East.

The blond mummies from four thousand years ago that have been found in China were wearing a type of weave that historians had long since officially said was developed in the Middle East two thousand years later. Apparently it was old when these blond people had it twice that long ago.

Historians were, as always, amazed, especially the ones who spent their entire lives studying the history of weaving.

YOU'VE EITHER GOT TO DISCRIMINATE OR STRIP-SEARCH GRANDMA

About 58% of whites favor profiling Middle Easterners as possible terrorists but blacks favor such profiling of Middle Easterners by 71%. This really upset black "leaders" who have a major campaign going on against all profiling.

One black comedian was worried about some Middle Easterners who were behind him on an airplane. He said, "Sometimes profiling is bad and sometimes it's just damn good targeting."

The attempt to separate racial profiling from racial discrimination are getting so silly even some respectable conservatives are beginning to notice.

Profiling is selecting people for special attention because of the group they come from. That is exactly what discrimination is. Since discrimination and profiling is exactly the same thing, the attempts to explain the difference get very long and complicated.

But if you are not going to discriminate, you will have to strip search as many old ladies as you do young guys.

In a country which practices absolutely no discrimination, everybody gets searched as much as everybody else. The NAACP has mounted a major campaign against profiling in the search for illegal aliens. On the Mexican border, white people are let through routinely while dark people are checked out just as routinely.

The NAACP insists that this discrimination stop, and that blond people be stopped and searched as assiduously as dark people are.

This is nondiscrimination in action. But it has another name, just as discrimination and profiling are two words for the same thing. When absolutely everybody can be randomly stopped and searched, it may be called nondiscrimination or it may be called a police state. They are the same thing.

January 5, 2002 - SOCIAL SCIENCE ADMITS IT'S PRIMITIVE, BUT WILL NOT FACE WHAT THAT MEANS

January 5, 2002 - SEMMELWEIS SOLUTIONS

SOCIAL SCIENCE ADMITS IT'S PRIMITIVE, BUT WILL NOT FACE WHAT THAT MEANS

Social science is in a primitive state of development and social scientists freely admit it. When I took some graduate courses in political science in 1992, the introductory course addressed itself to the exact differences between the more advanced "hard sciences" and the present state of the social sciences.

But as so often happens, this recognition goes to the brink of real usefulness but no farther. Social scientists insist that, despite the primitive state of their studies, they have the right answers for human society. This collection of "the ideas of the intellectuals" is what we call "political leftism."

While they freely admit their studies are still in an early stage, social scientists insist that they, the "intellectuals," have the solutions that should be applied to human affairs.

But a look at the history of the sciences demonstrates one thing about every field of study when it was at the primitive level of today's social sciences. When it was at this crude, basic level, every prescription an academic discipline gave was not just wrong, it was a disaster.

Look at early chemistry. It said that the four elements were earth, air, fire and water. This primitive science was practiced by alchemists. Look at the absurdities of the alchemists.

Ancient geography had three continents of equal size, Europe, Africa and Asia, and no one could get anywhere using its maps. Primitive medicine bled people to balance four nonexistent humors, taking pints of blood from sick people.

So leftist prescriptions by the social sciences, from getting rid of phonics in teaching reading to treating criminals as innocent victims of society to socialism, where "intellectuals" plan the whole economy, has been a disaster.

To repeat, the social sciences admit they are primitive, but their historians pretend not to notice that every field of study at this early stage has been ridiculous when it tried to address reality.

Look at all the sciences in their early stages and you will see one invariable rule. That is that when each field of study was exactly where social scientists admit they are today every prescription they agreed on for human beings was wildly and disastrously absurd.

And every time a leftist policy is applied to human affairs, it is a disaster. And like every other primitive science, social science refuses to learn anything from this.

Today, social scientists are as absolutely confident of their agreed-upon prescriptions as every other early scientist was. But they have less excuse, because they claim to be experts on history.

SEMMELWEIS SOLUTIONS

Doctor Semmelweis was one of many martyrs to science who found that what sounds good is far more important to primitive "experts" than the truth is.

Puerperal Disease, or "childbed fever," killed hundreds of millions of women and children over the weary millennia. All the Medical Intellectuals said puerperal fever came from Imbalanced Humors or (Yes, it was popular centuries ago) from Deep Seated Psychosomatic Causes.

In 1848, a young doctor named Semmelweis found that childbed fever could be stopped if the Great Medical Experts would simply wash their hands before delivering babies. It was the least salable explanation imaginable. It was too simple, too obvious. So, for a generation, millions of women and babies died in agony because the Medical Authorities were unanimously against Semmelweis.

The same thing happened with vaccination.

The same thing happened with the bacterial theory of disease. Millions died while Medical Authority and Intellectuals fought for the Humor Theory of Disease, for which there was no evidence except the fact that Authority supported it.

Like political leftism, the Humor Theory of Disease never worked, but university "intellectuals" in primitive medicine unanimously supported it.

One after another, each one of these common sense Semmelweis Solutions had to be sold over the screams of the Authorities and Intellectuals while millions died.

Medicine only began to be a science when it discredited all the old Intellectuals. A field of study can only be a science when it decides that if you have a cure that WORKS on one side and all the Intellectuals and Authorities on the other, Authority means nothing.

Semmelweis saved a few thousands lives personally. He has saved hundreds of millions since, and he is saving them right now.

But, in his lifetime, this forgotten hero of humanity watched millions die while he wore himself out trying to point out the simple reality that would save them.

Because he loved humanity too much for his own good, Semmelweis died in a madhouse.

January 19, 2002 - GO, PAT, GO!

January 19, 2002 - EVEN YANKEES HAVE STARTED TO CATCH ON

January 19, 2002 - YOU CAN SAY PEOPLE MAKE THE DIFFERENCE. BUT YOU'D BETTER NOT BELIEVE IT

GO, PAT, GO!

They were interviewing Pat Buchanan about his new book, "The Death of the West." "The Death of the West" describes what we have been telling people for fifty years. Buchanan is finally saying that the colored world is going to swamp the white world, and that sick-minded whites are all for it.

Pat says what you and I have been saying for decades, that there is something morally sick about ANY people who WELCOME their own disappearance.

Pat has come a long way since he used to say that Americans fought and died in World War II specifically for the purpose of opening Europe to massive Third World immigration!

And during the interview referred to here, Pat made the statement I have been waiting for SOMEBODY to make SINCE BEFORE I REACHED MY TEENS.

Pat was asked about the economic stimulus package that is the main subject of debate in Washington right now.

Pat replied, "The Visigoths are invading Italy and in Rome they're debating A STIMULUS PACKAGE! Compared to the Death of the West this is NOTHING!"

You cannot imagine how joyous I was finally hearing somebody say that. Like most of my older readers I have lived with this wisdom for almost fifty years.

All those years I was a desperate young person who saw what was happening to our whole civilization.

And all that time I had to listen to conservatives talk about "fiscal responsibility," religious issues, and absolutely anything else they could come up with. They shut me up when I tried to discuss the Real Issue, because the Real Issue was the one issue liberals will not let them discuss.

It never occurred to them there was a REASON that liberals banned them from discussing the One Real Issue.

EVEN YANKEES HAVE STARTED TO CATCH ON

When Yankees finally begin to see what is at stake on the race issue, they always ask me a question:

"During the fight over segregation, did you Southerners really understand that race was a WORLD issue?"

As always, most Southerners said it was all a matter of a few obscure words in the Old Testament that were at stake. But some of the highly literate segregationists LIKE YOU AND ME clearly saw what the long-term stakes were.

And all that time, I lived through a fifty-year nightmare. It is a nightmare for a very smart young man to see his whole world steadily and predictably committing suicide while those who should have been fighting back were telling me not to fight back.

Every now and then, even Pat would stop his theocratic ranting and mention how sick it was for whites to welcome their own decline. But liberals would call him "anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews!" and Pat would go back to being a harmless theocratic nutcase.

When Pat gets off of his own brand of Wordism, he is heroic.

PLEASE READ May 15, 1999 – WORDISM

YOU CAN SAY PEOPLE MAKE THE DIFFERENCE. BUT YOU'D BETTER NOT BELIEVE IT

The media say "People make the difference." But the media will lynch anybody who really believes that.

In a melting pot, people mean nothing. According to our ruling faith, you can throw any population into a country and it will work fine if you repeat the right liberal words.

The one thing you have to believe today is that America has nothing to do with its people. You could bring in any third world population and give them the Declaration of Independence and good attitudes and they would have freedom and prosperity.

With the right words, any population can be as American as you and me. Believe that or wait for the lynch mob to come for you.

Conservatives say that the Bible and Family Values are What America Is All About. Liberals say What America Is All About is liberal programs.

But both agree that WORDS are everything.

No Wordist wants the people to matter.

So people can't matter at all.

In the real world if you base policy on ANY form of Wordism, it will never work.

But who cares?

No one dares assume that liberals and theologues and other Wordists are talking nonsense just because they always have talked nonsense.

PLEASE READ May 15, 1999 - WORDISM

January 26, 2002 - IN BIOLOGY AS ELSEWHERE, POWER ***IS***** RESPONSIBILITY, WHETHER YOU USE IT OR NOT**

January 26, 2002 - ANOTHER EXAMPLE

January 26, 2002 - WHEN PREACHERS AND PROFESSORS AGREE ON SOMETHING, BEWARE!

January 26, 2002 - TODAY AS IN 1800 THE PREACHERS AND PROFESSORS HAVE DIFFERENT GOALS, BUT THE SAME STAND

January 26, 2002 - HOW POWERFUL WILL THE POWER OF BIOLOGY GET IN THIRTY YEARS?

IN BIOLOGY AS ELSEWHERE, POWER ***IS***** RESPONSIBILITY, WHETHER YOU USE IT OR NOT**

Now scientists are breeding pigs to supply parts to save human lives and functions. They have found that they can remove the characteristic from pigs that makes human bodies reject transplants from pigs to people.

At first, those who opposed human embryo research said they would support a huge program of research on using adult stem cells instead. But now they just want to hide behind the Bible and take no responsibility.

Embryo research will probably not be that important in the long run. But what infuriates me is the people who think that God is going to protect them from MORAL decisions.

The advance of science is our MORAL responsibility. If you decide NOT to use the biological revolution, that is as much a MORAL CHOICE as suing it. When we use it, as we have to increase third world population, that is OUR MORAL RESPONSIBILITY.

But I hate the fact that so many people use it as an excuse to avoid all the real, hard decisions about the biological revolution. They think that if they just attack stem cell research and use God, they don't have to think about all the other ways we are playing God right now.

When I demanded that those who take a stand on this issue first tell me how they would handle the problem of the Boy in the Bubble in France (May 12, 2001 - FRANCE - THE BOY IN THE BUBBLE).

Only one replied, and he avoided it.

A DIFFERENT reader was more honest. He said the whole thing just worried him. Here is my reply:

"Bob, I am no expert and can be seriously wrong in what I think I know."

Bob's Reply:

"So can I. But I KNOW it, unlike those who just quote selected passages of the Bible to protect themselves from reality.

Of course, as I keep saying, all the biological revolution is extremely dangerous, including the parts of it for which there are no convenient Bible passages.

But those who use God to avoid real decisions act as if it were all happening in a vacuum.

But in the real world all those kids are being born in the third world and the "Christians" say that's just fine because they say it's "natural." There is nothing natural about the survival of all those children. It is a direct result of our medical and agricultural sciences.

We play God a million times every day.

Back to the French boy in the bubble, the one everybody tries to ignore. If you can save that child's life by creating an embryo BUT REFUSE TO DO SO, you are STILL playing God.

I have yet to hear a single person address any of these other very real moral problems we are responsible for. To repeat, stem cell research does not occur in a vacuum.

I know what you mean. I wish I could just quote a Bible passage and avoid all the hard decisions. You are not trying that blasphemous easy out, and I appreciate it."

ANOTHER EXAMPLE

Some years back a couple with one child found that the child had a fatal disease. They had to have a transplant from a sibling. So they conceived a child to give a kidney to that child, since the child could live well with only one of her own.

Pulpits exploded coast-to-coast. This was Evil. Children should be conceived in the stinking alleys of the third world whenever those people feel like it, but it was Evil for a child to be brought into the world to save another.

The parents received thousands of hostile letters and a number of death threats.

But now nobody claims "credit" for all that terrorizing. The two children have been alive and well for some time. Just like the preachers who fought vaccination in 1800, no one will now claim "credit" for what they said then.

Don't preach to me about the biological revolution unless you also take responsibility for the population revolution science is producing. And please address the examples I give.

Could you sit there, look the parents in the eye and say the kid just has to die?

No decent person could. But I know that no one is going to deal with these questions. People who quote convenient parts of the Bible to say that God protects them from moral choices have no moral courage.

WHEN PREACHERS AND PROFESSORS AGREE ON SOMETHING, BEWARE!

It is essential that we understand the enormous similarity between the year 2000 and the year 1800.

The year 1800 introduced a century when medicine marched a hundred times farther in a single century than it had in all of previous history. In 1800, university authorities in medicine were untied against this

revolution. They were defending bleeding quarts of blood from sick people as the main treatment for disease and fighting the idea that doctors need to wash their hands, along with everything else that might save lives.

In 1800 as now, the preachers and professors were on the same side. Preachers were fighting vaccinations against smallpox. In fact, I do not know of a single medical advance in the entire period from 1800 to 1900 that preachers did not use the Bible to oppose.

The same is true today, and once against the whole thing is so obviously absurd only a respectable conservative would fail to notice it.

Just a few years back all the professors were pushing moral relevance. There were no absolute rules, they said.

But then came cloning and the biological revolution. Instantly they invented a field call "Ethics." Suddenly they have PhD's who were concentrating on moral relevance yesterday and who are now "biological ethicists." And exactly as in 1800, academics are standing shoulder-to-shoulder with the preachers against the coming revolution.

TODAY AS IN 1800 THE PREACHERS AND PROFESSORS HAVE DIFFERENT GOALS, BUT THE SAME STAND

Today, as in 1800, many preachers want use God to give their followers an easy way out of facing moral decisions. Today, as in 1800, the professors oppose the revolution because it upsets everything their old theories - which never WORKED - stood on.

Our whole social policy is based on the idea that genetics means nothing. If we have a social problem, we just turn it over to the psychologists, the sociologists, and the economists. But since the biological revolution began, anybody can see how ridiculous this idea is.

Anything that genetics takes over, the social sciences lose. And social scientists rule on all discussions of social policy on all our campuses. Asking a social science professor to compare heredity with environment is exactly like asking a social worker whether all social programs should be abolished.

HOW POWERFUL WILL THE POWER OF BIOLOGY GET IN THIRTY YEARS?

I am the only person on earth who remembers it, but for a few minutes during the 1969 moon mission, the world was sweating blood. One astronaut was circling the moon in the main vehicle while the other two went down to surface in a smaller one.

Then the two came back in the smaller vehicle and were supposed to link up with the main one to go back to earth. They and the other astronaut expected to know when the two hooked up together from the loud "Click" it would make.

Time passed and there was no click. Everybody was worried sick because the instruments showed that everything was going perfectly.

Finally, they realized that the computers doing the hook up were so powerful and did such a perfect job that there had been no "Click!" We simply could not get used to the computer age, where things are done with such inhuman perfection.

That incredibly powerful computer that put those vehicles together with such perfection in 1969 was inhumanly perfect.

Now here's the punch line:

Every single "Tickle Me Elmo" doll has a computer in it that is more powerful than that one.

Power is responsibility, and the power of the biological revolution has not even begun. God is not going to protect anyone from this moral responsibility.

February 2, 2002 - EVEN I NEED *SOME*** TACT**

February 2, 2002 - MAURICE BESSINGER DOESN'T TALK ABOUT COMBAT

February 2, 2002 - "NOBODY KNOWS THE TROUBLE I'VE SEEN"

EVEN I NEED *SOME*** TACT**

I want the whole world to know that Joe Sobran said that "Bob Whitaker is blunt and brilliant." Nothing is as flattering as praise from the praiseworthy, and I would rather have those words from Joe than anything any other national columnist could say.

The following columns invite you to criticize me when I need it. But do try to cushion the bad news a little.

I am blunt, but even old Bob needs people to use a little tact with him.

The best definition of that word that I ever heard is the following: "Tact is the difference between telling a woman that when you see her, time stands still and telling a woman that her face would stop a clock."

For example, you could look at my life's story and say one of two things.

Two guys look at my many experiences and my travels.

The tactful one says, "You are a very impressive person, Bob. You have been many places and had wide experience in varying fields of endeavor. You are well equipped to advise us."

The guy without tact would just say, "Can't keep a job, can you, Bob?"

So if you catch me bragging or whining, let me down easy, OK?

MAURICE BESSINGER DOESN'T TALK ABOUT COMBAT

I am bragging when I point out that I have known Maurice Bessinger for decades. We talked for many hours through the years. But I only heard him mention his Korean War experiences once.

He said he was walking guard duty in Korea with a Republic of Korea (ROK) soldier during the Korean War. The ROK soldier said for Maurice to stay on guard and he would go back and go to sleep.

A little later, an ROK officer showed up and asked Maurice where the ROK guard was. Maurice told him. The officer walked back to where the soldier was sleeping and a minute later Maurice heard the sharp crack of his pistol. He had shot the guard while he lay there asleep.

That was all Maurice ever said to me about Korea in all our many hours of conversation.

I came to find out later that Maurice Bessinger was in the most vicious part of the fighting in that awful war. But he simply never mentioned it.

I have known a lot of people who talk constantly about combat and others like Maurice who mention it barely or not at all. The ones who talk about it usually make you feel that they want you to feel responsible for it all. You owe them more money for it, and only they have any right to talk about war.

Then there are people like Maurice who don't claim some kind of special godhood from their time in combat. I was raised with the World War II generation, so I am very familiar with both types.

A very simple rule separates the braggarts and the real heroes like Maurice.

Maurice Bessinger did his fighting and then went back to being a citizen. He has had one hell of a life since then.

Another guy I know fought for five months in World War II, then he became an alcoholic and stayed in the service. Because he had won a Silver Star, they let him stay in, drunkenness and all.

This guy talks about nothing but World War II. He tells how he is the only person who should talk about war. He says we owe him.

The latter gentleman beats his chest so much I think he's broken some ribs.

The guy who talks about his college football days or his time in service all the time, hoping you will feel obligated and inferior, is almost invariably somebody who has not had a life since. I saw an outstanding example just a couple of years ago on the television program, "Cops."

The cops were called to a bar where an old guy kept pulling his pants down. When they arrived, he shouted that he had been at D-Day. I wonder how many times he has used that to stay out of jail.

Maurice Bessinger has shown physical courage in war, but he has also shown MORAL courage by taking the field in politics. It has cost him dearly. A major part of his life's work has been destroyed because he dared to speak out. Bessinger will never have to convince anyone worth talking to that he is a hero.

Please read November 20, 1999 - TYPES OF COURAGE.

"NOBODY KNOWS THE TROUBLE I'VE SEEN"

One of the main things I got paid for was taking long-winded verbiage and telling my busy boss what was actually said. I am a professional speechwriter, and I know a dozen nice-sounding ways to say anything, no matter how creepy it really is.

If you want to shut up all opposition, use the old "Nobody Knows the Trouble I've Seen" line. When I was coming up, no one was allowed to debate integration because "You don't know what it's like to be black." And then there was the "I am Jewish and..." crowd. These were the people who shut up all debate by saying no one understood how it was to be Jewish and so nobody but Jews had a right to talk about Israel or other issues.

You are not allowed to say that the Americans for Disabilities Act has gone too far, because, "You don't Understand..." what it is like to be in a wheelchair.

Let me tell you what is really stupid about using the "You just don't Understand" line. You can only use it on someone who does Understand.

If you use the "You just don't Understand how it is" line on someone who doesn't Understand, he will not pay you any attention. So you only use "You Don't Understand" because you know the person you are talking to DOES see how important your experience was.

As usual, appealing to conscience only works with those who HAVE consciences. The "Nobody Knows the Trouble I've Seen" line only shuts up the people who should be talking.

I beg you to save me from this. I try to explain how my many experiences taught me things. But like anybody else, I can slip into the "I had it so hard" whine. When that happens, PLEASE don't let me get away with it.

February 9, 2002 - WHITE ANTIRACISM IS REALLY VERY RACIST
February 9, 2002 - I AM NOT AN ANIMAL!

WHITE ANTIRACISM IS REALLY VERY RACIST

All the Politically Correct sources say that American history is racist.

But nobody dares to go into how this attitude shows itself.

New York State recently approved a textbook for general use, which declared simply that, "All whites are racist." It was pulled at the last minute. New York authorities suddenly realized how fatal it would be to their holier-than-thou attitudes if people really started looking closely at the attitudes of whites who call themselves "antiracist."

This is because Whites who are "antiracist" have thoroughly white supremacist attitudes. But their racism is so deeply ingrained that they don't even know it's there.

There is nothing like total self-righteousness to keep you from realizing your own shortcomings.

For example, everybody always tells me over and over and over again that the Chinese invented paper and gunpowder before it was in the West. I cannot have heard that less than fifty or sixty times in the last decade. Every literate person has.

Why do we keep hearing about Chinese gunpowder and Chinese paper? The population of China has consistently been equal to or bigger than the entire population of the West. Yet everybody has to repeat to everybody at least once a month that they had paper and gunpowder before Europe did.

Why is it such a major news item that the Chinese, a consistent one in five of the whole world population, invented some things before we did?

The reason for this is that, to self-styled antiracist whites, the idea that nonwhites invented anything is something we just assume to be front-page news. This endless repetition, which is supposed to be the very epitome of antiracism, is one of the best illustrations of how our view of the world is so deeply racist we don't even notice it when it is shouted in our faces as antiracism.

I AM NOT AN ANIMAL!

Another example of our totally racist outlook being presented as antiracism is the Politically Correct attitude toward animals and indigenous peoples.

For example, let us say you walk right into the middle of a television commentary and hear the following words,

"This may seem cruel and savage to us. But for them it is part of the natural scheme of things."

Let me ask you a question. Who is the "them" being referred to? Is the "them" the commentator is talking about native Americans, aborigines, or animals?

There is no way for you to know, because these same words are invariably applied to nonwhites and to animals. Unlike white people, they are an innocent part of nature, incapable of the sinfulness that comes with an enlarged brain.

The reason it is so easy to sell White Guilt is because, to our mind, animals and nonwhites are incapable of sinning. We find it easy to think that nonwhites and animals are always sinned against.

In other words, "antiracists" insist that to say that a nonwhite is guilty of sins against whites is as absurd as the idea that a squirrel could be guilty of a crime.

It is hard to imagine a more racist attitude than the one behind White Guilt.

February 16, 2002 - THE LATEST SCANDAL AT THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE SHOULD TELL US SOMETHING

February 16, 2002 - A GREAT ECONOMIC SECRET REVEALED

February 16, 2002 - WHEN BRYAN PATRICK REAGAN SELLS AMERICA OUT, WE ARE IN DEEP, DEEP TROUBLE

THE LATEST SCANDAL AT THE INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE SHOULD TELL US SOMETHING

For American professors and for the American East Coast, "international" means "sophisticated." They regard Middle America and the South as "fly-over country" on their way to the West Coast. As Martin Sheen and a host of other Hollywood celebrities have pointed out, America has never produced anything important.

Meanwhile, the United Nations is such a hopeless bureaucracy that it embarrasses some third world countries. The International Olympic Committee (IOC) is repeatedly caught taking bribes to locate the Olympics in some particular city, and the fix was just in - AGAIN - on the figure skating championships.

Naturally, the Hollywood stars and professors and easterners explain that any problem foreigners have is because they are misunderstood or the world is just unfair to them. Professors tell us over and over and over that if the world would just turn all economic planning over to the professors, everybody would be rich.

This is what they call 'socialism,' but it is really just rule by professors.

There have been actual recordings of Olympic judges putting in the fix, but nothing could be done about it. Like United Nations bureaucrats, these people simply cannot be gotten rid of. That is the nature of the bureaucracies in most third world countries and in Europe today, where there is a permanent depression going on.

A GREAT ECONOMIC SECRET REVEALED

All the professors and Hollywood stars love to explain why third world workers are so poorly paid. It always comes back to White Guilt and an Evil Conspiracy. If the world economy were just turned over to the professors, they would do as good a job of distributing goods as the United Nations and the IOC do.

Please read Whitaker Online for November 7, 1998, THE BEAD BUYERS. Here I explain once again a very simple fact of life: the reason some people make very little money is because if you pay them money they will give you almost nothing for it.

Eric Hoffer was talking about an American who had immigrated from Eastern Europe years before. This naturalized American was taking a vacation back in his homeland. People there knew he was an American and they knew that American workers got paid many times what they received for an hour's work.

So this new American was watching some workers in his original country laying some pipe. One of the workers laying the pipe said, "What would we get for doing this same job in America?"

The American, who was a pipe fitter himself, took one look at their work and said, "Nothing."

I worked on a plant in the 1950s in Germany and I was appalled at how slowly they worked. In South Carolina, our workers did many times as much work and got paid two or three times as much per hour, and that was with a recession in the United States and a labor shortage in Germany.

Since then, even Europeans admit that their standard of living has shot up only because they adopted American methods and a more American pace of work. America has become easier to compete with because we have adopted leftism and our work force and voting population is more and more third world.

All this is simplistic. But it is also true. If you doubt it, do what all the liberals say, "Follow the money."

Actually, workers don't do much work in the third world, but the pace of their work is the least of it. The reason nobody will pay decent wages in Mexico is not because of the pace of the work. The reason is because Mexico is run by MEXICANS.

Foreign bureaucracies are almost invariably cheap, stupid, mindless and dishonest, just like the ones we see in the UN and the IOC.

They also have lots and lots of academic degrees. In fact, they hire largely by academic degrees in high jobs in most bureaucracies around the world. "Doctor" Albierto de Whatever in South America does as good a job running his country's economy as the Doctors this and that here do running American education.

Think, for a moment, about American "intellectuals" trying to run any serious business.

This should give you a whole new insight into those International Institutions that are supposed to be so "sophisticated."

WHEN BRYAN PATRICK REAGAN SELLS AMERICA OUT, WE ARE IN DEEP, DEEP TROUBLE

Forget the ethnic jokes, this is deadly serious. For generations, the New England "blue bloods" sold America out to the Communists. Then the Old Boys' Network at the top of the secret services would hire more of these "blue bloods" from Harvard.

And gosh darn it, guess what happened? Gee whiz, another New England "blue blood" sold us out again! It is not an accident that Robert Welch, founder of the John Birch Society which pushed the Communist Conspiracy idea, was from Massachusetts. For him, the high-level Communists were a fact of life.

When I dealt with security matters, we just took it for granted that if you wanted the Reds to know, you let the Old Boys know. We were a bunch of judgmental rednecks, you see. We had a totally out of date line:

Commies BAD. We Good. Period.

Notice that when Senator Torricelli arranged it so that all information about questionable spies had to be cleared with the Washington office, not a single case was referred. Everybody knew exactly what would happen to spies about whom the central office knew everything.

If you don't trust the New England Old Boy Network, who do you trust? As a judgmental redneck, you trust OTHER judgmental rednecks. Yes, Virginia, these judgmental rednecks, aka patriots, are exactly the people ethnic stereotypes would tell you they are.

You don't trust all Southerners, but you trust Southerners. You don't trust all Americans with Irish names, but they are an excellent bet. With the same caveat, you trust Mormons, you look for Midwesterners, and you trust your gut.

So when Irish Catholic family man Robert Hansen and a retired army sergeant named Bryan Patrick Reagan are the two latest big-time sellouts, my blood runs cold.

No one else would dare say this, because it is just true. And the truth is no excuse. As with everything else, Political Correctness takes precedence over national security.

February 23, 2002 - EVOLUTION HAS SERIOUS PROBLEMS BUT EVOLUTIONARY LOGIC CAN BE USEFUL

February 23, 2002 - THANK GOD FOR READERS WHO CAN READ AND THINK

EVOLUTION HAS SERIOUS PROBLEMS BUT EVOLUTIONARY LOGIC CAN BE USEFUL

I have received many letters endorsing a very good anti-evolutionary book which goes into the structure of the eye in detail. The author points out that the eye is so complex and its functions so interrelated that it cannot be explained by the accidents of evolution.

He makes an excellent point. I was impressed when I read that point made by the anti-evolutionary gentleman in 1999. I was impressed by another gentleman who made the exact same point a hundred and forty years earlier. The latter man who said the eye simply could not be explained away by evolutionary accident was named Charles Darwin, and he said it in a book called "The Origin of Species."

Charles Darwin is one of my least favorite people. He was happy to see American soldiers being killed in the Civil War, and he said that if one white man had to die for every slave, that was only fair. As a Southerner, I despise the nasty . . . well anyway back to the subject.

On the other hand, about the funniest argument against evolution I ever heard was the idea that the Bible says that human life is a Just-So Story. Human beings are Proud and therefore cannot be descended from a common ancestor with the ape.

I often wonder if I am reading the same Bible people keep quoting at me. The idea that man is somehow a proud being isn't in my Bible at all. He's dust, which is considerably below monkeys on the evolutionary scale.

If you are hung up on the glory of the six day creation you might want to pay a little attention to what happened AFTER that.

Evolution has holes in it, big, ugly holes. But even most creationists do not deny there is a lot of evolution. You can explain most obvious characteristics of most animals only by using the logic of evolution.

Since that is the case, that's what I do. For me, Charles Darwin is not Christ, but he is also not anti-Christ. To the extent his stuff is useful, I use it.

THANK GOD FOR READERS WHO CAN READ AND THINK

I recently got one of the emails that makes this whole effort worthwhile. A reader criticized my idea that maybe the color of the skin is in fact very important when it comes to why races perform the way they do. I wrote her back my usual "Forget it" reply which is my response to the usual letter of this kind.

I cannot count how many letters of this kind I have received, but not like this one. All the others were from people regurgitating the same old cliches we have all read a thousand times.

But this young lady let me know in no uncertain terms she had read what I said. She really let me have it.

Lord, I LOVE that! I am so desperately sick of reading the same old predigested crap, and it is such a relief to have someone show they have actually read what I said and thought about it.

You see, this young lady actually wanted to know the exact point that I was making. Others who say that really just want to shriek about the fact that I am committing heresy. They want to repeat the same old cliches. I did her an injustice and boy did she let me know it.

So here is my reply to this e-mailer who has made Old Bob very, very proud:

"Thanks again, X, for your patience and attention. I am going to try this with you. So far, saying this to other people has been like trying to push toothpaste back into a tube, trying to get attention to the very simple statement I am making."

"Many years ago, I was reading a critique of Rousseau's idea of The Noble Savage. The writer agreed that the eskimos and the people who live in 'that land beyond argument,' the freezing lands of Tierra del Fuego, are indeed inoffensive, non-aggressive people. The same is true of the bushmen who live in the horrible environment of the Kalahari Desert in Africa."

"But, said the writer, this is not because being primitive and away from population centers makes you nice. On the contrary, it is because you are unaggressive that you have to live in such an awful place:

""He concluded that 'Nonassertive, peaceful people tend to live at unfashionable addresses.'"

"So it isn't that living in depopulated places makes you inoffensive. You live in such places BECAUSE you are inoffensive."

"Darwin said that when he first read Malthus, he immediately thought of the theory of survival of the fittest. In the same way, I thought this simple, sensible observation about adaptation versus dominance may be the key to the vexing problem of race."

"There are two general ways to survive. One is to dominate and the other is to adapt. Our mammalian ancestors lived beside the dinosaurs, and they did so by being tiny, quiet, mouselike creatures who came out at night. When the dinosaurs went extinct, we came out and dominated the world."

"If I were a Martian coming to earth, I would notice that the humans with the pink skin were dominant. I would wonder why the ones with the pink skins were dominant. If I read that there are two general types of survival, one of adaptation and one of dominance, I would say, "Well, the other two big races here have adaptations. One has sickle cells which protect it from malaria and a black skin, the other has epicanthic eyefolds and horned skin, both of them protection from extreme cold. So the pink ones dominate and the other two adapted."

"Like any good theorist, I would THEN -- AFTER taking the reality I see into account -- seek to modify or contradict this all-too-obvious idea. But to a human, this simplistic explanation of the world is hideously insulting, degrading, and above all simplistic."

"But is it true?"

"This is a separate question from justifying the survival of any race, and it is a mere theory of mine. Here is where I run into trouble. I have taken a look at reality first, and ask whether things are not simply as they appear."

"I guess that, unlike me, other folks are human and therefore go ballistic at the very simplistic approach to a Great Question that I am suggesting."

"So the canned replies roll out:

'I know many nonwhites. Some of my best friends are not white. There are a lot of BRILLIANT nonwhites. The most brilliant person I ever met was a Negro gentleman.'

"And so on ad nauseum."

"And then there is my favorite: the person I am talking to is shaking, red-faced, wants to kill me, and shouts, 'YOU ARE JUST BEING EMOTIONAL!!!!!!'"

"Then, sort of like Amen ends a prayer, there is the final tag line, "HITLER was an evil, evil man!"

"So I just sit here waiting quietly for someone to deal with a point I made -- not a complete theology, just a point I made. "

"I am still waiting."

March 16, 2002 - GOING TO PRISON FOR HATE IN EUROPE

March 16, 2002 - IF YOU ARE NOT A HERETIC, YOU DON'T NOTICE HERESY LAWS

March 16, 2002 - BACK TO THE TWILIGHT ZONE OF POLITICAL CORRECTNESS

GOING TO PRISON FOR HATE IN EUROPE

In Britain a man was sent to prison for "inciting racial hate." In this case, The Crown vs. Joseph Pierce, 1986, the judge declared that, "The truth is no excuse." What the man said about race was true, but it was not sanctioned and he wouldn't recant for saying it. Therefore he had to go to prison for saying it.

Over here we are used to the fact that Jane Fonda and the people who marched with Viet Cong flags in the 1960s and shouted "Ho, Ho, Ho!" in praise of Ho Chi Min got only praise in the media for their actions. Everybody is piling on today's non-celebrity traitor John Walker, but nobody is going to go after Jane Fonda. Jane Fonda is not only a celebrity, but she served the cause of the political left.

Even being a celebrity is no protection if you say something leftists don't like. A few years back, Brigitte Bardotte made some unpleasant comments about Moslem immigrants in France, and they convicted and fined her for it.

Because Brigitte Bardotte went through the usual public grovel everyone is required to go through for any rightist heresy she only got a fine. But a fine was not the limit, and that was not a truly racist comment.

The European Union recently got together and demanded an outlawing of "Hate" sites on the Internet.

In Idaho, a man was sent to jail for four days for calling a black man a "nigger." The black man, who had physically assaulted the man's wife, was not even charged with any crime.

The entire Northeast and its colonies throughout America are presently demanding the passing of Hate Laws like those in Europe. These Hate Laws would ban and criminally punish Politically Incorrect utterances, and as usual the leftists cite European precedents for laws enforcing Political Correctness.

And I keep getting letters telling me there are no such laws in Europe.

IF YOU ARE NOT A HERETIC, YOU DON'T NOTICE HERESY LAWS

Lately China's ruler assured President Bush that no one was imprisoned in Communist China for being a Christian or for advocating Christianity. All those thousands of Christians in prison over there, he told Bush, are there for secular crimes.

He believes it.

I remember being told by Communists two decades ago that they had freedom of speech behind the Iron Curtain. It was guaranteed in the Soviet Constitution written by Joseph Stalin.

What these good Communists were saying was that they could say anything THEY wanted to say in Communist countries. In Europe today, as in Stalin's Soviet Union, if you aren't saying anything the ruling leftists don't like, you can say whatever you want to.

In Europe under the earlier Inquisition - the religious one - if you got caught saying something the ruling religion didn't like - the earlier version of Political Correctness - you were not punished very severely. In both Inquisitions, if you did what Brigitte Bardotte did and went through the usual public self-flagellation, the punishment for heresy was minimal.

Jane Fonda was never even required to apologize for her treason, of course, because her offense was not against the established political faith.

Respectable conservatives here do the same thing. If one of them says something that violates orthodoxy on race, they hit the floor groveling, and they are forgiven. So they say they have full freedom of speech.

In Europe today as in Europe in the earlier age of religious bigotry, it is PERSISTENT heresy that merits the harshest penalties. Only those who did not recant were burned alive, and only those who do not publicly recant today go to prison.

So a good European will, like my Communist buddies, look you straight in the eye and tell you they have perfect freedom of speech over there.

BACK TO THE TWILIGHT ZONE OF POLITICAL CORRECTNESS

In Whitaker Online for the Ides of March of the year MM, i.e., March 15, 2002, I discuss how our media live in two worlds all the time. One is the world of Political Correctness, where you can get on an elevator at night in the middle of Washington, DC, with black folks and be just as safe as you would be in an elevator with all whites at noon.

Then there is the real world, where anybody who looked you straight in the eye and said that would be committed to some quiet place for recuperation.

In the real world, we all know that anyone who says the wrong thing in Europe and won't back down will end up in prison for inciting race hate. It makes not the slightest difference whether anything is actually incited by what they say. The general principle is that such general statements lead to the general incitement of general violence.

Here, if any respectable conservative fails to do his grovel, he will be ruined professionally, and his fellow respectable conservatives will lead the lynch mob.

And both the European and the American groveler will then look you straight in the eye and praise the right to say what we want to in the Free World.

March 23, 2002 - PEOPLE ARE BEGINNING TO UNDERSTAND THAT WE ARE RULED BY SOCIOPATHS

March 23, 2002 - WELL, DUH! *OF COURSE*** A MULTICULTURAL SOCIETY IS RUN BY SOCIOPATHS**

March 23, 2002 - A LIFE OF ADJUSTING TO CULTURAL RELATIVITY IS NOT A LIFE DEVOTED TO TRUTH

March 23, 2002 - HALF COKE AND HALF BEER - YUM YUM!!

March 23, 2002 - SO CONSERVATIVES HAVE TO AGREE WITH CLINTON SUPPORTERS

PEOPLE ARE BEGINNING TO UNDERSTAND THAT WE ARE RULED BY SOCIOPATHS

I never understood the Martin Luther Kings and Alex Haleys and Teddy Kennedys who all had to steal other peoples' ideas whole in order to get through school or write a book. I have always had more useful intellectual ideas than I knew what to do with. My life has been devoted to trying to get people to "steal" my words and thoughts.

When I was speech writing and legislating, a lot of people asked me if I minded putting my stuff under other peoples' names. Actually, nothing ever made me happier. I would much rather have one of my ideas spoken as the words of a major public figure than as my own.

This is a war to save my people. My weapon is words. I want them fired at as high a caliber as I can get them.

I write this column to spread my ideas. And spread they do. When you've been doing this sort of thing for over four decades, you have a feel for what originated with you.

On November 7, 1998 I wrote WHY WE ARE RULED BY SOCIOPATHS. Recently, I heard a leftist theater critic using almost my exact words.

A sociopath is a person who is incapable of feeling obligations to, or guilt about, his fellow humans. Ted Bundy stated it perfectly. He said, "I have never felt guilt and I feel sorry for anyone who does." From one to five percent of the American population is sociopathic.

I can tell that that leftist's quote came from me and from people using my ideas. If not, it doesn't matter, because the point is that the right kind of thinking is going around.

The fact that sociopaths rule both our entertainment industry and our politics is now understood widely.

Soon people will be asking why.

WELL, DUH! *OF COURSE*** A MULTICULTURAL SOCIETY IS RUN BY SOCIOPATHS**

Nobody denies that Clinton is a sociopath. Nobody denies that the President lied to a court of law. His defenders say he had a right to. Nobody denies that Clinton's opinions come from focus groups and think tanks. His supporters say that is what this country needs.

So even pro-Clinton people only argue that he is just the kind of sociopath America needs.

If conservatives mean what they say, they have to admit that Clinton's defenders are perfectly correct.

In order to defend themselves from the charge that they are naziswhowanttokillsixmillionjews, conservatives shout out their loyalty to The Melting Pot. On the other hand, they demanded that Clinton tell the truth and follow his true beliefs.

Where, pray tell, would a true melting pot president GET any true beliefs? True beliefs come from gut instincts, ideas of who you are and how your society should work.

But what do you do when you live in a country devoted to having no specific "society?" Your whole job in a multiculture is to govern according to the instincts of a number of different kinds of people

who DON'T have the same outlook you do. You can't do that just using your honest instincts. You can't afford them.

About two thousand years ago, there was a completely multicultural exchange between a Roman and a Jewish heretic. The young Jesus mentioned "the truth" to Pontius Pilate. Pilate's reply was a question: "What is truth?" Pilate ruled in the Roman multicuture.

The whole point of a multicultural society is that any answer to the question "What is truth?" is called simplistic. The perfect multicultural president would tell you that it all depends on what YOU mean by the word "is" the way Clinton did.

In a society based on a single outlook, this would be a laughable absurdity. But conservatives keep insisting that the only America they have any loyalty to is a Melting Pot America where there are endless numbers of outlooks, all equally valid.

His supporters defend Clinton by saying that rule from focus groups and advisors is what America must have. They insist he is the model of a successful president precisely because he was the perfect sociopath, doing what he needed to do to accomplish what he wanted to accomplish.

A LIFE OF ADJUSTING TO CULTURAL RELATIVITY IS NOT A LIFE DEVOTED TO TRUTH

Well over a century ago, Mark Twain wrote that "All sane white people hate noise."

This white attitude towards noise starts early. A number of teachers have told me that one problem they had with integration was that the white children would come to them crying to them about the loud noise the black children were making.

Every single one of these teachers told me how they explained to the white children that the whites must Learn to Adjust in order to benefit from this precious multicultural experience. The idea that the black students might adjust their noise level absolutely never came up, even as a hint.

But surely, I am told, there is a universal truth. You just tell people what you see. All of us use sight, so surely this truth is universal.

In a Politically Correct society, you had BETTER not just tell people what you really see.

HALF COKE AND HALF BEER - YUM YUM!!

Hundreds of millions of people love beer. Hundreds of millions of people love Cola. So the most popular drink on earth should be a mixture that is half Coca-Cola and half beer. But in the real world nobody bottles this combination for reasons that are obvious to any sane person.

Cola and beer are each the result of a separate evolution. Soft drinks competed for the favor of soft drink lovers and different beers competed for the favor of beer lovers. Throw them together and you have a mess.

You might even call it a melting pot.

But in a multiracial, multicultural society, such an observation is verboten. In the real world, the great beauties are seldom mixed bloods. You are still allowed to say "a beautiful blond," though I believe that remark will get you lynched by Melting Pot conservatives when liberals get around to condemning it. Our language adjusts to the melting pot every day. Every day a new expression is found to be racist or culturally judgmental.

So when I mentioned in a newsgroup that I didn't like the looks of mixed races in the same way I didn't like the taste of Cola and beer mixed, the immediate response was that the British just love Cola and beer mixed. I pointed out that if this were true there would be at least one bottler mixing the two somewhere on earth, and there isn't.

The fellow who made this point backed down and was an obvious fool, but his logic is impeccable to today's conservatives. You simply cannot allow people to get away with expressing an obvious taste or feeling in a multicultural society. What you say about what you see, feel or taste must be Adjusted.

In a multicultural, multiracial society the sociopath has a natural advantage that a person with a conscience simply cannot overcome. A sociopath spends his entire life adjusting what he calls the truth to something besides what he plainly sees or feels. For honest people, the strain becomes enormous, and finally they say something inexcusable.

SO CONSERVATIVES HAVE TO AGREE WITH CLINTON SUPPORTERS.

Today every word a public figure says is public property. In a multicultural society, a politician must say the right thing in a multicultural context ALL THE TIME.

No normal human being can do that, least of all one who has any truly honest gut opinions.

But every conservative agrees that the Melting Pot is What America Is All About.

In such a society, Clinton is indeed the ideal politician, as his supporters say. All of our successful politicians today are sociopaths.

I am not a sociopath and I have no use for a sociopathic society.

I RENOUNCE all loyalty to the sociopathic melting pot. I DENOUNCE all loyalty to the sociopathic melting pot.

As I said two decades ago in an article the Southern Partisan is ashamed to have printed:

"By definition a melting pot is nothing specific. Anybody who can be deeply loyal to nothing specific is in desperate need of psychiatric help."

March 30, 2002 - HOLD ME BACK! HOLD ME BACK!

March 30, 2002 - AMERICA'S "HOLD ME BACK!" LEADERSHIP

March 30, 2002 - A MAN WITH A MEMORY LOOKS AT IMMIGRATION

HOLD ME BACK! HOLD ME BACK!

National Review conservatives, who think they are real class, often act like the most cowardly of drunken rednecks. Please read this week's Whitaker Online about "Silk Pants Aristocrats."

I admit I spent my share of time in redneck bars, and the "Hold me back" guy was always there. He would act aggressive and then back down. But as soon as some kind person took his arm, usually to keep him from falling down, he would get tough:

"Hold me back! Hold me back!"

He would act like he was trying to shake off the person holding him up so he, a dangerous and angry tiger, could get at the guy he just backed away from.

You know the type.

And that is exactly what conservatives on television remind me of when they demand that American Taliban John Walker be lynched from the nearest tree.

I call Walker a traitor, but I also have the guts to call powerful people traitors. Conservatives would never dare demand punishment for Jane Fonda or other 1960's "Idealists," but they are all over Walker.

Liberals gave conservatives permission to go after Walker, so the liberals have to hold them back.

AMERICA'S "HOLD ME BACK!" LEADERSHIP

The job of the head of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) is to make sure the INS enforces the law. That is his only function.

As everybody knows by now, the INS recently issued visas to two terrorists who died six months before killing thousands of Americans. Last week they gave visas to four sailors meeting the terrorist profile. Those four promptly disappeared into the US.

After two total disasters reported coast-to-coast in which the INS did not enforce the law, the head of the INS really got tough with his employees.

He said they had better start enforcing the law, or else.

I am sure that everybody in the INS is shaking in his boots.

The Catholic Church in America would not hesitate to punish a priest who said something Politically Incorrect about race. Now the bishops say they may start punishing priests who rape little boys.

You see, the bishops get brownie points with the liberal media when they come down on "Racism" but the media doesn't give a rip about child molestation.

So bishops and mainline preachers and respectable conservatives all follow the orders they are given.

And now even some people in the media are beginning to ask, "Where the hell were you saints and INS heads all these years while dangerous aliens were given visas and children were being molested?"

And the answer from church and pulpit and conservatives is,

"Hold me back! Hold me back!"

I, for one, have seen a lot of "hold me backs" in my time. I have never seen a single holdmeback who ever did what he threatened to do.

A MAN WITH A MEMORY LOOKS AT IMMIGRATION

I was around before liberals gave conservatives permission to TALK tough about the INS.

Before September 11, being for immigration enforcement meant you were anti-Mexican, and that meant you were anaziwhoantedtokillsixmillionjews. As always, when liberals use that label, conservatives hit the floor groveling.

Many years ago Pat Buchanan announced on "Crossfire" that American troops had fought World War II to open Europe to third world immigration. Believe me, back then this was a standard and typical conservative statement about immigration.

The Wall Street Journal still demands a constitutional amendment that says, "There will be no borders." Jeff Bell, the 1978 conservative Republican candidate for the United States Senate in New Jersey, told me he was for open borders.

What happened on immigration was what always happens when liberals dictate to conservatives. The moment that liberals announced that conservatives had better not take a position because it was "racist," conservatives rushed to be more liberal on that issue than the liberals were.

President Carter's head of the INS announced that, if it were up to her, she would not enforce a single immigration law. No conservative but me said one single word about that.

I worked for one of the few congressmen who had the guts to criticize illegal immigration, and we had more liberal allies than conservative ones.

When the liberals told them not to say bad things about Jane Fonda, conservatives led the lynch mob against anybody who dared call her a traitor. Now, with John Walker, it's "Hold me back, hold me back!"

Any time you see conservatives yelling "Hold me back!" it's on a subject where they were on their knees groveling a little while before.

What a bunch of trash respectable conservatives are!

April 6, 2002 - DE-WAREHOUSING THE HOMELESS

DE-WAREHOUSING THE HOMELESS

When it comes to The Problem of the Homeless, every discussion leaves out how it got started. There was a court decision in which it was decided that you could not "warehouse" people because they were mentally incapacitated.

Just because a person could not take care of himself was no reason to provide him with bed and board on a permanent basis if he did not apply for it. You had to prove he was dangerous to institutionalize him.

The catch, of course, is that most people who are mentally incapable of caring for themselves are not likely to be the ones to show up, stand in line, fill out the right papers, go through the appeals and all the rest. They are in competition with people who have been professional welfare recipients for generations and who know all the ropes.

So civil libertarians won helpless people the right to freeze on the street and then made an industry out of raising hell about all those people out there freezing on the street.

June 8, 2002 - THESE 186 WORDS MUST BE OUTLAWED!!!!

June 8, 2002 - WAREHOUSING THE YOUNG

THESE 186 WORDS MUST BE OUTLAWED!!!!

I see a line of champion runners from Sweden, Germany, the Netherlands, and so forth. I am not surprised to see they are all black. I predict that the winners of almost any Marathons will be blacks.

If they were half white, these runners would lose.

The fastest short-distance runners come from one side of Africa, the fastest long-distance runners from the other. So far, nobody has any trouble with the obvious fact I have just pointed out.

Now I look for the countries that lead USEFUL technical development. Not pyramids or human sacrifice cults and huge and impressive accumulations of slaves, I mean USEFUL.

I also mean the countries which 1) lead the way and 2) to whose lands all other peoples want to immigrate. Orientals can copy from them, but Orientals stagnate.

Just as all the runners are black, all these peoples are white.

You have to believe that any race not only can do what whites do, but they WILL do what whites do. You have to believe that half black whites could and WOULD do exactly what whites do.

Do you BELIEVE?

WAREHOUSING THE YOUNG

The same people who created the homeless problem by de-warehousing the mental cases also warehoused the young.

There was a time when the age of fourteen was a critical time in the process of moving toward adulthood. That was the age at which a king "came into his own" if his father had died during his childhood. Even today, the Amish want their children to leave school at fourteen.

In earlier ages, a boy about fourteen would be apprenticed or he would be "reading law" in a real lawyer's office and witnessing a real practice. Aspiring doctors studied under real doctors. Very few went to colleges, and colleges at that time were openly Fantasyland. Young men studied Latin and Greek and Mythology. They did not pretend they were learning about The Real World in some sociology class.

Today, fourteen is the age at which kids begin eight years of warehousing. They sit through four years as freshman, sophomore, junior and senior in high school and repeat the same thing and call it college.

Where do children sit during the required eight-year extension of their childhood? They sit in modified high chairs, with a single adult sitting at a desk in front. And this, ladies and gentleman, is Reality to twentieth century young people.

During this century, the single adult who represents the only reality to these hopelessly overgrown babies have taught generation after generation of young people that professors should rule the world. The kids in their high chairs have been fed words like Revolution and Liberation, but it always comes back to the same bottom line:

Professors should teach bureaucrats who will go out and run everything from criminology to the government-planned economy.

In other words, the kids in their high chairs learn from the permanent adolescent who teaches them that he and they should rule the world.

And that, ladies and gentlemen, is all there is to the so-called "political left."

June 29, 2002 - DEAD WOOD AT THE TOP

DEAD WOOD AT THE TOP

In 1886, Doestoyevski described one of his characters:

"...an official who, in various Petersburg ministries and departments, had established the sort of career (from) which, owing to their rank and years of service, they cannot be dismissed, even though they are clearly unfit for any responsible work...therefore they receive fictitious appointments, especially designed for them, and by no means fictitious salaries of (enormous size) on which they live to a ripe old age."

Well over a century ago he described every powerful expert in America today!

Nothing social science professors demand ever WORKS. No academic ever lost a dime for that reason. They live very well, thank you, as "Experts" in fields they invent. They give us nothing in return.

Why should they?

The same is more or less true of all our experts

For example, no political expert ever ceases to be a highly-paid political expert, and here is why:

If you are a highly-paid political expert, only campaigns with lots of money can afford you. If the only campaigns you are in are the ones where there is lots of money, you will almost always win. In two-sided big-money campaigns, the few times you lose are no problem for your reputation.

So disaster after disaster occurs and we never lose confidence in our dead wood at the top. No, it is just "a wake up call" for them.

Today every security expert is getting a promotion because they let September 11 happen.

So why the hell should they wake up?

September 7, 2002 - THE COP WITH THE DEGREE

THE COP WITH THE DEGREE

Two cops in a police car patrolled a wealthy neighborhood at 2 AM. They saw two young black guys driving along very slowly in an old car. Kowalski, who only had a high school diploma, said, "We better watch those guys."

Smith was Kowalski's partner. He had a college degree in sociology.

Smith smiled knowingly. "Those men are American citizens traveling at a legal speed on an American street. We don't want to be part of the problem. We don't want to harass men because of the color of their skin or the price of their car."

A call came in a few minutes later. A car had been seen speeding on a nearby highway. Kowalski, reflecting his mere high school background, wanted to go after that car.

Once again, the Cop With The Degree smiled knowingly. "The driver of that car was speeding a few minutes ago. That does not mean he is speeding now. You can't bring up past offenses in court, where everybody has an advanced degree. So why should you and I jump to conclusions here?"

About then they came upon an old lady driving an expensive Cadillac. The Cop With The Degree turned on the blue light. Kowalski was puzzled, so the Cop With the Degree explained, "Random check. All over town cops are stopping young black men like the ones we passed a little while ago. We're going to balance the equation."

On the bullhorn he said, "Step out of the car." It turned out that the car was not registered in the woman's name. Kowalski wanted to let the woman go, but The Cop With the Degree knew that they would have held the black guys until they found out what was going on. So in a couple of hours they chased down the woman's daughter and found the car did belong to her and let her go.

At the end of the day, Kowalski had failed to learn anything from his educated partner. His only comment was, "Either he's crazy or I am."

But things worked out well in the long run. Kowalski was a hard worker, so he managed to send his son to college. The younger Kowalski got a degree and was ashamed of his unenlightened father. He is now a police lieutenant who thinks just like Smith.

For some reason, the crime rate has gone out of sight in that town. Kowalski Junior will soon make captain and work directly under Police Commissioner Smith. Smith is a member of the Mayor's Emergency Task Force on Crime. The Mayor's Task Force on Crime has been formed to study the alarming increase in felonies.

The Task Force has provisionally decided that the solution to the problem of crime lies in education.

September 26, 2002 - Good Jews

September 26, 2002 - Is Self-Defense Bigotry?

September 26, 2002 - Someone Who Says, "Are You Calling Me a Liar?" Probably Is a Liar

Good Jews

I spent a lot of time in the East Tennessee mountains during the 1960s. Greenville, Tennessee, has no Confederate monument. It only has a UNION memorial!

But when I was there East Tennessee was Wallace country. The local conservative Republican congressman spent a lot of his time at the Wallace for President headquarters. You will still find more Confederate license plates in that area than you will in South Carolina.

During the Civil War, East Tennessee was Andrew Johnson's home country. He was a Unionist who did not like the ruling Southern "slavocracy" which dominated western Tennessee. I can understand that point of view, though I do not think it justified treason against the South.

But today, the once Unionist area of mountain Tennessee is among the "goodest" of the good guys.

During the Civil War, both the Surgeon General and the Deputy Surgeon General of the Confederacy were Jews. The Secretary of the Confederate Treasury was one of the only two Jews ever elected to the United States Senate up to that time. The other had been from Florida.

Like all political theorists, I have a very complex world view.

Or at least I have as complex a world view as you would expect from somebody who is from Pontiac, South Carolina.

My world view is that the people who are on our side are good and the people who want to destroy us are bad.

Am I anti-semitic? That depends on the semite.

Is Self-Defense Bigotry?

Bigotry is defined as wanting to harm other people on the basis of characteristics like their race or national origins.

On December 8, 1941, the Congress of the United States adopted one of the most bigoted statements in human history. It declared war on Japan. Under international law that declaration meant that every American became a mortal enemy, individually, of every person in the Empire of Japan.

If you forget a minor incident that occurred at Pearl Harbor in December 7, 1941, the only explanation for the American Congress' action was pure racial and national bigotry and nothing else.

Franz Boas spent his life teaching - at public expense - that white gentiles were the common enemies of Jews and all other minorities. As another Jewish gentleman, Noel Ignatiev, who teaches at Harvard, put it, "The goal of abolishing the white race is on its face so desirable that some may find it hard to believe that it could incur any opposition other than from committed white supremacists."

You can state this as honestly as Ignatiev does, or you can say, "I'm Jewish, so of course I'm against racism." Since being against racism now means that every white majority country must become "multiracial and multicultural," either way you say it is pure genocide.

That is a more vicious declaration of hatred than the attack on Pearl Harbor was.

Am I anti-semitic? If a semite considers the very existence of my race to be anti-semitic, you're damned right I am as anti THAT semite as it is humanly possible to be.

Someone Who Says, "Are You Calling Me a Liar?" Probably Is a Liar

My life was spent in professional politics, so judging people is part of my professional background.

Especially liars.

I have pointed out before that one thing that became clear to me over the years had to do with someone who calls everybody "Liar!" I discovered that every person who used the word liar a lot was himself not to be trusted.

I think this is because, to those of us who take the simple truth seriously, liar is a huge word. It means someone INTENTIONALLY misleads you. A person who takes it seriously will not use that word often.

The same thing is true of those who, when you question them, immediately respond, "Are you calling me a LIAR!?" Not everything we are told is correct, as every adult knows. No one who takes the truth seriously is immediately going to think that a question amounts to an accusation of lying.

In the same vein, white trash will cut you with a knife. Where I was raised, it was useful for me to know if I was dealing with trash. What I found out was, "Trash is always insulted."

Trash has a very low self-image. That is a good judgment, since they should have a low self-image. They ARE low.

So trash will naturally take anything you say in the worst possible way. Someone who says, "Are you calling me a liar?" is showing that, if he is not actually trash, he is first cousin to it.

Life is too short to deal with touchy people, and if you deal with trash, it can get a lot shorter.

January 25, 2003 - Please Please PLEASE Stop Sniveling!!

January 25, 2003 - General Lee's Fatal Mistake

January 25, 2003 - South Carolina and Surrender

January 25, 2003 - Our Forces are Still Enormous

Please Please PLEASE Stop Sniveling!!

I got another of those email exchanges between rightist "leaders" that concluded with "I'll show 'em, I'll surrender." I hear it all the time and I'm sick of it.

For the few who don't get what I am talking about, I am referring to pro-white Southerners who groan that the enemy is too large. These snivelers tell us that, while they themselves are basically great heroes, they feel the Honorable and Practical thing to do right now is give up.

"Hold me back, hold me back!!!" they shout, and they tell us they would be great fighters, but it's all hopeless, so they recommend that we all go into a fetal position with them.

They call this realism. I call it sniveling.

General Lee's Fatal Mistake

Historians love to paint a verbal picture of General Lee at Appomattox, the noble Virginia Gentleman in his clean and pressed gray uniform offering Honorable Surrender to his fellow Americans.

What no one ever mentions is the fact that Robert E. Lee bitterly regretted that Honorable Surrender for the rest of his life.

The night before Lee surrendered, he called a meeting of his general staff. He told them he wanted to surrender not only his army, but all the Confederate forces in order to end the bloodshed. He would leave the South's fate to his fellow Americans.

A brigadier general from South Carolina (where else?) pointed out that those were not honorable Americans, they were Yankees. He demanded that Lee's small remaining army throw away its heavy equipment and run for the nearby Blue Ridge Mountains to form a guerilla force.

Lee refused to be a last-ditch guerrilla leader. He lived to see General Grant, the man he Honorably Surrendered to, become President Grant and impose military occupation and Reconstruction on a helpless South.

A South that was helpless largely because of Lee.

When Lee surrendered, there were hundreds of thousands of Confederate soldiers still in arms. As Commander in Chief, he surrendered them all.

The North could not have enslaved us so easily if we had had a guerrilla force still in being after 1865. General Shelby could have led his forces to Lee's guerrillas rather than to Mexico. The thousands of Southerners who went to Americana in Brazil and the others who died trying could have gone to join Lee.

But it was all hopeless, Lee said. So he quit.

And Lee never forgave himself for it until his death at the height of Reconstruction.

South Carolina and Surrender

A professor of military history at West Point wrote a book about how America won the Revolution. He said America lost its cities the way the Confederacy did, but they just kept right on fighting. He said the South couldn't do this in the Civil War because we had slaves.

I wrote this high-level military history professor about the Revolutionary War in South Carolina after Charleston fell. South Carolina had one of history's classic guerrilla wars going under the Swamp Fox Francis Marion. At that time, I pointed out, South Carolina had more blacks than whites, especially in the Low Country where Marion fought.

The professor wrote me and thanked me. He pointed out, without the slightest trace of embarrassment, that he didn't know that.

In the real world, the facts about Francis Marion didn't matter, because the professor was getting paid to make a Politically Correct point about how slavery made the Confederacy lose. Professors don't get paid to recite facts.

If Francis Marion had been Robert E. Lee, we would have lost the Revolutionary War. Marion was a general too, just like Lee. At one point there were only eight men sitting out there in the swamp with him. If Marion had said he had to be a Great Commander or he wouldn't play, he would have handed in his sword many times.

Our Forces are Still Enormous

At Appomattox, Lee saw his thousands of men as a tiny, useless force compared to the huge Yankee Army. A few years later, as a helpless old man under the brutal Yankee occupation of the South, he would have given anything to have a tithe of those forces as an army in being.

And this does not take into account the hundreds of thousands of other men in gray he surrendered to the Union.

Our forces today are still enormous. They would be bigger still if we stopped sniveling. It is true that anti-white whites outnumber us. But I do not go into a fetal position under my bed about this. I point

out that they are anti-white and wait as a painfully small number of them begin to realize that I am right.

Academia is training millions of young people to hate everything we want to save. So I wrote a book that should be in the hands of every young person going to college. He could humiliate his professors with it.

But for every single person who uses my book and promotes it, there will be ten sitting around and sniveling about how hopeless everything is.

Terrorism has brought our fight against anti-whites and open borders – and even diversity itself! -- to center stage. The snivelers keep sniveling.

More and more whites are taking on the mentality of a threatened minority. The best fighting whites ever did was as a threatened minority in the South and in South Africa.

But the snivelers would rather snivel.

The best times are ahead. If you want to spend that time pouting, please go under your bed where I can't see you.

We have a war on our hands and we don't need a bunch of sob-sisters to discourage us.

February 8, 2003 - Don't Worry, No American Is Going to Fight for Americans

February 8, 2003 - America Will Join OPEC Against Americans

Don't Worry, No American Is Going to Fight for Americans

America will soon occupy Iraq. Iraq has the second largest oil reserves on earth behind Saudi Arabia.

What will America do with Iraqi oil?

Opponents of the Iraqi War keep saying that we might use that war to benefit Americans. They say America wants to go in there to break OPEC's cartel and reduce oil prices.

Nothing is farther from the mind of George Bush and his advisors than using American troops to benefit Americans.

Nobody puts it the way I have just put it, of course. Bush lists his goals for war and throws in some words about how it's all for the good Americans. War opponents never say that the war might be used to break OPEC. They say the war will be used "for oil".

America Will Join OPEC Against Americans

So can the United States control Iraq without benefiting from Iraqi oil? To do that the Bush Administration will have to join OPEC.

Using Iraqi oil for American interests would not be respectable.

The only concern of a respectable conservative is respectability. The one thing Bush wants to do above all else is not to use Iraqi oil to reduce the price of oil for consumers.

The only way to keep oil prices to Americans high is for the United States to forbid any Iraqi oil to be purchased below the price that OPEC sets. In other words, America will join OPEC against American consumers.

If someone were to demand that American forces be used for American interests, they could silence the critics and win elections. But most people would rather spend all their time moaning about how bad things are.

Please see WhitakerOnline World View for January 25, 2003 - Please Please PLEASE Stop Sniveling!!

The only way to get the growing minority is to buy it outright. The way to get the American vote against both liberals and respectable conservatives is to openly tell the UN, college professors and Fashionable Opinion in general to go to hell and to do things that benefit actual Americans.

Believe me, someone is going to use that formula to take over American politics.

February 22, 2003 -- Do You Have an "I Don't Molest Children" Bumper Sticker?

February 22, 2003 -- Do You Have All the Right Feelings All the Time?

February 22, 2003 -- For the Multicultural Sociopath, Heredity Does not Exist

February 22, 2003 -- Are You a Bigot or are you a Sociopath?

February 22, 2003 -- Freedom is all About What Sociopaths Call "Prejudice"

Do You Have an "I Don't Molest Children" Bumper Sticker?

If a conservative wants to be allowed to speak on the liberal-controlled media he has to earn that "respectable" label from liberals. I keep repeating this because you cannot understand what passes for political debate in our age without reminding yourself of this overwhelming fact before listening to any political "discussion".

So when a liberal refers to an "anti-war movement" conservatives keep a straight face.

What if you and I were discussing crime and I said to you, "Well, unlike you, I don't abuse children." You would consider that a hell of an insult.

But if somebody refers to himself as being for Peace, with the clear implication that everybody else likes war, killing, bombing, orphaning children and all the rest, conservatives sit there looking respectful.

Do You Have the Right Feelings All the Time?

America's leadership is made up almost entirely of sociopaths

A sociopath is a person who is incapable of any genuine empathy with other people or any feelings of guilt. It sounds extreme, so we assume that genuine sociopaths are rare.

Recent studies have shown that genuine sociopaths are actually very common. There are between three million and ten million sociopaths in the United States alone.

Most sociopaths don't know that they are sociopaths. They spend their entire lives faking empathy and guilt and all the rest, and since they don't know what the real thing feels like, they think they genuinely feel empathy and guilt.

The result is that it is very hard for most people to feel all the empathy and guilt that the ruling sociopaths tell them they should feel. A sociopath honestly believes that his attitudes are just right all the time.

In a multicultural society the sociopath is king. Real people, people who are not sociopaths, have a lot of gut feelings and prejudices. In a multiculture you are not allowed to have gut feelings or "prejudices". Only a true sociopath can rise to the top in a multiculture.

So on a talk show, when a liberal sociopath tells a conservative sociopath that he is anti-war the conservative has no problem with that. The conservative is playing Patriot and the liberal is playing Peace Prophet, and it never occurs to either one of them that the "discussion" they are having is insane.

For the Multicultural Sociopath, Heredity Does not Exist

A few years ago identical twins were a fad. A lot of people did not know they had identical twins because they had been adopted into different families at birth.

Identical twins have exactly the same genes. What fascinated everybody about twins who had been adopted into wildly different families at birth was how alike they were when they grew up. One twin was raised as a Catholic while the twin was raised as a Jew.

One twin would be raised in a highly educated family while the other was raised in a poorly educated family.

The twins were raised differently but the similarities were astonishing. They liked the same brand of toothpaste, they went into the same professions. It was astonishing.

Throughout history identical twins studies have shown the same thing. Not only do identical twins raised in entirely different families commit the same number of crimes, they commit the same crimes at the same age!

This cannot be allowed. HITLER believed in heredity, so anybody who mentions heredity is anazihowantstokillsixmillionjews.

As I said, books on identical twins were a fad for a while. But one day Phil Donahue interviewed a man who had written such a book. Donahue said, "But doesn't this argue for heredity over environment?" The man looked like he had been hit in the face. He stuttered out a denial.

That was the day that fad ended.

When Bill O'Reilly discusses educational failure, he never mentions that some children are born dumb. He says it is all a result of bad rearing or poverty. You will never see anyone ever mention heredity in any discussion of education or any other social issue.

In a multicultural society heredity cannot exist and so everybody agrees it does not exist.

In a multicultural society race cannot exist so race does not exist.

In a multicultural society not only does heredity not exist, nobody will ever mention that it does not exist.

In a human race made up entirely of heredity and environment, only a group of true sociopaths can totally forget heredity and not even notice that they are ignoring it have done so. They take it for granted that everybody has all the right feelings all the time.

Are You a Bigot or Are You a Sociopath?

For the sociopaths who run our society "prejudice" is an awful thing. For the sociopaths who run our society, prejudice is an alien thing.

The sociopaths who run our society have no gut feelings. They have no prejudices. They do what they have done all their lives: They find out what feelings they should have and they believe they have them.

I would rather be prejudiced than be a sociopath. I would rather be a bigot than a sociopath.

Freedom is all About What Sociopaths Call "Prejudice"

Freedom means you do what you want to do.

The enemies of freedom always argue that you have no right to want anything they do not approve of.

Religious freedom means that you have a right to believe something that I think will make you go to Hell.

Do you have the right to believe something that will send you and your children to hell for eternity?

Do you have the right to have attitudes that I think are destructive or evil? Sociopaths do not hesitate to crush anybody who has the wrong attitudes. Sociopaths rule a multicultural society.

So a multicultural society can never be free.

March 15, 2003 - Whatever Happened to the Communist Conspiracy?

March 15, 2003 - The Ent Position

March 15, 2003 - Loyal Southerners Are the Ents of Our Day

March 15, 2003 - Everybody is for Them and Against Us

March 15, 2003 - The Two-Word Solution to the Korean Problem

Whatever Happened to the Communist Conspiracy?

It went public.

Back in 1913, a constitutional amendment was ratified that allowed an income tax. In 1914, the first income tax law was passed, taking one percent of all incomes above \$10,000 a year, which back then was rarer than half a million a year now.

One major newspaper said this tax would soon get out of hand. It was one percent on all incomes above \$10,000 a year to start with, but the editorial predicted that someday it would DOUBLE!

This prediction was called "absurd" and "alarmist". Only an alarmist would say that the one percent income tax would DOUBLE!

So what happened to that prediction that a tax of one percent of incomes above \$10,000 a year would someday double? Not only was it not "alarmist". It was so obvious that no one remembers it but me.

What happened to that prediction was exactly what happened to the Communist Conspiracy and the McCarthyite "witch hunts."

Exactly the same thing that happened to the prediction that the one percent income tax would someday become two percent also happened to McCarthy's Communist Conspiracy. What was a "witchhunt" in the 1950s was, "Well, Duhh!," by the 1960s.

If McCarthy had predicted in the 1950s that hundreds of thousands of Americans would be marching on the streets with Communist banners in the 1960s he would have been hooted down by his own supporters.

By the 1960s openly pro-Communist sentiments were common. Jane Fonda really didn't do anything special when she went to Hanoi and got photographed manning a gun that was used against American planes. A congressional delegation went to Cuba during that period and cheered at films of American planes going down.

Nobody notices, but any time you see a discussion of the McCarthy "witch hunts" of the 1950s today, those denouncing them make one tiny little amendment: they say the witches were in fact witches. Now that we have gotten a glimpse into KGB files we know that a lot of people were Communists in the 1950s that not even McCarthy suspected.

Nobody remembers this but me.

So why do people scream "witchhunt" now that we know there were more real witches than even the "witchfinder" McCarthy thought? Well, the word now is that there was nothing wrong with being for Stalin.

Besides, bothering the Stalinists of the 1950s could interfere with chasing down people who were for Hitler in the 1940s.

The Ent Position

I have read the Lord of the Rings trilogy many, many times since it was first published decades ago.

In the Lord of the Rings the Ents were the “tree herders.” They had taken care of the trees for millennia, so long that most of them had become trees themselves.

Bilbo asked his friend, the oldest of the Ents, whose side he was on in the War of the Rings.

“Well”, replied the Ent, “I am not exactly on anybody’s side, you see, because nobody is exactly on my side, if you understand what I mean.”

The Ent went on to say that he cared about the trees, the things with deep roots in the land. “But”, he said, “Nobody really cares about the trees.”

“But there are, the Ent continued, “Those whom I am altogether AGAINST.”.

Loyal Southerners are the Ents of Our Day

If you are a Southerner, no one is exactly on your side. For fashionable approval, everybody will sell Southerners out so fast it will make your ears ring.

To give but one example, A Scot will bust a gut if you call him an Englishman. But the Scots are the first to call all Americans “Yanks.” They do it on purpose. They may beat their chests and talk about how fearlessly Scottish they are, but they are desperate to show they do not take the South seriously.

Scots want to scorn the South to show they are, at heart, not really provincials.

It’s kind of pathetic. The only patriotism most American Patriots have is a common love of Lincoln and a common hostility to the South. That is about the only thing that unites Western fashionable opinion these days.

Please see May 4, 2002 - AMERICA, GET A LIFE!

A great friend of mine is very pro-French. He says the French are on our side in opposing the Iraq War.

‘Fraid not. France hates Americans, especially Americans in what Hollywood and New York call “flyover country”.

And most especially and above all they denounce Southerners.

Don’t burn out your stomach lining about attacks on Europeans. Southerners are in the Ent Position. We are on nobody’s side because, believe you me, nobody is on our side. Them and Against Us

Everybody is For Them and Against Us

In September 11, 2001 - MY ARAB SYMPATHIES, I explained that I have always had a special sympathy for Arabs. This comes from the days when Arabs and Southerners were looked upon as non-

human. Europe, Yankees, Hollywood, everybody hated Southerners and everybody was fanatically pro-Israel and anti-South.

Now that many European cities have an actual majority of Arab residents, the total dedication to Israel of those days has been forgotten today. But back then, at least an Arab could understand how it felt to have everybody against you.

But I also noticed that Arabs didn't LIKE being lumped with Southerners. Whenever any Arab could do so he would denounce the South and bask for a moment in the approval of fashionable opinion.

The Two-Word Solution to the Korean Problem

The more I think about fashionable opinion, the shorter my answers to it become.

On February 22, 2003, in The Three-Word Solution to the North Korean Problem, I pointed out that fashionable opinion in the 1960s used to worry about Urban Guerrillas.

What would we do, worried one fashionable opinionater after another, if Urban Guerrillas seized a city?

My answer was four words long:

“Cut off the water.”

You see, fashionable opinion is formulated in cities, and city people have no idea how vulnerable their little city world is.

But if you don't realize how vulnerable cities are you can kill a LOT of people. Instead of cutting off the water you would send in thousands of soldiers to die, just as many Americans are talking about doing in Baghdad.

My answer to the Urban Guerrillas Problem was four words long. My solution to the North Korean Problem was three words long:

“Let 'em sink.”

Like all leftism, Communism is just plain silly. No Communist state has ever survived without constant and massive help from non-Communist countries.

North Korea will not be able to massacre its people for long without our help, and Bush Administration is as desperate as any liberal to save the North Korean regime at taxpayer expense.

So fashionable opinion is trying to find a way to get North Korea to accept our help in return for more promises. We can either “Let 'em sink” or we can help Communism kill some more tens of millions of people.

Again.

You have to go all the way with the three-word solution or kill a lot of people. As to Urban Guerrillas, you have to adopt the four-word solution entirely or kill thousands of our soldiers.

Now we come to the two-word solution for the Korean Problem.

That solution is:

“GET OUT!”

We have thirty five thousand human sacrifices in South Korea right now. Those American soldiers are stationed in South Korea for absolutely no purpose except to die if North Korea attacks.

Someone in the Bush Administration just mentioned withdrawing some of those troops. The immediate result was a huge pro-American demonstration in Seoul. They had just voted in a new South Korean Government that demanded US withdrawal.

As long as we insist on keeping our human sacrifices in South Korea the South Koreans, the Japanese and the Chinese will sit around and act self-righteous while we deal with North Korea.

But to make it work, you have to take the whole two-word solution. To take care of North Korea you have to take the whole three-word solution. To deal with Urban Guerrillas you have to do the whole four words without compromise.

No compromises. No fashionable rhetoric.

Just do it.

April 5, 2003 -- On Popular Opinion the Media are Clueless and the Experts are Even More Clueless

April 5, 2003 -- Moderates are HORRIBLE People

Fun Quote:

Here is the Western answer to a three-thousand-year old riddle to which Oriental Wise Men devote their lives:

A single hand does not clap.

Next question.

On Popular Opinion the Media are Clueless and the Experts are Even More Clueless

I was in a hotel behind the Iron Curtain when I got on an elevator with a British girlfriend. There was only the girl, the operator and me. The elevator operator didn't even look at us as we got on.

When the door closed and we started to move between floors, all that changed. He smiled and said, “English?” I replied, “American.” He smiled broadly and said “Good, good.”

A moment later we reached our floor and the elevator operator resumed his stuffed frog imitation.

This kind of thing happened to me a lot in totalitarian lands. This kind of thing happened to everybody I knew in Communist countries. But I have never seen a single reporter mention this sort of thing happening in a Communist country. Every report I ever saw indicated that nobody behind the Iron Curtain ever gave this sort of indication that they were personally unhappy or felt afraid.

Today the experts and the media insist that Cuba loves Castro. Until about 1990 they insisted that Eastern Europe was not all that upset with Soviet rule.

People were not allowed to leave Communist countries and they shot people trying to escape. But if you go by what the media DID NOT say, nobody in those countries felt particularly oppressed.

When Moscow cut back on its total suppression of dissent in the 1980s, the entire Soviet Empire collapsed completely. The media and the Soviet experts were completely astonished. The only people more astonished than the media were the experts on Communist countries.

So the media and the experts are now telling us what the Iraqi people want.

Once again the media and the experts have not the vaguest idea what the Iraqis feel. Any logical approach to how Iraqis react is denounced as “simplistic.”

For example, media commentators were comparing three villages. In two of them some people who came out to see the American troops go by smiled and waved. In one village the people who turned out to meet the Americans were glum. Media experts are both media and experts, which mean that they are doubly clueless.

So the media experts concluded that Americans were popular in two villages and not popular in one. Then they proceeded to discuss why one village liked us and the other hated us.

Newsmen report on places where people are terrorized, but they get their reports by pleasing those in charge. Peter Arnett could never have gotten all that access if Iraqis didn't know he genuinely loves Saddam. Dissidents don't come up to the media the way they did to me because they know the media could turn them in.

You can get a lot of cooperation in a Communist country by informing on dissidents.

Back to those three Iraqi villages.

If you have ever been in a terror environment, it would be pretty obvious what was going on: two villages didn't have terrorizers in town and the other one did. There is no evidence whatsoever that two villages were friendly. There is no evidence the other one was hostile.

Let me explain a very simplistic fact to you. Outside of Western countries, people do not usually turn out and yell insults at heavily armed troops in tanks. As Al Capp pointed out about the “students” who

got shot rioting at Kent State, "It doesn't take a college education to know that the best way to get killed is to throw a rock at an armed man."

So the simple and simplistic fact is that the people who greet the troops at first tend to be the friendly ones. When the tanks first arrive the hostile people stay home.

Those who show up to greet the troops tend to be friendly. If they show up and are glum, chances are they were told to show up and be glum.

But the media never understand how real people react when they have a gun in their backs.

Moderates Are HORRIBLE People

Every conservative has to tell liberals and moderates how sweet they are. Every one of them talks about how they disagree with liberals and moderates, but those moderates are fine, patriotic people.

For ten years everybody has agreed to forget how horrible it was for Iraqis when President Bush Senior told them to rebel and then abandoned them. Can you imagine exposing yourself on the word of the American president and then facing the horror of Saddam's vengeance?

Was this something awful that happened because the sweet old professional moderate George Bush Senior just didn't know what he was doing to the Iraqis?

Before becoming president, George Bush Senior was head of the Central Intelligence Agency. He knew exactly what happened to people when they faced the revenge of a totalitarian regime.

As we all know now, many of our soldiers have recently paid with their lives for that sellout. So now many Iraqis fight because they think Saddam will be back after all our promises to remove him.

A moderate spends his life selling people out, and Bush Senior sold people out throughout his career. Please see March 15 2003 If They Turn on Me, They'll Turn on You and What Do You Expect of a Moderate?

Don't think that because a person is called "moderate" he is wishy-washy or harmless. These are the coldest, nastiest people you will ever meet.

The business of being a moderate is selling principles out.

The business of being a moderate is selling people out.

What no respectable conservative will ever tell you is that when Bush Senior turned those Iraqis over to Saddam's vicious, horrible thugs he was simply a moderate doing business as usual.

I have spent my entire life fighting the left. But I despise moderates even more than I do our outright enemies. Leftists hate my race and they hate my country and they hate the South.

But leftists stab you in the front.

May 10, 2003 -- Can You Hate Your Race and Love Your Country?

May 10, 2003 -- China's "Economic Miracle"

May 10, 2003 -- I'm Too Bigoted to be Anti-Semitic

Fun Quote: The liberal media is still whining about the rioting Kent State University students who got shot by the National Guard in the 1970s.

But the cartoonist Al Capp explained the situation with good common sense. He said, "It doesn't take a college education to know that the best way in the world to get yourself killed is to throw a rock at an armed man."

Can You Hate Your Race and Love Your Country?

Like so many other fanatical integrationists, Bill O'Reilly demands that "the races" be mixed in the name of "Americanism."

First of all, this has nothing to do with "the races." Nobody cares whether Chinese and black people intermingle. No one demands that Japan or Taiwan let in third world immigrants. No one demands that Africa let some other third worlders have some of its empty lands.

When integrationists say "the races," they mean the white race. When they say "getting rid of racism" it is code for getting rid of whites. Respectable conservatives want ONLY white majority countries to bring in the third world, and they demand that EVERY white majority country bring in the third world.

But O'Reilly and the conservative integrationists wring their hands when their children go to college and learn to hate America. What exactly did they expect? The highest morality they taught their children is to fight for the extinction of their own kind.

So naturally that sick "morality" will not be limited to a hatred of their own race.

It is hilarious to listen to conservatives whine about those who hate America when their idea of "True Americanism" is to hate their race.

China's "Economic Miracle"

Every China expert is bragging about the Chinese economic growth rate. They present it as a miracle brought on by state socialism.

Germany had an economic miracle after World War II. From being totally destroyed by bombing, their economy was back on its feet in a little over a decade. The growth rate from 1945 to 1960 was phenomenal.

One reason the German growth rate after 1945 was phenomenal was that it was starting from near zero. This does not mean that total defeat in war is the recipe for economic well-being.

By the same token, the reason China has had an economic miracle is because it started from near zero. What caused them to stay at zero for two generations was Communism.

As the Communist absurdity has been rolled back, the economy has begun to feed its people. As the Communist absurdity was removed, some Chinese even began to get a few creature comforts.

As one of the few sane economics professors told me, "The best way for a doctor to get credit for a medical miracle is to find someone who is taking poison and get him off of it."

By the same token the easiest way to create an economic miracle is 1) to have a war and end it or 2) to have socialism and end it.

Communism is as good for an economy as being destroyed in wartime.

China's growth rate just shows what leftism can do to people. But no one is going to talk about that. They're too busy praising the Red Chinese government for its economic boom.

I'm too Bigoted to be Anti-Semitic

No one seems to have noticed it but me, but a person who is paranoid has to have a gigantic ego.

Many pencil-necked leftists have told me through the years that they were being watched by the CIA.

I didn't say it, but what I was thinking was, "What in heaven's name gives you the idea that you are important enough to be watched all the time?"

On the television show "Seinfeld," Jerry Seinfeld had an uncle -- apparently drawn from experience -- who kept saying people were anti-Semitic. If a waiter brought him cold coffee, it was because the waiter was anti-Semitic.

Like everybody who criticizes the Israeli Lobby, I get accused of being anti-Semitic.

When the space shuttle disaster occurred I got an anonymous e-mail saying I was probably happy that happened because a Jew (an Israeli) was killed.

A lot of gentile Americans were killed on that shuttle, but that never occurred to the person.

Did it occur to this guy that even if I were anti-Semitic, the death of my fellow gentiles might bother me?

Of course not. He assumed that I was as totally obsessed with Jews as he was.

When a respectable conservative is accused of anti-Semitism, he always gives that speech about how he is more against anti-Semitism than Sharom is and how he thinks about the evils of anti-Semitism day and night, and so forth.

Ad nauseum.

Making that knee-jerk respectable conservative speech would turn my stomach. I am as interested in Jews as Jews are interested in people who were raised as country Methodists like me.

Anti-Semites don't make me scream like a self-righteous conservative.

Anti-Semites BORE me. For me, listening to an anti-Semite is as dull as listening to a Rabbi's sermon. They are both obsessed with Jews.

Jews, as Jews, interest me not at all.

The Israeli Lobby interests me because it is a real threat to our national interests. The Anti-Defamation League says the white race must go.

They say that anyone who mentions saving the white race is a white racist which means it is anti-Semitism. The Methodist Church says the same thing, which is why I left it.

A Jewish Professor at Harvard, Noel Ignatiev, stated this position honestly and bluntly:

"The goal of abolishing the white race is on its face so desirable that some may find it hard to believe that it could incur any opposition other than from committed white supremacists."

There are pro-white Jews and pro-white Methodists, and I appreciate them deeply.

But I consider my enemies to be my enemies, and for once I can honestly say that is regardless of race, color, creed, sexual preference or what kind of pie they like for dessert.

September 20, 2003 -- If Hitler Hated Jews, Then All Our National Spokesmen Hate Whites **September 20, 2003 -- Europeans Are True Yankees**

Fun Quote:

Report to the United Nations Human Relations Council:

There is a country that uses cartoons produced in Japan. However, since they decided that all Orientals look alike in cartoons, they insist that only Caucasian cartoon characters be used. Most of their cartoon characters even have blue eyes.

I demand that that country be condemned for racism.

That country is Japan.

If Hitler Hated Jews, Then All Our National Spokesmen Hate Whites

A German Nazi in the 1930s could look you straight in the eye and tell you he didn't hate Jews. Many a Nazi could honestly say that some of his best friends had been Jews.

Nazis did not identify their emotion toward Jews as "hate." They were just acting for the common good.

You say this is crazy?

Then let us look at WHY you say this is crazy. You say Nazis hated Jews because Nazis said that no place on earth was a good place unless it was “Judenfrei” (free of Jews).

Today you are a racist unless you want EVERY white country to import Asians and Africans and mix with them. You are a racist unless you demand that ONLY White countries import other races and mix with them:

“Africa for the Africans, Asia for the Asians.”

Unless you are a racist, you demand all that immigration and intermarriage because it will “solve the race problem.” But this “race problem” will not be “solved” in Africa or Asia. The “race problem” will be solved when ALL white countries and ONLY white countries are brown.

If you’re not a racist, you want a “white free” world.

That’s not hate, that’s Idealism.

The hippies' line was, "The white race is the cancer of history."

But absolutely nobody will call that hate. The hippies were Young Idealists.

Harvard Professor Noel Ignatiev put it best:

"The goal of abolishing the white race is on its face so desirable that some may find it hard to believe that it could incur any opposition other than from committed white supremacists."

That's not hate, that is what we pay teachers to teach.

Every respectable conservative agrees with Ignatiev. See

05/10/03 : O'Reilly Agrees: the only Point of Integration is to get rid of Whites

Another reason you insist that Nazis hated Jews is because Nazis never attributed anything good to Jews, and they blamed all evil things on the Jews.

When America landed on the moon, the speech had to say that it was “a great step for Mankind.” All the food, medical miracles, and everything else that white people produce is officially the product of “mankind.” If you say that “whites” did anything good, you are a racist.

But the Nazis did give the Jews credit for doing things, bad things. And only a racist today does not give whites credit for doing every bad thing that ever happened. Whites had slavery. Whites invaded other continents. You know the drill.

If you don’t know the drill, then you are a racist.

In Nazi Germany, more Jews were turned in by other Jews than by any other group of people. In the world today, whites are required to lead the charge against whites.

We’re all Nazis now. The only thing that has changed is who the Jew is.

Europeans Are True Yankees

New Yorkers think they are enormously sophisticated and they call all Southerners “hillbillies.” They call natives of coastal Mississippi or upper Florida “hillbillies.” A large percentage of the people those brilliant, knowledgeable New Yorkers called “hillbillies” never saw a real hill.

No New Yorker was ever bothered by this.

Europeans call all Americans “Yanks.” A lot of the people they call Yankees killed more Yankees than all of their other enemies on earth.

Europeans simply cannot talk enough about how sophisticated and knowledgeable they are. But no European has ever been bothered by the fact that he does not know what a Yankee is.

Europeans believe anything their so-called “intellectuals” tell them. So their so-called “intellectuals” tell them how smart they are for believing every single thing that fashionable leftists are saying.

Europeans are far left on dealing with criminals. Now that the third world is pouring into Europe, their crime rate is soaring. I remember when crime was very, very rare in Europe, especially in Britain. Now you are safer on the streets of New York City than you are in a small British town.

As the crime race and race riots got worse in the North, they spent all their time telling Southerners how we should do things. As Europe becomes a place where innocent people are routinely murdered and robbed, they spend all their time attacking the American death penalty.

In Britain burglars break into houses in the daytime because they know Brits have no guns.

In Britain, burglars don’t bother to wait until the family is out. They go into the house while the parents are there, reducing the father to a sobbing, cowering, helpless blob. So the Brave Poppa then goes out and demands Gun Control.

That’s what the “intellectuals’ told him to demand.

Europe has about a third as high a percentage of colored people as America does, and their crime rate already exceeds ours. So they spend most of their time telling us how to treat colored people.

All this is very familiar to an Old Southerner. Europeans are just Yankees.

Real Yankees.
