

"REVOLT AGAINST THE JEWISH MATRIX"



**Aryan**

**PRACTICAL IDEALISM**

## **API: Revolt Against the Jewish Matrix**

reject more and say more. So now we'll begin the show. So this is Aryan Practical Idealism and the guest is Bruno Carriou from France, who's a translator of Evola's works.

And we were, I don't know if you want to pick up where we were just discussing, or should we just sort of begin anew? Or do you want to continue with your point discussing females and their sort of collective consciousness? This. Hmm. Are you still there? Yeah.

Yeah. Yeah, we were talking about metaphysics of sex. But before I go on, I need to say to your listeners to your audience, that English is not my mother tongue.

So obviously, well, obviously, anyway, I apologize in advance for any well, mistake. I would and I will surely make and sometimes you will have to help me with some words or expressions, all the more as, as I've just said to you, I tend to get tired quickly of talking, and especially in a foreign language. Okay, now that this is clear, we're talking about the metaphysics of sex of Julius Evola.

Yeah, we were saying that, well, I was saying because you you haven't read that book yet, that among all insightful observation that are made in that book about women, there is the following one. Women, when they met other women, they don't know, in a room, in a place, they quickly interact with each other. Whereas it's the same thing for men, men are more reserved, or used to used to because of the feminization of men.

I don't really socialize anymore. But I suspect that I have my reasons to suspect that because of that feminization, men, well, males tend to behave like like females, be it only because they feel like it's, it's good to imitate females, that it's right, it's great. But partly to because their nature is also very, very feminine these days.

And that was to be that is to be related to the collective consciousness, the egregore of which we were talking previously. Yeah, so I guess now that the egregore has become more and more feminized through this gynocratic society that Julius Evola speaks of in his works, that influences anybody within that, within that egregore, or that thought form, the collective consciousness, so that they become that themselves, they become feminized. For myself, I don't really associate with anybody either.

I've just I've noticed that also in so called males, which you would distinguish between males and men. I think Evola spoke of that in his works also that in the past, you know, men were men, whereas now, they're more of a female nature. And that's even being encouraged in the crudest sense of sexual activity, and so forth, with males, allowing themselves to be, you know, subjected to feminist domination, and so forth, and various sexual practices of that nature.

Yes. But at the same time, we cannot afford to take that relevant analysis for granted. I

mean, reservations have to be made, historically speaking.

My point is that there is a clear feminization of there has been a clear and a deep feminization of males for the past of the past, I don't know, I'm not going to give a date, of course, a year. But I would say from the end of World War Two, when um, men were fully domesticated, fully domesticated, must have been the trauma, probably. Yeah, trauma based mind control.

Yeah. And also the fact that the best of us died. Yeah, so it had a dysgenic influence.

The most virile males died. And from there, the stay-at-home cowards were the ones to propagate endlessly afterwards, and be a hedonist, and so forth, a domesticated animal. Those were the warrior class.

Precisely. And you've got to think that before World War Two, there was World War One. Yeah.

And before that, there were the revolutions. Yeah. And before that, there were many, many wars where the best had died, too.

While their life wasn't, I mean, a paradise either, but certainly wasn't worse than man's lives. Yeah. So, about these reservations that have to be made about that insightful observation by Evola, it is true that a feminization, a deep process of feminization has been going on, which you can see on male's faces, actually, not just in their attitudes and behaviors.

You're familiar with the meme of that sort of weird smile that they always have, that open mouth smile? Yes. Yes. You've got to look like a female today to exist.

It's good. It's great. And if you don't behave like a female, then you can have no part in the game, no part at all.

Historically, it should be also clear that in the old days, not all men were men, not all. You see, men didn't become women overnight. It was a long process.

The best died, the most virile men died, and the rest, well, proliferated. Basically, I would venture to say that through history, virile men, many men have always been a minority, always. Warrior caste or the Kshatriya caste.

Sorry? The Kshatriya caste is the minority. Yeah. The majority are the Sudra caste and the Vaishya caste.

Yes. I wouldn't put it in terms of caste for a reason that I may explain later on. Okay, Loki? But say that many men have always been a minority, this minority getting smaller and smaller as time and wars went by.

In the old days, there are reasons to believe that many men ruled, had political power, and that's what matters. You see, that's what matters. Today, the very few, many men who remain have no power whatsoever.

Yeah, I guess the only recourse they have for their masculinity, maybe, is to be a police officer or a military member or something, and be sort of used to enforce gynecocracy. Good point. Well, that's a very good point.

I haven't thought about that. But it would be a, what Evola called a semitic kind of masculinity. Oh, yeah.

Confer three aspects of the Jewish problem. It's a... That was the text that you translated? Yeah, yeah. Yeah, there was a second edition that I published in 2016.

But the first was published in 2003. Anyway, it's a kind of rough masculinity at best. And at worst, it's called much machismo.

Machismo. Machismo. Yeah, okay.

Machismo. Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah. The macho.

See? Yeah, sort of a, I don't know, an exuberant silliness, a sort of irrationalism almost. Yes. And yes.

The best thing would be that I, if I quoted some brilliant picture, a brilliant picture that was given of the macho. May I? Go ahead. To understand why men have not revolted in the wake of feminism, we ought to note that in their attitudes to women, there are three basic types of men.

The macho, the mucho, M-U-S-H-O, and the masculinist. A macho is a brawny and sometimes brainy factotum who has been bred for nest slavery and who is indoctrinated to believe that he is the lord and master of the woman who rules him. A mucho is a hand pet version of the macho who hangs like a bleeding worm between the beaks of his nest queen.

A masculinist is a man who is devoted to male liberty and who would avoid nest slavery. All through history, the overwhelming majority of men have been machos. A hand pet minority have been muchos and very few have been masculinists.

As feminism won prominence and brought greater social acceptability to termagants, I don't know this word, termagants, you understand? Uh, G-E-R-M-A-G-A-N-T-S. Maybe that's a bird, I'm not too sure. Yeah, right.

More and more men have come under their influence and become muchos. On the other hand, stung by feminist accusations, a very tiny minority of men have re-examined the maid condition, found it to be nest slavery, and have rebelled and turned masculinists.

The macho, or maid chauvinist, or manly, he says, manly man, well, is a strutting factotum with budging biceps, stone-dry eyes, brains that are ruled by his gonads, and an ego indoctrinated to believe that he is the lord and master, the woman who rules him.

His psyche is primed to defend his woman's supposed honor from other men's advances. Thoroughly conditioned to serve women, his life satisfaction comes from loyalty serving his nest queen. Naturally, he is the matriarchist, ideal man.

When young, he suffers from the delusion that he is stronger, cleverer, and naturally superior to the woman who controls him. However, an older and wiser macho, if obliged to confess the truth, might say, I'm the captain of this ship, and I have the permission of my wife to say so. But by then... I've heard that from people before.

Yeah. Sort of cucked by their females. Yes, of course, the tougher guys will say that.

But by then, it is too late for him to be anything but a habitual macho. The modern mucho, the new or feminine man, is one that breeds of diffident men who have been bullied, guilt-tripped, ego-bashed, and penis-twisted into pram-pushing, diaper-changing, and breast-envy. He is the befuddled, hand-pecked maid who lacks the will to recognize his male interest.

He is one of those male wives or female husbands who have been described as the bleeding hearts and crying maids who make up the walking wounded of the modern sex war. The more articulate mucho even becomes a missionary for his hence anti-male views. This pathetic wimp is, quite naturally, hailed by feminists as the new man.

He is the tamagant feminist's ideal man. The masculinist belongs to an altogether different species from the macho and the mucho. He does not suffer from most of the illusions of the macho, he is not drawn to macho ambitions, and he views the mucho with robust contempt.

In keeping with his commitment to the liberation of men from nest slavery, the masculinist would end the psychological, social, and legal conditions for that slavery and create instead conditions for equitable relations between the complementary sexes. If men have not yet revolted in the wake of feminism, it is because there are still too few masculinists around. This is so because mother power still produces far too many machos, and because tamagants have taken so many lapsing machos in tow and made them into muchos, and because far too many men are ignorant of female power and its ways and means.

Consequently, the liberation of men depends crucially on the spread of the masculinist understanding of male-female relations. Well, what else is there to be said? Well, of course, a few other things, but let's focus on what has just been stated. The point is that, as previously stressed, virile or virile men have always been a majority, a minority, but in

the old days, they were generally those who ruled, whereas today they don't have any power whatsoever.

Yeah, so I guess what, the few that remain, what positions do you think they occupy typically in society? They're just sort of more outcasts than anything, outcasts of the world. So they're men among the ruins, basically. Oh, you give me the opportunity to say that, to point out that this is a wrong translation of the title by Evola, and yes, the original title is *Womini e Rovine*, which means men and ruins.

Man and ruins. What's the difference, Loki? What's the difference? I guess it poses the man over and against the ruins as a distinct thing, whereas men among the ruins means that the man is just in them. Yeah, the translation, the English translation is romantic.

And that's sort of feminine. Yes, the image of a man among ruins is a typically romantic 19th century topos. Yes, it can be, I mean, many paintings represent people among ruins.

Many 19th century paintings represent men among ruins. It was a romantic theme. Yeah, yeah.

A lot of the people in North America, especially who have taken on Evola's works, they have become, you know, suffering under that delusion or that confusion of the meaning. Do you see one of these images on things like countercurrents, how it's like some lone guy just among ruins or whatever? Well, yes, I'm not saying, let's see, I won't be pedantic. I won't be pedantic enough to say that it matters so much.

I was just, I mean, making that point in passing. It doesn't mean the fact that the title was mistranslated wouldn't prevent any reader from getting the gist out of the word. But I think it is relevant enough to be mentioned just in passing, just because I have never come across any article in English, or even in French, for that matter, that rectified this mistake, which, to close the matter, is not totally unimportant when what I've just said is taken into account, right? Yeah.

So let's not get distracted by this digression. Let's come back to where we started before I made it. And you were saying, Lucie, when I interrupted you.

Oh, I was just going to say how that whole topos or mythos or whatever you want to call it about man among the ruins, you know, how that is romantic from the romantic era. And that whole era seemed to be a very feminized era with Georges Bizet's *Carmen* and things of that sort. Of course.

Impressionism painting. Yes. The romantic man is a *mucho*, not a *macho*, but a *mucho*.

Yeah, it has too much of a feminine consciousness in that culture. That's why I've always avoided that culture for the most part. Yes.

But what is fundamentally important to understand and to state is that the problem doesn't lie in the fact that there are, or there were at that time, many feminized men. The problem lies in the fact that feminine men rule. That is the problem.

You will never, you will never recreate a people by prophylactic measures under a racial state. You will never create a people in which masculine men would be the majority. Never.

But what counts, what matters is that the men in power are the virile men. Yeah. So how can we get back to that at this time, if at all? Is there any solution to the modern world? Well, we discussed that by email and we discussed it by email, but I'm not a dreamer.

So I try to look at reality or realities as they are. And honestly, there is a little chance to recover from the disease from which the white world suffers. Very little.

Because when you think about it, in fact, far from diminishing, female power and semitic power have been strengthened, have been strengthened a lot. Well, it's become a total monopoly now. Yes.

Yes. As I told you yesterday, as I knew you were interested in, used to be interested in post modernist literature. Until the late, late 70s or maybe perhaps even late 80s in Europe, it was still possible to have thinkers like Foucault, Michel Foucault, Pierre Bourdieu, Baudrillard, right? It was still possible.

They were university teachers. But now, even that has come to an end. The net is waterproof.

The system won't let anyone of that capacity and with those kids to enter it. No way. Yeah, it's become an entropic system.

Entropic is the word. Yes. So it's collapsing on itself because it's not receiving any new information or any outside influence that strengthens it or adds to it, the system, but the system just becomes decadent.

Well, you see, I have my doubts as expressed before we went on air, sorry, on air, 20 minutes ago. I have my doubts about the system collapsing or being collapsing. I have my doubts about that.

And you must know that the Soviet Union didn't collapse. Well, to put it better, it was made to collapse when it had done its time and served its purpose. Yeah.

So they just transitioned through perestroika and so forth to a sort of quasi-capitalist system. Yes. It was collapsed, to be more specific.

And the American banks, which had been caring for the poor Soviet economy, just stopped providing money. That's all. That's all.

I'm sorry about, I'm sorry, in quotation marks, about those guys who, when you look at the footage again, about those guys who were, you know, on top of the world when the wall was... They were disillusioned. Yes, yes, yes. They thought they had won their freedom by themselves.

Sorry, guys. It was just a few bankers in New York that decided that the joke wasn't funny anymore. Yeah.

To quote a rather sarcastic English songwriter, the joke wasn't funny anymore. They needed something else. So, you see, it's hard for me to see a society collapsing because if it collapses, it would mean, from what I can see, that someone would push the buttons for it to collapse.

Yes, engineered collapses. That's probably what they're doing already right now with fake COVID, coronavirus. Yes, the masquerade.

Yeah, that's very Jewish, that sort of play acting, theatre acting. Oh, yes. That's the feminine consciousness right there, isn't it? Yes, and I know you don't carry him in your heart, Nietzsche, and neither do I, but he wrote a few interesting pieces about women as actors.

Did you say Nietzsche? Well, no, Nietzsche, yeah. Nietzsche, yeah. He wrote very, very insightful pieces about women as actors.

And, of course, the word Jews pops up in those paragraphs, in one of them, at least. Yes, the masquerade is, it is, I would call it, call it the present, the current experiment. I would call it, call it, but before that, I need to check something with you.

Of course, you know, Venice. Yeah, the merchants of Venice. Venice, no, no, but the Italian town.

I'm going to create a neologism, perhaps, in saying that, from Venice, in saying that the current experimentation is the, is a Venetian of the white world. Okay, I'm not too sure why that would be. Well, because.

Oh, you mean like anchors? Venetians used to wear masks. Oh, okay. Not just at, this is not well known, but not just during carnivals.

No, no, no, no. They would wear masks six months a year, six. Yeah, because the Jews must have had lots of influence in Venice.

Well, probably. I haven't, oddly enough, I haven't inquired about the influence of the Jew in Renaissance or even Middle Age, in quotation marks, Venice. I haven't.

But yes, I know a few conspirationists have written books about the black families. Black nobility? Nobility, exactly. And they, the black nobility, according to them, would



originate from Venice.

I don't know. But what I know is that Benjamin Disraeli, the former Prime Minister of Britain under Victoria, was born and raised, if I'm not mistaken, raised also in Venice. Oh yeah, that's interesting.

Yeah, I've heard that the Venetians derived from the Phoenicians. Oh, there is an helicopter around my head. Well, quite high, but sorry, you have to repeat.

I was just going to say the Venetians, I think they derived from the Phoenicians. That's what some people have claimed. Oh, Phoenicians, right.

P-H-O-E, yeah, yeah, okay. Not impossible, not impossible. In any case, they were in contact, in commercial contact, with the East for, I mean, centuries.

Venice used to be the door, as they say, for goods from the East, in Europe. And interestingly enough, Loki, there was a correspondent of mine. But we were wondering, with a correspondent of mine, six months ago, when that masquerade started, why Italy? Why was it that Italy was struck first in Europe? So, there was an obvious answer.

I mean, certainly, when you, I mean, when you organise a show, you, if you want to be successful, you don't hire third grade actors, right? Yeah. And you don't, I mean, you don't organise that show in a tiny town. No, you do things great, where you do things well.

So, obviously, Italy is one of the biggest European countries with Spain, France, Germany, and Britain. They had the choice, basically. It was either France, either Britain, either Germany or Italy.

I mean, how would have it looked had that masquerade started in, I don't know, Slovakia? Yeah, nobody would care. They only like sensationalism. Yeah, exactly.

I don't have anything against Slovakia, right? I'm just, it could be Slovenia. No, it wouldn't have looked good, wouldn't have been as convincing. So, Italy was a good choice.

But the most, perhaps the most interesting fact is that Italy, as has just been pointed out, was for centuries in Europe, the door for European, for Asiatic, for goods coming from Asia. They've always had a very tight relation with Asia, you see. Right.

So, you came associated with that. Yeah, I'm very careful about the hypothesis I make about what I call, what I call the occult war. Because too often, it leads to, I mean, fancies and flights of imagination.

But this is an hypothesis. And this is an assumption, let's say. But it could be a working hypothesis to be considered, surely, surely.

And besides, on a very trivial level, you may have heard that Italy received so-called help, so-called help from China. Right. Yes.

Always this tongue-in-cheek mockery of the goyim on the part of the Jews. Yes. Wu happened to be quite big in China.

There are very few, there have been very few books. I don't think that there hasn't been actually any book about Jews in China, but only... There have actually. There are two books, one written by a Jew, and then another one written by some guy named Istvan Bakony.

Chinese communists, Chinese Jews. Those are the two I'm aware of. Okay.

Well, I wasn't aware of those publications. Very interesting. Yeah, I can send you a link to them.

One of them used to be up on resist.com, but I don't think it's there anymore. Right. Well, no, it's not there anymore.

Right. You see, the China, Chinese communist regime might have been, and might be, even more, even more secret. It's not the word I was looking for, but even more secret.

The most secret communist regime in history. Well, you mean because of the Jewish influence up there? No, not particularly because of the Jewish influence, but because also of the Chinese character, Chinese nature. Yeah, they're very secretive and underhanded.

Secretive. That was the word I was looking for, secretive. Very good word.

Thing is that every Chinese is a bit of an occultist. I think their whole worldview is based on Confucianism and on the Tao Te Ching. That's what they say.

Yes, yes. I could not give my opinion about it because, and I need to make that clear. Perhaps I should have made that clear before.

I have chosen to focus on the study of the destruction of the white culture by other civilizations. And the Chinese civilization is not part of the, I mean, it's not one of those civilizations that I have studied thoroughly. And there is a reason for that.

The reason is that, just one second, please. Sure. I've actually looked through that book, Chinese Communists, Chinese Jews, by Istvan Bakony.

And it basically shows how the Chinese had been in, or the Jews had been in China for almost well over a thousand years from the time of Marco Polo and before that. I, yes, I was aware of that fact, but don't know more, don't really know more except that one of the right arms, one of the right arms of Mao was a Jew. Yeah, I've actually got a couple of pictures of that with several, or a couple of the Jewish advisors standing around with Mao

Zedong.

I had heard too that Mao Zedong was actually part Jewish, that his father was a Jew, but his mother was an ethnic Chinese. Right. So that makes him by the Jew's law, a Skalnik, I think they call them, when they are not a Jew on their mother's side, but only on their father's side.

And that's the way that Jews curse the Gentiles by putting a leader in power who is not Jewish on their mother's side, but only on their father's side. And then they can, you know, use them to destroy the population, just like they're doing with Donald Trump, but right now this time. In the case, yes, that puppet, yes, but that macho, not mucho, but macho, and much macho.

I have, before going on on that subject, very interesting subject, I wanted to say that I have a deep aversion and a deep disgust for anything Chinese. Yeah. I'm not even, to the point that I, yes, I don't even, I haven't been studying their civilization.

Really, it's an aversion. And I know what I'm talking about. I know.

But coming back to that issue, you see, it's possible, just as there are reasons to think that society as we know it might not collapse, or if it was to collapse, it would mean that someone would have pushed the right buttons for it to collapse, just as this is true, in quotation marks. So, it is to be wondered whether the Jews are more cunning than the Chinese, or the other way around. Well, I think that the leadership of China is probably Jewish.

Yeah, that's right. They are mixed people, and the mix is very powerful. Yeah, they have a, basically, I don't know what Evola would characterize that in terms of his racial typology.

Would that be basically a lunar consciousness for the most part? Yes, definitely. It's a most lunar consciousness, as lunar as you can get. So, the Chinese are the sort of archetype of lunar consciousness? You only have to look at their faces.

Yeah, moon men. Yes. I mean, how can a white person have any contact with that human type? It's like, yeah, he's asking for trouble.

Yeah, you know what's interesting? An anecdote. One time I had nowhere else to live, so I had a room with five Chinese students, and I couldn't stand living there more than like a day and a half, and I had to leave, because they were cooking up all sorts of filthy food, and, you know, just making all sorts of annoying noise. They're just completely dirty, creeping creatures that are always spying on me, and harassing me, and so forth.

Yeah, creepy, creepy. Another interesting anecdote, if I could just mention it quickly. In this country, where I was living, in the middle of the country, there was this one Chinese

guy who went on a bus and cut off a white guy's head, and ate his testicles and genitalia as well, and then he was only given a short term in a mental institution, and then he's now out on the streets.

The case is Vincent Lai, L-I. Like so many of those. Yeah.

Like so many of those. Just a caveat, caveat, C-A-V-E-A-T, right? Yeah. Of course, there are, I have met, when I'm talking about Asia, as I just said, I know what I mean, I'm just not talking about Asians from my armchair, right? There are, I've met exceptions, but it turns out that physically, they looked very much European.

That the Asians look European? Oh yes, there are some who do look like Europeans. Yes, very few, but there are. Those are the more mongoloid types that are, you know, the ones like in Mongolia and places like that.

Oh, yeah. Don't talk to me about them. I mean, yes.

Another thing is that the racial composition, makeup of Asia is not very well known by European, by white nationalists and racials. It's not very well known. You have to know that, in fact, Asia, most Asian countries are melting pots.

Yeah, they seem to have quite a lot of diversity of types. Yes, yes. From the very, very, it's not even a minority.

You can count them on the fingers, on your fingers, but relatively so. But from the European looking type to the Malaysian and the, you know, Polynesian. Yeah, the Negroid type.

Yeah, Negroid type. Yeah, yeah, yeah. It's a melting pot.

Um, something that would interest me, though, in Asia from a racial point of view, would be to be able to read the literature that has been published by Asian scholars on the racial mixes that occurred a long time ago in Central Asia. Yeah, because obviously the Aryans were there with their go-be-down civilization. Precisely.

And that might be, you know, that mix that occurred a long time ago might be at the root of our current problems. Because, you see, it's probably a mix that involves all races. Yeah, well, there was Lemuria, apparently.

I'm not too sure if you subscribe to the notion of the existence of that sunken continent where the Negroes were, apparently, in Lemuria. And then they migrated to India and around that region from around the whole of the South Pacific. And so they probably migrated inwards toward the continent of Asia and interbred, to whatever extent, or the Aryans interbred with them.

And then that created all these, you know, this cacophony of racial goulash. I'm not too

familiar with that issue. I don't, with Lemuria, I don't have spent, I haven't spent much time, you know, time is limited, of course.

And this just hasn't been my prior priority. So you are in a better position to speak about it. But yes, in India, in ancient India, it's likely that Aryans mixed with the Negroid type more than with the Yellow type.

It's from my readings, and I'm referring to a Hindu and Sanskrit scholarship, right, which is sadly, totally ignored in Europe, or even in North America by racialists. I want to stress that point. They did.

No, I haven't read any book or any study by any prominent racialists, European or American, that refer, that quoted, that drew upon the work, the excellent work done by those Indian scholars. I think Arthur Comte de Gabineau did. Sorry? I think Arthur Comte de Gabineau, he had done something on India, I think.

But I'm referring to, yes, to a current scholarship. Right. Yeah.

Yeah. I would invite, I would really encourage your audience to inquire, because these works, these books I'm referring to here, are devoid of any controversial intentions. They are really history studies, not concerned with any political, you know, agenda, right? Do you have any titles? Well, on my blog, there is everything one needs to have.

I will give the references later. Sure. But the thing is that most of those books are published by one or two Indian publishing companies.

So it's not very hard to find them, right? And they're not very expensive either. But I would really encourage your audience to have a look at them, really. I'll try to spread them around and investigate them myself.

Yeah, they would learn a lot of positive, actual facts about the early history of Aryans in India that are completely overlooked by our brothers, who, for most of them, tend to have a very idealized view of that period of our history. Idealized and therefore romantic. Yeah.

Let's just say for now, because I want to say this about the early history of Aryans in India, just one or two things people, white, racially conscious white people need to know right now. The first is that it's likely that the priests were not originally Aryans. It's very likely.

Yeah, the Brahmin caste, weren't the Dravidians or something? Yes, yes. Dravidians or mixed people. They must, your audience, if they are familiar with Evola or René Guénon, if they are, they must have heard about the very famous second birth notion, the notion of second birth.

Are you familiar with it? I think I've heard of it. Yeah, well, it's really central to Guénon's work, second birth. To cut a long story short, according to them, an Aryan was only half Aryan until he had been initiated.

He had received an initiation and that initiation was what's called second birth. I'm not going to say it in Sanskrit. So basically, an Aryan, until he was initiated and received and was reborn, was considered Aryan only biologically.

Only when initiated, he was considered as an actual Aryan. But that's, I'm just summing up Evola's views and Guénon's views on the matter. And most people's views on the view on the matter, most people in our circles derive their view on that second birth from Evola's books and Guénon's books.

This is simply not true. Simply not true. Or if it's true, it's just because the Brahmins had decided that to become an actual Aryan, you had to be initiated.

Right, so they could have a monopoly on power that way. So you're saying that Evola had got it wrong then? Oh, yes. Yeah, he got it wrong.

And so did René Guénon. So did, of course. I mean, I have in store, very few people have read it, but the description, which I sent you the other day, I made, of that, of the rite in question, of the ritual in question, it's symbolically, symbolically, it is so feminine.

It's, in fact, so feminine that it looks, it sounds, feels like a second biological birth, as if one was not enough. Right. It's really quite, the first time you read it, it comes as a shock.

Yeah, I sort of was a little bit nonplussed when I read it. I was thinking that you had intended it seriously or something at first, as if this was something to practice. And I was thinking, well, I don't see what's so good about this.

Mm hmm. Yeah, but you read it. Yeah.

And you were, well, you had to face the fact, but because you are an, well, let's say, open, very open minded person, you read it with your eyes and not with your imagination, and came to the right conclusion. It is not this ritual, which is considered by most esotericists and, well, how could I say, Hervolians and Ganonians as the summum, as the peak of Arianity. It is not.

It is, well. That's more the lunar, donic, telluric soul. Yeah, even Negroid, one could say.

You remember, it's about, at some point, it's about wearing the skin of an antelope. Right, yeah. Yeah, that's not even really feminine.

That's more just animalistic more than it is anything. Well, yeah, but... Shamanic at the lowest level. Sure, but it is coupled with an immersion in water.

Yeah, yeah, yeah. That sort of is like a gynecocratic influence in itself, even though it's apparently a male priest caste, just the consciousness is basically more female. It's self-evident, self-evident.

And, frankly, the shock was all the more deep that, for me, that I need to be honest. For years, I relied on Evola's views on it, frankly. But people need to be very curious.

I mean, curious about it. They need to check. You've got to have a critical spirit about everything, of course, about what our enemies say and state on media.

That's obvious. But you must not forget to be critical about also what our, what the thinkers we read and respect have written, because it's not the voice of, in quotation marks, God. All right? Yeah.

It's not. You had said, too, how spiritual practices are sort of female or effeminate. That makes sense.

As I said, it was a bit of a paradoxical statement from me. I just wanted to underline that in that part of the cycle, any spiritual exercise can backfire. Okay.

Because it can open you up to demonic possession and things like that, right? We are no longer, yeah, exactly. We are no longer in what the environment is no longer what it used to be. No longer.

And you see, the way our lives are well, organized or disorganized, we exercise, we would exercise spiritually. For example, when we have finished working in our leisure time, right? At certain hours. Well, this is a bit like a sport activity, frankly.

It becomes, basically, it's a routine. Spiritual exercise has to be made all day long. So I guess the only solution then for the person is to make their life like a ritual.

Yeah. Like Romans, apparently, Evola spoke about the Romans living this ritualistic life. Everything they did was a ritual.

Yes, it was ordered. The thing is, we live in a society that is completely disorganized and where everything is made for chaos to increase. And the question is to know whether, on a personal level, one is able to go against that tide.

People have had backfires, have experienced backfires. If I may talk about my personal experience, well, yes, because I have no, I mean, there is no, well, apologies to be made. I mean, we have to be at some point quite, we have to speak about things as they are and concrete things.

So I have no apologies, but I won't be long. I have, I think I have managed to avoid those backfires, but only because I was aware that it was coming. The environment, sorry? Oh, go ahead.

No, I was just thinking there was like a break in the audio. All right. The thing is that the environment, for, to live in the environment, the current environment, for someone who belongs to the egreore we mentioned earlier, is like for a fish to live in water.

Yeah. They are in, I mean, they are at ease. Do you understand? It's very simple.

I'm saying that they're on the same resonance or wavelength as everybody else. They are in their element. They have created it.

They feel very much at ease. Although, to live, I think they need medicine. Yeah.

Psychiatric drugs. Yeah. It's one of the conditions that enable them to live.

Without medicine, they wouldn't last for long. They wouldn't. But people who want to practice need to be aware that there might be consequences because you are fighting against forces that realistically you can't fight.

I'm sorry to be, I know some people in your audience will be kind of surprised by my statement, but that's my ultimate conviction based on experience. In Sanskrit, life, to live and to fight are two words that come from the same root. But again, I won't say them in Sanskrit.

Right. So, all life is a struggle. Yeah.

But no more. But no more. What do you want to fight against? Frankly, see yourself.

You'll fight. It is a fight, but what is it? It is a fight against a judge, a state behind that judge, against a state. Right.

So, it's amorphous. It doesn't have any form. No, it's not like fighting, for example, fighting, I don't know, in the forest, fighting for your life, fighting in natural conditions.

It's got nothing to do with that. We're fighting against shadows, intangible shadows. This fight is grotesque, grotesque.

I know many people will disagree with me, but I'm trying to see things as they are. What are you fighting against? You are fighting against, yeah, ghosts. Yeah.

So, the Jews, physically, they're bound up with these things, though. It doesn't restrict itself to them only. Is that what you're saying? That there are forces beyond them? Evola was the first to say, I think it was in the 40s, as he was writing a synthesis of the doctrine of race.

He claimed that, well, he was the, no, he was not the first one, but he claimed that white people had been Jewishized to the core. Yeah, Judaized. Yeah, Judaized, yeah, to the core, to the point of no return.



And I would, I agree and disagree. I would say Semitized, not just Judaized. Semitized.

Right. And the distinction is that it's broader than merely Jewish, you mean? Yeah. In three aspects, he makes it clear in the introduction, and I fully agree.

It's your three aspects of the Jewish problem you're referring to? Yes. He makes it clear that the Jewish problem is only a part of the, of a larger Semitic problem. Of course, I mean, the Jews inherited most of their, their, not beliefs, but mental, mental, yeah, mental tendency, their mentality, their mental structures were very much conditioned by the worship, the cults, and the beliefs of the surrounding people.

Right. Yeah. And those were all more or less Arabs, weren't they? And then there's more to the east.

Yeah, Mesopotamians. So the Jews, though, aren't they of Neanderthal derivation to some extent, so that that DNA is somehow bound up with this more chthonic, teluric consciousness? Well, the Bible makes it clear that the Jewish people is a mix, is originally a mix, but in which, of course, the tonic influences prevail. Yeah, I think that that might be one of the main reasons why, because of the Neanderthal ancestry, whereas we are more Omegnon ancestry.

Yes, but you see, three aspects of the Jewish problem is, has three chapters. One is about the Jewish, on the spirit, the Jewish substance. On the spiritual level, another chapter deals with the Jewish substance in economy.

And the third deals with the Jewish substance in culture. Right. And it all derives itself from the sort of demonic level, or conscious.

Yes. The thing is that when it was still possible to fight the Semitic spirit, as I would say, right, when it was still possible to fight the Semitic spirit, um, the fight could be, could be led on the on three levels, those which I have just mentioned, spiritually, economically, and culturally. The, the National Socialist Movement fought it on the cultural and on the economic plane.

But you're saying they didn't fight it on the spiritual plane? Well, no, but I don't hold a grudge against them at the same time. Another point that needs to be raised in passing here is that Evola's views on National Socialism, which Arctos has published. Right, what's on the third, right? Yeah, need, need, need to be qualified, need a lot to be qualified.

I, I written a study that took me six months, full time, about race, about the racial conception of National Socialist prominent authors. Is that on your blog? No, it's, it's, well, yes, in on my French blog, but it was, let's see, that it has been updated in the new book that I've published, that is to say, Synthesis of the Doctrine of Race. I have fleshed it out since then.

So to sum it up, yes, readers who can speak French can go to the blog and type Aperçu, A-P-E-R-C-U, on National Socialism, Socialist Racism. You can translate this too, if you use the website, Google Translate, and then you just enter it, enter in the URL of the blog. No, in English, it would just be about National Socialist Racism.

OK. Yeah. So the, you would have a fairly realistic insight into what National Socialist Racism was, actually.

Evola has, I must say, has distorted quite a lot the views of German eugenicists and racialists. Yeah. Like Fritz Lenz and people of that sort.

Yes. Well, yes, it was very unfair, very unfair. I think it was because of his jealousy, maybe, of the more pure type.

There is, you know, in Evola, I mean, I don't know if we are doing this, what if this program is about Evola or not, but that doesn't really matter. But in passing, it has to be said that there is a bit of Mediterranean jealousy in him. Yes, there is.

I respect very much. And it's one of the only authors that I fully respect. But you've got to know that there is a bit of jealousy in him.

Yes. Yeah, it does seem like that. Yes.

I mean, for example, it's not just his views on race, on German racial literature that is largely biased. It's, for example, his views on Hitler. Ah, well, which he had in one of the books published by Arctos.

He goes on to say that Hitler was essentially a vulgar. Okay. He was a leader and had to speak to crowds, to masses.

It is obvious that you cannot have this to speak to masses. You have to, I mean, at some point, you have to adapt yourself to masses. Right.

You have to calm yourself down to reach the lowest common denominator. Yeah. But now, if you think, if you think Hitler was vulgar, then what about Mussolini? Right.

Come on. Ah, now we can, he looks, he acted like, he looks and acts like an actor. Yeah.

Well, there's a lot of suspicion whether Mussolini wasn't also just like an operative of the Jewish cabal, because he had the, he had some sort of relationship with Scottish right free masonry and had a double headed eagle on his hat too. Well, yes, you suspect the thing is that you may have had contact with free masonry in your youth for some reasons. And you may have changed your mind.

You see, that's one thing about, I mean, famous people's lives that conspirationists do not take into account. I myself could be, I mean, I could be, I could be associated with a,

not a Jewish, but some kind of Marxist small group because of a conversation that I had 25 years ago on the net with someone, you know. I could, this could, at my level, I could be, you know, you could trace that article, you could dig it up and say, well, you see, he is, he's a Marxist.

People have stopped the revolution. Yeah, exactly. I'm not, I'm not condemning Mussolini because frankly, I was not him and nobody can know what was really going on in his mind.

But what I can say is that he looks and acts like an actor and he's not, not particularly like a gentleman, even though I must say, I do not like that word gentleman. Romantic. Yeah, well, yes.

Gentle, not gentle. And, but what I can say, because I've read things on the matter in Italian, is that indeed Freemasons were exert, well, played a huge role under fascism. That is a fact.

But now, was Mussolini himself connected with Freemasonry? Did he share their so-called worldview, which is really a kitchen view? There are doubts about that. For example, there is this anecdote, which is very interesting. One morning, he received a black rose at his offices in Rome.

Black rose, you see what I mean? No. No, the black rose is a, is a Masonic symbol. Although not the most known, but it is.

What does it mean? Sorry? What is the meaning of it? Ha! First, it's a very feminine symbol. Then, it's, black is not associated with a rose. It looks, well, suspicious.

Right. So, the point is that Mussolini was, and there were witnesses shot. So, my take is that he was, my take is that, given that this anecdote is very telling, he was, he did not share his Masonic views and wasn't prepared to, to, to follow and to implement the agenda.

But, but that doesn't mean that he didn't play in their hands. Right. I guess they just use whoever they can get and then destroy when they're done with them.

The thing is that the, well, the fascist regime was filled with Freemasons. Again, my reference is the only, the only book written in Italian that gives a full picture of the question. It was filled with Freemasons, filled.

And besides, the big, I mean, finance banks were given a free hand under fascism to a large extent, you see, which wasn't the case in, in Germany. Yeah, because Hitler had shut down the Masonic lodges, so far as I've heard. Yeah, he shut down, actually, he shut down any esoteric group.

I also heard that Rudolf Steiner was killed in that, in the Third Reich, because he was working with Eilers Crowley and so forth against the National Socialists. I don't know. I really don't know.

Steiner is a very odd figure, character. That's a theosophical, anthroposophical, which is basically Jewish. Well, yeah.

He had good, he made good points. For example, when he claimed that electricity had changed the world, that electricity had made a new, totally new world appear. I have made studies about electricity, the role played by electricity in the shaping of our society.

We're not going to dwell on that here. Let's just say that I studied that question before I read Steiner's text on electricity. He made good points.

But his thinking is so lunar. Yeah, that's what I meant. He said there was more Jewish.

Hmm. I don't know where it comes. It may come.

I'm not sure it may come from an Islamic background. No, it doesn't look entirely German. It looks more like Czech or something like that.

Yeah, true. To some extent. Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.

But once again, I mean, when you look at Goebbels, I mean, he doesn't look like an Aryan. He's Jewish more than anything. Well, however, I mean, I wish he was still ruling, you know, because we need people like that.

I mean, men to a very, very large extent. And that's one of the things that is very important in Eberle's writing, in that he makes a clear difference between the race of the body and the race of the soul and the spirit. Some have misinterpreted Eberle's views on the race of the soul, the spirit and the body.

They have misinterpreted it because they are too, they rely too much on their studies and not on what they can experiment in life. It is obvious that just through his actions, Goebbels, for example, proved to be more Aryan than, I mean, most of those who claim to be so. This wasn't the case of Goering, for example.

But Goebbels is something I hardly use the word, but I'm not sure it's perfectly appropriate, but a genius in his own field. Yeah, yeah. Sorry for this nostalgic moment.

But yeah, he was one. But not Aryan or Nordic by any means physically, yet the spirit of one is. The problem with that is you had possibly what you were going to discuss about how people misunderstand or misinterpret Julius Eberle's racial typology, the tripartite conception of race.

I think they assume that that allows for race mixing and stuff and for non-whites having an Aryan soul and all this sort of thing. That's often what people would misunderstand or try to reject Eberle's conceptions based upon the... Do they go so far? Some of them seem to, that it doesn't matter what race you are biologically, so long as, you know, because you can have all sorts of other souls and whatever. Yeah, yeah, yeah.

But I wasn't aware that some people interpreted it as opening the door to racial mixing. No, no, Eberle was very... If there was one thing he was clear about, it was this one. I mean, he described in one of the books I have published by him, he described the positive mixing and negative mixing, right? And between, I mean, or there can be no question of a positive mixing between a white and a non-white.

I mean, you just have to read elements of racial education. You just have to read synthesis of the doctrine of race. I'm very critical of Eberle, but let us not say that he did say things he didn't.

No, it would be unfair. I mean, fairness is very important. Well, that's what a lot of these people who are trying to shift people away from Eberle are saying.

That's basically disinformation on their part. People like Renegade Broadcasting, who are pushing a matriarchal agenda, naturalism, matriarchal veganism, and so forth. I haven't heard of them.

They're in the States, basically. It's just this crypto-Jews who have a radio show and so forth. Yeah, with a very large audience, I believe.

A fair audience for this movement. There's not too much going on. Some of those who level that kind of criticism, some of those are sincere, but it's just a misinterpretation.

What I've heard is people relating Eberle's theory, a racial theory, to gender studies. That goes very far, very far. But they're sincere.

They just don't understand it, and they don't understand this theory because they haven't read it. They haven't gone through it. Yeah, they're too quick to reject and not to accept.

I used to be like that a long time ago too, myself, that I was far too critical, prejudicial, without being willing to be receptive to other sorts of information. Be critical, not prejudicial. Exactly.

Well, yes, that's a good motto. But some people, of course, are interested in portraying Eberle as some kind of proponent of racial mixing. If that's what they want, there's nothing you can do about that.

But I'm only here trying to get the attention of sincere, although I don't really like the

word sincere either, but frank people, those who really are curious, honestly, about getting to know thinkers' views as they are, and not as they are portrayed. That's why your blog is called eberleasheis.wordpress.com. Yes, yes. Well, the blog, that's another blog, yes.

I'm just in passing, doesn't cost very much to turn a blog into a proper website, right? Doesn't cost much. Yeah. The reason I keep them as blogs is that it gives them less exposure.

Oh, yeah. Yeah, yeah, yeah. Less exposure.

Sorry? That way it's more private. Yes. It attracts less attention from the enemy.

Yes. I think people should know that. I mean, that's what I was told by someone who does know what seems to know what he's talking about.

Yes. So I keep them like that. Yeah.

In terms of search results that people with Google or check out on a search engine, they type in Ebola. Yeah. I mean, Ebola has been headlining, so to speak, for quite some time.

You know, since that political schemer, that American political schemer that supported the current political schemer in office there, mentioned him in a conference he gave in the Vatican three years ago. Oh, yeah. You mean that Bannon guy? Yeah.

Yeah, exactly. And since then, I mean, I know I receive because there is an option on Google.com. What is it called whenever an article is published on the net? Yeah. Google.

Anyway, so I read whenever an article is published that contains the word Julius Evola, I receive a notification. So last year, every two or three days, um. I heard of a some kind of websites that had mentioned Evola in one of his article, of course, they all copy and paste each other.

Yeah. So Reuters journalism. Yeah.

Well, you can't I mean, you can't hold a grudge on them for doing so. I mean, they are so dumb. And that's why they are.

I mean, they they work as journalists in on mainstream media. They're dumb. And so, of course, they are rewarded for their dumbness by being hired.

Yeah. Yeah. But by parenting.

That's the way that Jews want it. They want only to hire those who are easily controllable slaves so that they have a monopoly and know what's going on behind the scenes and nobody else can know. At the same time.

Wouldn't we do the same? I mean, in the conditions such as they are nowadays, had we political power, we would do the same really. Yeah, I guess that's the most pragmatic strategy. Well, yeah, except that journalists will could well would be selected on the basis of their racial on the level of racial consciousness and on not on the basis of their level of dumbness.

Yeah. I mean, it's the rule of the game. But I'm glad you don't spend too much time.

You don't spend much time. On criticizing the obvious state or stating the obvious, because it is so obvious that when a journalist work for a mainstream media is going to parrot what he's paid for. I mean, that's obviously it's really wasting time to we in France.

I don't know if you if you did mention that I'm French in France. This is a habit habit that nationalist circles have taken to spend hours, hours literally in shows on YouTube to criticize mainstream media media. Well, yeah, no point in bothering.

Yeah. One recent incident that I had encountered when I was trying to overturn my decision for pleading guilty to these charges because I was getting death threats. I wanted to overturn the decision.

And I talked to this one in order to get the message out so I could try to argue for overturning that. I talked to this one Marxist journalist. And the only thing that he would do throughout the entire conversation, you know, I asked him if he would record the whole conversation in full.

He's like, oh, I can't do that. And then the only thing he would do throughout the entire conversation is try to set me up and make me say compromising statements that would be so that I could implicate myself. So he was basically just playing the role of like a detective for the state unofficially.

And when he published his article, it was nothing but slander and smear against me. Do you mean that that birdied man? Which? That man with a bird. No, I mean, I mean, a journalist.

Yeah. But was it the one who interviewed you who had had a huge microphone? No, this one was a different one. It was on a news media called Vice.

OK, so this one was not dishonest and disloyal. Was. Yeah.

The one that I had an interview with, that was the one who was local. But this other one here, I'll send you the link. It's Vice News.

They basically just the guy just completely slandered me and, you know, portrayed me as tried to portray me as mentally ill and so forth. But he didn't do a very good job. So

his his articles were taken down from other websites because they didn't want they didn't want the message to get out to other people, you know, because because it was actually making me look somewhat good because I had written some story, a satire based on The Simpsons.

And so he tried to portray me in a negative light just for writing a satire. And, you know, that just is like a sort of mean spirited mentality. Most people would say, oh, so he wrote a little story on The Simpsons.

Big deal, right? No, I haven't. I haven't listened to that interview. It's just a little write up on his slander, basically.

Maybe he went too far. I mean, really too far. Yeah.

Well, that's that's the sort of the way the media works. It's you know, they have a somewhat of a spectrum of of ideology where they have the more extreme left and then they have the more center and the more conservative. That way they can get the extreme left to push the narrative, you know, the Overton window more and more leftward so they can create more and more chaos and destruction, more and more anti white bias.

And more and more audience. Yeah, that way people that way it hooks all the all the naive younger generations in and they play the younger generations off the establishment so they can create more, you know, a more working it toward a more Marxist leftist agenda. But you've just used a word, a very interesting word when you said that that journalists acted like a detective.

Yeah, that was his role. I think that's basically what their function is. And journalists act very much like a detective and they are very inquisitive.

Yeah. In this case, he was performing a forensic role, like he was actually trying to gather data on me and submit it to the police, because after I had this conversation with him, he I found out that there was additional charges that from the police that I had allegedly violated my bail conditions after discussing with this guy. Just in broad outline, discussing the desire to overturn my decision, and then he must have done something to submit information to the police or something to portray it as if I had promoted hatred or something, because that's what I'm being charged with here is willful promotion of hatred.

So so he that's basically what the journalists, the media of any kind, for the most part, their function is to serve as unofficial government agents who just who can sort of step outside of the bounds of the law more so unofficially. And then they can they can be used just like Antifa is used to harm the white population with more impunity. And then the government pretends that it's objective and so forth.



So they're they're basically like part of the phalanx, the leftist phalanx of like an unofficial government, government wing for the most part. Well, yes, that's that's you. You just.

And you did to a very. Something very important. In the understanding of the political situation today, the government nowadays will not will not directly prosecute or persecute an opponent.

I mean, no. It will it will leave that role to groups and organizations. But at the end of the day, it's still the government which persecute and prosecute white and racially conscious white people.

But it's more vicious, you see. Yeah, well, you can say that you could say that the organizations can be more vicious in some ways because they they're committing overtly criminal acts, but they can get away with it, like all the non-whites, especially, you know, the low scale crime that they're always committing. That's basically turned a blind eye to by the Jewish government so that they can create more chaos and build up their police state.

Yes, but it's very cunning, you see. Yeah, because in the old days and the the kings, it was him. It was the king who prosecuted people.

It was him. But they found something much, much better, much more cunning. Much more cunning.

And this is and what they found is, you know, what they implemented also is the prosecution and persecution of racially conscious white people by a private so-called private groups and organizations which are financed, sponsored by by the state. But it's far more cunning in this way. The government has always has always its hands clean.

They can say, no, we you see, it's democracy, liberty, freedom and so on. We don't do anything against against the so-called freedom of speech. No, no.

But that subgroup groups, sub organizations do it instead of them. And there is a few there are a few paragraphs in Freud's Nephew. A word elder is.

Yeah, yeah, yeah. Which I didn't understand that paragraph at the beginning. He says associations are fundamental, fundamental to democracy.

I didn't get that when I first read that sentence about 10 years ago. Of course. Of course, the point is that the government remains immaculate as it gives orders to subgroups, sub organizations, associations to do the dirty job.

Yeah, that's what they call communitarianism. I'm pretty sure now that it's just sort of like it itself is just a sort of feminine lunar, this this ubiquitous power that's that can't be

seen, but it pervades everything and everywhere. And and, you know, all the people in that, they're part of that collective consciousness and they become conscripted into it as it's instruments.

So the power doesn't even necessarily operate through the state, but so much as it does through unofficially, through through the people who are just under under its thumb. You've just summed up what I was trying to say. Yeah, of course.

And that's very cunning because the state appears, I mean, clean, clean. We don't do anything bad. No, no, no, no, no.

And that's a technology of power, you see. And the web that has been woven is huge. When I say government, I mean, I don't I'm not I'm not obsessed with the actual 30 or 40 political schemers in office.

No, it has to be clearly seen that in democracy the government is everywhere. Everywhere. Yeah, because the masses have been conditioned to look upon themselves as the government.

So they constitute its spy network. Yeah, spy. Yeah, in the broadest sense.

And it was started under the the old under the kings again. Yeah, the kings started it. They started it with the police.

The police, the way... Was that in Louis XIV time? Sorry? Was that in Louis XIV time in France? Yeah, yes, yes. In France. The Sun King.

He was the center of everything. Yes. The sort of transvestite, basically.

There's an interesting movie in French called The King and Mr. Bird. I don't know if you've heard of that cartoon, but it's about that too. I'm not too interested in movies, as I think that they are mostly a propaganda tool with psychic effects.

So I tend to avoid watching movies, in fact. Although from time to time I do. I watch a few of them just to get the sort of feeling of what's going on in people's... This one's from 1980.

This is like a French cartoon from 1980. And it's about... It's basically a sort of Marxist cartoon about how the king is tyrannizing over everybody with his police state and so forth. It's pretty interesting.

No, no, I haven't heard of it. But the thing is that by government, I mean all those people, and I think we would fully agree on that fact, fact, all those people top down who, whether unconsciously or not, whether they are on the payroll of the government or not, work for it. And by government, I mean, today we are talking about, I mean, a supranational government, of course, and I mean, banks, etc.

As everyone knows, the 40 or 50 political schemers in office have no political power whatsoever. Yeah, they're just strong men. I'm sure your audience is fully aware of that.

And that's not waste. It's time trying to analyze so-called world politics. This is something we are very good at in France, also, or we love to analyze world politics, you see.

What this political schemer has done and what he should have done has not. Just a waste of energy and time. But well, this is how we are here.

Yes, the web is huge. The web is huge. The police was indeed the way we understand it.

It was created by Louis XIV. He probably got the idea, again, from Venice. What I'm saying here, when I give facts, dates, give names and so on, can be checked on my blog.

I can reference and document everything I say. And believe me, my sources are not conspiracists. Books, they are not.

My sources, my references are either scholarly words or 19th, 18th century, how could I say, not thinkers, but literature. People would be very surprised if they read some books in which they would find in them much more information about the current occult war and conspiracy than they find in their conspirational books printed today. You mean like fictional books? Yeah, which are fictional books for most of them with UFOs and stuff like that.

I repeat, 99% of my sources, references I take are taken from scholarly literature, nothing else. You find a great deal of important information in them. It's just that they are, how could I say, they don't get the full picture.

They give you some information. It's up to you to link them to get the whole picture. Venice, where do I get this idea that Louis XIV got his idea of the police from? Who do I get it from? From a Freemason, a 19th century Freemason who was a rather well-known politician at his time.

French Freemason? Yeah, French with an Italian background, yes. He suspected strongly Louis XIV to have derived, to have created the police, to have taken his idea in Venice. But then I inquired, investigated and found relevant and very relevant information in the Italian literature, about police literature.

Yeah, as soon, as early as the 15th century, and not just Venice, but Italian cities had what we now call the police. They had that. So it's very possible, indeed, that this Freemason who called the police a tyrannical entity, by the way, which it is, it's very possible that he was right.

As I've just said, police, as we know it, was already active in the 15th century in Italian cities. And you know what the police is, in fact. They are not there to protect people,

right? They're just there to enforce the law.

They're law enforcement officers. Well, they are here to protect their masters. Yeah, pretty much.

Safety and security. And the question is, for who and in what way? So it's for the Jews and all of the other elites who serve the Jews, the Freemasons and all their useful idiots, Christians and so forth. The first police, again, I'm not familiar with China.

It might have been created there before it was created here. But say China, I can say that the first police was created in Egypt a few centuries before, well, BC, yeah, not BC, before Christ, right? So when it was sort of like Hellenistic? Hellenistic, exactly. And it was, here again, I found there is a book, there's only one book on the matter, by the way, it's by an English scholar.

And what you learn is that they were basically coups. Coups. And it has never changed.

Police force is made of coups. Yeah, well, they stole about almost \$9,000 Canadian worth of my stuff when they came in this house, claiming I was evidence. And they never gave it back.

They took about \$2,100 of bills, of money bills that I had that Jewish white genocide allegedly stamped on. And they never gave me back the value of the money. They just said it was evidence so they don't have to give back the value of the money.

So I was like directly stealing \$2,000 right there. Well, that illustrates perfectly the fact that when we say, when one says that police men are crooks, it is not a figure of speech. It is a fact, not a figure of speech.

I mean, the policemen are called the crooks by any junkyard. No, it's a fact. And it's a historical fact.

Take precisely, well, the police under Louis XIV. I've read the biography of the Louis XVII chief of the police who were in office before the revolution. They were all, except one, they were all crooks.

Yeah. Have you ever heard of Joseph Fouché, who was the chief of police under Napoleon? Yes, of course. Yes, of course.

There's a lot of examples in the book written by a Jew called the 48 Laws of Power, where he discusses that. But the Jew who wrote the book falsifies history and he tries to portray him as like a hero or something. Oh, he tries to portray Fouché like a hero? Yeah.

Well, yes, of course, from his point of view. I mean, he invented the techniques of modern police. As I said, police, as we know it, as a protector of the people, was invented by Louis XIV.

But the technique, the techniques of the police were created by Fouché. Yes. Yes.

What is that other famous French? He was formerly a criminal, a very famous criminal, and then he became the inspector of police or something. I don't think it was Fouché, it was somebody else later in the 1800s. Vidocq.

Yeah, that's it. V-I-D-O-C-Q. Yeah.

Yeah, I remember reading about that before in criminological literature. Oh, speaking of movies, I said I don't watch, I don't hardly watch movies, but there is a very good movie about Vidocq. It's called Vidocq.

And it was translated into English. I think I've heard of it, actually. Yeah, yeah, yeah.

He was probably the most honest and police man in France in the whole 19th century. Why? Because he was an ex-crook. Yeah.

Yeah. And he mocked, he kept mocking the so-called policemen as they deserved to be. Yeah.

Well, the thing is that he had a very negative impact on the very negative history of the police as he created, I think, I believe he was the first to create private police. I mean, security forces. Yeah, security force.

I mean, for rich people. Yes. Private security.

Yeah, I know in the States and in North America, there was an organization called Pinkertons that was around the 1900s that was used to basically, for industrial purposes, for private industry, so they could keep the working population basically in a state of slavery for the most part and spy on them, make sure they don't steal. So people might ask, but what do people, what did people do at times when there was no police? Well, people were the police. Yeah.

Your house was, I mean, your house was what you say, was a burglar. Well, you defended yourself with your weapons. That's it.

Yeah. Now in this country, you can't do that. If somebody breaks into your house, you have an obligation to leave and just let them do whatever they want.

Yeah, but it's worse here. It's worse. Believe me, France is North Korea, but dressed as a married woman, as a woman about to marry.

Yeah, North Korea dressed just like a woman about to marry, to go to church. So this is the only difference. Yeah, people were their own police.

Basically, people should have their own jurisdiction. Yeah. Well, a man's house should be

his own private castle or whatever the phrase is.

You should have inalienable property rights in a just society and you can do whatever you want within the confines of your property so long as it doesn't negatively affect other people in the surrounding area. Police did not exist neither in ancient Scandinavia nor in Rome or Greece or or ancient Britain. We didn't.

And well, life is dangerous. Of course, you may be killed, but that's part of life. That's the risk.

Yeah. Now they have that sort of prophylactic society where everything has to be regulated and controlled and observed and monitored. I don't know what Foucault would call that in his book *Discipline and Punish*, sort of a panopticon type world, this open air prison.

Well, the net is a panopticon, yes. Yeah. Your audience is very much encouraged to get that book by Foucault.

I mean, you will not find in any other books, book, a so, so, so accurate description of society as it is today, as you will find in that book. As you call it in English, *Punish and*. It's called *Discipline and Punish*.

*Discipline, punish*, forget your favorite nationalist or racist authors when it comes to that issue, no matter how good they are when they deal with the subject. But on that issue, society, as it is structured today as a disciplinary entity, go and read that wonderful book. Yes.

Even though it was written by someone who is a Marxist, homosexual and pedophile. Also, according to what I've heard, he was actually sponsored by the Rothschilds to write his books and was given boys in San Francisco as part of his compensation. But of course, that's what I heard.

That was only coming from the Catholic writer E. Michael Jones, so I'm not too sure if that's really true. But he does seem to be a bit of a suspicious figure in terms of his deviant nature, Foucault. Well, churchmen are really trigger happy when it comes to children abuse, but they don't have any lesson to teach.

No, we don't have any lesson to teach in such matters as children abuse. I mean, their religion boils down to child abuse. That is what it is.

But anyway, of course, Foucault's own views, I reject them. I mean, personal views, I reject them. But I wish he could resuscitate today because he would realize that what he was wrong on one point.

When it comes to minority, you must know that he was strong in what he defended all

kinds of minorities. Now, minorities rule. Yeah.

And yeah, I think that's a mistake most baby boomers had made that they assumed that, you know, because they were mind controlled by the Jewish media to celebrate this diversity agenda. And they just brought about, you know, the collapse of their society for the most part. Yeah.

But. Of course, there shouldn't be any misunderstanding with respect to what has just been said about Foucault. I mean, his work and only his work.

This man was not just an intellectual. People have to know that he worked in hospitals. You know, he knew his stuff.

Right. Look, the birth of the clinic. Yeah.

Yeah. Yeah. The birth of the clinic, which is, you know, very much like the birth of the prison.

And the birth of school as prison. You know that actually crime was invented in prison. Crime was invented in prison.

Foucault gave me a hint. Crime, I repeat, was invented in prison. It's so true that when did the mafia in Italy.

When was when was it born? I'm not too sure. Maybe around, I don't know, like the 1800s or something. Exactly.

Exactly. When was the mafia born in Russia? Probably around the same time. Yeah.

Well, prisons, the penitential system had just been created. Oh, yeah. So that it's interesting.

I remember this one work by a Jewish criminologist from the States that was written, I think, in 1920 or something called crucibles of crime. That's what he called prisons. They're basically just a factory that makes crime and makes criminals.

It becomes like a school of crime. But but lucky not. This statement is accurate, but should be deepened.

You are we are let's say we are at the beginning of the 19th century, living, well, in a city, whether in Europe or in the States or in North America. Sorry. There is no prison.

Hardly. What's the landscape in terms of crime? What is it? Well, um, mostly, well, there are there are bands. There are sorry bands.

There are groups of criminals. Sure. Sure.

There are. But I would say amateur amateur. There is no actual hierarchy.

Yes, there is a boss and an assistant, but hardly more. Now, and there are many small groups of criminals in the countryside, in the cities. Right.

And the prison prison are open around 1850s. Around the 1850s. What happened? Well, some of those guys are jails and prisons are big.

Yeah. So let's say that a one guy, even one guy. Among.

One guy belonging to a small group of criminal is jailed. And here comes another guy belonging to another criminal group and a third belonging to a third group. So they get organized.

Well, yes. Yes, exactly. Exactly.

It was as simple as that. Who had the idea? Who came with the idea? Well, Fouché, Fouché came with the idea, but he's not the only one. There's a Belgian guy, a Christian, of course.

Fouché was a former priest. Right. You've got to know also that many of his colleagues, assistants were former priests.

Hence their love for children. You see? Yeah. I mean, you see, that basically crime was crime as a mafia were invented in prison as that was the place where they could get organized.

What was the Belgian guy's name? Was that that was before Fouché, you say? No, no, I can't remember his name, frankly, is quite important in the shaping of the prison of the modern prison. But I just can't remember his name. It would be would not be very difficult to.

To find it again. No, but it's just that I had that file, I had to reset my computer and unfortunately, I forgot to put my my study on the genealogy of the police on that on the USB key. And that study, which had taken me months and months, I lost it.

And that was in that study. I mentioned that that the Belgian guy is very important in the shaping of the modern prison. But anyway, I could find it again.

But that is something that unfortunately you are experimenting, you've been experimenting for now a year, right? Well, no, two years, actually. I was yeah, I was arrested in August of 2018. And ever since then, this case has been going on and on and on.

I don't know when it's going to know what's going to happen or when throughout the entire time for the most part. So but yeah, everywhere I go, even now, I walk around



outside and I'll have like people spying on me and gang stalking me, the Christians and Antifa, and then the police sort of work with them. Like one time I came, I was going to see this psychiatrist so I could get a clean bill of mental health to prove that I'm compus mentis because they were trying to portray me as mentally ill so they could try to justify institutionalization of me.

So I went down to the psychiatrist and the person, of course, the female psychiatrist, you know, because she wanted a longer vacation. She was not there that day. She's like, oh, I have to take care of a sick relation.

That was her excuse. So I leave. And when I leave, there are two police cars to one of them.

Actually, both of them were undercover sort of like SUV type vehicles. One of them was white. One of them was black.

The white one had the Jewish sergeant in it. And the black one had the non-Jewish underling in it. And they were just like driving right past me.

And the Jewish sergeant gives me this sort of like nod of the head or something like that. And then I walk, try to walk away from this construction site going up through a bunch of bushes around a hill and, you know, in people's backyard so I can get back out to where I was going. And then as soon as I show up there, another police car just rips right past me.

And then I go further toward another destination. And then I see another police car coming around. And then there's a bunch of like clandestine people driving around in vehicles, unmarked vehicles.

So that's basically the sort of, you know, often that occurs where I'm being subjected to this sort of surveillance techniques of these people. Yeah, it's called harassment. Yeah, gang stalking.

It's also called that. So anyway, whatever the outcome, gang stalking may last quite a long time. Well, I'm pretty sure I've been gang stalked for years beforehand when I reflect back upon what had occurred in my life at different times, because I was always very vocal about Jews.

I went into the military and, you know, did some military training at the most basic level before I decided I didn't want to have anything to do with it. And I was talking about Jews there and so forth, like explicitly. So ever since I don't know when, even when I was in university long ago, I was, you know, having Jewish professors and I would draw on the desk, like a picture of a Jew with a talmud in one of his hands and a joke book in the other of his hands.

And I think he probably saw that. So he was, you know, they'd been aware of me for quite a long time. So I've probably been monitored by them for a very long time.

Who knows how long it's been? Yes. Yes. And let's say that you gave them, you probably gave them what they needed to take action.

Yeah. In terms of this particular case. Yes.

Yes. Sorry. It's interesting.

I just should mention additionally about this gang stalking that before in another place, I was doing a bunch of graffiti and stuff and I would be tailed around over the whole city by undercover people. And then I'd walk or I'd do like a run in the middle of the night, you know, just for exercise. And I'd have like a police helicopter following me around the city.

Yes. You mentioned it. Yes.

I mean, why would you would they go after you with such such determination and with so heavy material as a helicopter? That's that's. I mean, I don't know, but I know around this town, there's a military base nearby, a NATO base. And we're in the place I was before in the city.

They have like a police helicopter flying around at night, too. So that was just, you know, they they just put it on me, I guess. And well, yes.

So it's time for you to leave. Well, yeah, I'd like to leave. I don't know, at least this place here specifically.

I don't know where I'd be able to go, though. So ideally somewhere where I can escape them to the extent that's possible. I don't I don't know if it's even possible to do that.

Because it's a panopticon. It's basically like this invisible power like Sauron's eye and J.R.R. Tolkien's The Lord of the Rings. It's like that, the eye of Sauron.

At the same time, yeah, the eyes, I mean, in ancient mythology, in Semitic mythology, there is this creature that has one thousand eyes, you know, but it's still a panopticon. It's just more powerful, sneakier. Yeah, yeah, that Jeremy Bentham's the panopticon that Foucault spoke about in The Birth of the Prison or whatever, whatever the translation is, I think they translated discipline and punish here.

Yeah, it's good. It's an accurate translation. Do you know that, you know who Bentham got his idea from? Who is that? The idea for the panopticon? No.

His brother. His brother was a Freemason. Yes.

He admitted it. Well, he didn't have to admit it. He just said it in a letter.

And it is referenced in one of my studies. Yeah. And he got his idea from his brother, from his Freemasonic brother, when he was staying, when his brother was staying in Russia and joined him there.

He visited him there. That's that's when he got it. Yeah.

So, I mean, but at the same time, you see, the all comes down, boils down to the famous, notorious all-seeing eye. Yeah. The capstone in the pyramid.

Yeah. And contrary, unfortunately, contrary to what most people keep believing and writing in books, the all-seeing eye is not originally a Freemasonic symbol. It is Christian.

It is Christian. It is found on some churches, for example, in some Christian books also, before Masonry was even created in early 18th century England. People could argue, yes, but in fact, Freemasonry has been there for a long time, perhaps even to the it's been there for a millennia.

Yeah. Well, apparently it comes from Egypt originally. Well, yeah, but that's all to me.

That's fiction. Egypt, as it is portrayed both by Masons, Freemasons and anti Freemason is just a is a has no existence, never existed. Sort of romanticized it in a way.

Yeah. For example, and this is also referenced on my blog. And someone wrote a thesis about 30 years ago about the descriptions of the pyramids by travelers from well, from the Renaissance to the early 19th century.

And believe it or not, not one description looks like the other. Not one. Even the Sphinx is not was is not portrayed, drawn by these travelers in the same way, but in completely different ways, which leads the French author who got interested in that is very important issue to assume to assume that it was all a propaganda job.

People, travelers would represent in their books meant to be read by aristocrats at that time. And well, yeah, mostly aristocrats would represent something which had not yet been built. You heard me? Yeah, not because it's impossible.

I mean, go to say we are in 2500. And I'm writing a thesis about the Eiffel Tower in France. And I search for all the descriptions of the Eiffel Tower, let's say from the late 19th century when it was erected to 2400.

What am I going to get? What kind of descriptions? Basically the same. Yeah, we know that it was erected in the late 19th. And we know it is still there.

Okay, we know. It's a monument that was erected there, and which has survived until our days. But how can you explain that a monument that purportedly dated to millennia

before Christ is not represented the same way by different people who visited Egypt from, say, the early Renaissance, early 16th century to the late 18th? There's only one explanation.

It didn't, it wasn't yet built. Did they do that then with Napoleon's time when he came to Egypt? Exactly, exactly. Yeah, there are grounds, strong grounds for thinking that it was built by Napoleon's engineers.

So the Sphinx was? Well, it would go the same way. And attention needs to be given to the work of a historical school called Recentism. Well, I prefer to spell it because really, I looked for it on the internet in English, couldn't find any information.

And I'm not too bad at finding things on the internet. But in Italian, in French, in German, you can find information in English. I hardly found any website with the word Recentism.

But you were aware of it? No, actually, I'd never heard of that. I'm familiar with the notion that obviously history has been falsified and contrived, you know, many times textually. But yeah, in terms of the actual monuments and so forth, I'd never heard of that, that the actual ancient, alleged ancient monuments were constructs, which could very well be the case.

So the pyramids themselves were that you're saying, according to this series? Well, that author doesn't explicitly state that it was built by, it was actually built by Napoleon's engineers. But another website with rather conclusive arguments is of the opinion that it was so, or in any case, that it wasn't built before the 18th century. Yeah, you can see how Napoleon was obviously a Freemason.

He's depicted with his Napoleonic, Masonic pose with his hand, his hidden hand. But it's important to point that that website, which has a very thorough study on that issue, is not anti-Masonic at all, right? So it's, I mean, it's not an anti-Masonic site, website, right? Okay. So when they say that, when they say that it is very possible that it was built at the end of the, well, by Napoleon's engineers, they are really quite pleased with that, right? Yeah, they look upon that as a Masonic victory.

Yeah, achievement, exactly. But to get back from where we started, I mean, I don't care about those people who say that, who came, who would argue that, well, Freemasonry exists for a million years, and therefore, in fact, it was the Christians who took up the all-seeing eye symbol. Right.

No, because Egypt, because that symbol did not, could, is unlikely to have existed at that time. It was created, most probably, by Christians. All points to that.

Do you think that the all-seeing eye, does that refer to the planet Saturn in the South Pole, that configuration that looks like an eye? I wasn't aware of that. Because that's what the Jews are worshipping, basically, is their Saturn logos, and that looks like, the

eye looks exactly like the, you know, the all-seeing eye in the American dollar bill, that looks exactly the same as the, I think it's the South Pole on Saturn. Right.

I couldn't say, but there's something more I want to add before I forget, is that, even if the argument, the iconographic argument was not grounded, it would remain that the all-seeing eye is a prominent figure of speech in both the ancient and the New Testament. And more than this, it is, the Jews, thank you, the Jews probably derived it from Mesopotamian sources. Well, I know there's that symbol, that sort of sun symbol of Utushamash in Babylon, I think it is.

Yes, among others. Among others. All those, I mean, I've made a study about, well, in one of my studies, I devoted a few paragraphs on that subject, and many references are given to ancient pre-Biblical, if you want, pre-Biblical occurrences of that symbol.

But, you know, one thing is that what we find when we study Hebrew, and in general, all ancient languages, is that they are very concrete, they are very concrete languages. Yeah, they're sort of like a symbolization of... Well, no, no, like ours. I mean, we didn't have any term really for abstract notions until relatively recently.

It was the same for Semitic languages, among others. My point is that the symbol, before the symbol, there is a concrete fact. In the case of the All-Seeing-Eye symbol, it is very possible, as a few ancient texts would seem to show, that the All-Seeing-Eye is the king's spy.

Yes. Before becoming a symbol, the All-Seeing-Eye was a term that designated the king's spy, or the best spy, or the team of spies. Yeah.

So, that's related to that Hebrew or that Jewish mythological figure of the Thousand-Eye. Oh, well, yeah. Well said.

Yes, yes, yes. Yeah. It's Semitic, it's not truly Jewish.

It may be Mesopotamian, actually. But the fact is that it exists, and it sort of illustrates very well the world as it is now. Not that it should cause someone to become paranoid, by the way.

Yeah. Because one of the problems, from a psychological standpoint in our circles, is that people tend to get paranoid, and that way they play in the hands, in the enemy's hands. Yeah, it disengages you from any higher level of consciousness.

Put you in a reptilian ring state. To be avoided at any cost. Which doesn't mean that you don't have to be aware that you are, well, that you live in a panopticon, that you are being watched.

But that doesn't mean that you should be traumatized. Yeah, that's their intention.

That's obviously what they want for people to be in a state of fear-based consciousness, always thinking that they're powerless, and that they're controlled, and that there's no hope, and so forth.

It's hopeless, hopeless, utterly hopeless. Most and most racials fall in that trap. They do.

And they become paranoid, and then ego-centered, very much ego-centered. Because paranoia means, well, being paranoid means being sickly aware that you are being watched, and leads the paranoid person to believe that because he is watched all day long, he is actually more important than he is. You see? Yeah.

There is a movie, there is a movie. How can he neutralize you? Yeah, there's a movie, by the way, one of the last I watched 20 years ago, a bit joking, but with a famous Hollywood actor, and he is a sort of conspiratorist. And he believes he is constantly watched.

In fact, well, for the most part of the movie, there is no proof that he is being watched. Don't you see which movie it is? I think it's the Truman Show, what you're talking about. The Truman Show with Jim Carrey.

No, no. The actress, or the whore, is very well known, is famous. What's her name? She's a Jewish, her face looks like a... Sorry, I don't have anything against those animals.

But her face, like so many Jewish women's, look like a horse. Yeah, like a camel or something. Yeah, camel.

Yeah, camel, exactly. Sorry for the horse. Camel, exactly.

Yeah. And she's got the teeth too. I'm not too sure what movie you're talking about.

But anyway, let's move on. I mean, it's very important not to fall in that trap, because psychologically speaking, you are on your way to serious mental problems. Yeah, that's what they want to do too, because that way they can institutionalize you.

Yeah, of course. That's the game. Yeah, that's their end.

But it's not even that they are targeting a particular individual. It's not, except in your case. It's obvious.

But in your case, you do know that you're being watched. Yeah. It's not a fantasy.

Yeah, I guess that's one of the reasons why they have cameras, you know, publicly positioned everywhere. So everybody recognizes that they're always being watched. And that creates a psychological trauma.

Yeah, trauma. And the basis for trauma is terror. Yeah, so basically, the state is a terrorist.

Yeah. And terror doesn't mean 9-11. No, no.

It doesn't. There are many other ways to instill terror in someone. Many insidious and sneaky ways.

But tell me, when we say being watched, it means also being listened to. Yeah, well, usually when I have these discussions, the Jews next door always listen in their yard, because they can hear me speaking. So, yeah, a lot of the time, they'll hang around the outside of the yard, and they'll deliberately get their dogs to bark, or they'll deliberately do something to try to bother me.

Of course, they can't really hear what's going on, what's being said, but they can, you know, hear that conversation is going on. Mm-hmm. Right.

And anyway, your shows are all over the news. So that's good. They can listen to them again.

If they're not, I mean, if they haven't had enough, that's a good thing. Yeah, well, it just shows that this sort of content is what they don't want you to publish, because they're reacting to it. You know, they're getting all in a panic mode whenever you say something about them or expose them, because that's the greatest threat to their power.

At the same time, they are quite, I mean, convinced, and surely rightly so, that they are in full control. Yeah, you can see that sort of the arrogance. I don't know who said it, but something about how the Jew has a sort of, you know, cowardly obsequiousness when he's not in power, and then when he becomes in power, then he has sort of nasty arrogance.

Yeah. And that's coming out more and more at this time, where they become more and more dictatorial in their authoritarian personality. Back to Foucault, there's something he helped me a lot to understand, but he didn't explicitly state it in none of the books I've read from him, at least, is that if paranoia affects, let's say, common people, it also affects the ruler.

The Asian ruler was particularly paranoid. Why? Because he, I'm referring here to the works, to the books of the French political scientist Montesquieu. Yeah, Asian despotism.

That was the spirit of the law, or there were different books? Yeah. Asian despotism. The despot is also paranoid.

Why? Because no matter how much he is in control of the situation, he always tends to believe that someone is going to, I mean, to come after him. You see someone that he

knows, but perhaps someone doesn't know, perhaps someone around him in his entourage, perhaps someone in the people, something might be going on in the people, in the slaves, among the slaves, a coup might be organized, who knows? That's the way that kind of psycho thinks, you know, he's paranoid. Someone somewhere may want to make a coup and the same is true for today's political schemers.

Have you ever seen a picture of the Pope driving around with his bulletproof bubble vehicle? Yeah, although he has a reason. Yeah. Hmm.

But they are fundamentally paranoid. And no matter how tight is their web, yes, yes, no matter how tight is the web they have woven, they still think that there is a danger, hence, hence, total surveillance. And even if, where was that surveillance? Total, global, absolute.

The paranoid, the paranoid ruler would still fear that it's not absolute, total. No, because they know that there are some people who are willing to sacrifice themselves. Perhaps.

But we are here, we have here, in my opinion, one of the reasons, of the fundamental reasons for the launching of the current masquerade. Right, the coronavirus. Yeah, frankly.

Was the, was any danger for the political schemers in office? Was there any social danger? I think the yellow vests in France were picking up at that time. It was the yellow vest, as I know, I didn't mention it to you. The web, they had, it was found out, it was found out, sorry, and I checked it myself, on the Who's Who website.

You know, with all the domains, names, and so on, you can check when exactly a website was created, and you can have all the information about that website. I checked it, and everyone checked it. The yellow vest website was created two years before the movement even began in France.

Where was it created? If I'm not mistaken, in Colorado, Denver. Okay, yeah, that's basically the Defense Advanced Research Projects Institute, or agency, which is like the second seat of government is in Denver for the United States. So, I mean, of course, in the movement, in the Gilets Jaunes movement, there were people who were sincere about the, it was sincere, but it doesn't mean that they have not been used.

Right, that's probably, yeah, they're creating organic movements, so they're not really organic, they're just created, and then they just allow them to have a sort of influence, normal average people, and then that makes it look even more real and legitimate in the eyes of the average person. Yeah, and it's, at the same time, it's very handy for the political schemer in office here, because they are elected for five years. Yeah, okay, for the first two years of his being in office, the media had only one word in their mouth, Gilets Jaunes.



So, all of the problems. Yeah, it's a distraction. Yeah, that's a very good distraction.

And now, he's got two more years in office, and as a coincidence, well, for the next two years, media will only have one word in their mouth, coronavirus. How handy. Haha, how handy.

That's even what the Jews had done when they created the Federal Reserve System, they did it on Christmas Eve so that they could get away with it. They're basically always this sort of distraction and scapegoating and shifting attention away from what they're doing. Yes, yes.

Migrants, so-called migrants. I watched a video yesterday that was recommended to me by a correspondent of mine. So-called migrants, invaders, keep on disembarking, if I may say, on European coasts, even in England, even in England.

Yeah, you can tell that what they're doing with this corona is to try to build the police state up, disempower the populace, the white populace, and then fill society up with the foreign invaders as an arm that they're bringing in to try to destroy us. Yes. For four months, I'm sure that hundreds of thousands of invaders were imported legally here, I'm sure.

Under, I mean, under the guise of the confinement, you see. Yeah. And they're also letting them out of the jails, especially in the States.

Yes. They are so cunning and frankly vicious that I wouldn't be surprised if it was one of their goals. I wouldn't.

To try to mass-genocide us through using these savage beasts. Yes. Basically, they know that they've won the game.

Most nationalist groups are infiltrated to the core. And I know what I'm talking about, right? Yeah. Is anyone in this movement at all? Yes.

As far as England, at least, and France, of course, and Italy are concerned, I mean, all those groups are infiltrated to the core. To the point that, just an anecdote to, I mean, illustrate my point, to the point that a few years ago in Germany, they dismantled a so-called neo-Nazi group, small group. And so there was a trial.

But while the trial started, it could not go on. Do you know why? Do you know why? Why is that? Well, because all the persons of the small group that had been sued, it turned out that they were government agents. Yeah, I thought that was it.

All of them. But simply, I mean, something must have gone wrong in their offices. I mean, the information was not passed on.

Yeah, I guess that just goes to show the depth of their infiltration that they don't even

know who their own operatives are to some extent. But that's not going to be any saving grace for people because that just shows that everything is pretty much pervaded by these types. Yes.

I mean, this is worth of a novel. It's quite incredible. I mean, they've infiltrated so many groups with so many people that they must be left with, I mean, yeah, making up most of the staff of those groups.

Of course, they are not all aware that the other guy is also a government agent. They're not. But that way they can get them to spy on one another.

That's why they put them in teams. They have one spy on the other one. Exactly.

Yeah. But someone at the top knows it. Well, it's all compartmentalized so that even people in the government who might be somewhat decent and on the side of their own people, they couldn't do anything because there's so many checks and balances that they have no real ability to create any changes.

Yeah. On that matter, I'm convinced that there is no decent person in office, and even less so in administration. I am convinced that they've selected them very carefully.

And no, there's no one. No, no. That's an old dream, but I'm sure that you don't entertain it.

That's an old dream of nationalists and racialsists. They had the dream that someone there is watching. So-called hats.

Yes. No, that's simply not true. For a long time in France, or even in Europe, they thought that there were policemen who were on their side.

Yes, they were sure. Well, they were beaten by the police, but some of them still think that the police can be with them. Sure.

Dream on. Yeah, I've tried to do that in my propoganda to try to reach out to people before. But yeah, I do that more in a way, more only just as a token effort.

I don't really have much faith that they'd be doing anything at all. My only hope for the future was that society would just somehow collapse and that their plans would blow up in their faces, that they wouldn't be able to maintain their system. And then they would eventually get removed from power, the Jews and all their cronies.

But yeah, you can never really be sure if there's any hope at all in that regard. We've discussed the notion of collapse. I mean, I'm not, of course, I don't have, as they say, the truth.

But this is the only for us way out where, yes, the collapse of the system, clearly. So yes,

yes, the only. The only thing that any pro-white or racist person can do is just to focus on trying to survive and maybe assisting those of their own kind to survive and just withdrawing from the system as much as possible.

And being a gray man, I guess, is the word. I would say care for yourself, because as we discussed in one of the first email, the beginning of our conversation, of our email conversation, there are so many crooks and psychopaths and opportunistic people among our, in quotation marks, ranks, so many of them. Yeah, I learned that myself in the last couple of years when I tried to reach out to all sorts of other people, they would either backstab me or even steal money from me or else they would slander and vilify me for no reason all of a sudden.

So, yeah, it's not really, it's just like walking through a landmine field. Basically, you're going to be blowing yourself up if you involve yourself in any groups or organizations. Your worst enemy becomes the one who is supposed to be a friend.

Yeah, pretty much. And let's not underestimate the number of them who are on the, well, the police payroll. Let's not underestimate them either of their own choice, because they are opportunistic and all they want in life at the end of the day is to make money, or because, or you say, well, they did something one day and, well, the police holds them.

Basically, they compromise. Yeah, they have a file against them. I've tested, this is something and I'm not, you know, this is not hot air.

All that I'm saying, I've witnessed it. I used to know someone who was well in the know and who showed me things and so I could check for myself. It's not a, it's not a fantasy.

Many, many of them are actually, well, double agent, in quotation marks. These are not James Bond, of course, they are mediocre individuals, but the system uses them for its own purpose. And they, yes, they, of course, they are too happy to help the system when they are paid to do it, and too happy to help the system when they know the system could come down on them, as they have a nice file on them, if they did not obey.

The web is really huge. Yeah, so you think that it's, is it a possibility to try to involve yourself in more primitive living and just go off into the woods or the country somewhere and just try to set up a local community? It depends on the actual situation of each person. Did you understand? I mean, we are here now.

Sorry, you were there, I'm here. What is our situation? The financial situation, of course, is paramount. Let's be realistic.

Same goes for those who are listening. Is there a possibility to leave and to go and settle somewhere, in a place which is less affected for now by the forces that are so powerful here? It all depends on, basically, yes, on one's financial situation. Because what can you

do when you don't have any money? That's the thing, you see.

Yeah, yeah, don't expect to get any charity from anybody or, you know, let them, or expect them to give you some type of loans or, you know, let you live off their property as a slave or work for them or something, because you can never be too reliant upon what people represent themselves to you. And you don't want to just wind up in a place with minimal to no resources or skills and then just end up basically having to sell off whatever land you got or something and then wind up dead in the street or something. If one has relatively enough money, I think that's the way you should go, yes.

Yeah, so that's just a question of income source and then from there, once you get a, somehow, through whatever means, a stable income source, then go and relocate in a small area away from the major cities. If you've got some financial basis, then you can see things coming. Otherwise, it becomes far more difficult, if not impossible.

But the system sees to it that, I mean, some people do not have this, that kind of opportunity. The system sees it to it. So, yeah, it's better to do it before it's too late.

Especially if you're known by the system that they might, you know, they'll do whatever they can to prevent you from having employment because the Jews and their informal networks will just slander your reputation or, you know, they own all the companies and everything else. So, if you're going to try to get any employment, then you have to be hired by them. Human resources officers are typically Jews or minorities or females or feminists.

So, you're not going to be hired. You'll be one of the last people that they will hire for any employment, all things being equal, no matter what your skill level is. What skill do one need nowadays to work? That's a joke.

Most people, except of course in some branches of industry, no need to mention them, but most people nowadays, they push buttons. What they do is they click to earn a living. That doesn't require any skill.

Any monkey, say my respect to them, any monkey can do that. There's a very, very deep idea, well idea, it's not even an idea. It's an insight given by Baudrillard in simulacra and simulations.

That's John Baudrillard, simulacra and simulations for people in English who want that. An insight that is given, it doesn't last long. I cannot quote it now.

It's a shame because I don't have the English translation. But what he says in a nutshell is that, yes, basically one's function in today's society and the money one earns in that or that job has nothing to do with any skill whatsoever. Well, it's just connections basically.

Basically connections and being on the same wavelength. Yes. Because it is quite obvious that some people, well, those who belong, who are on the same wavelength, have some sort of antennas.

Yeah. Yeah. I've experienced that myself in different cases where the human resources officer would do what they could to try to get you hired if they liked you and vice versa.

If they had an inherent dislike to even working in the lowest job, you know, a minority, non-white human resources officer has that power, then they'll deliberately cut you out and not hire you at all because they have that spiteful, jealous, vengeful little attitude of theirs. Exactly. But there was a friend of mine, for some reason, in each of the jobs he entered, at some point, even though he never mentioned any political idea.

Never. At some point or another in the conversation, the name Hitler would pop up. You see? Just as a sort of bait.

Just as a sort of bait. Right. Yeah.

To see how he'd react to the sound. Yeah, exactly. Yeah.

The Jews do that all the time. They always reference Hitler. One time, long ago, I was rooming with this person who I found out was a Jew and they were trying to converse with me, you know, mentioning Hitler and stuff like that to see how I'd react.

So you basically have to develop an ability not to react to stimuli. You have to be very stoical or self-controlled. But at that time, had you made your views clear in public? I think that I might have.

This was, again, I relocated to this one place and prior to that, I think I was known possibly before that, several years before, because I had spoken to a Jew once in this private school where there's lots of Jews. So I spoke to the Jew and I didn't know almost anything about Jews. I said, there are a lot of Jews here, you know, and then he got all uncomfortable and stuff like that.

Yeah. So that was, I think that was one of the first times that actually explicitly mentioned, referenced Jews. And that was in, I think, 2001 or something like that.

So. Oh, yeah. In that case, you can be sure that they won't, I mean, let you get away with that and they will try to make you say more, to be more explicit.

Yeah. At that time, he didn't really answer me too much, though. He just got uncomfortable and just sort of said like, yeah, or something like that, so far as I remember.

But. Yeah. But here in North Korea, sorry, what used to be France, says that in public, there are too many Jews here.

Say that. Even too many Arabs or too many Polynesians or too many, too many Moroccans. Say that.

And I'm not, you know, this is not an overstatement to say that you are in the police station, at the police station within, you are sent to the police station within 30 minutes. I would say that in public, I mean, whether you're at your job place or in whatever public place. All right.

You end up in jail, well, at the police station within 30 minutes, depending on for the first, the closest police station is. Oh, yes. So, well, Canadians are so, so tolerant, open minded, I would say.

Now, say something like there are too many Icelanders in Paris or too many Norwegians in Marseille. Well, you could say it again and over and over again without. Yes, double standard.

It's not the same to that extreme here, of course, but it's getting to that point now where basically anytime you say the word, if you were to say the word nigger in public, then that would immediately, everybody would sort of cough under their breath and stare at you, this hostile look. But it's still not technically illegal to say that at this very moment, so far as I know. But they're working toward that with these so-called hate speech laws.

And this case I'm in right now, they're trying to associate the firearms that I had in my place with the hate speech so they can set legal precedents to try to, you know, strengthen their legal precedents to make the speech associated with violence. I fully understand. I fully understand your case.

Now, Loki, I need to make a five minutes pause. All right. OK.

OK, I'll be back. Yeah. All right.

So I'll just discuss that. That issue about the sort of panopticon of society and how it's becoming ever more totalitarian and controlled. And that's obviously what their intention is, to work it toward that point through these dialectical strategies, false flag terrorist events that they engineer to traumatize the population and to pose it in the media over and against that.

The their moral, quote unquote, moral issue about how anybody who doesn't go along with with censoring and condemning what what they call anything related to racial discourse becomes this terrorist figure, this violence, this vehicle of violence potentially. And so you have the notion of pre-crime with respect to that pre-crime. Yeah, you're right.

You're right. That is very much that is that is very reminiscent of the Soviet Union. Yeah, they had psycho prisons in the Soviet Union.

No, pre-crime. The intention. You see the intention.

And that's where psychiatry gets hooked into the control. You know, they use that as a means of railroading people through the system that they don't like by just labeling them mentally ill. We will come back on that when I'm back.

OK. OK. Yeah.

Give me five minutes. Thanks. Sure.

So the notion of pre-crime that's basically deliberately designed to work in conjunction with psychiatry so that they, the Jews, the controllers can use the discourse of psychiatry to justify rounding up anybody who speaks outside of their consensus reality, which is the the. Obviously, the egalitarian pacifism is what I would boil it down to in its simplest form is you have to be a pacifist and you have to be an egalitarian in order to be permitted to exist in this society. And if you do not, then you are basically vilified as a criminal.

So it becomes a crime simply to not explicitly go out of your way to virtue signal based upon the the morals or mores of society, which are pretty much along those very restrictive lines, Christian, liberal or whatever other new age variant it may be, that you have to be within this paradigm, within this mentality. And if you're not, then you're out. You're basically not considered a person.

You're considered an un-person. And I think Foucault's works are pretty valuable in the analysis of that, of what they do to people. I think it might have been the birth of the clinic where he discusses psychiatry as this this genre of discourse, this discursive genre or form of rhetoric that's used as an instrument of power to justify the imposition of physical power on the populace in the name of, of course, these abstract terms that the Jews hide behind—humanity, love, peace, equality—anything pacifistic and egalitarian, anything that is anti-race.

You have to be an anti-racist in order to be a part of their system. You can't just be neutral, you can't be silent, but you have to be explicitly against that. So that will lead into ultimately what I believe it might have been Emmanuel Macron or Nicholas Sarkozy had said about a forced mixture of the population as some type of a quote-unquote moral obligation.

So in other words, basically genocide, that they're going to codify genocide and make it legally obligatory. Now they've already put endless amounts of social pressure on people to forcibly intermix with those of different kinds so that they do not have any, you know, they're not allowed to be pro-white, they're not allowed to be conscious of their own ancestral history and identity, that of the whites, of the Aryan tradition. So from there, from that informal precedent, that culture, then they codify it.

That becomes a legal matter where it becomes legally mandatory to race-mix. Or even maybe, you know, they'll start creating euthanasia, so-called, or suicide, assisted suicide, where they'll try to put endless amounts of pressure on white males, white males and white men, whenever white men exist, to basically allow themselves to be subjected to assisted suicide as a means of, you know, doing away with the evil white man, the sort of Christian sin expiation complex that they're imposing on people through this traumatic mind control. I'm not too sure, Bruno, if you heard what I had said there.

I was just discussing Foucault and how they use the discourse of psychiatry to justify imposing physical power on people, and how they're going to eventually, Macron or Nicolas Sarkozy, I think, had stated that it's going to be, like, legally mandatory to mix, to basically genocide white people, to force them to intermix with the non-whites at some point. What needs to be pointed out is that racial mixing didn't stop 30 years ago, right? In France, it is estimated that, in the South, 30% of the population that you would call white, who indeed look quite white, are mixed persons with much Semitic blood. In Italy, the figures are even higher, not to say Spain.

Yeah, because of the Moorish invasion in Spain, and that was probably orchestrated by Jews in the first place. In France, too, I guess, you know, they had the Moroccans and the Algerians and so forth that were engaged. No, no, I'm referring to figures that were gathered before any mass immigration started.

Yeah, that's what I mean, that there was probably some intermixture because of the raiding, the raiding of France and Europe by the Arabs. Mm-hmm. In Spain.

But in France, there was no such invasion or occupation. And yet, just as in Italy, Portugal, and Greece, the level of Semitic blood in people's veins is very high, in fact. So, mixing hasn't started, obviously, 30 years ago, but it's very important that people clearly see that, because too often they tend to think that, yes, mixing started with mass immigration from the third world countries.

No, the reason why most people here in Europe welcome colored people is that they are mentally, spiritually, in quotation marks, colored people, because biologically they are mixed. That's it. That's why they are welcome.

That's why. Because they don't have that sort of purity of soul. I didn't understand the word.

They don't have a purity of soul. Oh, yeah. No, no, no, no, no.

Yeah, yeah, exactly. But now, we are all more or less mixed persons, but it depends with whom our ancestors are mixed, you see. And even in the case of someone who was, I don't know, a great father or a great, great, great father, married a, I don't know, a Semitic Italian, even in that case.



Yeah, introduces mixture into their bloodline. Yeah, well, even in that case, when a white man would look white and act reasonably like a white should, the Mendelian laws come into play. Right.

Gregor Mendel, the geneticist. Yes. Recessive and dominant.

You've heard about those, about that terminology, right? Yeah. Recessive genes and dominant genes. So, in other words, that even though they're white-looking, they have recessive genes of non-whites, and that contaminates their soul.

The soul is distorted. Yes, but this point should be deepened. Let's go back to that example that I've just taken about that man, say, Frank, who look white and behaves reasonably like a white person should.

It turns out that one of his ancestors married a Semitic Italian woman. Yeah. Italian woman with a Semitic background.

So, in his veins will flow, necessarily, some Semitic blood. Right? Yeah. Let's say, we're not going to use percent.

No, we won't. Either the genes, the Semitic blood in his veins can be dominant or they can be recessive. If they are dominant, it means that the person is fundamentally Semitic.

So, would their physical physiognomy reflect that, probably? No, not necessarily. No, no, no. You have blonde hair, blue eyes, English, or, for that matter, North American, who are more Jews than a Jew.

Yeah, I guess so. Well, it's not a figure of speech. Again, it is because plastic surgery may have played a role, by the way.

We won't go in that direction because that would lead us too far and in not so well-known territories. But let's keep at the back of our minds the fact that plastic surgery, which was created before most people think it was, let's keep that at the back of our mind. It's possible that it has played a part in the shaping of an Anglo-Saxon, blue eyed, white haired type.

Either the genes, the Semitic genes are dominant and then this person will, as he's aging, as he's getting older, he is more and more like a Semitic person does, and thinks. But, on the other hand, if the Semitic blood that flows in his veins, because one of his ancestors married a Semitic, an Italian woman with Semitic background, the Semitic background, then the white element in him will sort of obliterate the effect of the Semitic genes. Yeah, that's what Miguel Serrano, in one of his books, he talks about how the solution to the Jewish problem being forcibly mixing the Jews out of existence, either that or ostracizing them on a lone island like Madagascar.

If not that, then it would just be extermination. But he said that mixing the Jews' genes with others against their Halakhic law could lead to the destruction of the Jewish type, so that it won't be bound up with whatever dark entities it's bound up with. That's what he claims anyway.

That wasn't exactly my point, my view, the view that I was expressing. No, not exactly, but to rebound on Serrano's views, I would say that for that people to, well, for it to disappear as Serrano wants it to, in each person that is born from a Jew or from a person or two persons with Jewish blood, the Semitic blood would have to be recessive. What does that mean in terms of breeding, in terms of pairing? In order for that to exist or to be the end result, would Jewish women have to interbreed with some type? I don't know.

Unfortunately, there is no clear-cut answer. That's when nature, for lack of a better word, comes into play. But, and this is another of Evola's insightful views, we are not born by chance according to a tradition whose origins are to be found in northern India.

So, basically, according to an Hinduist tradition, a person chooses his birth. So, basically, before being born, you already, well, you choose what you're going to be. That's to do with sympathetic resonance, is it? I'm not too familiar with that notion.

Oh, it just means that you're on the same wavelength as whatever circumstances that you gravitate toward. Yes, yes, yes. Certainly.

But then, when born, of course, anything and everything can happen. It's the law of mixing. It's impossible to predict, except that, of course, some eugenicists would say that it's not unpredictable and that marriages need to be arranged so that people with the best genes marry each other.

Yeah. Yeah. But serenity wants the Jewish people to disappear.

I'm not sure. Well, first, I'm not sure it's possible, really, because they intermarry so much that their blood is basically bred in tens, hundreds of millions of people. Yeah, of course, the idea that that could ever be made to work, or that that would imply a centralized authority that could impose those conditions on people in the first place, as some type of racial law.

And in order to get to that point, you'd actually already have to have defeated the Jew in order to impose that. Exactly. So that's impossible.

That's what the Germans in Nuremberg did. Yeah. But their intention was not to suppress the Jewish people.

Yeah, just to purify themselves. Yes. Well, there were plans, as you know, to relocate them or to resettle them in various parts of the world.

Yeah. Madagascar was one of them. Yes.

And why not? I mean, that wasn't a bad idea. I think someone had said that because the Jews are somehow related to Lemuria and Lemurians, that Madagascar was like a remnant of Lemurian stock. So that that would be appropriate for them to live in that region.

And they can just, you know, finish themselves off in their own area with their own kind, or sink or swim on their own merits, basically. Yes. Without parasitical usury.

But that's another thing than saying, one, that trying to find a way to get rid of, I mean, physically, if that's Serrano's views. Yeah, I think that's what he had recommended in Menuh for the Nan to come. Well, realistically, I mean, needless to be a genius to realize that it's hardly possible.

And even if it was possible, hardly to be wished. I mean, no one. I mean, we don't.

We don't wish to genocide anyone. Yeah, well, I'm just saying that that would be the solutions that he spoke of. The solutions to the Jewish problem would be either removal or genetic, you know, mixing their genes so that they don't enable any sort of mixture with whatever entities they're bound up with.

And then also, if not that, then a physical extermination. I think that was what he had said, something along those lines. But I'm pretty sure he didn't advocate any genocide either.

It is, but. But in any case, that mixing is already effective. As you know, as I've just said, there are tens and hundreds of millions of people with semitic blood flowing in their veins nowadays.

So to cut a long, well, in a nutshell, to, yes, to solve the Jewish problem. You would have to see to it that the genes, the semitic genes in all those who bear some have a dominant part. And then that way you could distinguish between those who are Jews and not.

Well, by the way, they think, they act, yeah. Yeah, there are obviously all sorts of defining traits of Jews, as I wrote about in this this short handbook, who is the Jew, the Jew identifier document that goes through that. I don't, I haven't heard about that book.

It's just like a couple of pages that I put together that, that more or less encapsulate the general traits and behaviors and appearances of Jews. And then it gives references to the turn of the last century, a lot of racialist science, anthropological works where Jews are discussed in their physiognomy and their behavior. And that based upon references from the Jewish encyclopedia and various other Jews from around that time, like the late 19th and early 20th century.

Mm hmm. But practically, in a racial state, people would have to, I mean, would have to act, to think and to act in the way a white person is expected to. You see, so we would be beyond the physical aspect of a person, it would be quite easy to ascertain whether some, which race of the soul of the spirit, to which race of the soul of the spirit someone belongs.

Yeah. I mean, in daily life, in one's job, very easy. You start to lie, you start to slander people, you, well, you have no place in that society.

That's all. Yeah. And of course, all of that is just more an idealized conception of what should be.

But of course, how can we get there from this point, if anywhere, if there's any stability of that, given the pervasive influence of the Jew in society? Yes, but we're talking about a racial state such as that was that was founded by the National Socialists a long time ago. You see, without a such a state, it's impossible to move on. Yeah.

So the question, of course, becomes, how do we get to that point from this point in time? And I think this this point has been addressed. Yeah, that the only solution is basically just to try to reform your own community or go off into the smaller areas and detach yourself from the modern world. And anyway, big, big or large, large communities are the problem.

Even today, you can check that, you can ascertain that. I mean, who, which countries in Europe are in the best position economically, financially? Well, small countries or countries with a. With very few people take Norway. Right.

Yeah. Even when take Denmark, Sweden, Finland, leaving aside that these are a gynecocracies, I mean, female led countries leaving that aside. Switzerland also huge communities, the huge, the bigger community, the more open it is to to destruction and to decomposition.

Yeah, because it becomes excessively complex as a as a system. Yeah. People no longer know each other personally.

And that's when things like secret societies can be born, can be created. But people who are in the crowd can start making plans, conspire to to overthrow the legitimate ruler. So at the end of the day, at the very end of the day, at midnight, perhaps to quote for once the New Testament at midnight.

And the problem, the big problem with the capital B and a capital P is lies in the following sentence from the Bible, from the ancient Old Testament. Grow and multiply. Right.

Yeah. Be fruitful and multiply. Be sorry, be fruitful and multiply.

This is the Pandora box, Pandora box, the capital P and a capital B. That's the end of the end of any any racial community, truly racial community. That's the end. No.

So practically, practically looking what it means. Very practically, say tomorrow by some miracle, a racially grounded state comes to light in a white country. OK.

That country has colonies, right? Right. I guess it could do that in more out of the way countries. So third world countries, people.

Yeah. Well, France. Anyway, I mean, pieces of land of land can be bought in any African or South American or Asian country.

It can be bought. That's not a problem. OK.

There would be a selection of people, those who are with being with being a, of course, not a citizen that's a rationalist and Enlightenment terminology, but a member of the community. You see, we don't even we don't even we no longer have the words to do to define concepts and realities properly. Yeah, we've been so alienated from the community.

All that is all those words do not do not fit. I mean, guess you mind shaft in German would be better. Your mind shaft.

Um, but practically, it wouldn't be long before the selection would took place. It would be based on the observation of the the attitude of the acts, actions of people. You know, you're worth living in a white community or you're not.

Many people would leave because they are they have that disease that is called the right. I mean, cosmopolitanism. Yeah.

Yeah. They have that disease. So they would leave.

Many of them would leave. Of course, they would not leave before they have paid what they stole to the rationally conscious white. OK.

Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

Yeah. They love life. They love colored people.

Well, it would be free to live in African, South American or Asian countries. It would be much welcome. So many would leave as to others.

Well, I mean, as I just pointed out, for countries like France and even England, which still have colonies, they would be deported. Yeah. So you're saying that the best procedure is just to sort of recolonize our own countries first through segregating yourself from them and then build communities that way.

And then from there, potentially even branch out and create colonies in non-white countries. The colonies for them, they would be free to live among colored people as they love them. So they can love them in their countries, not here.

Yeah. I've often speculated that myself, that if these egalitarians claim that they love non-whites so much, then they should go and live with them in their countries instead of living off the backs of white people and white people's societies. But that's how they make their money and that's how they get their social capital.

There's a lot of these types who flee the city, these egalitarian whites from the upper class, especially. They flee the cities and then they go into smaller communities and then they bring their same egalitarian mind pollution into the smaller communities and facilitate the invasion of non-whites into those communities as well, because they can't clear their mind of that sort of mind virus of egalitarianism. Mass deportation.

Oh, at the beginning, yes, I must admit, it would look like we act like a sort of Asian despot. I must admit that. But it would be, I mean, there's nothing else that can be done.

I mean, the situation is so bad that they would have, we can say that they would force us to use such measures, to take such measures against them. It is them who, by their cosmopolitanism and their love for the colored people, would force us to act that way. We would be so sorry, but we would have to and we would.

So mass deportation and that would represent millions of people. It makes sense. I mean, they're already living in a multicultural jungle, so they may as well go there.

Yeah. So go and live your life where you apparently always wanted to live it, to the point of importing it through colored people here. But millions of people would