

## **Are We Winning?** by Dr. [William Pierce](#)

People often ask me, “Are we making any progress? Are we winning? Can you see victory ahead?”

I answer thus: “Yes, we are making progress, but not enough. The Enemy, despite a few setbacks he has suffered recently, is gaining ground faster than we are. Therefore, we cannot claim to be winning at this time. Nevertheless, I can see victory ahead – far, far ahead, and the road to that victory is rocky indeed. It runs through a vale of sorrows the likes of which we have never yet experienced.”

Let me explain my answer, because a full understanding of it is essential to all of you who have made, or may soon make, the decision to travel that road.

The Alliance has gained new members in the past year, and we have increased our capability for generating and distributing the printed word, although our rate of growth has not been what we would like. The real progress we have made, however, is of a different sort. It is progress toward a correct assessment of our situation and of its necessary remedy, progress toward the new outlook and the new attitude and the new attitude we must have before we can begin winning, progress toward truth.

There was a time, 10 years or more in the past, when virtually all racially conscious, decent White Americans were “conservatives” or “right wingers,” and all “radicals” and “revolutionaries” were either Jews or degenerate Whites. Gradually, however, the realization has dawned on more and more White Americans that the situation in which our race has gotten itself admits to no “conservative” remedy.

A correct assessment of the implications of the biological time bomb which the Enemy has built in American is beginning to be made. Former “right wingers” are beginning to understand that the growing non-White army of occupation in America, now 40 millions strong, cannot be made to go away by writing any number of letters to their Congressmen or by passing any Constitutional amendment or by undertaking any other sort of reform. It is a biological problem, and it requires a biological solution. There is no other way.

Without a doubt, those who have understood the unpleasant fact are still only a tiny minority, far outnumbered by those who will waste untold time and resources trying to get Mr. Wallace or Mr. Reagan elected next year. But the mere fact that ATTACK!, with its uncompromisingly revolutionary message, is now read by tens of thousands of substantial and respectable citizens each month – and not just by the “losers” and social dregs who are always ready for a revolution – is an indicator of real progress.

Willingness to recognize the necessity of revolution, as opposed to reform, is only the first part of the change in attitude we have been working to bring about. It is far easier to tear down an old, decayed structure than it is to erect a new, sound one in its place. What we must do now is infuse our revolution-oriented minority with a new outlook, a new world-view which will not only sustain them on the long

and difficult road ahead but will guide them in the building of a new society and a new world when victory has been won. Otherwise that victory will not be lasting.

This is an important point. One does not simply take a number of small businessmen, lawyers, housewives, students, farmers, and factory workers, convince them that the government in Washington is filled with traitors who need to be hanged, and then build a revolutionary army from these people who will proceed to do what needs doing. First, the task facing them is so difficult that extraordinary motivation is required. Second, they must have a unifying creed which serves as a guide to proper action in all matters.

We have until now concerned ourselves almost exclusively with various practical matters involved in building our army and in fighting the Enemy. We have worked to increase the circulation of ATTACK!, to distribute leaflets, and to do other necessary things, but we have not devoted as much thought as we should to the spiritual side of our struggle. Now we must work harder than ever at the things we have worked at before, but we must also begin making sure that we all know the answers to certain fundamental questions. Among these questions are: Why is it necessary that the White race maintain its biological integrity? What is God's will in this matter? What is the proper relationship of the individual to his race, and of the White race to the rest of Creation? In what way do our lives have an absolute meaning and value? What is the purpose of man's existence? How does the individual attain immortality? What are the basic values on which we want to build a new society?

It should be noted that these questions aren't new. But our answers to them are, even though in some cases we may simply be looking at an old answer in a new way. And the integrated whole of which the answers to these questions are parts is the new creed which must sustain and guide us. The degree to which we assimilate this creed and live by it is just as much a sign of progress as the numbers of ATTACK! newsracks we set up or the number of leaflets we are able to put into circulation. In the long run it will be more necessary for our victory than anything else.

To some the foregoing may seem an exaggeration. They may say: "We know who the Enemy is. The only other thing we need to know is how to destroy him. Tell us how, and let's get on with it. We don't need any fancy philosophical notions." Such an attitude might be acceptable if we were faced only with a tactical problem having a reasonably quick and easy solution, but that is not the case.

The problem before us is one of enormous depth and complexity, and its ultimate solution will be anything but quick and easy. It is so difficult a problem that few will tackle it and fewer still continue to grapple with it for long years on end, unless they first have a completely convincing answer to the question: "is it necessary that we attain the goal we have set for ourselves?"

Is our effort necessary? Are all our sacrifices necessary? Is it necessary for us to prevail over the Enemy?

That question has been asked, in different forms, by men of our race through the ages. Previously it might have been, "Is it necessary for good to prevail over evil?" Or, even earlier, "Is it necessary for the forces of Light to prevail over the forces of Darkness?"

But for us the most general form of the question is: "Is it necessary that the world continue its evolution toward ever higher states of existence?" And, in view of the clearly demonstrated intentions of the Enemy, the specific form of the question which is pertinent to our present struggle becomes: "Is it necessary that the most highly evolved race of man, the pinnacle of Creation, maintain its integrity – that it protect and preserve its unique features and give free rein to its creative urges, rather than drown these things in the cesspool of miscegenation? Is it necessary that man continue his climb toward the superman, rather than plunge again toward subman?"

And if we understand the great, upward course of evolution of the universe, the eternal process of Creation symbolized in our Rune, to be the self-manifestation of God – then it is clear that what we are doing is necessary. Our struggle is that part of God which is in us seeking its own self-realization. It is the struggle of the human toward the divine, of manhood toward Godhood.

In our race this divine spark, this upward urge, has always been too strong to be denied. In this age of the ascendancy of the powers of Darkness, however, the minds of many are confused. The urge is still there, but it has been misdirected. The Enemy has blinded most of us to the fact that the inchoate gases of the void; the silent, frozen mountain peaks; the rustling trees of the forests; the teeming jellyfish of the oceans, and man are parts of the Whole, which is God. God existed before man and will exist after man has surpassed himself, but man is now, for a period, a part of God, of the ever-changing, ever-evolving whole. All the parts of the Whole serve God's purpose, but of those parts only man is capable of a consciousness of that purpose and a willful contribution to that purpose.

Once we have freed ourselves from the false teachings of the Enemy – once we understand the inequality of all things, the inequality of the races – then the consciousness of our purpose can be restored and the necessity of our struggle becomes apparent.

To be continued...

### **The Twin Errors of Liberalism and Egoism** by Dr. [William Pierce](#)

Last month we began looking at the question, "What is the purpose of man's existence?" We saw that there is, in the men and women of our race, an inborn, intuitive urge to order our lives in accord with some purpose beyond the satisfaction of our daily whims. This urge is stronger in some men than in others.

We also saw the importance which this urge, or its degree of fulfillment or non-fulfillment, has in determining the type of world in which we live. Human society tends to be orderly and truly progressive when men with a more highly developed sense of inner direction prevail, and society becomes chaotic, regressive, and decadent when men with a weaker sense of direction prevail, or when all tend to lose or ignore their inner directions.

But even in the best of times, when men with a strong sense of purpose have the upper hand, few--if any--have a true understanding of what that purpose should really be. They feel an inner direction, but

they mistake where it is pointing. And so the great majority of even the best of men go in the wrong direction, following false purposes.

Men strive for the True Purpose, but their striving is in the form of an almost-blind groping for something seen only dimly and indistinctly, like a half-remembered dream. Their imperfect understanding leads them far more often into error than into truth.

The greatest cause of error--the greatest hindrance to a proper response to our sense of inner direction--has been a wrong outlook, a wrong general attitude toward life and the world, a wrong philosophical framework within which we interpret our inner promptings. Just as using a badly flawed lens to read a message distorts it and, more often than not, causes us to misread it, so forcing an interpretation of our sense of inner direction into the wrong philosophical framework distorts it and leads us into error.

The wrong general attitude toward life and the world which is presently leading our people into such grievous error and wreaking such havoc in the world is what is very loosely and generally known as "liberalism." It is what we have called neo-liberalism, in order to distinguish it from the attitude which was called liberalism prior to the 19th century. Its particular aspect which determines the individual's attitude toward himself and which is primarily responsible for the misinterpretation mentioned above is egoism.

Egoism predisposes the individual to ask the wrong questions, or to ask them in the wrong way, as well as to misread the answers he receives. In looking for his proper direction in life, for goals, the neo-liberal asks himself some variation on the question: "How can I achieve true happiness?"

The answer he receives may tell him that he must strive to be "well adjusted" or popular or successful at some endeavor, but the answer was already inherent in the question itself. For egoism is an attitude which considers only the self and ignores the Whole, of which the self is only a part and upon which the self depends for any meaning or significance. It is an immature attitude, an infantile attitude, the attitude of incomplete men.

The egoist may be "religious"; he may babble of helping others or of "serving God." But his vision of God is determined by his egoism, and it is a false vision. It is a vision of a supernatural yet personal father-figure in the sky, an anthropomorphic deity who maintains a personal watch over the egoist, shielding him from certain dangers, helping him achieve the self-gratification he seeks, and waiting to welcome him personally into a heavenly mansion at the end of his allotted three-score-and-ten years of earthly existence. Thus, to the egoist "serving God" is simply another way--a self-deluding way--of serving himself.

But the spiritually mature man of our race, the complete man, has a different vision, a vision with infinitely more distant horizons than that of the egoist. It is a vision which encompasses the Whole, or as much of the Whole as our understanding at this stage of our evolution will allow, and in which the self is seen as a part of that Whole--a vital part, an important part, but, nevertheless, only a part.

And yet even this vision of the spiritually mature man is usually not as clear and sharp as it might be. He must strive with all his will and understanding to see fully and clearly the way in which the part--

the self--is related to the Whole. When that is revealed to him, then he knows with certainty what his purpose is. It is the One Purpose, which we seek here.

And it is the greatest of ironies that, whereas the egoist, seeking only to save himself, ends by losing himself in death, the man who scorns egoism and orders his life in accord with the One Purpose thereby opens for himself the possibility of true immortality, as we shall see.

To be continued . . .

### **Following our race-psyche** by Dr. [William Pierce](#)

Before we proceed further toward the answers to certain fundamental questions, let us fix one fact in our minds: Reason does not, and never has nor ever will, determine our ultimate goals for us. That determination must, by its very nature, be made by our inner sense of direction, by our psyche rather than by our intellect. It is essentially a religious rather than a rational decision.

No matter how clever we become, no matter how far we advance in every realm of science, we can never use our reason alone to answer such questions as: What actions, what modes of behavior, are, by their nature, evil, and what are good? Or, having defined good and evil, why should we strive to do good and to promote good things? Why should we not do evil instead, or remain indifferent to both good and evil? Why should we seek beauty rather than ugliness? What is beauty, anyway? How do we know that the abominations of a Picasso or a Chagall are not beautiful, as the Jews say they are? How dare we assert that Aryan idealism is to be preferred to Jewish materialism? Why should the White race survive and have dominion over the earth? Why not the Jews instead? Or the Blacks? Or the gypsies? Or why not the liberal ideal of a mulatto world of universal equality and sameness? Which should a man, or a nation, seek in life: happiness or greatness?

No, our reason cannot answer these questions. Yet, they *do* have answers, and not arbitrary ones either, subject to the whim or inclination of the seeker. For each man and woman of our race, the answers are the same; they differ only for those of different race. But only our deepest inner selves can tell us what these answers are.

And that, my brothers and sisters, is why it is of such urgent necessity that we learn to seek through the veil that obscures the message our race-psyche has for us. When we have learned to read the runes which God has engraved on our souls, then we can answer the ultimate questions. Then we will know where we are headed and why.

And *then* our reason must tell us the best way to get there. Our reason can examine our subsidiary goals and tell us whether or not they are consistent with our ultimate goals. Reason is a powerful tool, an *essential* tool, for accomplishing our purpose.

Anyone who teaches that intuition alone is sufficient for our purpose is as much a fool and a deceiver as he who teaches that reason alone is sufficient.

The latter error--the error of rationalism--is especially widespread among our people today. Because it has led them to foolishly believe that their values could be justified by reason alone, the Jews have been able to wreak havoc among them with their destructive cynicism.

But the former error--the rejection of reason--is also fatal. We *must* use our wits to save ourselves. If we, like all too many simple souls today, wait for the heavens to part and a voice from on high to instruct us as to our course of action, we shall surely perish forever.

But first we must pierce the veil. And that, as explained in the last three monthly messages, is something which very few men are able to accomplish by themselves, no matter how sincere their intent. So, let me lead you by the hand to some very important answers. Together, the truth will be revealed to us. And then, together, we shall examine it and come to understand it and grow strong in our new understanding.

Come! We are already on the Path. It is a narrow and difficult Path, and dark chasms yawn to the right and to the left of us. The temptation is almost overpowering to turn around and retrace our steps to safer and more familiar territory--or, at least, to stop and cling to a rock while we rest.

But, ahead of us in the mists, there is already a faint glimmering. As we struggle upward a few more steps, the glow becomes brighter, and finally we can see the first part of the message we have been seeking. In fiery characters it tells us; "You cannot go back. You cannot stop and rest. If you seek your destiny, you must continue upward."

Not a very comforting message, indeed, but it tells us more than we might think at first glance. Anyway, there is more to the message, and we only need to go a little further to see the next part of it.

To be continued . . .

### **Following the Upward Path** by Dr. [William Pierce](#)

Last month we received the first part of the answer we have been seeking. It did not seem to tell us much, but in reality it contained the essence of everything else we will learn. Let us think about it for a moment before we go on.

What we are seeking to discover is man's purpose, both individually and collectively. Throughout a billion years of evolution the answer to our question has slowly taken shape and has been written by God on our souls, just as a different answer to an analogous question has been formed in the deepest part of the being of every living creature--and the non-living as well. (That is, the answers are different in detail, but they are all the same in a more general sense.)

In the words of one of our sisters in spirit ([Savitri Devi](#) ed.), the sum of all these answers is the total expression of "that mysterious and unfailing wisdom according to which Nature lives and creates: the impersonal wisdom of the primeval forest and the ocean depth and of the spheres in the dark fields of space."[\[1\]](#)

To each creature and to each race of creatures the answer assigns a role and determines its relationship to the Whole. We can have only imperfect knowledge to the answers which apply to other creatures, to other races, for, although our science can tell us much, we cannot see into their souls.

What is the role of the Negro? It is evident that for the last few hundred thousand years, at least, the Negro's message has, unlike ours, told him to stop and rest. Does it also tell him that, like so many other creatures in the past, his role is finished? Perhaps we will know later.

And what of the Jew? Who can see into those dark and murky depths? Judging only from what we can observe, we might easily guess that his role is analogous, on the human level, to that of the bacterium on the subhuman level: to serve as a ferment of decay and decomposition, infecting and bring about the disintegration of civilizations and races not proof against him. His role is to stand in the Path, cleverly persuading some to turn around and go back, slyly tripping others and causing them to stumble into the depths to one side or the other.

But the message for us is that we must neither turn back nor rest, but must continue upward, overcoming every obstacle in our way.

Upward, where?

Upward, why?

When we ask these new questions, the fiery characters before us shift and change, and now we can read:

"Upward, toward the Creator."

"Upward, because you yourself are not only an instrument of the Creator but a living part of his Being, which is the Whole. While you were unconscious of this truth, you were a very imperfect instrument of his Will. But now the truth has been revealed to you, and as your understanding of that truth grows, so will your degree of utility as an instrument in the service of that truth."

"And so will grow within you the portion of the Whole; so will burn more brightly within you the Divine Spark. And that Spark will serve to guide you further along the path you must follow."

Then, for a moment, the mists clear, and we are able to catch a breathtaking glimpse of what lies ahead of us. It is as if we are standing on a narrow rocky ridge. Behind us it falls off steeply into the dark jungle from which we have been slowly and laboriously climbing for so many eons--a jungle whose tendrils still curl across the ridge for some distance ahead of us, forming snares which will trip us if we are insufficiently vigilant.

But the ridge eventually rises above the last of the jungle and into the crystalline air above. And as our eyes continue to follow the ridge before us, ever upward, mounting to dizzying heights, we can only guess at the dangers which lie there. We already know that there were safer stretches of the ridge behind us, where the climbing was easier than it is now.

But, despite the dangers, the ridge ahead of us remains unbroken--and unending. Finally, it passes beyond the limit of our vision in the starry sky above. Who knows what new worlds it reaches--and then leaves behind it?

All we know now is that, unlike others who must remain in the jungle below, we must continue along this never-ending, always upward Path toward Godhood. But, even as the mists swirl about us once again, we can faintly see the other signs ahead, and we shall soon be able to decipher them. They will tell us more that we need to know in order that we can continue climbing with a sure sense of direction that will keep us from stumbling off the Path.

### **Identity, Purpose, Survival** by Dr. [William Pierce](#)

Dear friends, we have come a long way in five months. Do not be deceived by the brevity or the seeming ease of our progress. What we have learned so far can be stated in a few words, but a full appreciation and understanding of the meaning and implication of those words call for much careful thought. In the coming months we shall devote some of the necessary thought to the elucidation of those parts of our message already revealed, but it will not hurt us to look ahead occasionally to see where we are headed. We can always go back and digest more carefully what we learn.

We have been asking certain questions, and we have begun receiving partial answers to those questions. Taken altogether, our questions can be restated as just three inquiries:

Who are we?

What is our purpose?

What should we do to pursue our purpose?

Viewed as an answer to these three questions--who? what? how?--our message can be broken down into three general categories: Identity, Purpose, Survival. These three categories are all-encompassing.

The first category tells us that we are a part of the Whole, which is God. As we shall see, we are a *very special* part.

The second category tells us that the Purpose of the Whole is the self-realization of God. We shall see, in detail, how our purposes as individuals and, collectively, as a race, coincide with this One Purpose.

The third category tells us that the Whole has pursued its Purpose through the process of natural evolution--where we mean by the term "natural evolution" the whole process of God's creation, both in the inanimate and the animate realms. This has for us the very special requirement that we, in order to pursue our proper purpose, must safeguard our racial identity. We must preserve the very special set of attributes which the Creator has given us. We must, in other words, first *insure our survival as a race* if we are to proceed further along the Path determined by the One Purpose.



Now we have bitten off a great deal. It is time to back up and look at details, so that we can understand what the above generalities really mean.

## **Identity**

So, once again, who are we? What part of the Whole, and why *special*?

The Whole *was* the primordial fireball, and we *are* a part of *that* Whole, in that we are constituted from the same particles which constituted it.

Then the Whole *became* the vast array of young, condensing galaxies, and we *are* a part of *that* Whole also, for the same reason.

As the Whole continued its evolution, solid worlds formed in the galaxies, with stony mountains and heaving seas and soft, enfolding blankets of air. And the only life on these primitive worlds--in particular, the primitive earth--was the immanent Life of the Whole, the same Life which existed in the primordial fireball. God's Urge toward self-realization, toward self-completion. And we *are* also a part of *that* Whole.

Then the Urge brought forth a new manifestation of Life--biological life--on the earth. And this new life multiplied and diversified and evolved, over a period of a billion years and more. While the biological life of the primeval slime gave rise to ever newer, more versatile, higher creatures, the older Life caused the mountains to descend into the seas and new mountains to rise up in their stead and chasms to open in the earth and mighty rivers to form and then dry up again. But it was in the newer form--in biological life--that the Creator's Urge most dramatically manifested itself. For therein the first glimmerings of a new self-consciousness arose.

Before there had been only the deep, immanent self-consciousness of the Whole. But then that self-consciousness began sharpening and intensifying itself in a myriad of different animate creatures. In some it never reached a level much above that in the stones and the stars, but in others it climbed higher.

And a living hierarchy was formed, a hierarchy based on the degree of consciousness of the Whole, on the degree of self-realization of God. And we *are* a part of *that* Whole.

The races of man occupy the uppermost levels of the hierarchy (at least, in *this* corner of God's universe). They are stretched out near the upper end of a continuum which includes every living creature. The turtle, the sheep, the leopard, the gorilla, the Negro, and European man all have their places in the continuum, but at the very tip, the uttermost pinnacle, God has wrought something new and qualitatively different: a new step upward as significant as the step from non-living to living matter.

This new step, this new level of consciousness, which has been attained only by the highest elements of man, and only tentatively even by them, is a level from which its attainees may participate *actively*, rather than passively, in the Creator's ongoing process. They have attained the capacity for becoming the *conscious, willful* instruments of God, the ordained bearers of the upward Urge. In them--in us--the

Divine Spark, which glows to a greater or lesser extent in *all* created things, has finally burst into a tentative, flickering flame.

A full understanding of the meaning of this new development--and of the responsibility which it entails--is something which we will acquire later. Only then will we be able to answer fully the question as to our identity. (An aid to this understanding is a series of articles, now being prepared for [\*ATTACK!\*](#), which will trace the history of our race through the last few hundred thousand years and describe the basic characteristics which determine our uniqueness.)<sup>[1]</sup>

### **Purpose**

And only when we have fully answered that question can we fully comprehend our purpose. Nevertheless, we can gain a *partial* comprehension now, based on what the foregoing tells us of our identity. In fact, knowing our identity is, in a sense, *equivalent* to knowing our purpose. The two are merely different aspects of the same truth.

Another way of saying that is this: Our proper purpose is to be true to our own inner nature. And we have already seen that we are, *in essence*, the bearers of the Creator's upward Urge. Our purpose, then, is to further that Urge, that Divine Motive.

The One Purpose toward which the Divine Motive is directed is the self-realization of the Creator through the never-ending, always upward-striving process of creation. Each stage in this process manifests a higher level of self-consciousness of the Whole, a closer approximation to the ultimate self-realization of the Creator, than the previous stage.

We are now the cutting edge of the Creator's tool, his principal instrument of creation--and, as already mentioned, a *willful, conscious* instrument. We are now also the principal *raw material* of the creative process. We must, therefore, necessarily be transformed ourselves--we must transform ourselves--in that process.

Our purpose collectively, as a race, is to transform ourselves in such a way, through countless future generations, that we continually achieve higher and higher levels of collective self-consciousness, a fuller and fuller comprehension of the Whole of which our race is a part, a more and more nearly perfect manifestation of the Divinity within us.

And our ordained purpose *individually* is to further the purpose of the race to the extent possible during a single generation, a single lifespan.

### **Survival**

Finally, we come to our third question: how? The answer to this question is quite long, and we must postpone most of it until later. It involves, among other things, the entire subject of *ethics*. That is, it tells us how we must *behave*, how we must order our lives and our relationships with others and with the rest of the Whole.

But we can say two things of a very general nature at this point:

First, we must continue to *learn*. We must develop a fuller understanding, despite the unnatural conditions under which we live today, of our true inner nature. As mentioned in the message for February, we must learn to read the runes which God has engraved on our souls. Only then can we fully attune ourselves with the Whole. Only then can we plan for the future with confidence.

Second, we must make our understanding the basis of a movement which will acquire all the necessary means for putting into effect our plan for the future.

That is, we must teach ourselves, and then we must teach others, and then we must act to secure an unopposable power base for the implementation of our teachings.

Next month: some preliminary considerations on *ethics*.

### **Cosmotheist ethics** by Dr. [William Pierce](#)

The personal conduct of those who strive to follow the One Path is based on three foundations: Knowledge, Discipline, and Service.

First comes knowledge--an understanding of the nature of man, of his relationship to the Whole, and of his purpose. Then must come action based on that understanding; we must put our knowledge to work. We must let it direct us in our daily lives, so that we live in accord with our ordained purpose, so that we serve the ends intended for us by the Creator.

Knowledge is our *guide*, and service is our *object*, but discipline gives us the indispensable *means*. Discipline allows us to *actualize* the *potential* strength which our knowledge gives us. Without discipline, our knowledge will remain sterile, our actions weak and ineffectual.

The gaining of knowledge, the attainment of understanding, is a lifelong process, but we have already taken the first steps toward it in the last six months. Let us now consider briefly the proper discipline for translating that knowledge into action in our daily lives.

In the most general sense, the disciplined man or woman is a person whose conscious intellect exercises the fullest possible control over his body and its subconscious needs and desires as well as over the controllable circumstances of his life. In contrast, the completely undisciplined person is a slave to his subconscious nature and to events around him. In view of what we have already learned, then, it is clear that a disciplined person, as the bearer of a higher degree of consciousness than an undisciplined one, is further along the One Path.

But we need more than generalities. We need to fill in all the details of the structure, of the means, which lies between our guiding knowledge and the object of that knowledge. We need a detailed discipline which will allow us to translate our knowledge into service.

Please note that we using the word "discipline" in two slightly different, but closely interdependent, senses: first, in the sense of a general exercise of will, of a subordination of the unconscious to the conscious; and, second, as a specific *regimen*, a code of behavior.

The two senses are related in this way: We want to achieve a major goal, but we find that our untrained will is insufficient for that task; we are not sufficiently disciplined. So we begin with small goals that are within reach of our will, and we institutionalize the achievement of these small goals into a *proper regimen*, thereby accomplishing two things. We strengthen our will--that is, we discipline ourselves in the first sense--and we also shape and adapt our lives to better serve their ultimate purpose. We transform ourselves from impotent dreamers into disciplined and effective instruments of the Creator's Will, of the Devine Motive of the Whole.

Just as all other things are derived from our knowledge, so is it with a proper code of behavior to free us from the ills of this age and return us to the Path. But the subject now before us is a large one, and it will take some time to develop it in detail. It covers everything from sexual morality to our attitude toward private property.

Remember, in all that follows, the prime criterion we use in judging a course of action is the compatibility of that action with our ordained purpose. Let us begin with some considerations on sexual morality, sexual ethics--not because sex sit the most important thing we have to consider, but because we must begin with something, and sex provides an easily understandable application of our prime criterion, thus preparing us to understand the other things which will follow.

A warning, however, is in order. Our sexual ethics, just as other aspects of our ethics, will differ markedly from the code with which most Americans are familiar, namely, the ethics of the TV religion. Many have subconsciously accepted one or more aspects of the TV religion and will not find it easy to purge themselves of deeply ingrained ideas--especially ideas with the strong emotional attachments which sex has. But the time has come for us to decide whether we want to cure ourselves or not.

The primary consideration in our sexual ethics is that sexual intercourse is the means by which we *create* the next generation of our race. It is, in this era of the development of the Whole, the Creator's most important mechanism for self-evolution, for ascending the Path of self-realization.

Thus, it is the *result* of the sex act that is all important. It is, primarily and essentially, an *act of creation*. *What* it is that we create must be the primary criterion for the value and desirability of the act.

The ultimate sexual crime, then is interracial sex. And akin to this is sex which will, or is likely to, create a deformed, ugly, diseased, or other wise deficient child of our own race.

Sexual reproduction, the creation of the next generation, is the *highest personal responsibility* with which each man and woman of our race is charged. The most grievous dereliction of our duty is to shirk or abuse this responsibility. And the way in which we fulfill our responsibility is to exercise the greatest possible care in the selection of a sexual partner--care based on considerations not so much of compatibility as of genetic quality.

As a corollary, to recognize our own shortcomings and, in many cases, to *refrain* from reproducing at all is the way in which we may most completely fulfill our responsibility.

Note that we have not said that sex in which conception is not the immediate object is necessarily sinful. Nor is the use of contraceptives necessarily sinful. It is obvious from the preceding paragraph

that, in many cases, *failure* to use contraception is the sin. For men and women *will copulate*. There is no denying, no halting this. After all, it is not part of our purpose to attempt to contravene Nature, but live in harmony with it. Thus, when a man and woman who, because of genetic shortcomings of one or both, should not create a child are living together, then they are *morally obliged* to use some effective form of contraception.

Contraception only becomes a sin when, for reasons of personal selfishness or personal convenience, it is used by persons of healthy, superior genetic endowment to avoid their responsibility to pass that endowment on to the next generation.

In summary, the primary sin, or category of sins, in the sexual realm is to defile the most precious treasure in the universe--our genetic pool, the genetic heritage of our race. A related sin, a sin of omission, is to willfully fail to enhance that heritage.

After the sin of actual defilement must be ranked sins of *symbolic defilement*. Sexual intercourse with a Negro or a Jew in which contraception is used is among these. Sexual intercourse with an animal, in which conception is impossible, is a sin of the same rank. As is rape. And homosexuality.

Finally, we have certain lesser sins which involve neither an actual nor a symbolic defilement of the Whole, no contravention of our Divine Spirit, but which nevertheless are, or may be in many instances, an abuse of the sex act. Adultery, for example, or polygamy--or even premarital sex--may be frowned upon for good and proper reasons: for reasons of maintaining social stability or for economic reasons. Adultery, which may be regarded as a form of wife-stealing or husband-stealing, does not lead to a health social climate in a community if it is tolerated on any appreciable scale. And pre-marital sex of an irresponsible nature, with no thought for its possible consequences, or by persons without the means to properly care for any offspring, thus casting a burden on the community, is also reprehensible.

But, in any event, the acts in this last category, whether we regard them as sinful or not, are clearly of only tertiary rank.

It is a sign of the sickness of our times and of our radical opposition to that sickness that contemporary society has *inverted* this natural ranking. In most of the Christian churches, for example, extra-marital sex between a man and a woman is considered more sinful than a homosexual relation. In fact, the more "progressive" churches do not regard homosexuality as sinful at all. And none of the major churches forbid the most abominable of all sexual sins--interracial intercourse.

### **Our Eternal Purpose**

by William Luther Pierce

AS WE HAVE seen, our purpose as a race is, first, to safeguard our racial identity, to preserve the very special racial characteristics which the Creator has given us and which allow us, if we choose, to cross the threshold on which we now stand: the threshold between the animal and the divine. And then our purpose is to carefully and consciously, from generation to generation, ascend once again the upward path toward Godhead, toward a complete and perfect self-realization.

And our purpose socially and politically is to build a new society and a new political order with which to facilitate the racial purpose. In this regard, we define social progress and we define political progress as the social or political changes which aid our racial purpose. This is totally different from what is called “progress” today by those who misled and deceived our people.

But a false concept of progress is perhaps the least of the ways in which we have been treacherously led away from our ordained and proper Path. A more basic deviation is the perversion of our attitude toward life itself.

Arthur Schopenhauer said that the very most any man can hope for is a heroic passage through life. He was saying in his own words what has been written into the soul of our race, our race-psyche, by the Creator. What a different message that is from the one written into the Levantine soul, the Jewish soul — the Jewish attitude toward life which prevails today.

A thousand years ago our ancestors in northern Europe had not yet been corrupted. Their attitude is expressed implicitly in all the old sagas. It is the attitude that neither pleasure nor happiness nor power nor wealth is the really important thing in life, but, rather, what is important is the way we conduct ourselves, the extent to which we are true to our own inner nature. That is why honor was valued more than life itself, why it was considered more reprehensible to tell a lie than to kill a man. And it is why dying in the right way was considered as important as living in the right way.

Some of the old sagas spell this attitude out explicitly. For example, the saga of Grettir tells us: “Cattle die and kinsmen die, and so one must die oneself. But there is one thing I know which never dies, and that is the fame of a dead man’s deeds.” Even as recently as [seven] decades ago there was still an Order in Europe which had as a motto *Ewig ist der Toten Tatenruhm*. (The renown of the deeds of the dead is eternal.)

Schopenhauer’s use of the word “heroic” and the sagas’ reference to renowned deeds may in themselves be a little misleading. They do not mean that we should all think in terms of dying heroically on the battlefield, with sword or gun in hand. That, indeed, may be granted to some of us, but the basic message is one of having the proper attitude toward life — and toward death. That is something which all of us can do, even those who think of ourselves as being unheroic.

That attitude is one of living with eternity always in our mind, of living for the sake of eternity instead of living only for the moment. It is the attitude that the individual, who is mortal, is not an end in himself, but lives for and through the Whole — and, in particular, for and through his racial community — which is eternal. It is an attitude that seems to have eluded most of us today.

It is an attitude which is diametrically opposed to the Jewish attitude of materialism and egoism, and yet the alien, Jewish attitude is the one which has been adopted by most Americans. That alien attitude is one of the most important aspects of the spiritual sickness which has infected our people and from which we must make a strong and conscious effort to free ourselves.

The materialist, the egoist, lives only for self-gratification. A “good life” to him or her is a life with lots of money, lots to eat and drink, plenty of sex, new cars, big houses, constant diversions and entertainment. That’s all he lives for, all he cares about, all he understands.

He knows that he won’t live forever — although he doesn’t like to think about that — and he intends to get as much out of life as he can. Neither purpose nor eternity have any real meaning for him. If he thinks about the latter at all, it is only in terms of “buying insurance” by mentioning some church or other in his will. He may even go so far as to pay his “insurance premiums” regularly by dropping something into the collection plate every Sunday.

But when the time comes for him to die, everything he really values slips away from him. He cannot hold on to anything. All that he can see ahead is blackness, emptiness, total dissolution. With a last, desperate effort to hang onto a meaningless, useless, and wasted life, he slips away into nothingness. He utterly ceases to exist.

For a few days or weeks his friends will talk about him. Perhaps even five or ten years after he has gone someone may say. “Hey, do you remember old So-and-so?” But then even the memory of him will be gone. It is as if he had never existed. And all eternity still lies ahead.

It is an eternity of which each of us can be a part — if we choose, and if we are able to free ourselves from the Jewish disease. We can be a part of eternity by simply giving to our lives the meaning and the purpose they now lack — meaning and purpose which extend beyond the lives of any one of us and which we know will be carried on by others. We are talking about a meaning and a purpose which will exist not just in 15 or 20 or 100 years, not just until a successful revolution has been carried out in America and a new social and political order has been built, but which will still exist a thousand years from now, even after there is no longer a separate country called America. They will still exist a million years from now, when mankind has become something altogether different from what it is now — even 10 billion years from now, when the earth’s sun has gone out and countless new suns have been born in other parts of the universe.

By becoming conscious — fully conscious — that we are part of the Creator, who is eternal, and by ordering our lives once more in accord with the Creator’s Purpose, by following the Path — the one true path — we can partake in eternity. We can contribute to it, and we can become part of it.

That task is not a trivial thing. This change of attitude toward life is itself a life-long task. But we can begin that task now, and to the extent that we complete it we can overcome death. We can face death without fear, because we know that we have become part — truly and completely part — of something which is eternal and immortal. (There is also another way in which we — some of us — can overcome death, but we must learn certain things and accomplish certain things before we can understand this other way.)

Beginning now, we can all have a much richer and fuller life just by living no longer for the day — which passes — but for eternal purpose, which never will pass. In order to do this we do not all have to become ascetics; we do not all have to don burlap and live in a cave — although asceticism may be the best way for some of us. There is nothing inherently bad in eating well or in sex or in driving a new car

— so long as these things do not become ends in themselves for us, so long as they do not corrupt our attitude and divert us from our purpose.

What we must all do, however, whether we are rich or poor, young or old, is to make a conscious decision — and that can be done now — that we want to find the Path, that we want to begin reordering our lives and put them in accord with the Creator's eternal purpose.

### **Creating a New Society** by Dr. William Pierce

A wonderful thing about the philosophy which governs our movement is that it is very simple--it is completely summed up in our Affirmation--and yet it is all-inclusive. It tells us everything we need to know. Everything is derived from it.

It tells, for example, what kind of society we want to build in place of the present one. That is it gives us the basic principles which must govern the building of a new society. Since our principles are fundamentally different from those governing any society now on this earth, then our society will also be fundamentally different from those which exist today.

Today societies are categorized in various ways. A common way is according to which members of the society how the power. Thus, we have monarchical society, ruled by a single person, who usually inherits his power. And we have plutocracy, or a society ruled by the wealthiest members. And we have technocracy, or a society ruled by the technicians who keep the wheels of industry and commerce going. And gerontocracy, a society ruled by its elders. And democracy--or monocracy--society ruled, supposedly, by everyone. And, finally, anarchical society, in which, supposedly, no one has power, no one rules.

Another common way of categorizing today's societies is according to the type of economic system which prevails. Thus, we have communistic societies and capitalistic societies, as just two examples.

But note one thing about all above these different types of society. None are defined with respect to any purpose. They are defined according to which members control them, defined according to the mechanics of their operation, but non have any purpose--other than the common purpose of all societies, of course--namely, the static, day-to-day purpose of providing a framework within which its members function, presumably with more efficiency and greater security than they could function without a society.

Of course, the societies with which we are familiar may set goals for themselves: building an irrigation project, for example, or conquering a neighbor, or eliminating smallpox, or increasing the average wage. But these goals do not determine, in any fundamental way, the structure of the society. They do not provide a purpose which determines the essential nature of the society. A monarchical society or a



democratic society which sets out to build a system of dams and canals or to take some land away from the members of another society reminds monarchial or democratic, as the case may be.

But we want to build a society, we must build a society from the beginning, according to principles determined by our Purpose--in other words, a purpose-oriented society. And this is where we part company with all conservatives and with most right wingers. They are concerned with making slight modification to our present society--getting rid of Henry Kissinger, outlawing busing, dismantling the Federal Reserve System--or, at most, with reestablishing the society we had 30 or 40 or 50 years ago, by putting the Blacks back in their places, either in their part of town or back in Africa, and by interpreting the U.S. Constitution once again the way it used to be interpreted.

Now, there is no doubt that such changes would yield a society more agreeable to everyone in this room than the present society, but it would still be a society with no purpose beyond the basic purpose of all societies, which I just mentioned. It might be a safer society, a freer society, a stronger society, a more prosperous society, but we are aiming for something far beyond that.

The conservative, the rightwinger, wants a society, basically, which suits his needs and desires. We are aiming for a society which suits the Purpose of the Creator. And that's a big difference.

There is, however, one aspect of the society we want which is shared with the society most conservatives and rightwingers want, and that is naturalness. Everyone feels this Jewish-cosmopolitan chaos, this multiracial bedlam which passes for a society today is alien, is wrong, is unnatural. If we are to survive much longer we must have a society which is more in accord with our inner nature, a society which suits our race soul, the sort of society we might have expected to evolve naturally among an all-White population, without alien or discordant influences.

A natural society is, among other things, racially homogeneous. It is the social aspect, the social dimension, of a natural environment. It reflects all their characteristics and peculiarities. It is uniquely theirs. It provides for them a lifestyle, it embodies a mode of behavior, which is perfectly attuned to their innermost souls.

A natural society is a society which *feels right*, which *fits*. There are millions and millions of our people today, certainly not just rightwingers, who instinctively feel that this mass-production, nine-to-five, rush hour to rush hour, neon and asphalt and Negro lifestyle which has been forced on nearly everyone today some how just doesn't *fit*.

We want a natural society not just because our souls will be more at ease in such a society, but because, living and working in a society to which we are more closely attuned, we can be more effective. Each of us individually, and our race collectively, can make more progress, in each generation, along the Path ordained for us by the Creator.

Now, a truly natural society is something which is only formed slowly. Its institutions develop and grow over the course of generations. Only thus can it truly mold itself to the soul of a race. It is not something which is transformed over night by an edict of the government, as the alien forces in our present society have repeatedly transformed it in recent years.

And yet we are not talking about a static society but a dynamic one, a truly progressive society. But by progress we mean the advancement of our race along the One True Path, the Path toward Godhood. We do not mean new styles in clothing or automobiles every year, or a revolution in sexual practices every other year.

Although true progress is inherently slow, there are many things which can and must be done very quickly in lay the groundwork for that progress. One of those things, which we can accomplish in the first few months of our new society, for example, will be a drastic revision of the crime situation. I believe we can safely guarantee that in the first year we will reduce street crime to perhaps one percent of its present level and reduce all crime by perhaps 95 percent, that is . To about a twentieth of its present level.

Those who think that is an exaggeration are still think only in terms of what is possible in the degenerate society of today. There are many today who would sincerely like to reduce crime to such a low level, but they are not willing to do what is necessary to accomplish that goal--even if the ruler of this society would let them. They have the wrong priorities.

But we are willing to do what is necessary, because we have a goal, a Purpose, which determines our priorities for us. And among our priorities the health of the society ranks considerably ahead of the supposed personal rights of its thieves and rapists and drug dealers.

Of course, simply by excluding from our society those who are not members of our racial community, we will eliminate the great bulk of the criminal element. But, more than that, the simple act of removing these alien elements reduce their own inclination to anti-social behavior. For the root of anti-social behavior is alienation, the feeling of not being a part, of not belonging to society, and alienation naturally and inevitably is the accompaniment of racial mixing.

Now, please note that we are not promising the elimination of all crime, but only the majority of it. Husbands will still beat their wives occasionally. One man will occasionally kill another in a quarrel over a woman or over money or something else. People will still be exposed to temptations and provocations of various sorts every day, and some will inevitably yield. Perhaps, in fact, some types of behavior which we now considered criminal should no longer be considered so in a new society but instead should be recognized as natural and inevitable and be accommodated in some way. For we do not expect our new society to change human nature--or at least not very quickly. That is something we will attempt only over the course of many generations, only over centuries and millennia.

But simply by establishing a healthy social environment for our people and by introducing a few fairly simple and obvious reforms into our police and criminal justice systems we can keep criminal activity down to level where it will not be the socially destructive factor it is today. And that will not require, by any stretch of the imagination, a Big Brother style police state.

A society which is really determined to keep itself healthy, to eliminate certain sickness from its midst, a society which is not controlled or influenced by those who have a vested interest in maintaining those sicknesses, can use many means which are as effective, or more effective, than direct coercion--although we must not ever be too squeamish to use coercion when that is called for.

The prevalence of anti-social behavior, whether engaging in muggings on the street, or flaunting homosexuality, or even corrupting oneself through drug abuse, is determined to a very large extent not by the laws passed by legislatures but by the attitudes inherent in a society. Why is homosexuality, for example, so much more prevalent, so much more obvious and public today in America than it was 100 years ago? It is largely because of the attitude expressed by our controlled mass media and by our educational system that there's nothing wrong with it. If one changes the attitude expressed by the media and by the schools from one of toleration or even encouragement of this sickness, to one of the strongest disapproval, one may not change the basic nature of the homosexual who was born with some genetic defect which gives him his unfortunate tendency. But one will at least drive him back into the closet and one will prevent many persons of weak or disturbed character from acquiring the tendency.

And the same is true of other social illnesses. One can effectively suppress them by rounding up and shooting enough people, or one can eliminate them by establishing a healthy social climate. Some illnesses call for the first cure and some for the second--but in the long run a society can be and remain truly healthy and truly progressive only if the tendency toward health and progress is naturally rooted in the great bulk of the members of the society instead of being artificially imposed from above.

Nevertheless, we are talking about a society which is willing and able to guide its members, to impose constraints, to set both positive and negative examples. And this implies the exercise of power, real and effective power, even if not in the form of direct police power. For we are certainly not talking about an anarchic society or a libertarian society, in which everyone does his own thing.

Today, even in our present society, far more social control is exercised by the mass media and by the schools than by the Congress and the President and the courts, with all their legislative and police and judicial powers. In our new society should we simply leave these powers, the power of the media and the schools, up for grabs, to fall under the influence of whatever private groups can win control of them?

Hardly! They are the very determinants of the type of society we shall have. They do more than anything else to set its goals and shape its institutions, and we must be sure that these goals and institutions are in accord with our Purpose, with the Creator's Purpose. So this means that society as a whole must assume certain powers which are now either chaotically uncontrolled or are in the hands of the enemies of our people.

How shall these powers be administered and exercised? That is a question we want to answer very carefully, after the greatest deliberation. But we can make some tentative suggestions now. We can say quite definitely, for example, that we are not interested in the conservative goal of restoring the Constitution of 200 years ago.

We are not interested in minor variations on that theme either, which might allow, for example, some deviant person of great wealth or strong personality who favored reintroducing Blacks or Jews into our society to control, say, ten percent of the Federal legislature if he could convince ten percent of the public to vote for his party. We are, in fact, not even greatly impressed by the democratic axiom of "one

man, one vote.” That was supposed to insure against tyranny, but it has not quite lived up to expectations.

Let us remember that our Purpose, and therefore the Purpose of our new society, must not be to provide the best possible climate for free enterprise but to put us, as a race, once again on the Path toward Godhood. Because of this, it is likely that the privilege of choosing our society’s leaders will be somewhat more carefully bestowed than at present, when it is merely necessary to have attained 18 years of age.

It seems clear to me that our Purpose tells us that we must envisage a society in which the electorate consists only of those members of society who are wholly dedicated to that Purpose. Those who have the responsibility for choosing our society’s administrators and decision-makers must be persons who have proved, in deed as well as word, their dedication.

We might envisage the attainment of electoral status as a crowning honor bestowed on our most worthy citizens, an honor not only entailing great respect from the community but also a great responsibility for the welfare and progress of the community. Being given the privilege of voting might be made a ceremonial occasion, a sacramental occasion, the most important occasion of a citizen’s life, an occasion not unlike joining a Holy Order, in which the initiate takes a binding oath to fulfill his responsibility and to put his duties and obligations as an embodiment of the Creator and an agent of the Creator ahead of all else, throughout the remainder of his life.

This will be a status potentially open to all but actually achieved by relatively few, the best and ablest of our race. And it will be their responsibility to exercise the ultimate power, to control the destiny of the society. Those few experts who actually make the day-to-day decisions will be answerable to their electorate.

Now, there are many other aspects to the society we want besides the determination of voting qualifications. In most cases we must be very careful about being too specific, because the actual working out the specific details is something which will require a great deal of thought and planning. Whatever we say now is only of a tentative nature.

But we can be sure of some general things. We are sure that we do not want a society in which our Truth, our understanding of reality and of our Purpose, is but one idea in a completing chaos of ideas, a society divided against itself into a hundred conflicting sects. We want a society which is not only racially homogenous but also spiritually homogenous, a society which is a single, indivisible community inspired by a single, great Truth, working for a single Purpose.

And we can be sure of some other things. We want a society based on blood instead of on gold, a society in which racial quality, in which Life itself, is the basic value, instead of money, as in today’s society.

It will be a society in which the importance of the family will not be so much as an economic unit but as a biological unit, a creative unit; a society in which healthy, racially sound children will be the

greatest treasure which can be produced--a treasure far more significant than today's Gross National Product.

It will be a society which will judge its progress by the degree to which each new generation surpasses in racial quality the previous generation. The great task of our new society will be the upward breeding of the race. And this task will be shared by every institution of the society. We must have an educational system, for example, which not only prepares the child to lead an economically productive existence, but which instills in him a lifelong consciousness of his racial identity and his racial mission, a consciousness of the fact that he exists not only in the present, but that he is a link in the chain of generations which stretches from the distant past into an unlimited future, and that he has a responsibility to every other link, past and future, in that unending chain.

We want a society without artificial barriers based on social class or on personal wealth or family connections, but one in which status is determined by the quality of the individual and, even more so, by the extent to which that quality, those talents and abilities and character, are used in the service of our Purpose.

The ordinary workman who strives always to do the best job he possibly can, whether he operates a lathe in a factory or a tractor on a farm, the workman who puts his soul into his work because he understands that he is working not just for himself but for his racial community and for the Purpose it serves--such a person will be entitled to the highest honor and respect in our society.

We want a society, finally, which in all its institutions and its policies, in its schools and its athletic programs, in its taxing policy and its welfare policy and its foreign policy, in its environmental programs and its military defense program, reflects the one overwhelming fact that it is a society not of man alone, but of man as a part of God, as an embodiment of the Divine Spirit.

It must in its every aspect reflect the beauty and dignity of a higher mankind, and as man ascends the Creator's Path toward self-completion and total self-realization, our society must itself ascend that Path with him.

## OUR CAUSE

by Dr. William L. Pierce

EVERY DAY, I receive letters from our members across the country as well as from people here in the Washington area who have attended our meetings in the past. These letters and questions indicate that there is still some uncertainty in people's minds as to what we are, what we believe, and what we intend to do. Questions, in other words, as to what it's all about. I want to try again tonight to answer these questions as clearly as I possibly can.

I'm sure that one of the difficulties people have in trying to understand us is that they can't figure out quite how to categorize us. They're accustomed to putting everything they encounter in life into little, mental pigeonholes labeled right-wing, left-wing, communist, racist, and so on. And once they've done that, they think they understand the thing.

Now the trouble is that we don't quite fit any of the customary pigeonholes. And that is because the doctrine of the National Alliance, the truth for which we stand, is not just a rehash of old and familiar ideas but is really something new to Americans.

Perhaps the best way to approach an understanding of the Alliance is to start by getting rid of some of the most troublesome pigeonholes altogether. That is, by pointing out what we are not. We are not, as many people tend to assume at first, either a conservative or a right-wing group. And I'm not just trying to be cute when I say that. I'm not just trying to emphasize that we are a special right-wing group or a better right-wing group. In fact, our truth has very little in common with most right-wing creeds. We're not interested, for example, in restoring the Constitution. The Constitution, written 200 years ago, served a certain purpose well for a time. But that time is now passed. Nor was its purpose the same as our purpose today. We're not interested in states' rights, in restoring the former sovereignty of the individual states. We do not believe, as our conservative friends do, that a strong and centralized government is an evil in itself. It is, in fact, a necessity in overcoming many of the obstacles which lie ahead of us as a people.

What else is dear to the hearts of right-wingers? Do we want to restore prayer and Bible reading to the public schools? Hardly. Anti-fluoridation? Nonsense. Income tax? Abortion? Pornography? Well, we may sympathize more with the right-wing position on these issues than we do with the left-wing position, but they are still only peripheral issues for us. They are not the reason why we are here. They are not the things we are prepared to die for.

There are, in fact, several issues on which we are closer to what would ordinarily be considered the left-wing or liberal position than we are to the conservative or right-wing position. One of these issues is the ecology issue: the protection of our natural environment, the elimination of pollution, and the protection of wildlife. And there are also other issues in which we are closer to the liberals than to the conservatives, although I doubt that we agree with them completely on any issue; just as we seldom, if ever, agree completely with the right-wing on any issue.

The reason for the lack of complete agreement, when there seems to be approximate agreement, with either the right or the left is that our position on every issue is derived from an underlying view of the world which is fundamentally different from those of either the right or the left. That is, to the extent that they have any underlying philosophy at all. Often there is none, and a great many people who identify themselves as liberals, conservatives, or moderates simply have an assortment of views on various issues which are not related to any common idea, purpose, or philosophy.

Before we turn to a positive look at the Alliance, let me inject just a few more negatives. One thing we are not trying to do is to find any quick or easy solutions to the problems confronting us as a people. We have enormously difficult problems. If we are to solve them at all, we must tackle them with more determination, more tenacity, and more fanaticism than they have ever been tackled before. We must prepare ourselves mentally and spiritually for a very long, bloody, and agonizing struggle.

We mustn't imagine that we are like a squad of soldiers about to assault a cave full of robbers and that the only preparation we need is to be sure our bayonets are fixed and that our powder is dry. This seems

to be the attitude of most patriots these days and it is not a realistic one. “Throw out those bums in Washington,” they say, “and our problems will be over.”

No. We must think of ourselves instead as the beginning — the barest beginning — of a mighty army whose task is not to clean out a cave full of robbers, but is to conquer an entire hostile world. Before the first shot is fired we must build our invasion fleet with thousands of ships and siege engines. We must lay in massive supplies of cannon balls, powder, and all sorts of other munitions. And we must do a hundred other things.

In other words, we must prepare ourselves for our political struggle before we can count on it yielding anything other than the invariable failure which has rewarded patriots in the past. We must build a foundation which will sustain us for a very long campaign.

Let me give you another analogy. We are like a tribe of hungry, starving people living in a land which, although the soil is fertile, provides relatively little to eat. These people find a few berries growing on bushes and a few edible roots in the ground. All they can think about is that they are hungry and they must fill their bellies. This is their immediate problem. They spend all of their time, day after day, year after year, hunting for those scarce berries on the bushes and pulling an occasional edible root out of the ground. And they never really fill their bellies; they always remain hungry and on the edge of starvation. That is because no one has ever taken a few minutes off from berry hunting and thought further ahead than the immediate problem of filling his belly, now, for this meal. No one has proposed that while some continue to hunt for berries, others in the tribe should tolerate their hunger pains for a while and make themselves a few simple tools, a simple plow from a tree branch perhaps, and a hoe, and then use these tools to plow up some of the most fertile areas of their land and plant a few berries in furrows and keep watch over them so that the birds don't scratch them up. They could weed their furrows and perhaps divert a portion of a nearby stream for irrigation. If they did this, if they thought beyond their immediate problem, and, to the extent possible, tackled a much larger problem, they would eventually, even though it might take years, solve the problem of hunger which they could never solve when that was all they thought about. The solution to the problem of keeping their bellies full would be to develop an agricultural basis for their berry-picking and root-digging.

Now we need a philosophical and spiritual basis for our political struggle. A basis, of course, which tells us why we must fight and what we are fighting for. But we also want a basis which will tell us how to build a whole new world after we have won the political struggle. In other words, we are not building a basis to use for a month, or for a few years, but a basis which will last a thousand years and more. We are building a basis which will serve not only us, but also countless future generation of our race. And it is high time that we did this. We have drifted without any sense of direction, without any long-range perspectives, for far too long. It's time that we stopped fixing our sights on next year, or the next election, and fix them instead on eternity.

You know, we Americans are famous for being a practical people, a hard-headed, no nonsense people. We are not great thinkers, perhaps, but we are real problem solvers. We don't fool around; we plow right into things. That's how we settled this country. We didn't agonize about whether we were being fair to the Indians when we took their land; we just walked right over them and kept moving west.

That's what we had to do. We just followed our instincts and used our heads and, more often than not, we did the right thing.

But we also made some mistakes, bad mistakes. Because the southern colonies were ideally suited for certain types of crops which required lots of hand labor, there weren't any machines back then of course, we brought Negroes into the country. That seemed to make pretty good economic sense at the time. But we really should have thought harder about the long-range consequences of that move. We wouldn't have had to be real wizards to foresee the future. History provides a number of instructive examples for us to study.

We kept on making mistakes: mistakes based on shortsightedness mostly, mistakes from not being able to give any real weight to anything but the immediate problem, mistakes from not thinking far enough ahead. Analyzing the situation a little more deeply, we can say that we were shortsighted because we had no really firm basis for being longsighted. We had no solid foundation on which to stand in order to evaluate the long-range consequences of our decisions. And, as a result of this, we were suckers for various brands of sentimentality, strictly here and now sentimentality, sentimentality rooted only in the present. It was this sort of fuzzy sentimentality, this *Uncle Tom's Cabin* sentimentality, which led to the war between the states and to the dumping of some three million Blacks into our free society a hundred years ago. It also led to our failure to properly control immigration into this country, our failure to prevent the flood of Jews which poured in after the Civil War.

These things troubled many good people. Lincoln was troubled over the potential consequences of freeing the Negroes. Later, others were troubled over the dangers of uncontrolled immigration. But the fuzzy sentimentalists prevailed because those who knew in their hearts that the country was making mistakes didn't have a really solid basis from which to oppose the sentimentalists. They didn't have their sights fixed on eternity. They had no all-encompassing worldview to back them up.

And the same problem of shortsightedness is far worse today. A person goes to church and hears his minister tell him that we are all God's children, Black and White. And although his instinct tries to tell him that the minister is leading him astray, he will not challenge the minister because he has no firm convictions rooted in eternity to back up his feelings. The same is true of the whole country, and of our whole race, today. We are like a ship without a compass. Various factions of the crew are arguing about which way to steer, but no one really knows where the ship is headed. We've lost our sense of direction. We no longer have a distant, fixed star to guide us. Actually, it's even worse than that. We have lost our ability to follow a distant star even if we could see one. We are like a nation, like a race, without a soul. And that is a fatal condition.

No purely political program can have any real value for us in the long run unless we get our souls back, unless we learn once again how to be true to our inner nature, unless we learn to heed the divine spark inside us and base all our decisions on a clear and comprehensive philosophy illuminated by that spark.

Let me tell you a little story, which I believe illustrates our problem. Several years ago, I spoke to a class at a private high school in Maryland. It was the Indian Spring Friends' School operated by the Quakers, but with a student body which seemed to be about equally divided between Jews and gentiles,



with a few token Blacks thrown in. Throughout my talk to the class, a blond girl and the only Negro in the class were sitting next to each other in the front row and kissing and fondling each other in an obviously planned effort to distract me. The subject of my talk was the importance of White Americans developing a sense of racial identity and racial pride if we are to survive. When I finished, a White student, about 17-years-old, rose to ask the first question. His question was, “What makes you think it’s so important for the White race to survive?”

I was flabbergasted and at a loss for words. And while I stood there with my mouth open, a young Jew popped up and gave his own answer. “There is no good reason at all for Whites to survive,” the Jew announced, “because they have contributed nothing to the human race except the knowledge of how to kill people. Other races have contributed everything worthwhile, everything which allows people to be happier and more comfortable.” And then he rattled off a list of five or six names: Freud, Einstein, Salk, and a few others — all Jews. I then asked him if he himself were a Jew and he replied with as much arrogance and contempt as he could muster, “Yes I am and proud of it!” At this point the whole class, Whites included, rose and gave the young Jew a standing ovation. The teacher at the back of the room had a big grin on his face.

Needless to say, my talk was pretty well wasted on that class. The White kids in there had been subjected to so much moral intimidation, they had been pumped so full of racial guilt and self-hatred, their minds were so twisted, that it’s doubtful whether anyone could straighten them out. Certainly no one could in an hour’s time.

But the thing which bothered me even more than the phony collective racial guilt which had been pumped into those boys and girls, was my inability to answer the White kid’s question. Why *should* we survive? That’s one of those questions like, why is good better than evil? Or, nowadays, why is heterosexuality any better than homosexuality? If two people want to have sex together, who are we to say that it’s better that they be a man and a woman than that they be two men or two women? A related question concerns racial mixing: why shouldn’t a Black man and a White woman, or vice versa, live together if they can be happy? These are questions which most White people, even normal healthy White people, cannot answer satisfactorily today.

A hundred years ago, before the Jews came flooding into our country and taking over our mass media and our educational system, we might not have really needed answers. We just *knew* that it was important for our race to survive and to make progress. We *knew* that homosexuality and interracial sex were wrong. Our intuition told us this. The answers were in our souls even if we couldn’t express them in words. But then the Jews — who are clever people, very clever people — came along, and they began asking these very questions. And when we couldn’t answer them, they began providing their own answers.

Now all of us here tonight know what the Jews’ answers are. We read them in our newspapers and hear them on television every day. Some White people, in fact a majority at first, did oppose the Jews’ plans. But their reasons for opposing them were all the wrong ones. For example, when asked “Why shouldn’t your son or daughter marry a Black?” their answer was “Well, two people with such different backgrounds won’t be happy together. They will have children of mixed race who won’t be accepted by

either Whites or Blacks. There's a better chance for a marriage to work out if both partners are of the same race. The world just isn't ready for inter-marriage yet." Well, of course, the Jews made pretty short work of such shallow and superficial objections. The problem was that our people had already accepted most of the basic Jewish premises. Our criterion for choosing a marriage partner was happiness — happiness! — either ours or our children's. No one had any really solid answers, answers based on something fundamental. Certainly the churches, whose role should have been to provide the right answers, were of no help. They in fact were, and are, in the forefront of the Jewish assault on all our values and institutions. They are so much in hock to the Jews that they are busy now trying to figure out how they can rewrite the New Testament, removing or changing all the parts that Jews consider offensive, such as the Jewish responsibility for the crucifixion of Jesus.

The Jews were able to continue hammering away at White Americans — probing, prying, asking more questions, raising more doubts — until we had lost all faith in what we had earlier known intuitively was right. Our ethics, our code of behavior, our values, our feelings, and our aspirations all went down the drain. What they gave us instead was the new "morality" of 'if it feels good, do it.' Our children are taught in school that progress means more happiness for more people. And happiness, of course, means feeling good. The whole thing is summed up in a Coca-Cola commercial. I'm sure you have all seen it on TV: a ring of twenty people or so, of all colors and both sexes, obviously as happy and care-free as they could possibly be, are all holding hands and singing, "I'd like to give the world a Coke." Now who but the meanest and most narrow-minded racist is going to criticize something like that?

The average American — even one who does not approve of racial mixing — doesn't know how to respond to a clever appeal like the Coca-Cola commercial, certainly the average White kid in our schools today doesn't. And once he has unconsciously accepted the hidden premises in that commercial — and the entire attitude toward life from which it is sprung — the question I was asked at the Indian Spring Friends' School naturally follows. Since people of all races are equal and essentially the same — Whites, Negroes, Jews, Gypsies, Chinamen, Mulattoes — and since they can all be happy doing the same sorts of things, why should we worry about what a person's race is, or even about our own? Wouldn't sex be just as pleasurable for us if we were Black instead of White? Wouldn't a Coke taste just as good? What difference does it make if our grandchildren are Mulattoes so long as the economy is still strong and they can all afford nice cars and 25-inch color TV sets?

Now, one can attack this Jewish fantasy world with facts. One can point out that although Jews are clever, they haven't done everything worthwhile in the world. White people have done a few things besides kill other people. And one can point out that racial differences are more than skin deep. One can talk about IQ scores; one can cite historical examples in which civilization after civilization has declined and crumbled when the race that built that civilization began intermarrying with its slaves. But none of that is really going to convince the kid whose main concern is whether the consumers of the world — whether the happy Coke drinkers — will be any less happy in a world without Whites.

What we failed to do in the past was to understand the deep inner source from which our feelings and intuition about race and other matters sprang. We had no really sound and healthy worldview to offer that White kid in place of the slick, plastic, Jewish worldview of the Coca-Cola commercial. And so we

couldn't really answer his question about the survival of the White race any more than we could give him a really convincing reason about why he shouldn't do just anything that feels good — whether it is taking dope, or sleeping with Blacks, or experimenting with homosexuality.

You may think of that kid as an extreme liberal case, but he is really no different than the average — and I mean the average — businessman in this country. He used to be a segregationist a few years ago, but he became an integrationist when the Blacks started rioting and burning things in the late 1960's. After all, riots are bad for business. Their individual views of the world may be a little different, but the businessman and the kid in Maryland both base their thinking on one and the same thing — egoistic Jewish materialism. The kid who believes that the purpose of life is happiness, knows that there are not many things on this earth happier than a bunch of pickaninnies splashing in a mud puddle. And the businessman who believes that the purpose of life is to make money knows that a Black customer's money is just as green as a White customer's.

A person who accepts that sort of basis, indeed, **cannot** see any really convincing reason why the White race should survive. His aim is to live a “good life.” And for him that means a life with lots of money, lots to eat and drink, plenty of sex, new cars, big houses, and constant diversions. Entertainment: that is all he lives for, all he cares about, and all he understands. Talk about purpose to him and his eyes go blank. Talk about eternity and he laughs at you. He knows that he won't live forever, although he doesn't like to think about that. He intends to get as much out of life as he can. Anything beyond that means nothing to him. What a difference that is from the attitude toward life that our ancestors in northern Europe had a few hundred years ago. They were greedy for money like we are, of course, and they liked to enjoy themselves when they could, but that was not the **meaning** of life for them. Their attitude toward life and death was perhaps best summed up in a stanza from one of the old Norse sagas. It goes like this:

*Kinsmen die and cattle die,  
And so must one die one's self,  
But there is one thing I know which never dies  
And that is the fame of a dead man's deeds.*

The German philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer expressed essentially the same idea when he said that the very most any man can hope for is a heroic passage through life. Greatness, in other words, instead of happiness, is the mark of a good life. Now I don't mean to suggest that we must all think in terms of becoming famous or of dying heroically on the battlefield with sword or gun in hand. Some of us may be granted that, but what is important, what all of us can do, even those who think of ourselves as basically unheroic, is to adopt the attitude toward life and toward death which was implicit in the old sagas and in Schopenhauer's statement.

The attitude of living for the sake of eternity, of living with eternity always in mind instead of living only for the moment; the attitude that the individual is not an end in himself, but rather that the individual lives for and through something greater — in particular, for and through his racial community (which is eternal) — seems to have eluded most of us today. It is an attitude which is diametrically opposed to the Jewish attitude of egoism and materialism. And yet it is the alien Jewish

attitude that has been adopted by most Americans today. We have chosen happiness instead of greatness, the moment instead of eternity. We have become a nation — a whole race — of full-time self-seekers, a race concerned with one thing: self-gratification.

The average man, of course, has always been pretty shortsighted and his interests have always pretty much been limited to his own welfare. So the materialism of today that I've been talking about is a matter of degree. It has a somewhat stronger grip on the man in the street than it formerly did. But what *is* worse is that today it also has a grip on our leaders, on our teachers, on our poets, on our philosophers, and even on our priests. It has so thoroughly saturated the souls of all of us that we have reacted to it by becoming spiritually ill. And this spiritual sickness, this loss of our souls, is why we are in such a mess today. And it is why we will be in a worse and worse mess as time goes on. We will never overcome the problems facing us until it is cured.

And please do not misunderstand me. I am not talking about the “wages of sin” in the sense with which many of us may be familiar. I'm not talking about some anthropomorphic deity, some heavenly father sitting on his throne in the sky punishing us, keeping us from overcoming our enemies because we are not fulfilling his commandments. No, that's nonsense! We are not being punished by any supernatural being. We are in trouble for the same reason that an explorer in a harsh and trackless wilderness is in trouble when he loses his compass and cannot see the sky through the dense foliage. He no longer knows which way to go. That is our most fundamental problem — we do not know where we are going. We have no sense of direction. We have stumbled off the path.

But that is something I really should not have had to tell you because everyone here today knows this. Even if he doesn't understand yet how or why he knows it. He still knows that the present course our society has taken is wrong. It is unnatural. It is evil. We all know that it is wrong to accept the “I'm all right, Jack” attitude which prevails today. We know that it's wrong to live only for the present, to forget the past and to ignore the future. It is wrong to have instant self-gratification as our only goal. That's why we are here. We know that there is something more, something else, a better way. We know this for the same reason we are attracted to beauty and to nobility and are repelled by the ugly and the base, regardless of the artificial fashions of our day. We know it because deep inside all of us, in our race-soul, there is a source of divine wisdom, of ages-old wisdom, of wisdom as old as the universe. That is the wisdom, the truth, which we in the National Alliance want to make the basis of our national policy. It is a truth of which most of us have been largely unconscious all our lives, but which now we have the opportunity to understand clearly and precisely.

Our truth tells us that no man, no race, not even this planet, exists as an end in itself. The only thing which exists as an end in its self is the whole. The whole of which the things I just named are parts. The universe is the physical manifestation of the whole. The whole is continually changing and always will be. It is evolving. That is, it is moving toward ever more complex, ever higher, states of existence. The development of life on earth from non-living matter was one step in this never-ending evolutionary process. The evolution of man-like creatures from more primitive forms of life was another step. The diversification of these creatures into the various races and sub-races, and the continued evolution of these different races in different parts of the world at different rates, have been continuations of this

process. The entire evolution of life on earth from its beginning some three billion years ago, and in a more general sense, the evolution of the universe over a much longer period before the appearance of life, is an evolution not only in the sense of yielding more and more highly developed physical forms, but also an evolution in consciousness. It is an evolution in the self-consciousness of the whole.

From the beginning, the whole, the creator, the self-created, has followed, has in fact embodied, an upward urge — an urge toward higher and higher degrees of self-consciousness, toward ever more nearly perfect states of self-realization.

In man — in our race in particular — this upward urge, this divine spark, has brought us to a new threshold. A threshold as important as that which separated the non-living matter of three billion years ago from the living matter into which it evolved. Today's threshold is a threshold in self-consciousness. We stand now on the verge of a full understanding of the fact that we are a manifestation of the creator, that we are the means and the substance by which the creator, by which the whole of which we are a part, can continue its self-evolution.

When we understand this, when we heed the divine spark within us, then we can once again ascend the upward path that has led us from sub-man to man and can lead us now from man to super-man and beyond. But we cannot do this, we cannot find the path, without this consciousness, without this understanding that the responsibility is ours, that we are not the playthings of God but are ourselves a manifestation of God and can become, must become, now a **conscious** manifestation. Only in that way can we fulfill our ordained destiny.

Let me emphasize again, in different words, what I told you earlier this evening about building a spiritual basis for our political work. The Alliance's long-range approach is necessary, absolutely necessary, and unavoidable. The short-range approaches that other patriots are trying, and have been trying for many decades now, the thousands of *ad hoc* solutions of quick and easy one-issue approaches, whether of tax-rebellion or of bomb throwing, cannot solve the ultimate problems with which we are faced. They cannot give us back our souls. It may seem ironical that we should be trying to conquer and transform the whole world, that we should be planning for eternity, when no one else has been able to make a successful plan for achieving very much more limited goals, restoring the constitution, for example, or getting us out of the United Nations, or what have you. But it is the very shortsightedness of those working for these limited goals which has been the cause of their failure. And it is our rooting of our plans in eternity which gives us confidence for their ultimate success no matter how long it may take us.

So I tell you again, our approach is not just a matter of choice; it is necessary. There is no other way but ours. There is only one path. And there is something else we must understand. Our philosophy, our quest for the upward path, is not something that we should accept reluctantly because we see it as necessary to the solution of our race problem, our Jewish problem, and our communist problem. It is not something we accept because we cannot find an easier approach to these problems. No! If we look at it that way then we still haven't rid ourselves of the shortsightedness that has been our curse in the past. We must understand that the truth for which we stand transcends all the problems of the present. Finding our way once again to the one true path transcends all questions of economics, of politics, and

ultimately even of race, just as eternity transcends tomorrow. So let's stop putting the cart before the horse mentally and spiritually. Let's take off our mental blinders. Let's realize that the truth has a value in itself and that dedication to the truth is a virtue in itself. This is all the more true in a world in which falsehood seems to rule.

The problems with which we are faced in the world today are serious ones and they must be solved. But the first and most important task, the task on which all our other problems must eventually depend for their solutions, but also the task which would still be just as important for us to accomplish if all our other problems didn't exist, is the task, the one task, assigned to us by the creator. That is the task of achieving full consciousness of our oneness with the whole, achieving full consciousness that we are a part of the creator and that our destiny is to achieve the single purpose for which the universe exists — the self-realization of the creator.

Our truth is a very simple truth, but its implications are enormous beyond imagining. To the extent that we understand and accept it, it sets us apart from all the people around us. Our acceptance of this truth marks us as the only adults in a world of children. For implicit in what we believe is our recognition and acceptance of our responsibility for the future of the universe. The fate of everything that will ever be rests in our hands now. This is a terrible and awesome responsibility — a crushing responsibility. If we were only men we could not bear it. We would have to invent some supernatural being to foist our responsibility onto. But we must, and can, bear it when we understand that we ourselves embody the divine spark which is the upward driving urge of the universe.

The acceptance of our truth not only burdens us with the responsibility that other men have shunned throughout history, it bestows on us a mantle of moral authority that goes along with the responsibility, the moral authority to do whatever is necessary in carrying out our responsibility. Furthermore, it is an acceptance of our destiny, an unlimited destiny, a destiny glorious beyond imagination, if we truly have the courage of our convictions. If we truly abide by the demands that our truth places upon us, it means that while other men continue to live only for the day, continue to seek only self-gratification, and continue to live lives which are essentially without meaning and that leave no trace behind them when they are over, we are living and working for the sake of eternity. In so doing, we are becoming a part of that eternity.

For some, our task may seem too great for us, our responsibility too overwhelming. If they are correct, if we choose to remain children instead of accepting our adulthood, if we continue the shortsighted approaches of the past, then in the long run we will fail utterly. The enemies of our race will prevail over us and we and our kind will pass away forever. All our sacrifices, and all the dreams and sacrifices of our ancestors, will have been in vain. Not even a memory of us, or our kind, will be left when the creative spirit of the universe tries, in some other place, in some other time, in some other way, to do what we failed to do. But I do not believe that we will fail. Because in working to achieve our purpose, we are finding our way once again to the right and natural path for our people. We are working once again with the whole. And we have a mighty tradition behind us.

Our purpose is the purpose for which the earth was born out of the gas and the dust of the cosmos, the purpose for which the first primitive amphibian crawled out of the sea three hundred million years ago

and learned to live on the land, the purpose for which the first race of men held themselves apart from the races of sub-men around them and bred only with their own kind. It is the purpose for which men first captured lightning from the sky, tamed it, and called it fire; the purpose for which our ancestors built the world's first astronomical observatory on a British plain more than 4,000 years ago. It is the purpose for which Jesus, the Galilean, fought the Jews and died 2,000 years ago; the purpose for which Rembrandt painted; the purpose for which Shakespeare wrote; and the purpose for which Newton pondered. Our purpose, the purpose with which we must become obsessed, is that for which the best, the noblest, men and women of our race down through the ages have struggled and died whether they were fully conscious of it or not. It is the purpose for which they sought beauty and created beauty; the purpose for which they studied the heavens and taught themselves Nature's mysteries; the purpose for which they fought the degenerative, the regressive, and the evil forces all around them; the purpose for which, instead of taking the easy path in life, the downward path; they chose the upward path, regardless of the pain, suffering, and sacrifice that this choice entailed.

Yes! They did these things, largely without having a full understanding of why, just as the first amphibian did not understand his purpose when he crawled onto the land. Our purpose is the creator's purpose, our path is the path of divine consciousness, the path of the creator's self-realization. This is the path which is ordained for us because of what we are, because of the spark of divine consciousness in us, and in no one else. No other race can travel this path, our path, for us. We alone must prove whether we are fit to serve the creator's purpose. And if we are fit, if we once again heed the inner knowledge engraved in our souls by the creator, if we regain faith in the things we once knew were true without fully understanding why and if we now also teach ourselves why, then we will once again be on the upward path ordained for us, and our destiny will be godhood.

Those of you who are with us for the first time have, I hope, gained at least the beginning of an understanding of who we are and of what we want to do. I know that I have left many of your questions unanswered; questions about current political, social, racial, and economic issues; questions about concrete things. We do talk about those things in our meetings. We talk about them in a very concrete and down-to-earth fashion. I've discussed them in past meetings and I'll discuss them again in future ones — the goals of overcoming the enemies of our people, of safeguarding the future of our race, and of building a new order of beauty, sanity, strength, and health on this earth, so that our people can progress and mature until they are capable of fulfilling the role allotted to them by the creator. But now I want to be sure that you understand just one thing. If we ever are to achieve these concrete advances, these physical victories, this material renewal of our nation, of our civilization, of our race, then we must first make the spiritual advances that I've talked about here. Without the spiritual basis, the material victory will not be achieved.

As I said, in our future meetings we will explore many individual issues in much greater detail than we have here. We hope you will join us in these future meetings and further increase your understanding of our work, and we hope that you will begin to share our commitment to this work. And let me say this especially to those who are with us for the first time, we do not care who you are or what you have believed in the past, nor do we require that you agree exactly with us on a hundred different social,

political, economic, and racial issues. All we require is that you share with us a commitment to the simple, but great, truth which I have explained to you here, that you understand that you are a part of the whole, which is the creator, that you understand that your purpose, the purpose of mankind and the purpose of every other part of creation, is the creator's purpose, that this purpose is the never-ending ascent of the path of creation, the path of life symbolized by our life rune, that you understand that this path leads ever upward toward the creator's self-realization, and that the destiny of those who follow this path is godhood. If you share this single truth with us, then everything else will follow and we invite you to make a commitment now, today, to join us and work with us.

### **Crossing the Thresholds** by Dr. William Pierce

At our previous meetings I have talked to you mostly about the nature of our Truth, as expressed in our Affirmation, so that we will have an understanding of our identity and our mission. Tonight we want to look ahead as far as we can into the future, in order to see where our mission will lead us in the next few years.

I have already said many times that our principal task now is carrying our Truth to others of our race who are capable of understanding it. That is, our job now is to continue waking up America.

But were do we expect these efforts to lead us in the next year or two? What do we hope to accomplish by continuing to bring new people to these meetings and by continuing to distribute newspapers and leaflets? Do we really expect America, as a whole, to wake up and rid itself of the Enemy? Of course not! Certainly, not in the next year or two.

There are two things we *do* expect our activities to accomplish, however. One, and it is the more immediate and pressing, is to continue to wake up *individual Americans* and to recruit them into our community. This is an open-ended goal. The harder and more effectively we work at it, the more people we will wake up and recruit, but we will still remain only a small minority among a largely indifferent and Jew-serving majority, no matter how hard we work. It may not be advisable to emphasize that fact in [ATTACK!](#) But it is essential for us to be completely and coldly realistic ourselves.

The second thing we expect our present activities to achieve is much longer range. It is the sowing of seeds, a sort of program of general enlightenment. When the *average* person reads one of our newspapers or leaflets, he does not become a convert, and the chances are he will never become a convert--at least, not until after radical changes have already taken place in our society and the Jew is no longer with us. And that is because the process of conversion to our cause is much more a spiritual process than it is an intellectual process. Providing the average American with facts about what the Enemy is doing to our race will not cause him to come running to join us. Instead, he will go back to his TV set and his funny papers.

But he will, never the less, remember what we have said, or part of it, even if it sinks deep into his subconscious and is only brought to memory at some later time by some other event or something else



he learns. Spiro Agnew learned from somewhere about the Jewish domination of the news media as did General Brown, and it is doubtful that they learned this through independent research in a library. The chances are they learned it from reading an *ATTACK!* Or some other publication attempting to expose the Enemy, or they heard it from a friend who read an *ATTACK!* Or some other publication.

Learning about the Jews did not change either of these men's lives. There is every reason to believe that Spiro Agnew is still basically a money-grubber. If he had not been stabbed in the back by his Jewish associates, he would still be serving them. And General Brown still apologizes profusely to the Jews every time he lets slip in public some of what he knows about them. Neither of these men is even a potential convert to our cause, and it is utter foolishness to imagine that they are. Nevertheless, it is obvious that it is important that they did learn from somewhere about the Jews. And it is important that others learn too, whether they hold high posts in the government or not and whether they are in a position to influence with their knowledge the whole nation, like Agnew, or only a few friends and neighbors.

And this task of sowing seeds, of public enlightenment, is also open-ended, just like our recruiting task. The harder we work at it--the more seeds we sow--the greater the harvest we will reap when reaping-time comes--even though we expect no more spiritual commitment now from the vast majority of those we enlighten than we expect from Mr Agnew or from General Brown.

So, where do we expect this recruiting and this public propaganda to take us in the next few years, if we don't expect a mass-awakening of the public?

What we can see ahead of us are two thresholds which we must cross. The first of these thresholds is that which separates the struggling, scrabbling, hand-to-mouth, one-man organization which we are now from a truly viable organization. When I refer to us as a one-man organization now, I don't mean in any way to belittle the invaluable efforts, the absolutely necessary efforts, of our many members and supporters, both here and elsewhere, who are working wholeheartedly for us. I am referring to the fact that if I were killed or locked up tonight I doubt that the Alliance would survive. A truly viable organization is one in which no single person is absolutely indispensable, an organization strong enough to carry our Truth onward undiminished and undistorted and to continue growing, even if the Enemy succeeds in eliminating me or other individual member or leader, regardless of his function.

Making a very rough estimate, I would say we need to increase our present numbers by a factor of approximately 10 in order to cross this threshold. I am talking primarily about our numbers here, in Washington, because it is here that we are building the nucleus of our movement. It is from the people here that we must find those capable of carrying on and expanding my work. Of course, it will also be helpful if our numbers across the country increase at the same time, because that broadens the base of our support and reduces the financial burden on our members here. I would estimate that we need a full-time staff of approximately 15 persons, supported by the general membership, to cross this first threshold.

Now, getting from here to there will require more work and more commitment and a greater sacrifice from all of us, but it is something we *know* we can do. It may take us only one year, or it may take two years or even five years, but there is no doubt that we *can cross* that first threshold.

There is quite a bit of urgency about this first threshold, because everything is in jeopardy until we do cross it. After we do it we can go on for quite a while, and the only way we can be stopped then is by an all-out campaign on the part of the Enemy. But, being reasonable, I think there is a pretty good chance the Enemy will not attempt such a campaign against us until it is too late for him to succeed.

Now, please understand one thing. Although we need the increased numbers I've mentioned to cross this threshold, numbers alone won't do it. We need people for sufficient quality and degree of commitment to our Truth so that we can be absolutely certain that the Alliance--that our community of consciousness--will remain on the straight and narrow path, come what may. We must be certain that there will be no compromised, no yielding to expediency of the sort we've just seen in Rhodesia and South Africa. There must be no false directions, no tangential developments. Which means no conservatives and no right wingers in our leadership nucleus, even though such people may remain among our general base of support.

And it should also be understood that in addition to the very best people we can find we must also employ some extraordinarily organizational principles, which will make us rather different in our structure and in our method of operation from other organizations. I said it is unlikely the Enemy will launch an all-out, shoot-on-sight campaign against us in the next few years. But we can't afford to gamble on this likelihood, nor can we allow any lesser campaign to imperil our existence. As individuals we will all be called on to take risks repeatedly. But we cannot expose the ultimate success of our mission to any avoidable risk. And that is why I say we will do some thing in extraordinary ways. But that does not change the basic fact that crossing this first threshold and having a viable organization is something we *can* do.

Our second threshold is one which takes us from a merely viable organization to an organization with the capability to begin carrying out our mission. It takes us from a community which embodies and safeguards our Truth to a community which begins clearing the way for the universal triumph of our Truth.

Now, it is a fact--an extremely important fact--that there is more than one way we can go about things after we've crossed our second threshold. Some of those ways I can mention now, but others I think it better not to mention.

We may do physical battle with the Enemy, or we may find it better to postpone battle and nevertheless begin implementing the victory of our Truth. Or we may do things in more than one way at once.

I know that many people think the [\*Turner Diaries\*](#), which we are publishing in serial form in ATTACK! is a blueprint for the way in which I think we will do battle with the Enemy. I assure you, with all sincerity, that it is no such thing. It is simply an educational story. I hope that it will cause our people to think about some things they haven't thought about before. That's all. It is *not* our plan of action, even though it is possible the future might, in some developments, resemble the *Turner Diaries*.

But the future may also develop in other ways. We are not committed now, nor are ready to commit ourselves, to any particular course of action to be followed after we cross our second threshold. Remember, neither tactics nor strategy are doctrinal matters with us. The only thing we are sure of is that we must win. How we win is not of fundamental importance. But it is not too early to begin thinking about various possibilities and even to take certain preliminary steps.

One of the things we really should do now is broaden our horizons by reminding ourselves of the nature of our problem: taking the control of the American government and the media away from the Jews and their Gentile stooges. Looking at it that way tends to be discouraging, because it is hard to see our way clear to a political victory, whether we choose to fight with ballots or with bullets. I'm not saying it's impossible, just very difficult.

But there are other ways to look at our problem. We may look at it, for example, as a biological problem instead of a political problem. As conscious agents of the Creator, what we are trying to do is prevent the loss of a certain level of consciousness, which has been achieved after billions of years of creative effort, the loss of a certain evolutionary breakthrough--namely, our race and the consciousness, the Devine Spark, it embodies.

If we lose America; if we lose Western Civilization; even if we lose the earth itself--and still save our race and the consciousness embodied in our community, then we will have won.

Let me give you the most extreme example I can think of. If, 30 or 40 or 50 years from now, one racially sound couple--one man and one woman from our community--are placed on the surface of the planet Mars, along with the necessary machinery for burrowing into the ground and establishing a pressurized, self-sustaining colony; and if the entire earth then yields to the Jews, through a combination of governmental force and succumbing to the Jewish spiritual disease of liberalism: and if it takes the colony on Mars a thousand years--forty or fifty generations--to grow and develop its resources while the Jew-dominated earth sinks back into a state of mulatto chaos and savagery; and if then, when the Martian colony returns to earth, its members are obliged to utterly exterminate the race of khaki-colored sub-humans lurking in the earth's rewilded forest and in the ruins of the earth's cities before they can begin building a new civilization; even if all this happens, then we will have won--then our Truth will have triumphed utterly and completely, because in the long run all the sacrifices of that thousand-year exile will be as nothing.

It is good to remember that, in the long run, no lives can be saved--only genes, and the consciousness of our identity and our mission, which, like our genes, can be passed from generation to generation.

Now, I do not mean for the little science-fiction story I just told you to be thought of as something we are actually planning. Its only purpose was to stretch your minds a little, so you can see that there are a great many possibilities ahead other than conventional political or guerrilla-war possibilities. In fact, we have no intention of conceding this planet to the Jews, nor, if we are forced to do that, do we have any intention of putting all our eggs in a single basket on Mars. But we do have every intention of winning our war for survival, no matter *what* it takes. And that means that we must eventually cross that second threshold, so that we have the capability of doing whatever is necessary.

If we have to do something as far-fetched as planting a colony on Mars (or infiltrating and taking over a colony planted there by the government), then we are probably talking about a time interval of 30 years or more to reach that threshold.

If, instead, events develop along the lines of the *Turner Diaries*, we may be talking about a time span as short as five years between the first and second thresholds which lie ahead of us.

But, in any event, there are certain general capabilities which we must plan on developing before we can cross that second threshold, whether we use those capabilities to establish an isolated colony somewhere, or to fight a guerrilla war against the government, or simply to continue growing by waging spiritual warfare against the Jews and, when necessary, going underground, like the early Christians in the catacombs, without interrupting our recruiting. That last possibility is more likely, at least as a starter, than many other possibilities we might imagine now.

Recruiting effectively and over a long period from underground requires a lot more resources than recruiting in the open, and we might reasonably expect to have to increase our numbers by another factor of ten or more, over what we will need to cross the first threshold-- that is , a staff of perhaps 200 or so full-time men and women, dispersed around the country and supported by the general membership. But, far more than an increase in numbers, such a development must represent an increase in will and dedication. A much more disciplined organization, a more totally dedicated organization, will be required for successful underground work than will be required for work in the open.

We will not plan on going underground unless we are forced to, of course. But we must build an organization with the strength and the hardness to work underground indefinitely, if it has to--if, for instance, the time comes when the government declares that it is illegal, a violation of the Genocide Convention, perhaps, to teach our Truth to others.

And there are other capabilities we must plan on developing. We must be able to operate a self-sustaining , self-contained, self-perpetuating community of consciousness for an indefinitely long period of time. That means, among many other things, that we must provide for the *complete* education of our own children. It means that we must be large enough so that all marriages of community members will take place inside the community. It means we must develop a high enough degree of economic self-sufficiency to avoid unbearable external economic pressures.

Most of all, we must develop, in a matter of a few years, the strength to quickly adapt our tactics and our strategy to the changing conditions we are bound to encounter and to take advantage of the new opportunities which are certain to arise--opportunities which we are far too weak to exploit in any meaningful way now. But developing this strength, developing these capabilities, is something which we *can do*. It is something which is far easier to do than voting the Jews out of power or whipping their troops and secret-police forces in a guerrilla war. It is something which every one of us should be capable of imagining and hoping for and working for realistically.

And that is what we *should do*, instead of allowing ourselves to become discouraged by trying to see our way all the way through to a final victory now, when we really have no idea what new developments the future holds for us.

But even more so, we should fix our attentions and concentrate all our energies on crossing the first threshold which lies ahead of us, so that we have a truly viable organization to serve as a vehicle for our Truth and carry us forward to the second threshold and everything which lies beyond

### **Building Our Community of Consciousness** by Dr. William Pierce

I talked to you last time about what we want to accomplish, in the way of building our movement, in the next few years. The essence of what I said is this: the goals which lie before us are not political goals in the ordinary sense. We are not thinking now in terms of having won over a certain percentage of the electorate--of having taken a certain portion of the Jews' power away from them--by a certain date in the future.

Instead, our goals are organizational goals. We are think in terms of increasing our capabilities. We talked about [two thresholds we must cross](#), the first and more pressing being the threshold of viability, and the second the threshold of aggressive action.

When we have crossed the threshold of viability we will have an organization capable of preserving and safeguarding our Truth indefinitely, complete and undistorted. When we have crossed the threshold of aggressive action, we will have an organization capable of seizing a wide range of opportunities to pave the way for the eventual triumph of our Truth.

Now, it is the fashion these days for organizations of various sorts to pretend, right form the moment of their inception, that they have already crossed the threshold of aggressive action. Typically, they call a press conference, and then, with great flourishes of militant rhetoric, they proclaim an ultimatum. Or they stage some spectacular stunt.

A good example is the [Black Panthers](#). One of the first things they did was muster their whole strength--a dozen or so Negroes--give everyone a shotgun, and then march into the California State Legislature in Sacramento with the shotguns over their shoulders. They began waving their guns and making threats until they were arrested, and the news media gave the incident enormous coverage, greatly helping the growth of the organization.

There are two criticisms which can be media of such activity. First, while it worked for the Panthers, it certainly won't work for everyone. The news media, while not directly praising the armed invasion of the California Legislature, reported it in such a way that it seemed a heroic action: the downtrodden but nevertheless noble, brave, and manly Black taking up arms to gain his rights, ect.

If the sympathies of the media masters and their rank-and-file employees had been different, the action could have been reported instead as a hollow and silly gesture, because the Panthers clearly had no means at all to back up their theatrics. In general, when such stunts are tried by right-wing organizations, that's the way they are reported. In fact, it doesn't even work all the time for the left wing. The [Symbionese Liberation Army](#) is an example of a left-wing group which foolishly imagined

that it had crossed the second threshold and began acting accordingly. It had not even taken the precaution of making sure that it would have a sympathetic press gallery before it began its theatrics.

But there is also another criticism of this fashion of pretending to be much bigger and more powerful than one really is. Even if it does not make an organization look merely silly instead of potent--even if it works the way it did for the Panthers--it yields, at best, an inorganic sort of growth. That is it results in the mere agglomeration of an undigested mass of members and supporters.

Now, there are instances where inorganic growth is perfectly satisfactory--in the building of front groups, for example, ad hoc organizations with a limited purpose and limited duration.

But for what we are trying to do now--the crossing of our two thresholds-- we must have organic growth. Each new man or woman we win for our cause, in this stage of our development, if he or she is to be a real increment of strength for us, must be someone who understands our Truth and makes a full commitment to it. Each new member must become fully integrated into our community of consciousness.

This is quite different from winning the approval of a portion of the public. It is different from selling [ATTACK!](#) Subscriptions to people who are in general agreement with our position on regaining control of the news media, for example, or with our position on racial separation. And it is different from most of what we have been doing in the way of interaction with the public in the past. We had a reason for what we did in the past. We had to establish contact with the public. We had to become known to a number of people measured in the thousands, at least--better, in the tens of thousands--so that from those thousands or tens of thousands we could begin sifting out the few, measured in the hundreds, who were ready to make a commitment, ready to join our community. And a newspaper is really a mass organ, by its very nature. It is simply not economically feasible to publish a newspaper for an audience of only a few hundred people, even very dedicated people.

And so in the future our newspaper will continue to be directed toward the public, and we want to see the number of people it brings us into contact with each month rise from the tens of thousands to hundreds of thousands. But we must also do something else, which our newspaper by itself cannot do. That is to devote ourselves to promoting the organic growth of our community. We must recruit, one by one, the few from the many; we must recruit those capable of making a full commitment and becoming integral, full functioning, fully participating parts of our community. We must find and separate out these few from the many who will only stand on the sidelines and cheer. Finding and winning one such person is more valuable to us now than any public demonstration we might stage.

And this calls for a new type of effort by us. It calls for a much more personal, much more intensive recruiting effort. It will no longer suffice to put a leaflet under someone's windshield wiper or sell him an [ATTACK!](#) on the street. Now we must also make a personal contact. We must explain, almost on a one-to-one basis, our identity and our mission, the meaning of our Affirmation, and how the life of that particular person will be changed when he or she begins living for the sake of eternity instead of for the moment and begins serving the Creator's eternal Purpose instead of only his or her personal whims.

Each of us must become a missionary for the Alliance, as well as an *ATTACK!* distributor and leaflet distributor. For many of us, that many mean coming out of the closet, but it must be done.

In order to make this missionary work easier and more effective, we have been preparing some new materials. We already have an Introductory Meeting Tape, about 45 minutes in length, which was designed especially for this purpose. All you need is a cassette tape player and a place where you can bring new prospects, one or two or three--or a dozen--at a time and sit them down to listen. Within a few months --perhaps this year, if we can solve our labor problem in the National Office--we'll have a book in print which presents, in coherent form, the things we've talked about in our earlier meetings, as well as a few things we haven't talked about. It will explain, as simply and completely as possible in a few dozen pages, our identity and our mission, our Purpose. It can serve as a guide for us in explaining these things to new people. And we also have a couple of other things in the works which should help this missionary effort.

But most of all we'll have to depend on ourselves for this new effort to be successful. If we've been keeping our Alliance activities a secret from our friends and neighbors and fellow workers, because we didn't want them to think we're radicals, we'll have to change. We'll have to stop worrying about what the wise guys will think, the people who have never had an idea that didn't come from their television sets. Let them go back to their funny papers and their TV and their Jewish view of the world. We have more important things to do--infinitely more important things.

This new work--this person-to-person missionary work--will be different, and it won't be particularly easy. You may play our introductory tape for 20 or 30 or 40 people before you can find one with the open-mindedness to understand something so different from the Jewish lies he's been taught all his life, and with the character to make a commitment to it once he's understood it. But all that effort is worth it. If each of our members wins for us only one new member each year in this way, then we will double our membership each year.

We will also still be winning new people through our public distributions of *ATTACK!*, as in the past. But the most important activity contributing to our growth in the future will be our new person-to-person missionary work.

This work, for many of us, will be--and should be--at least in part, a transformation of our lives. The way it is now, one can dispose of one's monthly quota of *ATTACK!*s in a few minutes and then forget about one's obligation to the Alliance until next month's package of *ATTACK!*s arrives. But this person-to-person recruiting is something one must think about and work at every day.

The work itself, even if it does not go beyond playing our introductory tape for someone every time you find a chance, will serve to raise your own consciousness, of course, just as the little exercise I described for you at one of our earlier meetings. Pretty soon, you should have only one thought in your mind each time you meet someone, or each time you talk to someone you're already met. That thought should be: How can I arrange to have this person hear our tape?

But beyond this increased awareness of a purpose in our social contacts, becoming a missionary for our Truth should change our lives in other ways. Types of behavior which we may have tolerated in

ourselves before, when we stood for nothing and had no mission to fulfill, will become intolerable when we are fully conscious of our identity as parts of the Creator and our mission as agents of the Creator. Drunkenness, for example. The wasting of our precious time in foolish and meaningless diversions, whether in front of a television set or in some bar or nightclub, for example.

With an increased consciousness of just what our work stands for should also go an increased consciousness of our personal worth. We should all be better people for it, leading lives which are not only busier, because of our additional recruiting activity, but also more dignified, more meaningful, and better examples, for all the world to see, of our Truth applied to daily living

### **Why We Will Succeed Where Others Fail** by Dr. William Pierce

I don't think I need to convince anyone here that what we are trying to do is very difficult. It is obvious from our own experience of the last few months that it is not easy to build up our numbers even to those needed for a truly viable organization, which I talked about a few weeks ago. It is not easy to bring new people to our meetings in the numbers we would like.

The difficulties we experience tempt some of us, I am sure, to place less emphasis on the fundamental Truth we express in our Affirmation and to turn instead toward gimmicks of one sort or another. If people will not listen to our Truth, some of us may think, then we should talk to them about things they are interested in: income taxes, school busing, pornography, abortion, the right to keep and bear arms.

Now, there is no doubt that, right now, we could win a greater response from the general public if we stopped talking about our Purpose, our Truth and concentrated all our efforts on one of those topics. We would also be more successful, in a certain sense, if we were careful not to mention the Jews or to talk about race. We could win more people, in other words--we could be a bigger organization--if we would behave like conservatives or right wingers.

The reason is that most people have always been more interested in concrete, personal things like money, sex, or their own safety and comfort than anything else. And they have always been shy of anything controversial, anything that might be inconvenient, or even dangerous, for them to get mixed up with. That's why conservatism has always been more popular than radicalism. And it's also why the two major parties, the Democrats and the Republicans, have always been even more popular. They appeal to the public's basest instincts. They promise each segment of the population more of what most of them really want: more money, more comfort, more security.

Now, I'm sure no one expects us to try to out-Democrat the Democrats or out-Republican the Republicans. But we must also understand that, regardless of the difficulties it means for us now, we must not try to out-conservative the conservatives and right wingers either.

Because, while it is true that a conservative appeal, based on immediate self-interest, may win us more people in the short run, in the long run an appeal based primarily on self-interest can save us as a race. No ad hoc program, no matter how cleverly disguised, is going to achieve our long-range goals for us.



We are not going to sneak a sack over the Jews' heads under the pretense of an anti-busing or an anti-tax movement.

And there will be no general awakening, no general uprising of the public any time soon as the result of any conceivable right-wing program. No matter how unhappy people are about what's going on in the schools or about Henry Kissinger's program to liquidate White Rhodesia, the majority of them will keep on voting for the Democrats and the Republicans as long as they think that will allow them to keep their station wagons and all their shiny electrical appliances. And reasoning with them that their children or their grandchildren will be better off if they make some sacrifices now won't help either.

We've talked about all that before. It can be summed up this way: The great majority of people do not behave the way they do primarily as the consequences of either reason or any idealistic impulses. They respond, most of them, to their crudest and simplest instincts: herd instinct, or a compulsion to conform; hunger, including the compulsion to accumulate money and other material goods besides food; and the instinct to avoid dangers and discomforts. Those are the instincts the Democrats and the Republicans appeal to, the instincts the mass media appeal to--and if we want a massive public following, we must ultimately, at some time in the future, appeal to the same instincts. It is no accident that throughout all recorded history, fire and the sword have been the means necessary to bring the masses of people around to a radically new view of things. And the fact is that the other side has all the fire and the swords, so to speak, at this time.

So that means that we must, for some time in the future, remain a minority movement. Not forever, of course. There will come a time of fire and sword--an ax-time, a wolf-time, as the sagas say--and the great masses will come to see the error of their ways and will be persuaded to change their views and their allegiances. But we have much building to do, much long and hard work to do before we can be sufficiently persuasive.

And the way in which we must build--the way in which we must recruit our minority--is not simply by copying the Democrats and the Republicans, that is, by appealing *at this time* to the same instincts that they appeal to. Because, as I have already told you in our earlier meetings, the relative balance of power between us and the enemy being what it is, we can recruit only fools in that way. Only a fool can believe that he will come out ahead, with more money in the bank or an easier or more comfortable or safer life, by joining our fight, by opposing the Jews and their solidly entrenched power. And we do not need fools for the work that lies ahead of us.

We must appeal to instinct--because that is what motivates people--but it must be a different instinct. And you know what different instinct that is, because we've talked about it many times before. It is the Creator's Urge toward Self-Completion. It is the basic driving force behind the evolution of the Universe. It is the most powerful, the most irresistible force in the universe--potentially. It lies slumbering the souls of all our people, even though in many it may be as hard to detect as in a lump of clay. In others--in a few-- it predominates over all the other instincts. But even in those few, it is nearly always an unconscious force, unrecognized for what it really is.

It is the instinct, the unconscious drive, which motivates the creative minority of our people, the poetic minority. We see it at work in our inventors and explorers and adventures, in our poets and artists. But we also see evidence of this same instinct in every craftsman who does the best job he possibly can in everything he makes or repairs--not to earn more money, but to satisfy an inner need. And it manifests itself every time we feel a stirring, a response, in our souls to something beautiful or noble or sublime--every time our souls respond to something unrelated to heard instinct or to hunger or sex or fear or greed--the sort of response we have, some of us have, to viewing a beautiful sunset, or hearing a tale of heroism, or first understanding some new secret of Nature, some new mystery of the Creator.

This instinct is, as I have already said, very real. It exists. It is the Divine Spark, the Fire of God, in our souls, and it is potentially the most powerful force in the universe. When it is properly harnessed and directed it will sweep the Jews and all their clever, practical, successful henchmen out of existence forever. The materialism and egoism which they have harnessed and which seem so powerful today will seem like straws in a hurricane. Of that I am sure. And I am also sure that there is no other force which can prevail over our enemies, no clever, right-wing gimmick, no pretending to be an anti-busing movement or an anti-income tax movement to build up our strength without the Jews or the masses realizing what we really intend to do until we suddenly pull the rug out from under them. No, there is no other way but ours. Now, while we are building our strength, we must follow openly and straightforwardly the same Path we want our whole race to follow one day. That is the way to victory--the only way.

But, as I said earlier, there are many difficulties in our path. This irresistible force we want to harness is, even in most of those where it is strongest, an unconscious force. Its bearers do not recognize it for what it is, as the Creator's Urge in them. Many are confused. Many even work for the enemy, distorting and perverting their creative instinct. So, even though we know what the instinct is to which we want to appeal, we have problems. We must make the minority in whom this instinct is strong recognize its true nature.

That is a great and difficult task of enlightenment which we must perform. Very great. Very difficult. And you may wonder whether we are really any better off now than we were before I started talking this evening. We already knew we had a big job in winning over enough people to make victory possible for our cause. And it may seem like I've just stated our problem in different words, and that contemplating the task ahead is just as discouraging as before.

But I have done more than just state our task in different words. I have tried to show you that our actual task is one quite a bit different from what it may have seemed. That is, I have pointed out that, instead of trying to win by appealing to an instinct that seems very weak in most people, instead of trying to awaken an idealism which seems completely smothered by materialism and egoism, instead of trying to make idealists out of materialists--instead of that we are attempting to reach a minority of our people in whom the Creator's Urge is naturally strong and educate them as to the true nature of that Urge. We are not trying, in other words, to coax into life the very weak Urge of the masses but rather to waken into full consciousness the much stronger Urge of the minority. And that is not only an altogether different task, but it is also a much more hopeful one. And when we have accomplished that task, then the other

becomes feasible also. Then we can think in terms of whatever it takes to persuade the masses. But the key to victory--the path for us now-- is one of consciousness wakening and consciousness building.

### **The Trouble with People** by Dr. William Pierce

Many of our people who are attempting to recruit new members, or even to get a new person to come to one of our Sunday evening meetings have commented to me recently how very difficult it is. In the first place they find that people resist new ideas. Most people are pretty much in agreement with what their TV set has told them, and they don't want to be told by someone else that their TV set has been lying to them.

That's the largest category of people that we meet. But even those people who are wise to the lies of the controlled media are not easy to motivate. Some are afraid, even if they won't admit it. They are afraid to say or do anything including joining the Alliance which may cause Big Brother to retaliate against them in some way. They're afraid they'll be fired from their jobs, or that their tax returns will be audited, or that something else unpleasant may happen to them. And then there are the slobs who are just plain selfish or lazy and who just don't care. They agree with us they say, but they can't become members because they need that three dollars a month for other things -- beer, cigarettes, clothes, new records for the hi-fi or what have you. Or they can't come to a meeting because they ordinarily bowl on Sunday nights, or they have to get up at six o'clock the next morning, or it's too far to drive, or they'd miss their favorite TV program or something.

Now when we talk to people like this, day after day, and most of the people we talk to are like this, they fall into one of the categories I've just described. When we talk to so many people like this, it's easy to become disillusioned, discouraged, and cynical or what's just as bad, to retreat into hobbyism. Well it's a good thing to become disillusioned, to get rid of false expectations but it's very bad to become discouraged, or to become cynical, or to become a hobbyist, and by that I mean a right-wing gossip who subscribes to everything, joins everything, and although he really believes nothing, he makes a great game out of pretending.

The reason that so many of us start off with illusions of easy success is that we tend to judge others by ourselves. We expect other people to react the same way that we do to something which is so obviously true and right and exciting.

I remember the first political magazine (note: [National Socialist World](#)) I published ten years ago. I printed and mailed out three thousand copies to individuals, to libraries, news agencies, some prominent right-wing politicians and others. I thought I was dropping a real bomb which would shake up the whole world. I really expected that I would receive long distance telephone calls from hundreds of excited people and that at least a thousand subscriptions would come pouring in. And I also expected that the enemy would immediately begin harassing me and attempting to silence me. And when almost nothing happened I just couldn't understand it.

No long distance calls, no jewish harassment, no signs that my magazine had inflicted a mortal wound on the system. What I did receive was a hundred and twenty or a hundred and thirty subscriptions or about one response from every twenty five persons who received my magazine. People older and wiser than I told me that I had done quite well to get even that much response.

I had judged others by myself. I had expected the people who received my magazine to read it and then to exclaim, "Ah! Here is truth. Here is righteousness. Here is wisdom. Here is beauty. The man who has dared to publish this has real courage. He has identified the enemy. He has suggested that we fight the enemy and he has offered us a creed to serve as a basis for our fight and for building a new society. Wonderful! I'll do everything I can to help him and to join him in any way that I can."

At least I had expected a lot more than one out of 25, a lot more than the four percent response that I got to react in that way. And actually my real response was a lot less than four percent, probably closer to say one quarter of one percent because most of the four percent who did subscribe were certainly "hobbyists," people who were not interested in really fighting the enemy or in building a new world but only in amusing and titillating themselves, only in pretending to do something from the safety and comfort of their easy chairs, only in having something new and interesting to gossip about with their fellow hobbyists.

I had expected the world, in other words, to be idealistic and I had run head on against the hard fact that it is not. I had found out the hard way that most people are incapable of recognizing the truth even when their faces are rubbed in it and that furthermore they are not really interested in knowing the truth even if they recognize it. They would just as soon stay with the lies that they have gotten accustomed to and are comfortable with.

I discovered also that people are almost incredibly timid in that they are selfish and materialistic as well and that their only real concern in life is in pleasing themselves and in being safe and comfortable. In other words what our late Secretary of State, (sic, Secretary of Agriculture) [Earl Butz](#), said about Negroes and got fired for it, is not only true of Blacks but it's also true of most Whites as well. So I lost my illusions but instead of becoming discouraged or cynical I tried to understand what had happened and I think it's important for all of us to understand so that we don't continue laboring under false ideas and don't become discouraged when our expectations are not met.

Before we start looking at the shortcomings of our fellow citizens that we must take into account in our recruiting efforts though, let's remind ourselves of one very positive and encouraging fact and that fact is that no matter how little people seem to be motivated by idealism, still the divine spark, the fire of God is in them because they are, parts of the whole. No matter how much they are like the other animals on this earth, like sheep, even like lumps of clay, they are still the highest embodiment of the Creator.

Men have dreamed great dreams and then worked and fought to make the dreams reality. Civilizations have been built. Mozart and Beethoven and Wagner did compose. Michaelangelo and Leonardo and Rembrandt did paint. Shakespeare and Milton did write. Newton and Darwin did commune with the

Creator and discovered many of nature's mysteries. And great idealistic movements involving millions of people have arisen and transformed the whole world time after time.

So let's always keep that in mind. Let us remember that no matter how much trouble we may have with people who will not or can not respond to our message in the way we would like them to, no matter what obstacles we must overcome, the force pushing us onward in our task is the eternal and irresistible life force symbolized by our rune. It's the upward driving force of the Creator seeking self-completion and it can not be stopped. The only question is whether we ourselves, you and I, will play a role in the things that are to come, or whether we won't. Whether we'll help the life force in the accomplishment of its task, or whether we'll stand aside, or even get in the way.

So people are, we are, like many other parts of the whole, animals and animals are motivated primarily by instinct. They are programmed by the Creator to react in certain ways to certain situations. A dog or a rattlesnake or a tarantula or an eagle has relatively little to say about the way it will behave, the way it will conduct its life. Its instincts govern it and the same is true of Man with only a slight difference in degree.

Now men can reason and they can do idealistic, or let us say, unselfish things. But as a matter of fact, so can many other animals. Anyone who's ever owned a dog or a cat knows that they can reason although not as finely as man. In the higher animals at least, dogs and cats and horses are capable of unselfish acts. Again, it's a matter of degree -- we're all parts of one whole although we're different parts.

We've made the mistake in the past of imagining that a great gulf separates man from the rest of life, from the other animals. That man is a reasoning, compassionate, idealistic creature, and that the other animals are not. Above all we thought, Man reasons and the other animals don't. Well now we've learned in the last few decades that the ability of non-human animals goes quite a bit beyond the sort of reasoning we can observe in our pet cat's and dogs. Chimpanzees, for example, we know now use not only tools but they also make tools. And they can be taught to communicate with men using a language complete with rules of grammar even though their vocal apparatus is not suited for human speech.

So the great gulf has disappeared and in its place we have a continuum, a continuously ascending hierarchy of life. The ability to reason and to do other things we once thought of as exclusively human is distributed along this continuum and all we can say is that the ability becomes more pronounced, more refined, as we ascend through the various species toward Man, and then through the various races of Man, and finally through the various individuals that make up our own race. But just as we now must share our so-called human attribute of reason with other animals, so we share their attribute of instinct much more than we were formerly willing to admit. The fact is that although man can reason, it's instinct, or inborn behavior which is pre-programmed by the Creator which determines most of what we do on this earth.

Some people, especially those who have been influenced by humanist ideas, that is by the notion that human beings are somehow distinct and separate from the rest of the whole and are the possessors of something called human dignity which differentiates them from all other animals and also incidentally

makes them all equal to each other regardless of race, color, creed, national origin or sex, such people may find what I've said offensive but that makes it no less true. And it's interesting to note that the principal propagandists for human dignity are the very ones who best understand the essentially instinctual basis of human behavior and who make the most use of that understanding. They are the skilled manipulators of mass behavior who use the news and entertainment media and all the techniques of Madison Avenue to assure that, on the average, we'll think and vote and spend our money the way they want us to.

They manipulate our sexual instincts and our herd instinct or instinct to conform to those around us, and our instinct for self-preservation. Just about the way that we use our knowledge of animal behavior to get our domesticated animals, our cattle, our sheep, our horses, to do what we want them to. The only essential difference being that the Madison Avenue manipulators must use a considerably refined technique. Consider, for example, herd instinct, that's a simple name for a very complex phenomena, It governs our behavior in many different ways, some of them quite obvious and direct, others much more subtle. It's not reason but herd instinct which tells us to wear approximately the same type of clothes as the people around us; to read the same books; to cheer for the same team; to like the same music; and to pay the lip service to approximately the same political, social, and religious ideas. A person doesn't become a Baptist, or a Quaker, or a Catholic through a process of comparing these different sects and then making a rational decision as to which one is best, at least 999 out of a thousand people don't do it that way. A person goes to the church he loves because it's the one the people around him, usually his immediate family, go to.

And herd instinct also plays a very important role in determining people's attitudes towards things like racial integration, racial intermarriage. People will generally be for or against the things that their neighbors are for or against. Again it's not reason which determines their attitudes, not a calculated attempt to curry favor or to be popular by pretending to agree with one's neighbors, at least not in the great majority of cases. One's beliefs and attitudes genuinely change in order to stay in harmony with what one perceives to be the beliefs and attitudes of those around one and it's herd instinct which causes this change.

Now I don't want to spend a lot of time tonight trying to analyze this phenomenon -- it's a complex and tricky subject with all sorts of complications. As just one example, people don't usually remain among the same neighbors all their lives. They move from one part of the country to another to go away to school, to change jobs and so on. And the attitudes acquired in one environment, that is among one particular group of neighbors, take a while to change when a person moves into a new environment, a new group of neighbors.

And since, because of all the moving around that we have today in this country, no environment, or at least very few environments are really homogeneous anymore but instead consist of people from many different environments with consequently different attitudes, why then herd instinct has a little trouble in deciding just which shades of opinion to make a person conform to.

Furthermore there are often conflicting instincts at work simultaneously. Take racial integration, for example. We have on the one hand a natural xenophobia which tends to keep us from mixing with alien

racism and on the other hand we have the influence of the manipulators using herd instinct to make us conform to their immediate projected goals of integration and forced equality. But despite the complexity of the instinctual control of our behavior we can make some general observations.

First, the dominant role of instinct in our lives is not, as the liberals would have us believe, something shameful, something to be overcome, something which despite the fact that we share it with other animals is somehow less than human. No, it's simply the way things are and if we look at it the right way then it's pretty hard to criticize the Creator for it. If sex, for example, were a matter of reason instead of instinct, why then none of us would be here. Our race would be extinct, because long ago some nutty religion would have sprung up and declared sex sinful and told us that the only way to get into heaven is to remain chaste but no such religion has ever prevailed though a number have tried because our sexual instinct just wouldn't stand for it. And to our xenophobia we also owe the very existence of our race. It's what has kept us from mixing with non-White races long ago and, thereby, disappearing through the process of amalgamation. In fact, evolution could not take place at all if there were not an instinctive tendency of like to breed with like.

Our reason can easily be fooled but our instincts, in general are far, far wiser, far less fallible. When reason and instinct are in conflict it will generally be the instinct which is right. It's our instincts which show us the way to the upward path and our reason which must be used as a tool to help us in the direction pointed out to us by our instincts rather than being used as a means of opposing these instincts.

But again we're dealing with a complex and tricky subject and we have to be very careful about our conclusions. For instance, I just said that our instincts are usually right BUT one of the ways in which we have been led astray has been through the artificial manipulation of those instincts and in today's unnatural society even we are obliged to buck some instincts, herd instincts for example, in our work to bring about certain changes which will allow a more natural play of our instincts and allow the Creator's upward urge to again become predominant.

There is one firm and safe conclusion we can draw, however, and it's this: our efforts will be more effective, we'll be more successful in recruiting new people the more we are able to work with people's instincts instead of against them. Now we are appealing to just one instinct. It's the highest, the finest, the noblest instinct that we have -- the Creator's urge toward self-realization but we cannot now also appeal to people's cruder instincts, the instincts which, in most people, are the dominant ones. We cannot, at this time offer people safety or popularity or wealth. All that we can offer them is an opportunity to make sacrifices, to undergo dangers and hardships, and to suffer social ostracism for the sake of the Creator's purpose. And that means that our message will find a response only in a small minority of our people at this time. That makes things slow and difficult and often discouraging for us but there's no way around it for a while yet.

The good aspect of this is that we'll recruit only the spiritually best of our people and those are the ones on whom we must build our foundation. But time is also important to us, we have two thresholds to cross which we discussed earlier and we want to cross them as soon as we possibly can. And so we

must be thinking now of the ways in which we can broaden our appeal in the future to ways in which we can appeal to people's other instincts in a natural and healthy way consistent with our purpose.

The most important of these ways is the building of a genuine organic community. When we have not just a collection of people paying their dues each month to the Alliance but a real community of men and women and children living together, working together, and sacrificing together for our common purpose, our shared purpose, then we will have come a long way and it need not be an especially large community. What's more important than numbers is the sense of community, the feeling of community. When we have that then we can put our own herd instinct to work and it will be a much more powerful, more compelling herd instinct than that which the enemy is now manipulating because the enemy, in order to accomplish his destructive purpose, had first to set about breaking down and undermining the already existing sense of community in America. Before he could begin employing herd instinct to promote racial mixing he had to destroy the basis on which herd instinct had formerly opposed that mixing. He had to destroy White solidarity. He had to turn a national and racial community into an atomized mass of individuals, and that's exactly what he's done.

I doubt that anyone here feels a sense of belonging to Arlington, Virginia, say, as a community or to Washington, or Falls Church or Silver Spring, or wherever you happen to live. That disappeared years ago, decades ago in America, and people miss it. There are, I'm sure, a few neighborhoods left in America, ethnic neighborhoods, racially homogeneous neighborhoods, South Boston perhaps, a few other places, but the seeds of their destruction have already been sown and are growing fast and the same is true of nearly all the various Christian churches, all the other social entities which use to provide for people the feeling of community which their souls crave and so it will be of enormous importance to us when we have in the Alliance a real community and can offer to soul-sick Americans the sense of security, of companionship, of moral reinforcement which only belonging to an organic community can provide.

That's what we can look forward to and that's what we must work for now. When we have it then we'll not be obliged so much to buck people's instincts and our recruiting efforts will certainly be much, much more effective. But for now we still have to do things the hard way and it will be slow and difficult for a while yet and all I can say to you is that we must continue building our own consciousness and thus our strength in the ways that I've told you about and we must concentrate our efforts on person-to-person recruiting, each of us every day in the way that I talked to you about a couple of weeks ago, and then we will have a community, and we will cross our two thresholds, and our truth will prevail.

## CHANGE VS PROGRESS

by Dr. William L. Pierce

THURSDAY, as some of you may know, I was out of the office, because I had to go to a juvenile court. My two sixteen year-old sons — it was a relatively minor thing — had been riding with some girls in the back of a pick-up truck belonging to their friend, and the friend managed to overturn his truck in a field. No one was hurt, but the owner of the field charged everyone with trespass.



When the court finally got around to hearing the case involving my sons and their friends, the judge dismissed the charges, but meanwhile I had to sit through several other cases.

One of the cases involved two sisters, about sixteen and seventeen years old, who had run away from home. Both girls were really quite pretty, one a blonde and one with long brown hair. But the parents were middle-aged, working class people, nondescript except that the mother looked rather hard. It was easy to imagine her in front of her TV set every day, curlers in her hair, a drink in one hand and a cigarette in her mouth. Well, the judge asked the father what the problem had been which had caused his daughters to run away. The father wasn't really sure, but he said that in general he couldn't control the girls and that he had given up on them. The judge asked him if he was ready for his daughters to come home again, and the man hesitated, and then he said with obvious reluctance that he would give it another try if the girls would promise to behave. But then the mother spoke up and said she was fed up with both girls and didn't want them back. So the judge ordered the matron, who was with the girls, to take them to the state penitentiary for juveniles, and they were led away crying.

It was the first time I had seen something like that, and I was shocked. Talking to other people in the court afterward, though, I realized it happens pretty often. In this particular case, there was no way for me to tell what the underlying problem was, whether the girls were really incorrigible, or the parents had made life at home intolerable for them, or perhaps both. But to deliberately send young girls like that, who had not committed any crime, off to a detention home, where they would be mixed with Blacks, just seemed sick to me, and I was reminded of something I've been writing about for our paper.

There are groups of parents in the District of Columbia — middle-class White parents — who have deliberately moved into mostly-Black neighborhoods, and who send their children to the mostly-Black neighborhood schools. A couple of these parents have been interviewed by the *Post* and the *Star*. In the most recent interview, about two weeks ago, one White mother reported on the experiences of these White parents and their children, and one of the things that she had found out was that when the White children are in the minority in the school, they tend to seek acceptance from the Blacks rather than banding together and maintaining their own identity. And this woman was really quite happy about this discovery. She proudly described how her children had learned to speak the Black dialect and how one of her daughters had gone off on a camping trip with her Black classmates. She had come back with her blonde hair done in the Negro 'cornrow' style.

It is hard to understand such sickness. I can only surmise that these White parents in Washington have been so brainwashed by Jewish racial propaganda that they have become guilt-ridden, and, by exposing their own children to Blacks and destroying their feelings of racial identity, they are in some way punishing themselves for what they feel is their racial guilt. But, whatever the reason, I can imagine the sick, hopeless, lost feelings of their kids. It must be just as bad for them as for those poor girls I saw on the juvenile court. I doubt that the parents in juvenile court were guilt-ridden liberals, like the ones in Washington — probably just slobs, just poor White trash. But, in both cases, the parents had done something to their kids, which makes it almost impossible for them to grow up to be healthy, productive, creative adults.

I'm certainly not one of those bleeding hearts who believes that there's no such thing as a bad boy or a bad girl, and who believes that society is to be blamed for everyone who turns out bad. I know, and you know, that there are plenty of people who are *born* wrong. And we both know that there are people who are born good and who remain decent, wholesome people despite rotten home environments. But certainly in a great many cases, it's possible to damage or ruin a child's natural potential by forcing him or her into an unnatural or an unhealthy environment. It's possible to produce screwed-up adults and a screwed-up society in this way. Certainly none of us should be surprised if the two girls from the juvenile court end up as prostitutes, and the children of the sick White liberals in Washington end up marrying Negroes.

I think it's clear that the healthier and more natural an environment a society can provide for its children, then the healthier adults those children will grow into, and the healthier the whole society will remain in the next generation. And I think it's also clear that if we want to fulfill our racial mission, then we must do whatever we can to assure the healthiest possible society for our people.

We can't, of course, build a perfect society — because we are not perfect. And we must always count on having people who are born wrong or who go bad. But we certainly can have a society which is much, much healthier than this.

You know, we are not conservatives: We are not interested in going backward in time. Yet, thinking backward into our own experiences of a few years ago, I believe most of us can see several important ways in which the society in which we grew up was a healthier one than the society in which today's kids are growing up. When I think back to my own school days, I'm thinking back twenty-five to thirty-five years — others here may think back further, some may not be old enough to think back that far — but even fifteen or twenty years ago is far enough back to see some significant differences.

Let's see if we can pick out the ones that are really important.

The difference that the materialists are always emphasizing is that today's society is much richer, much more affluent. In the old days, no kid could even dream of owning a digital wristwatch, for example, or an electronic calculator that would give him logarithms or functions at the punch of a button. Today everyone can afford those things, even the poorest members of our society.

Science and technology have done many wonderful things for us and can continue to do so in the future. Some of the new gadgets that we have acquired in recent years, of course, are mixed blessings. Television is one such, and I'm not really referring here to the fact that it's an instrument in the hands of our enemies being used to enslave our minds and souls. Even if we could strangle the last Jew on Earth, television would still be a mixed blessing. A few years ago, when a kid, or an adult for that matter, wanted a quiet hour or two of relaxation by himself, he read a book. Today, he turns on the TV. And there are certain penalties to be paid for that. Nevertheless, I believe that in a new society with the proper safeguards, we can learn to live even with TV.

Technology can be used to enrich man's life, and, more important, to provide him with more powerful tools for accomplishing the mission ordained for him by the Creator. It can also degrade and weaken

him, if there is not a little wisdom shown in introducing new technological developments into our society.

For many years, Western technology increased man's standard of living by increasing his productivity. He had to work fewer hours each day to earn his daily bread. Now, we are in a sort of a transitional period, where technological developments are being approximately offset by a decline in the average quality and the average motivation of the national workforce, so that productivity is no longer rising. In fact, the average standard of living for the American production worker has fallen about seven per cent over the last four years. There are more and more gadgets for us to buy now, fancier hi-fi equipment, TV sets, CB radios, lots of other things — but we have on average, less money left, after the groceries and the rent, with which to buy these gadgets.

But the average quality of the workforce is something we can do something about in our new society. Productivity can and will be made to rise sharply again after we settle some racial matters.

But then we'll be faced with a really fundamental problem related to technology. That problem is how to hold off the process we've been undergoing recently — of becoming softer and more decadent — as we continue to increase our standard of living. This will require some of the most difficult and most drastic decisions that we will be required to make. Actually, this is a subject that, although is vitally important, I just don't want to get into tonight. It's something we'll talk about at length later.

But I think that we can refute the materialistic notion that our richer society today provides a healthier environment in which to raise our children.

When I was a little boy, I went to classes in school buildings that were mostly more than twenty years old. They had wooden floors. They had paint peeling from the walls in places, and in general they showed the wear and tear of educating many thousands of kids over the years. And I got to and from those buildings by walking, often more than a mile. There were school buses of course, but they were not considered an absolute necessity in those days and for the most part they were provided for those kids who had further to go than I did. Today, the idea seems to have taken hold that a school is no good unless it is less than ten years old, is built according to the latest architectural ideas, is air-conditioned and has wall-to-wall carpeting, and everyone drives to school.

I'm sure that, although one *ought* to be able to give kids just as good an education in the new glass and air-conditioned school buildings as in the old ones with wooden floors, there is no way that one can give them a *better* education in such schools, no matter how much more the new schools cost than the old ones. The new schools may provide a fancier, even a more convenient, environment — but certainly not a more spiritually healthy one. And I'm convinced that the greater use of school buses these days is actually a step backward.

But it's not primarily the material things which have made the important differences in the environment in which young people grow up everywhere. I believe one of the more important factors is the false notion that all change and all growth are equivalent to progress. And I believe that another important factor is the loss, or partial loss, of our sense of community. Both of these are big subjects in

themselves. But perhaps we can get at least some idea of their significance just by recalling our own experiences.

Progress requires change. It does *not* necessarily require growth — that is, a bigger population or bigger gross national product. And by no means does every change imply progress. Our society has changed vastly, in the last thirty years or so. Yet, very little of that change represents true progress from our standpoint, as conscious agents of the Creator.

But even more than that — and I say this at the risk of sounding like a conservative, which I'm not — there is great danger in too much change, in too rapid change, even when that change is substantially progressive. The danger lies in the loss of our roots, the loss of our orientation.

When we were in school, certainly when I was in school, society was changing less rapidly than it is now. One very important consequence of this slower change is that one had time to become accustomed to things. One could develop a certain feeling for life, for the world, for society, as it was. And one could relate one's knowledge, one's feelings, to things as they were in the past. And one could be reasonably confident as to what the world would be like tomorrow. One could gradually learn to know and appreciate the traditions of one's people. One could develop a sense of historical continuity, a sense of having roots in a society, of being the inheritor of social traditions and of cultural developments — traditions and developments which meant something in the past, and would still mean something tomorrow.

This feeling of permanence, one might say, allowed one to value one's traditions, one's cultural inheritance, and it gave one a great deal of confidence in facing the future. And one could keep one's orientation, one's roots, even while planning changes for the future — truly progressive changes.

But when changes begin coming too fast, whether these changes are progressive or not, one doesn't really have a chance to become accustomed to them, one can lose one's orientation. The outside world, in becoming less permanent, becomes less real to us, and we retreat into egoism. Everything becomes devalued. Traditions and social institutions lose their significance. We lose our confidence in the future, and we tend to live only for the present. A rootless child, an egoistic child, a child with no strong sense of values and no confidence in the future, is a spiritually unhealthy child. The same applies, of course to an adult, to a nation, or to a race.

Now, our whole outlook, our whole view of life as expressed in our Truth, is based on the idea of progress, of never-ending evolution toward Godhood. But the evolution we want is clearly not what has been taking place in recent years. Change has been far too rapid. And, although we are now obliged ourselves to work for a revolutionary rebuilding of society, we must in the future find an optimum rate of progress which allows us to keep our roots and our sense of continuity as we ascend the Upward Path.

Today, of course, there are people who deliberately introduce change for the sake of change, because they want to destroy our roots; they want us to lose our orientation; they want to keep our children from developing a strong sense of values or a feeling of historical continuity. We know what we must do about these people when we are able.

One of the most important and most spiritually destructive changes of the last thirty years has been a decrease in the sense of community felt by the average American, and especially for the average child.

When I went to school all my classmates were White, and all my teachers were White — except for the unfortunate exception that there were a few Jews amongst us because we made the mistake of considering them White.

Now, certainly, when I went to school, and when you went to school, we didn't "love everyone" and everyone didn't love us. There were bullies; there were smart-alecks; and there were teachers we thought weren't fair. We got into fights; we had all sorts of other problems. And yet we always had the feeling, or most of us did, that we belonged to the school and that the school belonged to us. We had a feeling of community which was based on a shared set of values, a shared outlook, shared traditions, a common racial and cultural heritage, and a common destiny. There were many differences between us, but there was also an essential spiritual homogeneity, based on racial homogeneity, without which there can be no true sense of community.

Today, the homogeneity is being deliberately and consciously destroyed, all over America. In many places, the destruction is already virtually complete. And, as homogeneity goes, so goes our sense of belonging, our sense of community, our sense of responsibility for anyone or anything but ourselves.

This destructive process is happening, not only in our schools, and not only to our children. It's happening to all of us, in our neighborhoods, in our colleges and universities, and in the places where we work, where we shop, and where we take our recreation.

This loss of our sense of community is, more than anything else, at the root of America's problems and especially at the root of the problems facing our young people. For the people responsible for this loss there can be no excuse, no forgiveness, and no mercy when the time comes to deal with them. But, even before we can deal with them, we have to deal with ourselves, here in the Alliance.

We have to provide for ourselves and for our children a substitute for the lost roots, the lost values, and the lost sense of community which America has suffered, if we are to grow in numbers and in strength so that we can someday do what needs to be done in the larger society.

It used to be that the individual family to a large extent provided roots and values and a sense of community. But today it is becoming harder and harder for the family to compete with the schools, with TV, and with all the other influences which have become to a large degree destructive of the things essential to good spiritual health.

If our children are to grow up healthy — and if we ourselves are to be healthy — then, in the long run, we must be able to provide them, and ourselves, with a racially and spiritually homogeneous community. That is the immediate and urgent task of the Alliance today.

If we cannot achieve that, then it's not likely that we'll achieve anything else. But to the extent that we *do* make of the Alliance a true racial and spiritual community, we will not only be able to lead happier and more useful lives — we will not only hope to avoid for our children the sort of tragedy that I saw in the juvenile court Thursday — but we will gain for ourselves and for our race the source of spiritual

and moral strength needed to carry out our racial mission, and we can become a working model for the transformation that we must one day bring about everywhere.

### **Changes Ahead** by Dr. William Pierce

In the year which lies ahead of us, we must accomplish some things which we started to do this year but have not yet done. In order to accomplish those things we must make some substantial changes in the way we have been going about it. I want to talk to you tonight about those changes, but first I want to review the situation in which we find ourselves and the way we have responded to that situation so far.

Perhaps the easiest way to begin is to refer to the film we saw here last Sunday, [\*Triumph of the Will\*](#). That film showed us the triumphant outcome of an enormous and heroic act of will by an idealist, spiritually elite minority of the German people to free themselves from Jewish tyranny and cure themselves of the Jewish disease.

After World War I, the Jews had Germany exactly where they wanted her. She was defeated, demoralized, broke, and hungry--in other words, down, and so the Jews began kicking her. They launched a successful communist revolution in Bavaria, under [Kurt Eisner](#). All over Germany they began acquiring the newspapers that were not already in their hands. As the economy collapsed, they took over more and more German businesses, homes, farms, shops, and factories. They slandered the German fighting men who had made such a heroic sacrifice at the front, much in the same way they incited the spoiled and mindless dregs of our own population here against the U.S. armed forces during the Vietnam War.

And everywhere they spread the infection of liberalism. Promoting every form of vice and degeneracy in the name of freedom. Homosexuality, drugs, prostitution, pornography, Negro music, degenerate art--all these things were pushed in Berlin and in the other major German cities to such an extent that Jews and liberals today still look back fondly on the decadence that they generated in the so-called [Weimar Republic](#), which was Germany in the period from 1919 to 1933.

But the German people still had a strong and healthy minority among them which did not succumb to the Jewish poison. They defied the law--they defied the Jews and traitors who had taken over their country-- and they secretly acquired weapons and they trained themselves and they fought the criminals who were destroying their people. Jews like Eisner and [Rathenau](#) they shot down on the street like the dogs they were. One of the top communists, a Jewess named [Rosa Luxemburg](#), got her brains smashed out with a rifle butt and her corpse thrown into a canal.

And [Hitler](#) and the people who worked with him built a fighting movement which eventually won the support of the great masses of the German people, and they took Germany away from the Jews and the liberals. What we saw last week was the outcome of a 14-year struggle and the beginning of the

building of a new German society, a strong, vital, healthy German society with the same spiritual basis the we in the Alliance have today.

In achieving his victory--in his 14-year struggle against the Jews and their allies--Hitler did not compromise or equivocate. He did not pretend to be a "conservative" or a "right winger." He did not have any clever plan for sneaking up on the Jews from behind. He fought them openly and straightforwardly. He denounced them for the destructive parasites and the liars that they were, he announced that he intended to free this people from their influence, and he did it.

Now, what we done in Germany inspires all of us, I am sure. There are few, if any episodes in human history more beautiful and heroic than that which took place in Germany in the years 1919-1945--the rise and triumph of [National Socialism](#). That is why the film, *Triumph of the Will*, has such a powerful effect on all of us. And we can learn many things from a study of the struggle of Germany.

But there are also some very significant differences between the German situation and ours today. For one thing, the Germans, even in the most degenerate years of the Weimar era, never sank to the moral and spiritual depths to which Americans have sunk today. The Jews did not have television in those days, and so they were not able to enforce the rigid conformity in public opinion in Germany that they are able to enforce in America. The Germans had a long and proud tradition of resistance to alien influences which we simply do not have here.

And the Germans did not have some 40 million or so Blacks, mulattos, quadroons, Chicanos, Middle Easterners, Far Easterners, and every other kind of non-White or half-White or three-quarters-White mongrel imaginable in their midst. They were all White, and they had only one enemy in their midst to focus on.

Well, despite the great physical and moral differences between the two situations, we have so far been going about our struggle here in much the same way the Germans went about theirs--that is by openly and straightforwardly exposing and attacking the Jews and the race-traitors who are destroying America. We have never equivocated or compromised. We have said as loudly and plainly as we know how what is wrong here and what needs to be done about it.

But we are not receiving from the American people the sort of response that the German National Socialists received from theirs. We are growing too slowly, and that is very dangerous. We are not recruiting new members fast enough; we are not building the circulation of [ATTACK!](#) fast enough; we are not increasing our resources fast enough to insure that we will be able to cross that crucial first threshold of viability we have talked about earlier, before it becomes too late.

We must reach the point beyond which that long-term survival of our community and the Truth it embodies can be assured no matter what happens, no matter how bad conditions become or what form of repression the enemy tries against us. We must cross that threshold before the Jews head us off at the pass, so to speak. But right now they are getting to the pass faster than we are.

So that means that, even though we are holding our own now--even though we could continue publishing our newspaper and our membership bulletin and holding our meeting indefinitely--we must

do something else. We must reach the pass before the Jews do. The question is: How? How do we grow faster than we are growing now?

I have thought long and hard about this question, and I have listened to many suggestions from our members both here and around the country. I have been able to find only two possible answers.

The first answer takes us back again to the example the Germans set for us 50 years ago. We note that the Germans not only exposed and criticized the people who were attempting to destroy them, they not only published newspapers and leaflets attacking them and held protest meetings, they actually attacked them physically. And I don't mean the way some of our so-called "militant" right-wing organizations attack the enemy today by having shoving contests during street demonstrations or by setting off stink bombs or playing other pranks on them. The German patriots shot them. They beat their brains out. They cut their throats.

And I have agonized over whether we should also do that. I have driven past [Henry Kissinger's](#) townhouse probably 50 times when I had to go to Georgetown, and I have convinced myself that we could kill him, to a certain extent--but I have finally had to reject that answer, for this reason: any course of action we choose must not be chosen haphazardly, to suit our whims.

[Dr. Pierce said the FBI opened an investigation against him on what he said about Kissinger but they could not make a case for prosecution]

We cannot shoot Henry Kissinger just to see what happens or just because he needs shooting. Anything we do must be planned as carefully as it can be to fit into a strategy for reaching our goals--in this case, for crossing our threshold of viability. And I am convinced that shooting Kissinger would not help us reach that threshold, even if we got away with it so to speak--that is, even if we got credited for it--or suspected of it--without all getting locked up. And that is simply because the situation here is so different from what it was in Germany, in terms of the attitude of the public and the sort of reaction we could expect.

Actually, I think we have to give the German patriots credit for a lot more reckless bravery that we have so far shown. I don't really believe they had yet worked out a long-range strategy before they began to act. In Eisner they saw a communist Jew who needed killing, so they killed him. And that act inspired others to kill Rathenau, who was to them simply a capitalist Jew who needed killing. They had the courage to act without regard for the consequences. And it so happened that the conditions in Germany were not altogether unfavorable for such a decision. But here it is different, I am convinced.

Anyway, if we wanted to begin physically attacking the enemy now, Kissinger would not be the best target--even though he still has a certain symbolic value. We do not need to begin shooting or stabbing or blowing up the Jews or the Blacks in America half so much as the Whites who collaborate with them. Instead of trying to assassinate all the head Jews or all the militant Blacks we might plan to strike Whites only--priests, judges, politicians, businessmen bureaucrats, editors and writers and news commentators and race-mixers of all kinds--in a sustained campaign until any White who collaborates with Jews or who defiles his race must be constantly in fear for his life. And so that the Jews, without so many White collaborators to front for them--without so many [shabbos goyim](#)--must take a more



exposed position, so that it is evident to everyone who is running the System. Then after that has been achieved, we could begin dealing with non-Whites.

But the fact is that we cannot yet--or should not yet-- begin such a campaign, because we cannot sustain it, and it would not be successful. We certainly do not want to go out in a blaze of glory like the [Symbionese Liberation Army](#). The issue at stake is far too important for futile gestures.

So if we rule out that answer for now, we must turn instead to the second one, and that is to place more emphasis on building our foundations that we have in the past. That means a shifting of emphasis from attacking the enemy to teaching, preaching, and developing our resources for recruiting. It means less emphasis on the negative, on immediate problems and provocations, and more emphasis on the positive, on our long-range goal of striving toward Godhood.

That may seem contradictory, since the thing we must do is achieve our short-range goal of crossing the threshold of viability--and we must do that as soon as possible, which means we must grow faster than we are growing now. And when one is faced with an urgent problem, an acute problem, one's natural tendency is to lower one's sights, forget about longer-range problems, and concentrate all one's energy on immediate things.

In addition to that, the provocations the enemy presents us with almost daily are very hard to ignore. To allow the people who write the lies in the *Washington Post* to go unpunished, to fail to take action against the degenerates who promote racial mixing on the television networks, seems dishonorable. When one sees a racially mixed couple in public, one feels a moral obligation to do something. It is a national disgrace that Henry Kissinger has not been shot.

Even if one doesn't take some physical action in these cases, one feels compelled to shout out one's feelings to the public, to expose and condemn the malice and the greed and the foolishness which is destroying our race. One feels compelled to warn the people, over and over again. One feels that one must challenge a situation in which everything rotten and degenerate is held up to praise and everything right and good and noble is condemned.

But that is exactly what we have been spending most of our time and energy doing until now, and, regardless of how commendable or how justified such activity may be, it is not getting the job done well enough or fast enough.

It doesn't do much good to say that if we could reach a million people each month with our newspaper and if 500 or 1,000 people came to each of our Sunday-evening meetings, then the types of things we are doing now would be sufficient. The fact is that we have certain resources now, and we are using all of them doing certain things, and we are not getting results fast enough. So we have to use those resources in some other ways instead--ways that will allow our resources to increase faster than they are increasing now, so that one day we *can* reach a million people each month with exposures and condemnations of the enemy and warnings for our people. And so we *can* launch sustained campaigns of direct action which can be maintained in the face of all the repressive power the enemy can bring to bear against us.

So more teaching and preaching and developing our resources for recruiting--a diversion of a part of our present resources from exposures and warnings to longer-range goals, a raising of our sights: Why should this be more successful than what we are doing now?

The answer is: Because of what the American people we're trying to reach are like. Because of the reactions we have observed over and over again to what we are doing now.

Aside from the liberals and the conservatives, that is, people who, either through wrong-headedness or ignorance, don't agree with us, the two most common negative reactions we encounter are fear and lethargy or lack of incentive. Let's consider fear first.

We find two kinds of fear. One kind is unreasoning fear many people have that if they become affiliated with us in any way, even to extent of subscribing to *ATTACK!* The government or the Jews or the Blacks will find out about it and get back at them in some way. Some people imagine that Blacks in the postal service will notice that they are receiving *ATTACK!* in the mail and will assault them or say something hostile to them and embarrass them. Some imagine that the Jews will find out about them and will do something to damage their business or their credit rating or will somehow get them fired from their jobs. Others have a really pathological fear of the FBI. They are terrified by the thought that the FBI will put them on some sort of "enemies list."

To those of us who understand a little better the way things actually work, such fears seem laughable and contemptible. We may be inclined to say that we don't need such paranoids and cowards. But it is a fact that a very large portion of the population which otherwise agrees with us is afflicted by such fear, and it seriously limits our recruiting.

The thing which makes me feel there is some hope for recruiting many of these frightened people and getting some useful participation out of them is the memory of my own feelings 10 years ago, when I first published something critical of the System. I was afraid then. I was really worried that I might be assaulted on the streets by gangsters hired by the Jews and that hostile Blacks might try to break into my home and harm my family.

I soon found out how foolish my fears were. That doesn't mean, of course, that there are no dangers in what we are doing, but the dangers are not what most people imagine them to be. And I am sure that if we could make the initial step of becoming affiliated with us less frightening, many more people would be able to take the initial step and then, later, overcome their fears and go much further with us.

There is also another kind of fear people have, and that is a fear of doing something or being associated with something unpopular, something which will bring the disapproval of their friends or neighbors or co-workers. It's a manifestation of herd instinct.

Now, the Jews have very wisely blackened, in the public mind, everything in which we believe. They have attempted to protect themselves by making any resistance to them, any White efforts at self-defense, seem disreputable. The average American is more terrified of being considered a racist--even if he is one, and most people are--than he is of being assaulted on the street or arrested by the FBI.

Again, just as with the other type of fear, we may be inclined to hold such people in contempt and to say that any worthwhile person should have the courage of his convictions. But, in fact, most Americans who agree with us do not have the courage of their convictions, and it doesn't do us any more good to lament that fact than it does to lament the fact that people are so blind as not to see what the Jews are up to or so self-centered and materialistic as not to care. That's the way people are, and we can't change it until we can provide a healthier spiritual environment for them.

There are still people left in this country who have not spooked themselves with exaggerated fears of Black mailmen or the FBI and who are not afraid of being called a racist. We want and need such people. But I believe experience is showing us that there just aren't enough such people. We need other s too, and if we are to recruit them, we must try to find ways to help them overcome their fears.

There is no perfect solution to this problem, I am sure. There will always be people too timid to join us, no matter how much care we take to avoid spooking them. And we will always be too disreputable for some people, no matter how we try to change our public image. But I believe that downplaying the negative a bit and accentuating the positive can help our recruiting a great deal.

I am not talking about compromising our ideals in any way. I am not talking about ceasing to expose and condemn the Jews and those of our own race who collaborate with them. But I am talking about making it a little easier for those to join us who are not quite as strong or as brave as we would like. And that will mean shifting of emphasis.

This shift will have to be made primarily in our newspaper and in our leaflets and other printed materials. Some of the things which in the past have been explicit--about physical action, about racial matters and the Jews, will have to be left implicit in the material intended for public distribution.

Now, besides fear, the other problem I mentioned which we have to deal with if we are to grow faster is lack of motivation. Both among the public and among our own members we have a severe problem of inactivity--of people who are not afraid to come to meetings or to distribute ATTACK!s or to recruit other people, but who don't do these things because they would rather watch TV.

We have not succeeded to the extent we should have in making these people want to participate. And for nearly everyone, that's the key. They have to *want* to do something or they won't do it. A sense of duty just isn't sufficient, except for a very few--too few. Remember, we're dealing mostly with the [Spock](#) generation.

This doesn't mean we need a fun-and games approach to our revolution. It's still going to be hard work and sacrifice, and there's no way of changing that. But we can do a better job of motivating people to do their duty. And I believe there are two ways we can increase motivation. One way is through an increased understanding of our long-range goals--that is, through a raised state of consciousness, both among our own people and those we are trying to recruit. The other way is to try harder to have an organization which fills a real need in people's lives.

The first way means more education and more consciousness-raising, with a stress on the message in our Affirmation. It means a bigger effort to make potential recruits fully aware that we are trying to do

much more than solve a number of acute social and racial problems now confronting America--that our work is not over when the last Jew and the last shabbos goy have been buried, but that it will really be just beginning then--that the problems of today are merely an initial roadblock which must be cleared away so that we can begin a program of building and climbing that will go on and on, for generation after generation. And, again, that means a shifting of emphasis away from the terrible and disgusting things that are going on now which we want to stop to the new things that we want to begin doing in a cleansed America and in a cleansed world.

The second way means providing an opportunity for a sense of community in the lives of those who now have none, who feel isolated and alone in a hostile world because their outlook is similar to ours. It means providing a hope of fulfillment, a hope of doing something worthwhile, something with eternal meaning and significance, for those who have the terrible knowledge that their lives now are without meaning or significance and are thus being wasted.

And, again, that means a shift of emphasis from short-range things to long-range things. It means stressing the spiritual basis of our organization even at the expense of temporarily neglecting some of the current problems in the world around us.

It is too often the case now, I believe, that we try to recruit someone on the basis of working with us to halt the takeover of our schools by Black savages or to free our national news networks from Jewish control, and the prospective recruit agrees with us that it would be nice to do these things, but he looks at us--a few hundred people with no apparent resources beyond a monthly tabloid newspaper, and he looks at the enemy's enormous resources, and he shakes his head and says to himself, "No way." He just can't work up any enthusiasm or motivation for trying to do something he doesn't believe can be done. It's just not worth the trouble, the embarrassment, the risk, the expense. So he stays in front of his TV set.

If, instead, that prospective recruit saw in us a spiritually compatible community which he might join, a group of kindred spirits whose beliefs and teaching he found exciting and soul-satisfying in themselves, then he might very well leave his television and participate with us in spreading our message because he wanted to, because he found it rewarding in itself. And so might many others also. And then what had seemed impossible before will have become possible, because we will have become much more than a few hundred, and our resources will have become much more than a single monthly tabloid.

Many of the way in which we will shift emphasis in the months ahead remain to be seen. Some are already in progress. ATTACK! will change. Our bulletin will change. We will publish, as soon as we possibly can, a book citing a clear and fairly complete exposition of our philosophy and our long-term goals, that is, of the spiritual basis of our existence.

But whatever we do will remain implicit in and derived from the one, eternal Truth contained in our Affirmation. We will merely be trying new ways of presenting that Truth, emphasizing new aspect of it, drawing new conclusions from it.

And whatever we do will depend upon the full and wholehearted participation of all those here tonight and all our brothers and sisters in spirit and in blood across the continent who also receive this message.

## **Conservatism or Radicalism?** by Dr. William Pierce

Conservative and right-wing political groups are concerned with a number of problems these days: forced school busing, taxes, gun control, street crime, inflation. They oppose these things in various ways: through public demonstrations; through propaganda efforts with leaflets, magazines, or newspapers; through lobbying; and through election campaigns. And they gain members and supporters from those elements of the population who are also opposed to these things.

In general, the more concrete, specific, and immediate a problem is, the larger and more enthusiastic will be the public response to right-wing efforts. Some of the ad hoc organizations opposed to forced school busing claimed more than a million members at one time. The National Rifle Association, which is certainly the principal group opposed to gun control, has more than a million members now, I believe.

The people who joined the anti-busing groups did so, generally, because they felt immediately threatened by a specific and concrete menace. The people who support the NRA because of its opposition to gun-registration and gun-confiscation laws feel—and rightly so—that their fundamental right of self-defense is in immediate danger of being taken away from them.

When the issue becomes less immediate or more abstract, right-wing groups can still gain support—but not so much. American foreign policy in the Middle East and in Rhodesia is horrendous, but there is far less organized opposition to it than to busing or gun control.

Even more abstract issues, such as miscegenation and non-White immigration, still bring forth a good bit of right-wing rhetoric, but there is almost no public response to this rhetoric.

Now, everyone has observed this, and the consequence is that people or groups who want to win public support for themselves, for whatever reason, honest or dishonest, concentrate their propaganda on immediate, concrete, specific problems. That wins elections. And it brings the contributions rolling in to the money-hungry, “conservative,” fundraising outfits.

But, interestingly enough, the immediate, concrete, specific problems remain with us and continue to grow worse. Why is that?

Why is it that with so many people belonging to or supporting organizations opposed to forced busing, we have every year more and more school districts being ordered by the Federal courts to bus White children into Black schools?

Why, with all the rhetoric against taxes and with so many conservatives and right wingers supporting anti-tax organizations, do income taxes and social security taxes and property taxes become worse practically every year?

Actually, there are two ways of approaching the question. We can say we have more and more busing every year, despite all the opposition to it, because the enemies of White America want to mongrelize

the country, and they are stronger, with all their money and their control of the media, than the busing opponents, and they have slipped their allies into the Federal judiciary over the years, and they have brainwashed the public, and conservatives won't work together, and so on. And we can answer the questions about taxes and gun control the same way.

But answers of that sort, about the mechanics of the struggle, are not what I'm interested in tonight. We have a general and fundamental question before us, which is: Why do the enemies of White America keep on winning? Why are they stronger than their opponents? How is it that they have been able to slip the sack over our heads so easily? Why does the White majority always lose?

The answer we want to understand tonight is this: *Right wingers, and conservatives, and the White majority generally, have been losing battle after battle—and are obviously losing the whole war as well—simply because all they are really willing to fight for are immediate, concrete, and specific things—and, in particular, things which affect them personally.* That is the answer we must understand.

I was talking to our guest, [Ed Fields](#), after our last meeting, and he told me about a speech he gave at an anti-busing rally in Louisville, Kentucky, last year. He had been talking for about 10 minutes, he said, about the importance of preserving the White race and saving White culture and stopping non-White immigration and halting intermarriage, when he was interrupted by a shout from someone in the crowd who yelled, "We don't care about all that crap! Tell us how to stop this busing!"

Now, I believe that was an extreme case. Most opponents of busing and certainly most ordinary, decent White people do care about the things Ed Fields was talking about. They just don't care enough about them to leave their TV sets and go to rallies and risk being labeled "racists" by a yapping pack of Jewish media hounds and their liberal camp followers. They'll only put out that effort and take that risk to oppose something which they see as an immediate and personal threat.

So, the big conservative and right-wing groups concentrate on those things—the immediate, concrete, and personal things—and the White race keeps losing the war.

The problem is a matter of motivation, of priorities, of values.

The great majority of our people who are not liberals—that is, who have not joined the enemy—are not really concerned with winning the war. They just want to avoid becoming personal casualties. No army in history with that sort of motivation has ever won a war. And we won't either.

When a man has a personal problem to solve—a truly personal problem—then self-interest is a proper motivation. But when a whole race is faced with a major problem, self-interest is no longer a proper motivation, and it will no more solve the problem for the race than an attitude of "every man for himself" will win a war—or even a battle—for an army.

And yet self-interest is what the conservative and right-wing organizations keep appealing to, because that is what gets an immediate response.

The essence of the problem is this: The man who is against busing is generally a man who is fairly well satisfied with the other things around him. Let's solve this busing problem, he thinks, and then I can go back to my TV. Or let's defeat this gun-control law, and then I can go back to what I was doing before.

If you read conservative publications, you are overcome by the stench of this attitude. *American Opinion*, the magazine of the [John Birch Society](#), reeks of it. And so does the weekly tabloid published by [Liberty Lobby](#).

They are outraged about the Federal bureaucracy because of the way it interferes in their lives. They don't want the government meddling with their property rights. They want to be left alone so they can continue making money and spending money the way they want and doing what they want without interference.

And about the last thing they want to do is have a revolution. Why, that would be even more of a nuisance than busing, gun control, and all the Federal meddlers put together. That would really keep them away from their TV.

Remember, there are literally tens of millions of people out there, a substantial portion of them conservative, patriotic Americans, who really care whether Liz will leave John and go back to Dick again and whether the Dodgers will win the World Series.

I said it's a problem of values. Let me give you a couple of specific examples. In *American Opinion* a few months back there was an article complaining about Federal forced-housing efforts. The author didn't want anyone to think he was a racist, and he said that no true conservative has any objection to Black neighbors, so long as they are good, quiet, middle-class Blacks. He said conservatives would rather have hardworking, middle-class Blacks for neighbors than poor Whites, or, as he put it, welfare-class Whites.

The conservative objection to forced housing, he said, is only that it is forced, that conservatives don't want to be told they have to have Blacks for neighbors, especially dirty, disorderly, welfare-class Blacks, whom they regard in exactly the same light as poor Whites.

Well, we certainly must admit that there are some Blacks who would make quieter, cleaner, more orderly neighbors than some Whites. And if that's all we care about—that and not having the government tell us what to do—then we have to agree with the Birch Society.

But we believe—all of us here believe, I hope—that there is much, much more at stake in the forced-housing issue than property values and freedom from government interference. We have a set of values and a motivation which are fundamentally different from those of the Birch Society. And yet so many people can see only the superficial resemblance between us and the Birchers that comes from our having similar stands on certain issues.

Let me give you another example. In this week's issue of Newsweek magazine there is a guest editorial by a White conservative complaining about the ridiculous extent to which the courts and the Federal bureaucracy—especially the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission—have gone to assure minorities a better-than-even break. Reverse discrimination, he says, is un-American.

Of course, we've all heard the Jews yelling the same thing, as soon as Blacks started demanding their share of jobs in those occupations in which Jews are overrepresented, such as journalism and university teaching. With the Jews it's clearly selfishness, pure and simple, because they're all for reverse discrimination when it's the White plumber or electrician or sheet-metal worker who has to give up his job to a Black or a Chicano or an Asiatic.

But I don't believe the White conservative writing for Newsweek is worried that some Negro is going to get his job. His worry is simply that the Jews and the guilt-ridden liberals and the corrupt politicians who cater to the minority vote are overdoing the "equality" racket and are generating a backlash among Whites which is undoing what the Federal equality laws were supposed to do, namely, to create a society without discrimination of any kind, a color-blind society.

He sees the EEOC fanatics stirring up a hornet's nest of hostility, of racial conflict, of divisiveness. Forcing equality on people, he says, is disuniting the United States and unmelting the melting pot. And that means trouble and unrest ahead. And, like conservatives in general, he doesn't want trouble. He wants unity and prosperity and peace at any price.

Now, perhaps we should try to be charitable and not accuse such conservatives of being motivated by nothing but egoism and materialism. Perhaps the fellow writing in Newsweek is basically a patriot who simply wants a strong and peaceful and united United States above all else, completely aside from what these things will mean to his own income and safety and living standard. And perhaps he really believes that a truly color-blind government, which discriminates neither in favor of Blacks nor Whites, will make America strong and peaceful. Maybe he really believes that. I am sure a lot of conservatives do.

But even if they were right—and, in the long run, they certainly cannot be—their values and their priorities are totally wrong.

Prosperity and harmony are nice. Peace is nice—but not peace at any price, certainly not peace at the price of racial mongrelization.

And, in fact, our values are so totally different from conservative values that I say we would not even be interested in peace if we could be guaranteed that it would not lead to mongrelization. Not even if the country or the world could be divided up into little enclaves for Blacks and Whites and Chicanos and Jews and so on, every one respecting the rights of his neighbors and staying inside his own boundaries. That, again, is the dream of a conservative soul, and it is a false dream.

Our dream is a progressive dream, a dream of unlimited progress over the centuries and the millennia and the eons which lie ahead of us. It is no conservative dream of peace, no sheeplike dream of ease and consumption and safety, but a dream of the achievement of our Destiny, which is Godhood. It is the only dream fitting for men and women of our race; it is the spirit of the Creator, it is the Universal Urge within us, expressing itself through our race-soul.



You know that is true; you know that is the only dream for us, that what I am telling you is right. Yet, when you leave here tonight it will be all too easy, I am afraid, for you to slip back into old ways of thinking, into wrong ways.

I'm afraid of that because I receive letters all the time from our members, who've been paying their dues and receiving their bulletins regularly, who apparently do not understand what is written in those bulletins. They are teachers and policemen and lawyers—people for whom our message certainly should not be too abstract or too complicated to grasp—but they are also people thoroughly enmeshed in contemporary society, thoroughly involved, every day, with other people whose values and ideas all come from their TV sets.

And because our values are so different from the TV values, it may be hard for some of our people to make the transition, to clear the conservative cobwebs out of their minds, so that our dream, the dream of the White race-soul, comes through loud and clear.

It is easier for us, here in our little community, to understand our Truth, and it may be necessary for many of our other members, scattered all across the continent—all across the world now, in fact—to also have the moral reinforcement which comes from living and working together with others who have the same dream before they can achieve the same degree of understanding we have.

I am sure that will be necessary for some, but not for all. For some the dream is strong enough so that it is sufficient for them to receive our publications and listen to our meeting tapes—that is, to be members of our community in spirit, even if they cannot be here in the flesh.

But the problem that remains for us is this: our dream is a radical dream, and the dream of the masses is a conservative dream.

We want a revolution which brings about a permanent transformation of the values and priorities and goals of our society and lays the groundwork for the building of a whole new world. They want a quick and easy end to certain concrete and specific annoyances, so that they can go back to their TV.

Even the least selfish and most thoughtful of the conservatives base their programs entirely on the TV values, the TV philosophy, the TV religion. At most, they want to annul the social and racial changes of the last few decades and restore what existed before the last war.

So this great gulf lies between us and them, between our Truth and the materialist-conservative view of life. And yet, they are our people. It is from them, from the great masses, that we must recruit the new members upon which the growth and even the continued existence of our community depend.

We certainly have not reached the point where we can afford to wall ourselves and our families off from the rest of society, where we can isolate our community from the Jewish Babylon around us and depend upon our own reproductive powers to continue building our community. We may never reach that point. So we must bridge the gulf.

How? Do we put on a conservative mask and continue putting out leaflets and publishing a newspaper which talk about busing and gun control and racial job quotas and the media monopolies and the other

things conservatives are interested in—as we have been doing—but without the radical overtones which frighten or confuse or bore them?

That is, do we deradicalize our public image? Do we become a sort of conservative front group?

Remember, we talked a couple of meetings ago about making it easier and less frightening for prospective recruits to join us. We talked about the necessity of growing faster than we are growing now.

But there is also something else to remember. And that is that there are dozens of conservative groups already out there, experienced, well-financed, well-organized conservative groups. And at least some of them are run by real conservatives, men who think and feel the same way those do they are trying to recruit.

Should we imagine that we, outsiders who think and feel on an entirely different wavelength, can be more successful at that game? I think not.

And even if we were more successful, by being cleverer or more energetic or more ruthless than the others, would we have a real success?

We would have a structure without a foundation, a structure held together by pretense. Is that what we want for the long haul ahead? I think not.

Now, I am certainly not ruling out the use of front groups and ad hoc organizations. They are perfectly good and useful tools, and we expect to use them at a certain stage of our development.

But for the achievement of our long-range goals, for the principal vehicle for our revolution, for the organization which embodies the fundamental Truth expressed in our Affirmation, we must have a foundation of the hardest stone, not of sand. And that stone must be cemented together with truth, not pretense

We do not bridge the gulf between our community and the masses of our people by pretending to be something we are not. If we have made a mistake in the past, it has been trying to sit on two stools at the same time, trying to be both conservative and radical. And if we are to correct that mistake in the future, it must be to abandon conservative pretenses. It must be to become completely truthful in our recruiting efforts.

So, let us light a beacon of truth and let us always hold out a friendly hand of understanding to the masses of our people who do not yet share our outlook. But let us make no compromises with the falsehoods which now govern their lives. Let us make no pretense that we believe that busing or taxes or racial quotas are really fundamental issues. Let us make it clear to everyone that these things are only symptoms of the disease, and one does not cure a disease by treating its symptoms.

What this means for us now and in the near future—that is, as long as we are working through one organization and are not yet ready to use fronts—is this: We will concentrate our resources on fundamentals and will be obliged to a very large extent to let other groups attack the symptoms. We will concentrate on reaching the masses of our people with our Truth in its most fundamental form, and

we will let the National Rifle Association fight gun control and the National States Rights Party fight busing, and we wish them well.

Another way of saying this is that we will be uncompromisingly radical rather than conservative. Of course, if the word “radical” still frightens you, you may substitute “fundamental”—which means exactly the same thing—for it.

And does this make sense when we so desperately need to grow faster than we have been? Does it make sense to try to reach people ruled by materialism with a message which is essentially spiritual? Does it make sense to be more radical when some of our own members even now are still thinking in conservative terms?

Well, let’s concede first that, although we will be preaching to the masses, we understand that only a minority, only a spiritual elite, will be capable of responding to our message. We want to light a beacon and we want to make it burn as brightly as we can, so that it will cast its rays over all our people, but we know that only a few will actually see our light, will actually understand and respond to our Truth. We concede that.

But this is the way it has always been. Every great and positive revolution of human history, every conscious step upward on the never-ending Path of Life symbolized by our Rune, has been the work of a minority, of an elite. Masses don’t make revolutions—determined and committed minorities do.

We don’t hope to make revolutionary idealists out of the egoistic and materialistic masses, but we do hope to awaken and inspire and recruit that minority of our people in which the Divine Spark already burns brightly enough to illuminate their souls and their minds so that they can grasp our Truth. And the way to do that is to present our Truth to them as purely and as plainly and as clearly as we possibly can—not to dress it in a conservative disguise, which leads only to confusion.

We want everyone to know that we understand that what’s really important is not whether we can elect a government which won’t try to impose racial quotas on us or whether we can achieve domestic tranquility but whether the Truth that is in the race-soul of our people shall overcome the alien falsehoods which rule us now, so that that Truth can guide us once again to the upward Path, to the Path of the Creator’s Self-Realization, and so that we can once again become agents of the Universal Will—except this time fully conscious agents—and resume our never-ending ascent toward our ordained Destiny.

That’s what’s important, and that is what must be achieved. Then everything else—all the conservative goals—will either have been taken care of automatically or they will have become irrelevant.

So, once again, the immediate question before us is not whether to be more radical or more conservative in order to grow faster, but how to present our radicalism—our Truth—in the best, in the clearest, in the most appealing way, how to avoid confusion, how to minimize negativism, how to reassure those who are timid and hesitant.

We understand that we are casting our net very wide and expecting to catch only a few. But we want to be sure that we do catch all those who are fit for catching. And the way to catch those who are fit is with the pure and unadulterated Truth.

### **A World Gone Mad** by Dr. William Pierce

A few days ago I was looking through a batch of pamphlets and leaflets published by various groups at Portland State University, which M.S. brought here with him from Oregon. Some of the material was published by a homosexual group calling itself "Men's Resource Center," and the interesting thing about it was that, if one skipped over the explicitly homosexual statements, the material read just about like the great bulk of the garbage published by non-homosexual, White, liberal groups which is continually coming across my desk. That is, it has the same general tone, the same general feeling. It all reflects basically the same sick and perverted view of life, whether it is from some Christian church group appealing for funds to fight racism in South Africa or from a local so-called "fair housing" group in Fairfax County, which puts out a monthly mimeographed bulletin.

As an example of this similarity, one of the publications of the queer group in Portland is a leaflet announcing a men's potluck dinner at the home of one of the members and requesting, in small print at the bottom, that no bring any table grapes or head lettuce or Gallo wine--the reason being, of course, that the White growers and producer of these grapes and lettuce and wine are--or were--involved in a dispute with some non-White labor groups. One just knows intuitively that in any conflict between Whites and non-Whites, White liberals will gravitate toward the non-White side. Even when the fight is between two labor unions, in this case the Teamsters and [Cesar Chaves'](#) Chicanos, one knows the White liberals will be on the Chicano side.

As another example, one continually runs across the same jargon in nearly all these publication, queer or non-queer: the compulsive use of such words as *chairperson* instead of chairman, the breathlessly respectful references to the so-called "third world," and so on.

But, more than anything concrete or specific that one can point to, this material all *smells* alike. I suppose that a connoisseur can distinguish something subtly different in the aroma of queer publication, but anyone can smell the same general stink that comes from everything written by White liberals, queer or not. It is the stink of decay, the stink of death.

I used to have a theory about the relationship between liberalism and homosexuality. It was based essentially on the non-masculine character of liberalism. That's a hard concept to put your finger on, and I'm not really going to try to explain it tonight, except perhaps with a couple of examples. National Socialism is a masculine "ism." Fascism is a masculine "ism." there is a boldness, a forthrightness, an assertiveness about them. And I think it's fair to say that even communism should be regarded as a masculine "ism." at least, in its Stalinist variety. There's certainly nothing effeminate about Stalinism, regardless of how much we hate it.

And please note the distinction between the term “effeminate”--which I mean as essentially the negation of “masculine”--and the term “feminine,” which is complement of “masculine.” Masculinity and femininity are both healthy, though certainly different, characteristics. Effeminacy, on the other hand, is a profoundly unhealthy characteristic. And liberalism is an essentially effeminate “ism.” And I mean, specifically, White liberalism. Jewish liberalism is an entirely different thing. Actually there is no such animal.

As I said, I used to have this theory, but it has a couple of weaknesses. For one thing, it became apparent that, although the great majority of queers are liberals, a great many liberals are not queers. One can almost, in fact, divide White liberals into two neat groups: the members of one group, whether queers or not, display in their personal behavior the essentially unmanly attitude toward life which is a fundamental characteristic of liberalism, while the members of the other group tend instead toward a hard-nosed, aggressive, non-effeminate posture.

Those in the first group are the hand-wringers, the bleeding hearts. They are the ones always babbling about “love,” the ones Jimmy Carter was able to con with his big smile and his platitudes during the recent election campaign. They are the mush-headed liberals, the saps, the ones who are perpetually participating in so-called “workshops” and “rap sessions” and “encounter groups” and “sensitivity seminars.” They wear their neurotic guilt and their self-hatred on their sleeves. It’s almost as if each of them has a sign on his back saying, “I’m White. Please kick me.” those are the ones who fit my theory.

But there are also plenty who don’t. They’re the ones who’ll kick back if you kick them--provided you’re White, of course. There’s nothing mush-headed about them, nothing fuzzy about their thinking. They know how to get the job done. And that job is the destruction of America, the destruction of Western civilization, the destruction of the White race.

They worked to bring about the pardoning of draft-dodgers, and now they are working for the pardoning of military deserters too. They have re-written the public-school textbooks, so that they’re now full of Black leaders of the American Revolution, Black cowboys who won the West, and long, tear-jerking eulogies about St. Martin Luther King, how much we all owe him, and how we ought to hate ourselves because a White man finally got fed up with him and shot him. And they’re scheming now about how they can cancel vital defense-oriented research programs and prevent the development of new weapons for our armed forces.

Every important liberal project is a destructive project--in fact, a self-destructive project. And that gives us, I believe, the clue to the relationship between homosexuality and liberalism. Forget, for at moment, about the sexual aspect of homosexuality and regard it as simply a self-destructive aberration. It is hard to imagine anyone more self-destructive, anyone more obsessed with self-contempt that a homosexual.

So, now if we take an overall view of liberals, we can see this one, outstanding characteristic which they all share, whether the soft-headed or the hard-headed variety: they have all rebelled against their own nature, against their natural role in the world. Some have rejected their natural sexuality; they are the queers. All have rejected their racial role as the natural masters of this earth. For some this racial rejection is turned against themselves personally; they are the soft-heads, the guilt-ridden hand-

wringers. Others, the hard-heads, direct their hostility outward, against Western political and social institutions, and against cultural norms, against White rule or White dominance or the maintenance of White racial quality.

And what a strange thing this liberalism is! There are so many questions we can ask: Is it some sort of perverse reaction to the egoism and materialism which rule our thinking today, and to which we also are opposed?

I don't think so. Liberals hate what they are, their race, their traditions--but self-denial, that is, asceticism of a Spartan life-style, a rejection of materialism, certainly doesn't seem to be characteristic of many of them. They seem to be about as interested in their own bank accounts as everyone else is.

Then one notes the striking liberalism of all the Christian churches in recent decades, and one may be inclined to jump to the conclusion that liberalism is Christianity run wild, a sort of compulsion to carry out the program of the Sermon on the Mount: "The scum shall inherit the earth." But the fact is that, in addition to the Christian liberals, there are many White liberals who belong to no church and profess no Christianity.

Perhaps, then, liberalism is some sort of built-in self-destruct mechanism activated by our unnatural lifestyle ever since the Industrial Revolution--a natural analogue to the instinct which makes lemming commit mass suicide when their population density becomes too high. Well, the fact is that, although I have puzzled over liberalism and its cause for years, I still cannot claim to understand it. It is just too abnormal, too perverse. Nevertheless, I am certain that our society can be cured of this disease and that, once cured, a relapse can be prevented.

It may be, of course, that the disease has already progressed so far that only radical surgery can bring about a cure. I'm rather afraid that's the case--that many of the carriers of liberalism will have to be treated with extreme prejudice, as they say in the CIA.

But the more important question is how to prevent liberalism from recurring, or, if it does recur in isolated individuals, how to prevent it from spreading. And to that we do have an answer. All we have to do is look at the way it has spread in the past.

You know, most of the people today who profess liberal doctrines are not really liberals. They do not hate themselves or their race. They are not really salivating in anticipation of the Whites in Rhodesia being butchered and raped by Black terrorists, even if they do pay lip service to the Blacks. They aren't obsessed by a desire to pull down Western civilization and submerge themselves and their children in a rising tide of colored sub humanity. In fact, they seldom, if ever, even think about these things.

They just want to be fashionable. They just want to have the right opinions. They want to talk and behave the way their TV tells them to, the way the smart set they see on TV talks and behaves. If their TV has succeeded in instilling any feeling of guilt in them, it's a fairly superficial sort of guilt which will evaporate soon enough, after the news and entertainment media are in different hands.

But, despite the fact that real liberals are only a minority of the population, liberalism has spread, and it does have our country and, in fact, our whole race--at least, in the West--in a death grip today. And the reason is that there has been no significant opposition to it--certainly not in the last 32 years.

What more-or-less organized forces have opposed the spread of liberalism? Well, the conservatives, for one. Fifty years ago they were much better organized than today. But their strategy was strictly defensive, a hold-the-line strategy. And their philosophy was defensive too: defend the American way of life, defend the Constitution, defend our traditions and customs.

The Gentile business community was also an anti-liberal force--that is, until the businessmen were convinced it would be more profitable for them to switch than fight.

And the great masses of people didn't really resist actively at all. Their resistance was only the passive resistance of inertia, the same sort of resistance they put up for a while to everything new or different. Now they are ready to defend liberal institutions and ideas with the same mindless, half-hearted enthusiasm with which they defended the older institutions and ideas.

Liberalism triumphed because those who opposed it--and those who might have opposed it--were spiritually empty. They had no strong, vital, positive spiritual basis for their lives--just a lot of mostly Oriental claptrap. And so the spiritual disease of liberalism really fastened itself on a sort of spiritual corpse--which is what our society was as liberalism began taking over, and still is. Except that today it is on the brink of becoming a physical corpse as well.

And so now we have a government dedicated to deserters and draft-dodgers here at home; to the destruction of the White people of southern Africa; to the further destabilization of our economy; and to continued decadence and degeneracy of every sort: cultural, political, spiritual.

As I've already indicated, I'm afraid the cure for the liberal disease is going to involve some painful surgery. But avoiding its recurrence is simply a matter of nerve again becoming a spiritual corpse, because liberalism is the sort of disease which, like anaerobic bacteria, can grow only in a vacuum.

Now, everything I've said up to this point may seem like a negative prologue to what follows. It may seem like the establishment of a negative base for our Truth, our program, our philosophy, relegating it to simply a means of plugging up a spiritual vacuum, in order to keep liberalism out. Well, that's an unfortunate way of looking at it.

But it does seem true that often, if not always, mankind must be forced right to the brink of destruction in order for him to be able to summon up the inner strength to take another giant step upward. So one might even view liberalism as a sort of blessing in disguise--a terrible and dangerous blessing, indeed! We may not survive it.

But, really, in a world gone mad a sound mind is much more than merely a defense against insanity. And in a spiritually empty world a healthy soul, filled with our Truth, is much more than merely a defense against liberalism. It is the essential prerequisite not only for the continued survival of our race on this earth but also for the reassumption of our ordained mission, which is to be always the pioneers, the vanguard, in the never-ending ascent of the Path of Life, symbolized by our Life Rune.

Our people, our race, has always before been the vanguard of progress: the race which has searched out the secrets of life, peered deep into the inner mysteries of the atom and at the same time into the farthest reaches of the Universe, the only race to have set foot on another world--or, what's more important--the only race to have wanted to.

Yet, all that we have done has been, in a sense, done unconsciously, blindly. We have followed our inner impulse, our inner Urge, intuitively, instinctively, and it has led us upward and upward. But we never really understood the why or the where. We didn't understand the source of our upward Urge. Often we didn't even realize it was there. And we didn't know where it was leading us, or why. We did not understand that we are parts of the Whole, parts of the Creator, and that the Universal Will was acting through us.

And because we didn't understand these things, or didn't understand them clearly enough and didn't make such an understanding the guide for our actions, we made some bad mistakes. We let a type of society grow up around us which is alien to our innermost nature, and we let the disease of liberalism take root in this society and spread until now it is suffocating all of us.

And this alien, diseased society blunted our instinct, confused our instinct, blinded our vision, stifled in the inner voice which had kept us, more or less, on the right track. And so now we are off the track, off the Path of Life although. We have lost our confidence, lost our will. We are no longer sure we want to be the vanguard. Why, that wouldn't be fair to the other races!

We are in the process now of giving America back to the Indians--literally, of forcing our brothers and sisters in South Africa and Rhodesia to give their countries to the Blacks, and so weakening our military strength here and in Europe that we are virtually inviting another Mongol invasion from the East. And here we sit, night after night, in front of our television sets, while a gaggle of Hollywood Jews pumps more confusion and guilt into us because our ancestors owned Black slaves.

And so I tell you again, if we ever succeed in restoring sanity to this world, if we are to once again be the vanguard, it will only be after we have regained our vision, after we have again learned to heed our inner voice: the voice of our race-soul.

And if we are to maintain a sane world, it will only be because we substitute for the unconscious Urge which guided us in the past the conscious knowledge of our identity and our mission, and then make this conscious knowledge the basis of our social institutions, our politics, our legal system, our educational system, and our religion, throughout the White world.

## **Human Dignity: A Racial Ethic**

*A Cosmotheist lecture never before transcribed*

by Dr. William L. Pierce

I WANT TO talk to you some more this evening about ethics and about behavior, in particular about the way in which we should behave. Last week we saw a couple of interesting films on man's origins and on animal behavior, and let me remind you what I said after those films last week. Our pre-human



ancestors were, as all the fossil evidence now indicates, predators, meat-eating apes, who hunted and killed with weapons, rather than tree-dwelling vegetarians. But this fact is no excuse for any kind of behavior now. Whether our ancestors 15 million years ago were aggressive meat eaters or whether they were timid, non-aggressive vegetarians, as the liberals so desperately want to believe, in a certain sense is irrelevant to what we should do today.

It's good to know such things because it helps us to understand our true nature. But, they are no excuse for war or other violent behavior on the one hand, or for cowardly pacifism or disarmament on the other hand. What we should do now must be determined by one thing only, and that thing is our purpose, which is the Creator's purpose, which is the Creator's self-realization. In immediate, concrete, and specific terms, that means our guide to action must be our goal of assuring the survival of our race and promoting the progress of our race. Spiritual progress first — through the spreading of the consciousness of our truth among our people until it prevails over all opposition and all indifference. And then material progress, biological progress, for a return to the long-neglected upward breeding of our race.

At our last formal meeting two weeks ago, we derived from this goal some general rules or guiding principles for our behavior and in one instance, namely in the case of sex, we went further and drew some specific rules from a guiding principle. The guiding principle is that sex is the means by which the Creator seeks self realization through the evolutionary process, and that therefore the sex act is sacred. It is first and foremost an act of creation. Specifically, we have the positive obligation to select a racial and genetically sound mate and to engender healthy and racially pure children. And, we have negative obligations; first we may have no sex which defiles the race, because that is also the defilement of the Creator. Such sex is interracial sex and sex which brings unsound children into the world. Second, we may have no sex which symbolically defiles the Creator through the defiling sex as an act of creation; such sex is homosexuality and rape.

Needless to say, our sexual standards derived from this principle are quite different from the standards of those who follow the Jewish materialist line that "if it feels good it's okay," and they're also different from the Puritan standard that if it feels good it must be sinful. A great deal more can be said about sexual ethics, but I want to talk about some other things too, about the specific ways in which our general ethical principles derived from our purpose should guide our behavior.

Remember that the reason for having rules of behavior in the first place is in order to get the job done better. Some of the rules that we must obey are concerned in a direct and physical way with our purpose — the rule against interracial sex, for example. And others are more symbolic than physical; they also serve our purpose, however, by affecting our consciousness. We briefly mentioned one such rule last time: a rule against drunkenness. Drunkenness is intolerable among our own members because it degrades us and robs us of our dignity. There is hardly anyone less dignified than someone who is intoxicated, whether by alcohol or with some other drug. Such a person is a figure of contempt and if he is one of our members, a representative of our truth, then he not only brings contempt by the public down on our truth but he robs himself of the self-respect which everyone must have in the highest

degree if he is to rightfully consider himself a bearer of the ordained mission of our race and a fitting seeker of our destiny, which is Godhood.

So, symbolic behavior is important. It may not seem to be of really cosmic significance if someone gets drunk or not, but in a sense it is: Behavior is as important as the truth it represents. Of course, an individual or a whole community may not represent anything; it may not stand for anything beyond themselves. We don't have to look far to find a community like that with hundreds of millions of individuals. But *our* community does stand for something, for a single great truth — and it must reflect that fact. An idea or a truth may exist in a mind somewhere, or it may be set down in a book buried in a library, but it only acquires significance when it becomes *embodied in a living community*. A community embodies a truth not just by individual members having it in the back of their minds, but by the behavior of the whole community continually reflecting it — by having the truth mold and shape the community.

If a stranger comes into a community which truly embodies a spiritual idea he doesn't have to discover the fact of that embodiment by having a member take him aside and explain it to him. He can see it all around: the way that members of the community act, and the way they conduct their daily lives — in other words, in their attitudes and their actions as well as their beliefs. An idea which is not embodied in a community in this way, which is not reflected in the behavior and attitudes of the community but which only exists in the mind or on paper is a sterile idea; it has no vitality, no real significance. That's why no religion worth mentioning has ever existed in an idea alone, in a theology or a cosmology alone — but always in an idea coupled to continuing *action*. The idea determines the form of the action and the action in turn reflects the content of the idea.

Although it may seem a bit artificial to separate this action into two different types, it's customary to do so: The two types are what we call *ethical action*, or behavior derived from an ethic; and *ritual* or *symbolic action*, which simply reflects in a more formal way than ethical action does the content of the governing idea. Both types of action are essential to the vitality of the idea. An example of ethical behavior is the conduct of one's sex life in accord to the principles we derived earlier. An example of ritual action is the recitation of our affirmation at each of our meetings. Another example is the wearing of our Life Rune, but, as I just said, the separation of these types of behavior is artificial and it is better to view *any* action as having two aspects, an ethical aspect and a symbolic aspect. In some cases the ethical aspect is predominant and in other cases the symbolic aspect, but I think it's important to view nearly every action, nearly everything we do, as having both these aspects.

I want to elaborate on that. We have a goal-oriented ethic. Our standards of conduct are all directed towards our purpose, whether it's a sexual standard with an immediate biological object in mind — or whether it's the application of the golden rule to our social relations with each other, which has the simple object of minimizing social friction and increasing our efficiency and our solidarity as a goal-oriented community. But the single most important factor in maintaining and building our community is *consciousness*. An ever-present awareness and understanding of our identity and our mission. And the entire purpose of symbolic behavior or ritual behavior is to build and maintain this consciousness. So that symbolic behavior is as surely aimed at our goal as is ethical behavior. Not only *what we do*

should be determined in a more or less direct way by our purpose, but also *how we do it*. The way in which we go about it is symbolically significant — and therefore also important.

Though we hear a lot these days about human dignity from the television commentator or the *Washington Post* editorial writer, that's just a code phrase for reminding us that since Blacks belong to the same species we do, they are the same as we are in every respect. They have "human dignity" just like we do. Now it's too bad that the concept of human dignity has been abused and misused in this way. It's too bad that it's been degraded to serve as a phony excuse for most of the insanity, or at least much of the insanity, which afflicts our society today. Like so many other things it is used perversely to destroy the very thing that it's supposed to represent. Nevertheless, human dignity is a very important thing, once we realize that it has nothing to do with racial equality or with a bigger welfare budget or with job quotas or with changing the name of the Boy Scouts because a certain minority group finds the word "boy" offensive. No, we human beings do not have dignity bestowed on us by any civil rights laws — or by having more money to spend — or by being able to elbow our way into any club or school — or by being able to marry anyone's sister. And we are certainly not born with any type of automatic dignity. Just watching the everyday behavior of most of the people around us should convince us of that.

We acquire human dignity and we acquire it only to the extent that we behave in a way that reflects the fact that we are of the Creator; only to the extent that the spark of divine consciousness inside us illuminates and guides our lives. Human dignity expressed in our behavior and our manner symbolizes what we are and what our purpose and our destiny are.

Let's illustrate that with some examples. It's easy to think of negative examples: A drunk, even though he may be solemn or even pompous, is without human dignity — and so is a person who has no consciousness or pride of race.

It's no mere coincidence that during the same period in which the government, media, and the schools have done so much to eradicate consciousness of race and to destroy racial pride, we have seen politicians reach new depths in undignified behavior — and have also seen the American public vastly increase its consumption of every sort of drug and intoxicant. And we've seen them do other things too, such as abandoning their traditional dance styles which at least used to have a little bit of dignity about them and replacing them with African styles which have no dignity at all.

History provides us with a number of positive examples also: Among the ancient Greeks, the Spartans were foremost among the upholders of human dignity, and by that I mean *real* human dignity, not what passes for it on TV today. The Spartans were also the most racially conscious of the Greeks. The English historian Edward Gibbon tells us that after King Leonidas and his 300 Spartans, who fought to the last man defending the pass of Thermopylae against the Persian army in 480 BC, all the Greeks were very impressed with their heroism — all except the other Spartans. They didn't consider the action of Leonidas and his men exceptional at all: What they did at Thermopylae was their *duty* and every Spartan would have behaved in exactly the same way if he had been at Thermopylae instead. The Spartans were, first and foremost, conscious of who they were and what they represented. They were a

warrior elite who had come down from the north and subjugated the racially inferior people who vastly outnumbered them.

This Spartan consciousness is what lay behind the famous Spartan self-discipline. It determined every aspect of their behavior throughout their lives. The Athenians may have been more cultured but the Spartans had more human dignity — and as long as they maintained that dignity they prevailed over their enemies, including the Athenians. For us, just as for the Spartans, *consciousness* is the prerequisite for human dignity. But, in order to achieve that dignity, we need not only consciousness but also *self-discipline*, so that our behavior reflects at all times what we are and what we are striving to become. Consciousness leads to human dignity — and human dignity in turn serves to continually reinforce that consciousness.

### **A Program for a New America** by Dr. William Pierce

The topic I announced for tonight is a little misleading. I said I intended to talk about “A Program for a New America,” but a more accurate title would be “Why We Haven’t Yet Announced a Program for a New America.” That is apparently a subject which is on the minds of a great many people. When I talk to a new person who has recently read an [ATTACK!](#) for the first time, the questions he asks tend to be of the sort: “What do you plan to do with the Blacks?” or “How do you propose to solve the Jewish problem?” or “Do you intend to do away with the income tax?”

And many of our own people, who have been reading [Alliance](#) publications for quite a while, ask similar question MS asked me several questions of this sort a few days ago and TO was pressing me for a program statement on the Jewish problem about two weeks ago. The answer I gave both M and T was essentially this: We don’t have any plan for dealing with the Blacks We don’t have a proposed solution for the Jewish problem.

I have the feeling that neither of them was completely satisfied with this answer, and since the questions were important ones which are also in many other people’s minds, and since I have actually given quite a bit of thought to my apparently trivial answer, I think it may be worth while elaborating on it, so you can understand just why that is the only correct answer at this time.

If the [National Alliance](#) were a political party; if the [Cosmotheist Community](#) were a political party: if I or M or T were running for a seat in the U.S. Senate--then, of course, we would have to have a program, and we would be obliged to have specific answers to all sorts of questions, not only questions about how we propose to deal with the Blacks and the Jews and income taxes, but about many, many other things also: about wages and prices, about the armed forces, about public transportation, about pollution and energy and so on.

But neither the Alliance nor our Cosmotheist Community is a political party, and I am not and, so far as I know, neither M nor T is a candidate for the Senate, and so we are not anticipating being in a position next month or next year where we will have to introduce legislation or take other concrete actions

relating to the Jewish problem or taxes or anything else. So we do not have to have a program, with specific proposals for dealing with these things.

On the other hand, we could have a program, even though we are not obliged to. Anyone can sit down and daydream about what he would do if he became king tomorrow. And, in fact, that seems to be what most small radical groups, on both the left and the right, spend most of their time doing. And nothing sounds sillier than a blustering 15-point ultimatum from a 10-member group of leftist revolutionaries or an announce by a right-wing "party" consisting of five members and a mimeograph machine that they intend to send the Blacks back to Africa or to do anything else, when they clearly have neither the power to carry out their program nor even the faintest prospect of attaining that power. All they do by announcing a program is accentuate their own impotence. One immediately recognizes them for what they are: children who lack the maturity for coming to grips with the real world and who choose instead to live in their own fantasy world.

Let me back up for a moment. Everyone daydreams occasionally. I can well imagine that thousands of spiritually healthy men in this country have occasionally caught themselves fantasizing, as I have, about being trapped in an elevator for an hour with [Henry Kissinger](#) as the only other passenger--and an icepick. But unless we actually intend to put icepicks up our sleeves and go looking for Mr. Kissinger, right now, it is best to put such fantasies out of our minds and think instead about the things we actually do intend to do. [Dr. Pierce said the FBI opened an investigation against him on what he said about Kissinger but they could not make a case for prosecution] Fantasizing is only bad when it begins to serve as substitute for real planning. And the announcement by a political group of detailed proposals for remaking the world is only bad when it serves as a substitute for actually tackling problems of a somewhat smaller magnitude--a magnitude that the group is actually capable of handling or has reasonable prospects of soon being able to handle. There is a name for the habit of indulging oneself in make-believe as a substitute for the real thing, and we want no part of it.

Now, we are still a small group, we are not a political party, and there's not much chance one of us could be elected to the White House or the Senate in the next few years. But we might win a seat on a local school board, if we put up some candidates. Suppose we did. What about announcing a program then?

Well, if we were serious about wanting to win a school-board election, instead of merely using the election campaign as a forum for attracting attention and expressing our views, we would have an important decision to make; to tell the truth or not to tell the truth. That is, we could, on the one hand, run on a platform consisting of promised to oppose forced school busing--if that were a threat in a particular school district--and to make the schools safe by instituting a policy of permanently expelling anyone caught shaking down another student for his lunch money or assaulting a teacher. We might even go so far as to promise to overhaul the school curricula, weeding out the phony-history courses dealing with the imaginary gassing of six million Jews and the equally imaginary Black-roots topics. Such a platform would invite the wrath of all the liberals and the minority elements in the district--including of course, the media. Nevertheless, there are still enough White people with good instincts left in the population so that such a platform might not frighten them too much. One might conceivably

win with such a platform might not frighten them too much. One might conceivably win with such a platform, although it is certain not likely, considering the hullabaloo the liberals and the Jews and the Blacks would raise at the very prospect of having such a “racist,” such a “bigot,” such an “anti-Semite” on the school board.

On the other had, one could tell the whole truth to the public--one could have an election platform which let it all hang out, so to speak. One could explain that it is not busing which is wrong, nor hooliganism by animalistic Black students, but racial integration itself. One could explain that the problem with what the kids are being taught in school today is not that the textbooks contain a few lies about the last war and about the supposed great contributions of the Black man to Western civilization, but that the entire basis of our educational system is rotten, that the entire American educational philosophy is wrong. And one could give promises to work to remove all non-Whites for the local schools, if elected, and to purge every Jewish and other non-Western influence from faculties and curricula--promises which, quite obviously, one could not effectively keep, because one would bring all the power of the Federal police state down on one's head if one tried.

Needless to say, considering the brainwashed conditions of the American electorate, the chances of winning a school-board election with such a platform are quite a bit less than with the first platform. And that is true even though one might very well run into less opposition from the media and the liberal establishment with the second platform, because then one could be dismissed as such an extremist, such a nut, that there was no significant danger of one's winning. One's candidacy would just be one of those freaky thing we have to tolerate in a democracy, like the candidate the Prohibition Party puts up for the Presidency every four years. He receives very few votes, even from the tee-totalers, because they see no point in wasting their votes on a man who would not be allowed to carry out his program, even if he won.

To recapitulate: The choice, if we put up a man or a woman for a school board seat, would be this: either to announce a program, a platform, full of compromised and evasions and half-truths--even to lie outright about our intentions, if questioned too sharply by the press: or to tell the whole truth, and thereby turn the campaign into an exercise in futility.

Now, you might very well ask at this point, “So what's the matter with lying and compromising, considering the absolute necessity of what we're trying to do. After all, all's fair in war. And besides, lying and compromising are obviously what it takes to win elections under the present System--in fact, they are inherent, they are inescapable, in any democracy. The average person, the average voter, is never capable of dealing with the truth when it is unpleasant or calls for self-discipline.” That's what you might say.

Well, the trouble with lying and compromising is that we would not survive such tactics, in my opinion. I do not believe that any radical group, any fundamentalist group, can survive its own lies, at this stage of development. It is simply incorrect to believe that one can adopt such tactics with paying a heavy price. That is because we depend almost completely now upon true believers for everything we are doing. We receive economic and moral support, of course, from a large number of people who agree, to a greater or lesser extent, with the ideas expressed in *ATTACK!*, but who do not really understand our

basic motivation--and probably never will. Their thoughts and attitudes are too strongly locked into conventional patterns. But the active core of our movement consists of people who not only understand but are totally committed to the basic spiritual values from which all the ideas in *ATTACK!* and everything we talk about in these meetings are derived. Those are the values which are given to us by our Truth, by our Affirmation, which we recite together at the beginning of this meeting.

For the great majority of the people who send us five dollars a year for an *ATTACK!* subscription, it may be sufficient that we are opposed to school busing and to the Jewish domination of the news and entertainment media. But for the people who give up their careers, who expose their families to hardships, who work long hours when others are relaxing, who, in fact, may be called to put their lives on the line for the sake of what we are doing, these superficial things are not sufficient. Their commitment is rooted in the fundamentals. And they are not willing to compromise those fundamentals.

As our community grows, we expect there to come a time when we are large enough that we can diversify our efforts by setting up subsidiary organizations or front organizations which will make whatever compromises are necessary to accomplish specific, limited, political tasks--without our central community compromising the values on which it is founded.

But that time has not yet come, and every new step forward we take now requires the winning of new true believers to our cause, people who are attracted only by the beacon of eternal Truth and not merely by a desire to find quick and superficial solutions to a few acute social or economic or racial problems. They are not, in other words, the kind of people who are continually jumping on bandwagons and the off again--[Goldwater](#) bandwagons, [Wallace](#) bandwagons, [Reagan](#) bandwagons--but people who make a lifetime commitment to a single Purpose. Those are the people whose hearts and minds we must win now, and so we must not lie, and we must not compromise.

Now, up to this point, I've given you two reasons why we haven't announced a specific, detailed program, or platform, for solving America's current problems and building a new and better America. The first reason is simply that we don't want to sound foolish by announcing a lot of plans that we have no apparent prospect for being able to carry out. The second reason is that we are unwilling to say things which we do not believe for the sake of a large public acceptance, because we need those men and women who are attracted by our pure and unadulterated Truth far more than we need a larger public acceptance.

Does that mean, then, that our program is limited to the broad and general goals described on page seven of each issue of *ATTACK!* and that we have no idea about specifics? In *ATTACK!* we say:

*Our members are working to build a revolutionary new order of things in American life--a new order based on natural laws.*

*We want to develop in America a healthy cultural and racial approach to politics reflecting an understanding of authority, discipline, duty, and honor.*

*We want to achieve an organic society which will not only protect and perpetuate the great, traditional values of Western civilization but will purify the Western world of the degeneracy of communism and liberalism.*

*We want to secure for our people control over our own destiny by eliminating from the nerve centers of our society every anti-American and anti-Western influence.*

*We want to safeguard our racial identity by putting an end to the present insanity of enforced racial integration, which is threatening all involved with social chaos, cultural dissolution, and racial death.*

*We want to foster among our people, through the recapture of our information media and our educational system, a new spiritual outlook: the outlook of free men living and working in harmony with Nature.*

*We want to make possible for our people a new way of live, a meaningful and satisfying way of life as opposed to the present rat race in which every man and every woman exists simply as an exploitable economic unit.*

*We want our country, one day to have a sane policy toward the other nations of the world, in place of the self-destructive idiocy which presently passes for American foreign policy. We need a policy based on a recognition that our interests are bound up with those of the other peoples haring our common racial-cultural heritage, whether in Canada, Europe, southern Africa, Australia, or elsewhere, and that other races must develop in accord with their own distinct racial-cultural imperatives--without help or hindrance from us except where such development poses a distinct threat to our own security.*

You see, that program gives no specifics. It say, for example, that we want an end to racial integration, but it doesn't say how we are going to achieve that goal. It doesn't say what we have in mind for the 30 to 40 million non-Whites in this country, especially if they decide they want to stay integrated. And it doesn't say how we intend to recapture our information media and our educational system. I doesn't answer many questions which naturally arise about our intentions. It only says, in very general terms, what we want, but it doesn't say how or when, and it doesn't give details. Does that mean that we don't have a more complete program?

Not exactly. We have thought about specifics, and we do have a number of ideas along particular lines relating to these general goals. But we haven't published them--or a watered-down and compromised version of them--and we don't intend to, for the two reason already mentioned and also for an even more fundamental reason, which I'll tell you about in a moment. But first let me get a few more preliminaries out of the way.

In the first place, the political, social, and racial goals I just read are not going to be achieved tomorrow--or next year. Any really detailed plan of action requires a knowledge of the circumstances, of the conditions, which will exist when that plan is implemented. We known that our goals must be achieved, but we cannot say when, and we have no way of knowing under what conditions. I don't think it is very profitable for us to speculate publicly about what conditions will be like in this country



10 or 20 or 30 years or more from now and then to announce detailed plans based on such speculations. In fact, all we can do, even in private, is tentatively explore various contingencies which might arise, try to estimate the various probabilities, and then think about what we should do now to be able to deal effectively with the broadest range of likely future developments.

In the second place, even if we knew the circumstances ahead and could make a detailed program now, it is not likely that it would be a program we could publish. I see a future for the American people--for White people everywhere-- which is very, very grim. I see a general public which in the future will be even less disciplined, even more decadent and spiritually ill than now, and I see some extraordinarily painful measures being required to restore our people to moral and spiritual health.

I see a future which is red with blood because of the accumulated foolishness of decades, and I hardly think this grim picture is one which the public today wants to look at, nor do I think it will help our cause to try to force them to look at it or at a political program based on it. They would reject it. They do not have sufficient understanding. They do not have the spiritual basis required to understand and accept it.

And that brings us to the essence of the reason for not publishing, at this time, a political program more detailed than the general statement of goals which appears in *ATTACK! Our Purpose*, after all, is not to elect a conservative Congress or to repeal the 14th and 15th Amendments to the Constitution, so that we can return to "business as usual." It is the Creator's Purpose; it is to begin ascending once again the never-ending Path of Life which leads from man to superman and beyond, the Path which carries our race, and what it will become, through higher and higher levels of consciousness toward the total and perfect Self-realization of the Creator.

That is our Purpose, the Purpose for which our program must be designed. It is a program which can, therefore, be only partly political in the ordinary sense and is, in fact, more spiritual than political. And it is utterly wrong to believe that we can achieve our political goals, the political portion of our program, before we have implemented our spiritual program.

That is the fundamental mistake of virtually all the right-wing parties and groups today, whether they are running candidates for office or not. They seem to believe that they can radically transform the political, social, and racial scenes without a spiritual transformation, a spiritual reawakening, of our people first. It cannot be done.

We have, I am afraid, a natural tendency, a natural weakness, which leads us to this mistake. It is the tendency to place all or most of the blame for what ails us on others instead of on ourselves. It is very easy to blame the Blacks for the fact that our cities have become filthy, crime-infested jungles and our schools combat zones where very little is learned. And it is very easy to blame the Jews too, not only for allowing the Blacks to do what they do, but for the corruption of our economy and the undermining of our national defense.

But it is a fact that when this country was formed we had no Black problem and no Jewish problem. We ourselves, our own people, were in total and complete control of our destiny, and everything that has happened to us had happened, in a sense, with our own consent.

We certainly cannot say that what the Blacks have done to our cities and to our schools was done by sneaking up on us and pulling off some sort of coup. They have done it gradually, over a period of more than a hundred years, and we failed to stop it. We failed to act even before the Jews had captured our news and entertainment media and begun injecting their spiritual poison into us. Just as with the Blacks, we had every opportunity to halt what the Jews were doing, but we did not.

And the reason we did not is essentially a spiritual reason. We allowed ourselves to fall prey to these alien influences because we did not have a spiritual basis for resisting them. We did not have the proper values, the proper priorities, the proper standards, the proper attitudes and goals; we did not have the proper understanding, the proper degree of consciousness of our identity and our mission. Our lives, individually and collectively, were not committed to the One True Purpose. And until we have cured that situation, until we have cured our own inner sickness, we cannot hope to deal successfully with our external enemies.

Now, this cure, this healing of ourselves, is much, more than a matter of education, much more than merely getting the facts to the public about race and about what the Jews are doing. It is primarily a matter of bringing about the inner reorientation that will give the public the desire and the will to act on those facts. This is something which I have talked about before--it is largely the subject of our Introductory Meeting Tape--and I will not repeat myself on that score tonight, except to recapitulate our reason for our program being of the nature that it is.

Other groups--third parties and fourth parties and what have you --will continue issuing political programs and running people for office. And that is fine. We certainly have no complaint about that. Such activity at least calls public attention to certain problems and serves an educational purpose, although a quite limited one.

But we are fundamentally different from these other groups, and we will remain different. We have stated some, though not all, of our general goals. But our program is not one of working directly through ordinary--or extraordinary-- political processes to achieve these goals. We understand that they cannot be achieved by themselves, without first laying a proper spiritual basis for them. Therefore, our program is directed almost entirely toward the accomplishment of this spiritual prerequisite for our political goals. Our program is concerned now, and will be concerned for the foreseeable future, with awakening a consciousness of identity and mission in an elite minority of our people, a minority in whom the Divine Spark, the Universal Urge, the Creator's immanent Self-consciousness, burns brighter than it does in the rest, and when welding this awakened elite into a growing community of blood and consciousness, a spiritual community primarily rather than a political one, a community imbued with an understanding of our Truth and unconditionally dedicated to our Purpose, which is the Creator's Purpose.

When this community is strong enough so that it can begin realistically to contemplate the implementation of our political goals in the larger society--that is, when we have crossed the second threshold of which I spoke to you some weeks ago--then, and only then, will we formulate and announce a full and detailed political program.

And I might make one final observation I said our spiritual program is a prerequisite for our political program, but it is not just a prerequisite, not merely a prerequisite. It stands on its own. In fact, if I had to say which program is of more fundamental importance, I would immediately say it is our spiritual program.

If, by some miracle, we could carry out our political program directly, without a general spiritual reorientation first, I would have no faith in the results. They would not last. But as long as our community survives, as long as there are at least one man and one woman of our race left who are committed to our Truth and able to raise their children and pass that Truth on to them, then even if this country were obliterated utterly, even if Western civilization were obliterated utterly, I would still have confidence in the future and in the eventual implementation of a new version of our political program, no matter how long that might take.

### **Making Your Life Count** by Dr. William Pierce

As we grow older our attitudes change--not just our opinions on particular subjects, but also our general outlook on life. This changing outlook is manifested in different people in different ways, but there are common elements which apply to most people. For example as most people grow older they become less willing to take chances--chances of any kind. Politically, economically, and socially they become more conservative, more determined to hold onto what they have than to try for something different. And older men are also less willing to risk their lives--even though they have much less to lose--than younger men are.

In addition to these things, many men at about mid-life--around the age of 40 or so --go through a period of restlessness, uncertainty, sometimes involving depression or emotional instability. Sometimes during this period a man may do fairly drastic things--change his occupation, acquire a mistress, get a divorce, become an alcoholic.

Now, some Jewish writers have interpreted this period in a man's life in a sexual way-- as, in fact, they seem inclined to interpret everything in life. They have referred to it as a male menopause. They say that at about mid-life a man's virility begins to decrease, and this causes anxiety. A man wants to hold onto his virility, his sexual potency, and he wants to assert his mastery over circumstances in a more general way to reassure himself that he is as manly and as potent as he ever was. Perhaps there is some truth in this view. Sex does play a very important role in determining all sorts of things--although it is certainly not the only thing which plays a role, despite what Freud and the other Jewish writer have said.

And there may also be some truth in the purely hedonistic, purely egoistic, view of the Madison Avenue advertising types whose philosophy is expressed in a popular beer commercial with the theme "You only go around once in life," so grab everything you can. According to their view, a man--or a woman--becomes concerned toward mid-life that he may have missed something, some pleasurable or exciting experience; he may not have grabbed everything he could have. And so he or she, sometimes

will make abrupt changes in sex partners or occupation or lifestyle during this unsettled period, in a frantic effort to pack in a few more experiences while there's still enough vigor left to do it. I have known people to whom this explanation of their mid-life behavior applied pretty well, I believe.

Actually, in our present society one does 't have to reach middle age to feel a frantic urge to begin grabbing experiences. There are all too many teenagers with this obsession. And there are all too many young men and women in their twenties who are suffering from depression, because they are afraid they have already tried everything once, and there are no new ways left for them to amuse or titillate themselves.

That is only to be expected in this society, with the values which underlie it. Parental permissiveness from birth, unrestrained self-indulgence from the time one can make one's decision, the lifelong abhorrence of discipline--these things lead naturally to the outlook on life expressed in the beer commercial.

But I believe--in fact, I know--that these two views, the Freudian view and the Madison Avenue view, do not provide the whole explanation of mid-life restlessness and uncertainty. For some people, at least, for the more thoughtful ones, the more sensitive ones--and for women as well as men--there is another explanation, perhaps not the sole explanation, perhaps mixed with some of the other elements I mentioned, but still it is there.

It is a nagging question in the back of a person's mind. "Am I making my life count?" A person doesn't have to be a philosopher to ask himself this question. Quite often it's expressed other than the way I just expressed it. One may reflect on one's uniqueness, on the fact that there never has existed before in the history of the Universe, nor will there ever again exist, a creature with exactly my characteristics, another I.

Furthermore, in the billions of years which make up the past and the billions of years which make up the future my 60 or 70 or 80 years is very brief indeed. It is an instant out of eternity. This unique and wonderful being that I am, the likes of which there has never been before and never will be again, exists only of a tiny moment in the overall scheme of things, and then it is gone. In my brief flash of existence, am I doing what I should be doing? Am I spending my precious instant of existence that way I should? Am I putting the unique and temporary being which I am to its proper use?

This sort of question, this sort of reflection, applies to everyone--or nearly everyone, at least, of our race--in one form or another. And it is a basically different sort of reflection from that implied in the Madison Avenue injunction to grab everything while there's still time. This question, this worry about whether we are spending our lives in the right way is something which comes to those who share our Cosmotheist Truth as well as to those who don't. The difference between the way it affects us and the way it affect others is this: We already know--in *general* terms--what we should be doing. We already know the general direction, the general purpose of our lives, while the other don't.

So they have a double uncertainty. They must grope not only for an answer as to whether they, personally and individually, are doing the right thing with their lives, but they must also try to decide what, in general, is the mark of the right thing. How does one distinguish, in general, between a wasted

life and a well-spent life? The result of this double uncertainty is, I believe, a much greater difficulty in focusing on the problem--and on coping with it. Their anxiety is much less likely to be resolved: they are much less likely to find any answers. And the things they are likely to do in response to their unrelieved anxiety will be more erratic, more tending toward emotional instability and alcoholism and other problems than is the case for us.

We already have the general part of the answer. That general answer, as to what we should be doing with our lives, comes from our Truth, as expressed in our Affirmation. And the answer is intimately tied to our understanding of the true nature of reality and, in particular, of our oneness with the Whole, which is the Creator. The answer is tied to our knowledge that each of us, like every other part of the Whole, is permeated with the Universal Spirit, which is the Creator's Will toward self-consciousness, toward self-realization, toward completion. Our proper purpose is the Creator's Purpose. The proper aim of our lives is advancement along the Path of Divine Consciousness. The goal of our lives should be to carry us just a tiny bit closer to our racial Destiny, which is Perfection, which is Godhood.

So, we have this general knowledge, and that puts us along way ahead of everyone else. But each of us still must answer a very specific and personal question: What about *me*? Am I doing the specific things that I should be in order to advance our general Purpose? After all, I am a little different from everyone else: I am unique. I have different abilities, different inclinations, different starts and weaknesses. Am I doing what I am best fitted to do, what I have been ordained to do, what will make my life count most? Am I doing what I should--or should I be doing something else instead?

That is the question which each person, ultimately, must answer for himself, for no one can see better into our own souls than we ourselves--at least, not after we have trained ourselves to look there. Even so, one of the purposes of our Community here is to help each member, to the extent possible, find the correct answer for himself. We can do that through individual guidance, and we can do it through collective guidance.

What I mean by individual guidance is that the experiences and insights of other individual members of our Community can usually help any particular member find his own answer.

And by collective guidance I mean that there are certain common factors which can help all of us find the right answers, and by making those common factors a part of the structure and the activity and the teachings of our Community we make it easier for anyone who comes into our Community to lead a life which counts.

Of these common factors the first is knowledge; the second is consciousness: the third is discipline: and the fourth is service. Knowledge is simply an objective understanding of our Truth, as understanding of the meaning of our Affirmation. We have talked about one aspect or another of that meaning in each of our meetings, and we'll continue to do so in future meetings. Our knowledge, our understanding, grows with time.

Consciousness is the next step beyond knowledge. From our knowledge we know what we must do. Consciousness comes when we not only know but also *feel* what we must do. It comes when we have learned to look into our souls and have seen the same message there that we have understood from our

Affirmation. It comes when we have agreed not only outwardly but also inwardly that our ordained purpose is the Creator's Purpose--not stroking our nerve endings; not indulging our whims: not accumulating property or being secure or enjoying ourselves.

And when we have attained knowledge and consciousness, we should also have at least some inkling, some tentative ideas, as to the specific role which we can best fill. Perhaps we will try one thing first and then find later that we can be more effective, that we can count more, doing something a little different. But what is important is that we begin translating our ideas into actions, that we begin serving, in one way or another, the one general Purpose which gives meaning and value to our lives, and that is the Creator's Purpose.

And in doing this discipline is both necessary and sufficient. Discipline allows us to focus vague aspirations and tentative ideas onto specific goals, and then it gives us the strength to work steadily toward those goals without hesitating or straying. Our community is, at this time, I am afraid, deficient in discipline. That is mostly because we are still small, and the primary way in which we develop self-discipline is through the discipline imposed on us by doing things together as a Community. This situation will improve as we grow, and at the same time the fourth factor, service, will become increasingly important. That is, the stronger our Community is, the more it can serve our Purpose. And as each of us advances from knowledge to consciousness and finally to service through discipline, we can more and more surely find the answer to the question I posed earlier: "How can I make my life count?" For in the final analysis the fullest understanding of the particular way in which each of us can serve best comes only from the actual experience of service.

Now, our understanding and our consciousness that our lives acquire meaning and value only through serving our Purpose distinguishes us in the most fundamental way from the great majority of the people around us. Let's look at some examples:

On the NBC Saturday Night News at 6:30 last night the newscaster spoke of the rapidly falling birthrate in the United States. The reason for this, he said, is that more young couples today are deciding to improve the "quality of their lives"--enjoying leisure time they wouldn't have if there were children to take care of, buying sports cars and boats and other luxuries they wouldn't be able to afford if they had the expense of raising children. For the newscaster and for the young couples who are not having children the "quality of life" is defined strictly in terms of pleasure. The more pleasure they can pack in, the higher the quality of their lives. The more vacations they can take, the fancier the car they are able to buy, the bigger their high-fi systems--the more meaningful their lives are.

And I don't mean to suggest that all these people are crude, insensitive types who get pleasure only from drinking and whoring and riding around in big cars. Maybe they also go to the opera. Maybe they collect art. Maybe they are birdwatchers. The point is that it is only pleasure, it is only sensation, it is only personal experiences which have value for these people. That's the way they define their lives--only with respect to themselves, their feeling and wants and desires, nothing else.

But what about the people who do have children? Are most of them really different? And I'm not talking about non-Whites or about White trash who have undesired children because they have too little

self-control to use contraceptives measures. I'm talking about ordinary White people who make a conscious decision to have children.

Isn't it true that their reasons are, in most cases, self-gratification? Don't they see having children, raising children, as something interesting, challenging, even exciting? Aren't most of them people who have decided that life without children would-be boring? Don't most of them see in children an outlet for their affections? How many people today think of child-raising as a service to the race, or a service to anything? Very few, I am afraid.

One has the excuse these days, of course, that there's no point in our trying to out-reproduce the colored swarms of this earth. They are too far ahead of us, and other measures will have to be used to eliminate that numerical imbalance. But the point is that very few even bother to use that excuse.

And I don't really mean to imply that the people who have children are in *exactly* the same category as those who do not, Just as those voluntarily childless couples who spend their leisure time in nature-study, say, or devote it to music--real music, that is --are not exactly the same as those who spend it drinking and whoring and watching TV. We can see a progression of degrees of social desirability in these different groups of people.

But the important truth that I want to point out to you is that all these different types of people, who make up most of the society around us, base the value of their lives on personal pleasure. They found pleasure in various way, but it is the *one* thing which has value. That is what the larger society is based on-- maximizing pleasure, minimizing pain. The voluntarily childless couple is different only in degree, not in kind, from the average couple with children.

Now, I have stated the foregoing truth in a critical tone. One might suspect I see something evil in pleasure, that I am a later-day Puritan, perhaps.

Well, that is not so. Seeking pleasure and avoiding pain are very natural things, and we are generally in favor of what is natural. Every animal, from the lowest insect up to and including the men and women of our own race, has built into it the tendency to seek pleasure and to avoid pain. It is instinctive. It is what has assured survival, in the past. I have spent many hours watching my pet cats, whom I dearly love, and their whole lives are determined by instinct. They do exactly what pleases them, except when fear of punishment or a being hurt overcomes their desire. The idea of service never enters their heads. And man is pretty much the same.

And yet, there is a difference. Man--our race--stands at a threshold, and evolutionary threshold. It is the threshold of Divine Consciousness, the threshold of understanding and feeling our oneness with the Whole, our Purpose, and our Destiny.

Most men hold back from this threshold. Pleasure and pain are sufficient for them.

But not for us. For us there must also be something more, something in addition to the purely animal. And so we press forward. We take the first, small step across the threshold. And that step brings us into a new realm, where all the bases of value and of meaning are different that they were before. Because now we can see, for the first time, the meaning and the value which our lives can have *beyond*

ourselves, their meaning and value in terms of the Creator's eternal Purpose--if we so act as to give them that meaning and value.

So, egoism, self-seeking, is the way of most of the world--value based on personal pleasure. But for us value is based upon service to the Creator's Purpose.

A moment ago I said that seeking pleasure and avoiding pain was Nature's way, the Creator's way, for animal survival, for animal evolution. If you want to survive, you look out for yourself.

But now I say this: **For man, from this time onward, egoism is the way of death; and service is the way of life.**

That may sound like a paradox, but it is not. I hope you will think about it.

## Has the White Race Become Too Liberal to Survive?

by Dr. William L. Pierce

IF YOU HAVEN'T yet read Jean Raspail's best-selling horror story, *The Camp of the Saints*, you should. Reading it is not a pleasant experience, but it is a valuable experience, a consciousness-raising experience.

The essence of Raspail's book is an unarmed, non-violent invasion of Europe by a starving horde of refugees from India. The Europeans, who are morally paralyzed by a terminal case of liberalism, are unable to resist the invasion. In particular, they are unable to accept the only feasible method for opposing it, which is simply to exterminate the invaders *en masse*. So the wave of brown subhumanity rolls over Europe, and Western civilization is extinguished forever.

Raspail's fiction is especially terrifying for White American readers, because we can clearly recognize, all around us, exactly the symptoms of the liberal disease which Raspail describes so starkly in his book. In fact, we can see a painfully close analogy between the European reaction to the fictional invasion which takes place in the book and our own reaction to the very real invasion of the United States by illegal immigrants from Mexico which is taking place today.

Chicanos from Mexico and other parts of Latin America and Blacks from the Caribbean are swarming across the U.S.-Mexican border at a rate of more than a million a year now — and that's not counting the additional half million non-Whites who immigrate into this country legally each year — and all we seem to be able to do about it is debate the issue.

There is undoubtedly a certain element of conspiracy behind this non-White immigration problem. For example, the U.S. Border Patrol, which has the job of keeping illegal immigrants out, has been deliberately kept undermanned and underequipped, so that it cannot do its job effectively. The Border Patrol has been sabotaged by the subcommittee in the U.S. House of Representatives which deals with



matters of immigration and naturalization and which oversees the Border Patrol and appropriates the funds for its operation. This subcommittee is headed by Joshua Eilberg (D-PA), who is a Jew.

The man formerly in charge of the Border Patrol (before Jimmy Carter appointed Chicano Leonel Castillo as his replacement earlier this year), retired Marine Corps General Leonard Chapman, repeatedly told the Congress about his problems and requested more money and more men, but Congressman Eilberg deliberately sat on his requests. The result has been that the Border Patrol is able to put only one man on duty for each 10 miles of border, along some stretches, and the immigrants come pouring across almost without resistance.

And there are other factors. We have politically powerful alien groups already in this country — most notably the Jews, but also others — who see a future for themselves which is brighter the darker it becomes for the White majority. They see the greatest opportunities for themselves in a racially cosmopolitan society, just as they see the greatest threat to themselves in a unified and racially conscious White majority.

An Italian Coast Guard vessel rescuing a boat full of Tunisian migrants off the coast of Lampedusa in 2011. A state of emergency was declared in Italy after 4,000 immigrants arrived in just four days following the fall of Tunisia's ruler.

And we also have all too many White renegades in the political and economic power structure of this country, people who habitually prostitute themselves for alien interests or who see their own political power base among aliens: the Hubert Humphreys and Teddy Kennedys and Jimmy Carters of America; and people who are making money from the alien presence here: the sweatshop owners and the exploiters of migrant farm labor.

But in addition to these causes a more fundamental reason why we're unable to deal decisively with the immigrant problem is the moral paralysis of the American public.

An editorial in a recent issue of *U.S. News & World Report* (May 30, 1977) gives what I believe is an accurate assessment of the inability of most White Americans today to face tough issues and deal with them realistically. The editorial is a plug for Jimmy Carter's clever proposal to "solve" the problem of the enormous number of illegal immigrants in the United States by the simple expedient of legalizing them, i.e., of granting most of them automatic citizenship or legal-resident status — which is about like "solving" the crime problem in this country by abolishing all our laws.

After asking the question, "Should all those now illegally in the U.S. be sent home?," the *U.S. News & World Report* editorial gives its own answer: "Whatever one may say in theory, Americans are not going to clamor for a mass deportation in which millions of women are hounded out of closets and children are dragged from under beds by their feet. Since these people are not going home, then we have a choice: Leave them as outlaws . . . or give an opportunity for citizenship or legal residence to those who have already established themselves here, thus bringing them into society where they can contribute and be counted."

Now, the author of that editorial is *U.S. News & World Report* editor Marvin Stone, a Jew. He has the same interest in increasing the number and variety of non-Whites in America — thus further weakening the political strength of the White majority — as have Mr. Eilberg and the other Jews on the Congressional subcommittee overseeing the U.S. Border Patrol. And he, therefore, jumps a bit too eagerly to his conclusion that “these people are not going home.”

Nevertheless, Marvin Stone is almost certainly correct in stating that the American majority has no stomach for forcibly removing the aliens who are already here or, as he points out later in his editorial, for using “machine guns and mine fields” along the border to keep more aliens out.

The essential truth to note here is that this inability to act against the rising tide of colored immigrants is, at root, not primarily due to the fact that White Americans are disorganized, or to the fact that they are being betrayed by their government, or to the fact that they have been deliberately confused and demoralized by the lying, alien-controlled news media. It is primarily due to the fact that they have become too liberal.

Perhaps “liberal” is a misleading word to use here, for we are talking about a condition which affects all segments of the political spectrum, so-called “conservatives” as well as liberals. “Morally spineless” or “morally irresponsible” might be a better adjective to describe people who simply refuse to deal with problems which require tough or unpleasant decisions.

Americans pale at the thought of dragging all those millions of brown-skinned children and their mothers out from under beds and herding them back across the border at bayonet point into Mexico, where most of them would undoubtedly starve to death. So they grope for a “nice” solution to the problem — but there is none.

There is no “nice” solution, because those millions of non-White immigrants are breeding like flies. Within the next ten years the illegal immigrants who are already here will have produced approximately 15 million more offspring — and, in accord with the *jus soli*, those offspring will automatically be full-fledged U.S. citizens, whether the status of their parents has been legalized or not. Present U.S. law grants automatic citizenship to any featherless biped born inside our borders, even if both parents are aliens and even if they’re here illegally. That may sound crazy, but it’s a fact.



Jimmy Carter, the 39th President of the United States, lighting the “National Menorah” for the first time in 1979. He is one of many U.S. Presidents who were subservient to organized Jews, especially with regard to non-White immigration.

Actually, the situation is much worse than that. Not only will we still have virtually all the present illegal aliens with us ten years from now, plus their 15 million or so naturalized-by-birth children, but also all the new illegal (and legal) aliens — who are coming across the border at an ever-increasing rate — and their children.

And if Mr. Carter grants citizenship to all or part of the ten million or so illegal aliens already here — I suppose I should say when he grants them citizenship, rather than if — then they will be entitled to send for their dependents still in Latin America. They average five such dependents each, for a total of as many as another 50 million.

The great majority of these illegal aliens are Chicanos (mestizos, Amerindian-White mongrels), and they are the fastest breeding race on the face of the earth. There is literally an inexhaustible supply of them in Latin America. No matter how bad the economy gets here, and no matter how many half-measures we take to make it harder for them to find jobs, they’ll keep pouring in, if we let them, because conditions will always be even worse where they came from.

So the “nice” White American majority, which doesn’t have the guts to do what needs to be done now, is guaranteeing that its own grandchildren will become a minority race in the United States.

Perhaps some Americans — the ones who have the courage to even think ahead 50 years to the White minority United States their irresponsibility is guaranteeing — believe that when we become the minority we’ll receive the same consideration we’re giving to other minorities now. That is the sort of

hope one might expect of a race of moral jellyfish, and it is a forlorn hope. Once we allow the non-White races of this world to gain the upper hand, we'll get from them exactly what we will deserve, which is extinction. The muddle-headed liberalism which makes us shrink in horror from prodding picaninnies with bayonets is a uniquely Western disease.

Why is that so?

Why, for instance, do Whites sheepishly accept the condemnation of any of their efforts to maintain White exclusivity in schooling or housing, while the largest and most active Chicano group in this country, La Raza Unida (The United Race), proudly supports among Chicanos the same kind of racial solidarity of which Whites seem to be ashamed?

Why, for instance, are White Americans of all social strata and political persuasions horrified by the fact that Uganda's Idi Amin is exterminating, root and branch, the tribes in his country he doesn't trust, when Africans consider such behavior perfectly normal — even if some of them are unhappy with “Big Daddy” Amin at the moment for other reasons? When the Nigerian majority was suppressing a rebellion by the Ibo minority a few years back, they killed everyone they could get their hands on, women and children as well as men, and often in the most gruesome ways imaginable. The Watusi and the Bahutus are treating each other the same way today in Burundi. That's the way Africans have always behaved.

Why, for instance, are White Americans importing uncounted thousands of half-breed children from Vietnam, Thailand, and other Asian countries, when the natives of those countries reject them precisely because they are half-breeds?

Why, for instance, do the hearts of White Americans — and Canadians and Englishmen — ache for the hundreds of millions of destitute brown people in India and Pakistan, in their rags and filth and hunger and hopelessness, when their better-off brown countrymen couldn't care less about them?

And we might also ask why conservative and right-wing Americans are so fascinated by the present controversy over how many Jews were actually killed by the Germans during World War II — why they are so anxious to prove that our White cousins in Germany didn't actually commit genocide — when the Jews themselves have just chosen as their prime minister in Israel their foremost advocate and practitioner of large-scale genocide against Palestinians? Does anyone believe that the Jews are ashamed of the fact that Menachem Begin massacred the Arab inhabitants of whole Palestinian villages, that he had his men in the Irgun slit the throats of hundreds of Palestinian women and children, or that he tortured to death British soldiers who fell into his hands? Begin himself has written a book bragging about these things, and they were even admitted in *Time* and *Newsweek* magazines a couple of weeks ago.

Professor Arthur Butz has written a very fine book, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, which the National Alliance sells, in which he conclusively proves that the Jews have vastly exaggerated their losses at German hands, but so what? Why should we think better of the Germans — and, therefore, of ourselves — just because they didn't actually gas six million Jews during the war?

Part of the answer to these questions is that Whites have, as an inborn racial characteristic, a more highly developed altruism than other races. The impulse in the White race-soul which gave rise to chivalry, for example, is unknown to the mestizo, to the unassimilated Jew, and to the African Negro. It may very well be that we have child abuse in this country, that we are often brutal toward women and prisoners and others over whom we have an advantage, but these things are nothing compared to the brutality which is natural and habitual among the non-White races of this earth.

Our altruism is a wonderful thing, and we must never lose it. But we must learn to direct it exclusively toward the members of our own racial community. When it is not coupled with a healthy xenophobia regarding other races, then it becomes an especially swift form of mass suicide.

Misdirected altruism, indiscriminating altruism, is part of the answer. Another part is that our over-civilized lifestyle during the last century or so has made us too morally soft, too squeamish in the presence of Nature's realities. The old cycle of birth, struggle, and death still holds, but we like to pretend that it doesn't.

We don't want to accept the fact that the world and its resources are finite, and that the more there are of them, of other races, the more tightly we will be squeezed.

We don't want to face the truth that when a race's birth rate is high, then either its death rate must be correspondingly high or it must expand at some other race's expense — as is the case with the Chicanos and us today. We are afraid to accept the responsibility for making sure that the former of those two possibilities is the one that holds.

Misguided White altruism: The Peace Corps organization sends many Whites overseas to spend years "empowering" non-Whites.

We don't want to realize that had our ancestors not killed a great many American Indians and squeezed the rest of them into reservations, we'd all be mestizos now, Chicanos, and there would be no United States as such.

In the old days, when each of us had to kill his own meat before he could eat, our understanding of these things was less clouded. Nowadays we still like our steak rare, but we look down on the butcher.

And we still enjoy all the luxuries and advantages of our White birthright, but we have become ashamed of the fact that a great deal of blood — non-White blood — was spilled in establishing and maintaining that birthright during tens of thousands of years of prehistory and history. If our ancestors had been "nice" to the non-White and the partly White races they came in contact with, we wouldn't be here today.

Relative to the current immigration crisis, what this all boils down to is that, while we may still be ready to shoot down armed troops storming across our borders, we are not ready to do the same to unarmed, brown-skinned women and children, who are just as dangerous as armed troops in the long run.

Unwilling to shoot, we instead indulge ourselves in liberal fantasies about America being “big enough for everybody” and optimistically assume that if we grant citizenship to the non-White hordes already here and pass a few laws to make it a little harder for the ones still pouring across the border to find jobs, everything will work out all right, with no unpleasantness for anyone. We seem to have forgotten that granting citizenship to our Negro slaves more than a century ago has made them no less Negroes than they were before — but has made them infinitely harder to live with.

And so we find ourselves, as a race, slowly sinking in a cesspool of colored sub-humanity, able to calculate that within another two generations the filth will be over our heads — and yet unable to act to save ourselves. That is where the White majority of America stands today.

And the situation is different only in degree throughout the rest of the White world. In southern Africa the situation is more critical than it is in the United States. In Canada, Australia, Britain, and most of Europe it is not yet as critical as it is here, but we are essentially all in the same boat. When the boat goes down, we all drown, those on the upper decks just as surely as those on the lower decks, even if a bit later.

And it need not be so. If we could snap out of the moral paralysis which grips us, we have the physical means to settle the racial threat facing us in an instant and for all time. If we could once again, as a race, face up to the simple but profound truth that we are not living in some huge, worldwide nursery school, where all we have to do is enjoy ourselves and be nice to everyone else, and some kindly schoolmaster up in the sky will keep us from getting into any really nasty jams — if we could wake up from that dream — then we would be well on the way toward a solution to our problem.

Ultimately we need to go a bit further and relearn the eternal wisdom that there can be no life unless there is also death; that there can be no progress, no evolution, except when the kingdom of life is hierarchical in structure, not equalitarian; and that the hierarchy of life is determined by struggle.

No race remains long at the top of that hierarchy unless it retains its moral superiority — its will — as well as its physical superiority. It has always been that way, and it is that way today.

If one wants to be perverse, one can distort that wisdom into something altogether different, and that is exactly what the disseminators of the liberal poison which keeps us paralyzed have done. They tell us that man used to live according to the Law of the Jungle, which says “kill or be killed,” but that now we have risen above that law, and it no longer applies to us.

In the old days, they say, man lived a very brutish and unpleasant existence, always fighting and killing, all his energies absorbed in just staying alive, all his ingenuity devoted to plans for killing his neighbors. Then gradually we learned that killing is wicked; that inequality and domination are wicked; that everyone is really the same, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin; that no group has the right to decide the fate of another group; and that if we will all love one another and abide by the Golden Rule instead of the Law of the Jungle we will all be healthy, wealthy, and wise and live to a ripe old age.

It was only when we rose above the Law of the Jungle that true civilization became possible, with station wagons and backyard barbecues and Sammy Davis, Jr., for everyone. And, of course, we will lose all these wonderful things if we abandon the Golden Rule and go back to the Law of the Jungle again — that is, if we drag all those little mestizos out from under the bed, hustle them back across the border, and then do whatever it takes to make sure they stay there.

Very roughly, that is the philosophical claptrap which is used to justify our present rate of moral paralysis. For the more sophisticated moral basket cases among us it is dressed up with lots of additional rhetoric about world opinion and the brotherhood of man and the necessity of staying in the good graces of the Third World, but that is its essence. And it is, of course, total nonsense.

There is nothing brutish about accepting the facts of life. Being realistic, being mature, being morally responsible, does not mean a descent back into the jungle — quite the contrary.

Nor does it mean being bloodthirsty. The morally responsible person is not an insensitive person or a crude and violent person or a person motivated by hatred. He may love animals and children and poetry — but he faces the facts, whatever they may be.

He accepts his responsibility for the state of affairs in the world around him whenever he is in a position to influence those affairs. And he is ready to kill — without hatred, without passion — when killing is necessary, instead of wringing his hands and moaning about not having the right. He understands that the Creator bestows the right upon those who are fit to bear it.

Contrary to liberal dogma, not only our civilization but our very existence today is a consequence of the fact that our ancestors understood the above truth, at least intuitively, and acted on it. We will lose both our civilization and our existence in very short order if we do not begin to understand it also

### **Cosmotheism – Wave of the Future** by Dr. William Pierce

We have ready tonight the first of a series of pamphlets intended to serve not only as guides for us, but also as aids in enlightening new people and in bringing them into our community. This particular pamphlet, “The Path,” is the first in the series because it's the most fundamental. It states in a very concise form...also, I hope, in a relatively easy to understand form...the essence of our truth, the essence of the idea on which our community is founded. What it doesn't state is a great many very important things, namely everything which is implied by the Cosmotheist truth, everything which can be derived from it. It says essentially nothing, for example, about ethics, about race, and about many other things, some of which we have talked about in our earlier meetings here. And the reason that it says nothing about these things is simply that it would have taken a book ten times the length of this pamphlet to say them, and we couldn't have had that book ready tonight...perhaps not even by this time next year. We eventually will have a book, but first we'll have a series of pamphlets dealing with ethics, with race, and with everything else of importance to us, and this is the beginning.

Now, in choosing to commit our Cosmotheist doctrine to writing in this step-by-step way, which is the only practical way for us at this time, we make some difficulties for ourselves and we leave ourselves open to some dangers, and I'll talk about those in just a minute. But there's at least one advantage to this way in addition to the strictly practical one of not having to wait forever to have at least something down on paper. That advantage lies in stressing to ourselves, and to those that we come in contact with, what's fundamental and what's derived. This is first because it's fundamental. It's the source. It's the essence from which everything else will grow. And, so, having this first will, I hope, help us all to avoid the error of putting the cart before the horse, of attaching more importance, more significance to derived things than to fundamentals. It should remind us, and it should remind others, that Cosmotheists are not people primarily...and I stress the word "primarily"...they're not people primarily interested in promoting certain racial goals, or certain social or political or economic goals, but that they are people primarily concerned with fulfilling their mission as the bearers of the Creator's purpose, as agents of the universal will. That comes first. Everything else...race, politics, culture, economics...is a means to that single end. And the reason I emphasize that tonight, and the reason I've emphasized it many times before, is that it is easy to slip into the error in this regard, and we want, always, to make sure that one of the distinguishing features between us and others who pursue similar racial or political or social policies is that we don't put the cart before the horse. Everyone else almost certainly will, but we, alone, are working for ultimate things, for eternal things, for infinite things, and we must never forget that.

Now, having noted that, we should also understand that we will have difficulty in using this pamphlet by itself in carrying out our work. The truth in it is in too concentrated a form for most people to get their minds around it very easily. They need their evasions. They need the secondary things, the specific examples and illustrations which follow from this truth in order to begin to comprehend it meaningfully. I know that that'll be the case with most ordinary people even though I took pains to state things clearly and carefully in this pamphlet, so we'll have to put up with some difficulties and do the best we can until we have actually produced some of those other pamphlets dealing with ethics and race and so on.

Now, beyond this difficulty there are some real dangers inherent in the generality of our truth as expressed here. Those are the dangers of misinterpretation, of drawing false implications, either accidentally or deliberately. Let me give you a couple of trivial examples.

*:Nothing in the universe exists entirely independently and of itself. Everything is a part of the whole. Therefore, Whites and Blacks are brothers and we should ignore the superficial difference of race.*

Another example:

*We're all parts of the whole, which is the Creator. Our destiny is godhood. Therefore, all human life is sacred as a part of the Creator, and we mustn't hurt or kill anyone...that is, we must be pacifists and humanitarians.*

Well, among ourselves, we hardly need to go to the trouble to refute these transparent errors. We hardly need to point out in the first example, that, indeed, in a certain sense, we are brothers to the Blacks, but



in the same sense, we are brothers to rattlesnakes, to sea urchins and to crabgrass, and even to every stone and lump of dirt. We're all parts of the whole, but we don't ignore the differences between the parts. Those differences are as essential a part of the one reality as is the unity of all things because it's a dynamic reality, an evolving reality. In the second example, everything is, indeed, a part of the Creator and therefore partakes in the Creator's divine nature in the same way that every wart or pimple or blackhead on our bodies is a part of us and partakes in our nature. In that narrow sense, everything is sacred in itself, but the overriding importance lies in the particular role a thing plays. It lies in the particular way in which the thing serves the Creator's purpose, and the fact is that not all things which are parts of the Creator serve that purpose anymore than our warts serve ours.

Well, this is a big topic in itself. We could talk a lot more about these two errors and we could think of a lot more examples of the way in which our truth might be misinterpreted, but I just wanted to illustrate the general nature of the problem that we face which is inherent in the inadequacy of human language itself. We can certainly refine and improve the way in which our truth is stated, but we cannot ever entirely eliminate the danger of misinterpretation. If we were the only ones involved, that would be one thing, but we are not the only ones involved in interpreting our truth. There are many others involved. That has both its good and its bad aspects. Many others are involved because Cosmotheism is an idea whose time has come. I told you before in our earlier meetings that we can find partial expressions of Cosmotheism among the writings of the ancients twenty-five centuries ago. A great many of the Greek and Roman philosophers understood parts of our truth. The same was true of the pagan philosophers of northern Europe and also of certain outstanding Christian thinkers of the Middle Ages, despite the fundamental contradictions of Cosmotheism with the teachings of the Church. Then in the 18th and 19th centuries there was an enormous outpouring of Cosmotheist feeling. Cosmotheism, or at least one aspect of Cosmotheism, was the underlying idea of the entire Romantic movement in art and literature, from Alexander Pope to Joseph Turner and William Wordsworth. And Cosmotheism is the underlying idea of 20th century science. Today, more and more thinkers...scientific thinkers in particular...are coming to understand that fact and, also, to give explicit expression to that understanding.

I pointed out to you in earlier meetings some of the specifically Cosmotheist statements of some of the Medieval thinkers, and also of some of the more modern philosophers...Hegel, Fichte, others. The more one looks into the matter, the clearer becomes this Cosmotheist thread running through the spiritual and intellectual history of our race. Every week, I run across more and more examples. Just last Thursday, someone sent me this statement by the novelist D.H. Lawrence, and I quote just a part of a longer statement by Lawrence: "We and the cosmos are one. The cosmos is a vast, living body of which we are all parts. The sun is a great heart whose tremors run through our smallest veins. The moon is a great, gleaming nerve center from which we quiver forever. Now all this is literally true, as men knew in the great past and as they will know again."

Well, hundreds of other Cosmotheist expressions by prominent men during just the last few decades can be found. There can be no doubt that our people down through the ages have been groping for the

Cosmotheist truth, and today, more than ever, they're finding it. Tomorrow, it will be the dominant idea in the world.

Now, it's possible to understand just why this is our moment in history, just why the Cosmotheist trickle over the last twenty-five hundred years should have become a flood today. I don't want to spend a lot of time on this tonight, but I'll just point out a confluence of things which has led to this flood. Perhaps we can talk about them in more detail at another time. One of the things in this confluence was the reorientation of Western thought during the 19th century from an essentially static to a dynamic view of the universe. Darwin, of course, is the man who played the key role in this reorientation, although it began before him and it was not complete at the time of his death. The Medieval view of the world was as a finished creation. Since Darwin, we've come to see the world as undergoing a continuous and unfinished process of creation, of evolution. This evolutionary view of the world is only about a hundred years old in terms of being generally accepted. Before that, the people who expressed Cosmotheist ideas expressed, primarily, their feeling of the unity of the universe, in particular, of the oneness of God and Man as opposed to the Church's view. These ideas fall under the general heading of pantheism, but pantheism is only one aspect of Cosmotheism. The pantheists...at least, most of them...lacked the understanding of the universe as an evolving entity, and so their understanding was incomplete. Their static view of the world made it much more difficult for them to arrive at the Cosmotheist truth.

Another thing in the historical confluence leading to the acceptance of Cosmotheism today has been the drastic decline in the role of the Christian church in the last hundred years. Until fairly recently, the Church dominated the intellectual life of the West. Church doctrine, which, as I just mentioned, is fundamentally opposed to our truth, strongly influenced the outlook of most...in fact, of nearly all...thinkers, most teachers, and most writers. Today, the Church directly influences only a relatively small minority of the leading thinkers, so this fundamental barrier of the acceptance of the Cosmotheist truth for more than a thousand years has crumbled. And I don't mean, of course, that Christianity is dead or that the Church has no more influence. Among the masses of the people, Church doctrine is still relatively powerful, but it is no longer so among the leading minds of the West.

Finally, there is the inescapable fact that Cosmotheism is the outlook toward which one is led by modern science whether one approaches the world microscopically or macroscopically, whether one is studying elementary particles or stellar evolution. And so I repeat, Cosmotheism is the wave of the future, but just as we rejoice that this is so, there are many more people...that there are many more people now than before who are able to understand and to accept our truth, so we must be gravely concerned because of the dangers that this brings with it...because of the dangers that there are so many people who can accept, for example, today, what's in this pamphlet. A minute ago I gave you a couple of examples of ways in which our Cosmotheist truth might be misinterpreted. We can be sure that it will be misinterpreted both accidentally and deliberately...in fact, it is now being misinterpreted. It's being misinterpreted accidentally, or, we might say, without malicious intent, by people who have found their way to the essence of our truth and accepted it, but who simply do not have the courage to follow that truth when it leads them into areas which have been made taboo by modern liberalism.

They don't have the strength of character, the degree of independence from peer pressure, to allow themselves to draw the correct conclusions from the fundamental truth they've accepted when those conclusions are contrary to prevailing liberal dogma. And so they try to bend that truth, unconsciously, to yield conclusions which are socially acceptable to a degenerate and decaying society, to a society which is morally and intellectually corrupt...a spiritually empty society.

It's worthwhile noting here the difference in the type of opposition we face from the liberal establishment today and that which pantheist philosophers faced from the Church in past centuries. The Church was opposed to pantheism and to Cosmotheism on fundamental grounds. The Christian church had men who were genuine philosophers...true intellectuals who were deeply concerned with the nature of reality and with knowing the truth. They were wrong, but they were still sincere men concerned with fundamental ideas. When Johannes Eckhart...Meister Eckhart...was charged with heresy in the 13th century, it wasn't because he refused to say the Mass according to the prescribed manner, or because he rejected the dogma of the virgin birth, or any of the other things having to do with his duties as a priest of the Church. In all of those things he was strictly orthodox. His heresy lay in his deepest philosophical writings, as the Church immediately spotted this deviation and jumped on him for it. Liberalism, on the other hand, is not at all concerned with truly fundamental ideas. Liberalism is not a philosophy, but a disease of the soul. The true liberal is never a true intellectual because liberalism is fundamentally anti-intellectual. Liberalism consists of a collection of tendencies...related tendencies...which, at any particular time, may be given concrete expression in a body of dogma, but liberal dogma is not derived from any fundamental philosophy which can be held up for comparison with Cosmotheism and the contradictions noted.

And so, we have a situation relative to liberalism today, which is essentially different from the situation relative to the Church in the past. A person who follows the herd in observing liberal dogma...they nevertheless accept our truth with no danger that his liberal friends and co-workers will shun him or stone him. There's no contradiction, no heresy, no social penalty until one draws conclusions which don't jibe with liberal dogma. And so there is, and will be, a strong social incentive for the people who are finding their way to the Cosmotheist truth to draw the wrong conclusions from it or to refuse to draw any conclusions at all.

Now, let's remind ourselves for a moment of the nature of Cosmotheism. Its truth, its understanding which is arrived at in a particular way, and that way is through the synthesis of subjective and objective knowledge or, to use the same words that are used in our pamphlet here, it's the perfect union of the Creator's eminent consciousness and Man with Man's reason. Our truth comes to us through a blending of the universal consciousness and race soul and our genes with our reason. Thus, our way of arriving at truth is fundamentally different from the way of most major religions, which depend in a very basic way on revelation, whether through oracles or prophets or what have you. It's also different from the purely mystical, purely subjective religions of the East which are a fad among so many lost souls in the West today, just as it is different from the pure rationalism which used to be the undisputed philosophy of science until recently. We're not subject to the sort of problem that the revealed religions are...or that they have, rather, in which the prophets may contradict one another, or some fine morning someone

may claim he had a vision, or that an angel showed him a book written on leaves of gold, or that Jehovah appeared as a burning bush and handed him a couple of stone tablets inscribed with a new set of laws. And no Cosmotheist can get away with babbling whatever nonsense comes into his head like the Maharaji and the other Yogas can, because our truth is absolute and it must agree with our observations of the universe. And because our truth also comes from the soul, it's something towards which everyone who shares the same race soul, the same genes, naturally gravitates. This, as I pointed out before, is why one can find a Cosmotheist thread running through the entire length of Western spiritual history, including those periods when fundamentally opposing ideas ruled.

But despite these advantages, we do have problems. We do face dangers. One danger is that of misinterpretation so as to draw socially acceptable conclusions, which I just mentioned. There's also the danger of deliberate perversion of our truth. The Jew, after all, even with a different race soul, is heavily involved in the intellectual and spiritual life of the West. The Jew, despite fundamental tendencies which have historically expressed themselves in an entirely different way, is playing a role in modern science in particular. It may be generally true that the Talmud is the typical expression of the Jewish race soul and that the Jew with intellectual pretensions is epitomized by the modern hair-splitting, haggling lawyer. Nevertheless, some of them have seen the Cosmotheist truth underlying modern science, and they are quite clever and quite energetic enough to try to establish for themselves a dominant position in giving expression to this truth and in interpreting it for everyone else so that they can blunt the danger it poses to them, so that they can turn it aside and guide it into safe channels. It would be quite naïve of us to say that Cosmotheism is our truth, not theirs, and that we have a natural advantage in interpreting it, that it would be as unnatural and awkward for a Jew to try to set himself up as a Cosmotheist as it would be for a White man to set himself up as a Talmudist and to try to debate the rabbis on points of Talmudic doctrine. After all, a Jew, Baruch Spinoza, was one of the foremost expounders of pantheism during the 17th century, at a time when that was hardly a safe or a popular position for anyone to take. He was, in fact, excommunicated by his fellow Jews as a consequence, but because Spinoza was a Jew, he couldn't help but give a Jewish flavor, a Jewish interpretation, to his pantheism. The ethical conclusions that he drew from his pantheism in particular were strictly Jewish, and I think it's only fair to assume that Spinoza had no ulterior motive. We're in a rather different era today and ulterior motives abound.

Well, the danger exists, and it's a very great danger, but there is a way to overcome it, just one way. That way is to give concrete form to our truth...to spell it out, not only in its generality as in our first pamphlet here, but also in all its particulars, and then to embody those particulars...ethics, the racial policy, the social policy and all the rest...in a living, growing community of consciousness and blood. That's what we must do, and that's what we're beginning to do now.

**Evolution and Conservative Beliefs** by Dr. William Pierce

Since the "[Who We Are](#)" series began appearing in *NV*, the National Office has been receiving complaints from subscribers who are unhappy because the account of man's origins given there doesn't jibe with the Jewish account in the Book of Genesis.

Some readers have sent curt notes, such as, "You evidently don't believe in the Bible. Don't you know that evolution is the work of Satan? Cancel my subscription immediately!"

Others have been more patient, explaining either that (a) the first White people were placed on earth via flying saucer somewhere around 7,000 years ago, or that (b) the Creation occurred as described in Genesis, but Adam and Eve were Whites, not Jews, and that the people of the Old Testament eventually migrated to northern Europe and were the ancestors of the European race.

Complaints were definitely in the minority, with most readers indicating an approval of the race-history article, but there was no intention of offending any of our readers' religious sensibilities with the "Who We Are" series. On the other hand, the Alliance never hesitates to print the truth--even when the truth conflicts with cherished myths. The racial history and prehistory in "Who We Are" are in accord with the presently known facts, whereas the account in the Old Testament and subsequent migrations from Eden to Scandinavia are not.

But the objections to presenting the facts of biological evolution, and our insistence on doing so, go deeper than a quibble over Jewish mythology. Evolution is not just a scientific concept which helps us understand race history; it is an idea which is absolutely fundamental to our whole way of thinking. The doctrine of the Alliance is based solidly on the evolutionary concept.

Throughout recorded history the prevailing idea of the world has been a static idea. The world existed. People were born; they grew old; they died. The seasons changed. But year after year, the world remained essentially the same. The stars always returned each year to their same places in the sky. There were always the same animals, the same types of weather, the same cycles. The world did not change. So it had always been, and so it would always be. That was the central fact of life.

For the last thousand years in Europe, in particular, there has been a static view of the creative process. The Christian religion, just like the Jewish and Moslem religions, regards the creation of the world, not as an ongoing process, but as something completed. Both the material and the spiritual worlds were finished long ago. In particular, God is finished, already a perfect being--hence, incapable of improvement or change. And man, of course, has also been viewed as an unchanging creature, with a fixed relationship to the unchanging Creator.

A century ago [Charles Darwin](#) shattered forever this static view of the world--although many people didn't realize it at the time, and many apparently still don't. Darwin, of course, was not the first man to see the world as an evolving reality rather than as a static reality. And his work was flawed in several respects: he made some errors, and he failed to understand the mechanics of evolution. (the explanation of that --at least, as far as biological evolution is concerned--we owe to [Johann Mendel](#) and his successors in the fields of genetics.) Nevertheless, Darwin did overturn the old, static worldview, and he replace it with the evolutionary view. That is the greatest revolution in human thought which has ever taken place.

Life, of course, goes on, more or less, as before. People are born: they grow old: they die--but now we see each generation as slightly different from that which preceded it. The seasons still follow the familiar cycle--but now we know that the average climate also changes slightly from year to year, carrying the earth into a new and different climatic epoch. Even the stars do not return to exactly their same spaces in the sky each year; the whole pattern of the heavens is shifting, changing into something altogether new and different. The universe is evolving.

Because the pace of Cosmic evolution is slow, compared to the pace of human life, we are able, as mentioned, to go on more or less as before. But our vision, our understanding, is now altogether different. We no longer see ourselves or the world around us as a finished product. We no longer see the process of creation as something which ended long ago, or the universe as complete and static, ruled by a being with perfect knowledge.

We see instead a dynamic, evolving Whole, of which we are parts. We see an uncompleted world. We see a universe, a Cosmos, which is perfect neither materially nor spiritually, but each is striving toward perfection, toward perfect knowledge, toward perfect consciousness.

This is an exacting vision, vastly more exciting than the old view of the world, but it is a vision which makes conservatives uncomfortable. They don't want excitement; they want the feeling of security which comes from a sense of permanence. They want to be comfortable and safe and sure.

Our vision takes in not only the world as it is, but also the world as it was and the world as it *can be* in the future. We see the Cosmos moving upward along a path which climbs without limits through more and more highly evolved states.

That is a view which gives the conservative vertigo. To be sure, even we cannot see the whole path which lies ahead of us. Beyond a few hundred years it becomes lost in the clouds of uncertainty which lie ahead of us and above us. But we know it is there, and we form our plans, choose our values and our goals accordingly. The conservative, instead, fixes his gaze on that portion of the path immediately under his feet and tells himself that that's all there is. And he makes his plans and chooses his values and goals accordingly. And they are, of course, different from ours.

An understanding of the evolutionary nature of reality makes us radicals. We see that tendencies which may be deeply buried beneath surface appearances now can, nevertheless, have profound effects on the way things develop in the long run. In evils which many seem small and tolerable to the conservative we recognize the potential for great damage, if their effects are allowed to accumulate long enough.

The conservative would like to patch things up superficially, to alleviate the immediate and obvious symptoms of the social and political and racial problems around him. With a static view of the world, he believes that things swept under the carpet will stay under the carpet.

We, with our evolutionary view of the world, know that treating the symptoms of a disease is not enough. We know that the world is dynamic, and that the causes of a disease will continue festering under the surface until we go after its roots and tear them up.

That is why the conservative, for example, has always been willing to settle for racial segregation as a goal, while we have not. More generally, it is why the conservative turns away from difficult questions with harsh and unpleasant answers; he does not see the necessity of doing unpleasant things now in order that life may be on a higher plane in the future. It is why even the racially conscious conservative finds it so difficult to make sacrifices. He sees only the men and women around him, with all their imperfections, and he says to himself, "I should sacrifice myself for *them*?"

We on the other hand, see not just our race as it is today, but our race as it *can become*, and it is this ideal for which we sacrifice.