



## CHRISTIAN CRUSADE FOR TRUTH

### Intelligence Newsletter

*"And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." John 8:32.*

**November - December, 1998**

## Race And The Decline And Fall Of The American Epic-Part 2

In the [September-October issue](#) we discussed the fact that the word **race** has become an evil word throughout the entire Western culture. Anywhere one travels within the European-derived nations, to speak of race immediately places the person on the politically incorrect list. This has been accomplished intentionally for a political purpose.

To reinforce the point made in that issue, God has a purpose for each race and each of them have attributes that He wants to remain pure as He created them. In another recent issue of the *Intelligence Newsletter*, we used the example of the problems within modern Mexico to show the results of miscegenation. According to well qualified researchers, there seems to be a war within the soul of modern Mexico such that they don't know who they really are. Such are the results of violating God's Commandments.

We also included in that issue a list of just a few of the many books, written by world-class researchers and authors whose works cannot be repudiated. Nevertheless, the modern politically correct "truth" is to either ignore those scientists, authors and Biblical researchers or to violently oppose those who believe that what God says is inviolate. **It has been said that Truth always goes through three stages, 1. Ridicule; 2. Violent Opposition; 3. Acceptance as being Self-Evident.**

Nearly all of the authors of the classical books described in the last issue show a common thread running through their studies. Each of them reveals the identity of the perpetrators who have attempted to destroy what God has put together. In this issue, those perpetrators will be named.

*"Well hath Esaias prophesied of you hypocrites, as it is written, This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, as the washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do. And he said unto them, Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition. For Moses said, Honour thy father and thy mother; and, Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death: But ye say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, It is Corban, that is to say, a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me: he shall be free. And ye suffer him no more to do ought for his father or his mother: Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which he have delivered: and many such like things do ye." ([Mark 7:6-13](#)).*

We generally think of that passage as a matter of immediate family but we can also think of it another way. Our nation was founded by Christians. It is taught that one can enter into any meeting of 100 people and the chances are great that 50 of those people attending will be relatives within four generations! That can be called our extended family. Our forefathers developed a set of Godly laws, including the limitations of immigration. We discussed that in the last issue. The reason was simple, to keep our nation intact as it was

formed by our founding fathers. We call them our "fathers." They are because they formed us as a Christian nation, to live by God's rules.

As a nation we are doing exactly what Jesus accused the Talmudic Pharisees of doing in that day. What our founding fathers formed is being changed by the traditions of men, and by **the same group** as in the time of Jesus here on earth. We will now show how it was accomplished in this country (and it is being accomplished using the same technique in all of the other European-derived nations).

We stated in the last issue: "Where does this hatred of the West come from? In the next issue we will be showing exactly how it was done and by whom. You will be amazed by its simplicity!" Well, it was simple and we will start with the overall technique and then fill in the details.

One word can be singled out as being the key to this dilemma. That word is **Anthropology**. Great men such as Edward Gibbon, Madison Grant, James Stoddard, Norman Douglas, Lothrop Stoddard and Oswald Spengler constantly discussed Anthropology. It is the key to the study of race. When it becomes difficult, if not impossible, to intelligently discuss Anthropology as applied to the people of the world, then we have lost any meaning of the word "nation." Even that word is misused in our vocabulary. It is commonly thought of as a government or country. That may, or may not, be true in the modern concept. The word *nation*, or *national*, refers to ethnicity or race. It comes from the Greek word *ethos* which means race.

There was one man who can be considered the one responsible for a change in the meaning of Anthropology and how it is applied to the sciences. That man was Franz Boas. This man's influence upon the Social Sciences throughout the Western European-derived nations cannot be exaggerated. He spent his entire life on the idea of destroying the concept that race was a primary source of the differences to be found in the mental or social capabilities of human groups. He accomplished this mission with his ceaseless and relentless message on the concept of culture. To him, culture or environment was primary and not race. His charisma matched his relentlessness.

The great minds of the world have always agreed that it is race and not environment which sets the mental and social characteristics of each of the races. Each of the various races has separate and distinct traits which are peculiar to their specific group.

This rule applies not only to the human species but to the various birds and animals. For example, when we wonder why a swallow returns to the area where it was hatched to build its own nest, we then wonder why that specific specie of birds always builds the exact type of nest as its parents used. Yet, the bird wasn't trained in this habit. We simply rationalize it as "instinct." But now we know it as "DNA Heritage Memory." All of this is in the DNA ladder and God wants it left there.

But, according to Franz Boas, none of that is germane. According to him that may be true among animals and birds but we can change that DNA ladder in the human species. To him it was as simple as changing the definition of the word **Anthropology**. He, and his colleagues were prominently involved in the movement to eradicate the study of race as a part of the science of Anthropology. So, according to Franz Boas, the works of the great scientists and anthropologists of the past are therefore invalid.

It was Franz Boas who fought so tenaciously to develop the concept of a culture which would in time expunge race from the literature of all of the Social Sciences. This, of course, would include Psychology and Sociology. He certainly didn't do it from a scientific perspective. His thought process was the result of an ideological commitment that was

aroused in his early years of life. He was a classical Socialist in all that he did. With that mindset he collected evidence and developed arguments that would refute the concept of classical Anthropology. He considered it restrictive upon individuals and thus undesirable for society as he envisioned it in his Socialist terms. He wasn't interested in any particular country and its predominant race. His outlook was as an Internationalist. As is common to all those of his background, he was a citizen of the world.

Franz Boas was born of Jewish parents in the area of Prussian Germany. His parents were also Socialists and had the revolutionary ideals of the 1848 Revolutions in Germany and France. This naturally had tremendous influence on Franz. It was natural, therefore that he introduced this socialist concept into his study of Anthropology. He was intensely concerned with the idea of anti-Semitism. He was violently opposed to the entire Gentile society and its morals and mores. In simple terms, this entire mindset made Franz Boas an arch-enemy of the Western European culture.

Boas, following his training in Europe, took a professorship at Columbia University here in the United States. He immediately directed his actions to be in conflict with the writings of such great scientists as Madison Grant. The outcome of that conflict between Boas (with his colleagues) and Madison Grant (and his colleagues) was to be the final blow in the decline of the American Epic.

Madison Grant wrote the book *The Passing of the Great Race*. The preface to that book, written by Henry Osborn describes the message to be found in that book:

**"European history has been written in terms of nationality and of language, but never before in terms of race; yet race has played a far larger part than either language or nationality in moulding the destinies of men; race implies heredity and heredity implies all the moral, social and intellectual characteristics and traits which are the springs of politics and government.**

**"Quite independently and unconsciously the author, never before a historian, has turned this historical sketch into the current of a great biological movement, which may be traced back to the teachings of Galton and Weismann, beginning in the last third of the nineteenth century. This movement has compelled us to recognize the superior force and stability of heredity, as being more enduring and potent than environment. This movement is also a reaction from the teachings of Hippolyte Taine among historians and of Herbert Spencer among biologists, because it proves that environment and in the case of man, education, have an immediate, apparent and temporary influence, while heredity has a deep, subtle and permanent influence on the actions of men."**

So there are the two opposing concepts with respect to race, that of men like Boas who have been busy modifying definitions and the scientifically-qualified Anthropologists who understand the great part that race and heredity play on all of the human species. Either Anthropology is a science or Anthropology is a social issue. We will discuss in this writing how it has been changed from a science to a social issue and by whom.

First, let's define the word **Anthropology**. Webster's Unabridged Dictionary states: "The study of the races, physical and mental characteristics, distribution, customs, social relationships, etc. of mankind: often restricted to the study of the institutions, myths, etc. of primitive peoples."

We can readily see that Webster, in preparing the modern dictionary has included the concept of Boas. From that definition we can see that Boas, a supposed Anthropologist, took the "institutions, myths, etc. of primitive peoples" part of the definition and totally

disregarded the racial, mental and social aspects including the customs of the various races in his analysis. Since that is the current "politically correct" position it becomes obvious as to what would be the outcome of any study which was conducted by Franz Boas.

The words "customs, social relationships etc. of mankind" as found in Webster's definition of Anthropology must be considered in terms of religion. Customs and social relationships are a direct result of the religion of that race being considered. We have discussed many times before that Christianity is the religion of Western man. True, we have sent missionaries to other lands and have ostensibly (in a declared or pretended manner) converted many other races to the Christian faith. However, history proves that those conversions always carry with it at least some of the customs and social relationships of their parent racial religion.

So when we discuss race from an anthropological viewpoint, we must consider religion and not just "institutions and myths of primitive people." The next question now becomes obvious in discussing how Franz Boas convinced the American people, their churches and their government, that race doesn't make any difference in the nationhood of our country. If race and religion naturally go together, would the religion of Franz Boas have anything to do with his viewpoints on race? Of course it does.

The Talmudic faith has an entirely different code of ethics, morality, customs and laws than that of the Christian faith. We have discussed in many of our issues that this nation was founded on Christian Principles, regardless of what the "politically correct" position is. We will save the details of that difference for a later issue but it will suffice to point out that Talmudism is the root of the thought processes of the liberal left mind, including that of Communism. Franz Boas was of that persuasion.

So, how did Franz Boas accomplish this totally erroneous concept of Anthropology in Western society? First, he accomplished it through the teaching of a revised definition of Anthropology in our universities and colleges. He then used the immigration laws of the United States as the tool which would change our people's concept of Anthropology. Once that was accomplished here in the United States, he turned to all of the other Western European nations. He managed to utilize his Talmudic compatriots all over the world in this work. He was able to utilize the great majority of them whether they were Zionists or Internationalists through the use of that famous buzz-word "Anti-Semitism."

Professor Kevin MacDonald, Department of Psychology, California State University, has written a paper titled "*Jewish Involvement in Shaping American Immigration Policy, 1881-1965: A Historical Review.*" The Abstract of that paper states this:

"This paper discusses Jewish involvement in shaping United States immigration policy. In addition to a periodic interest in fostering the immigration of co-religionists, Jews have an interest in opposing the establishment of ethnically and culturally homogeneous societies in which they reside as minorities. Jews have been at the forefront in supporting movements aimed at altering the ethnic status quo in the United States in favor of immigration of non-European peoples. These activities have involved leadership in Congress, organizing and funding anti-restrictionist groups composed of Jews and Gentiles, and originating intellectual movements opposed to evolutionary and biological perspectives in the Social Sciences."

Notice that the professor ended his abstract by writing, "Originating intellectual movements opposed to biological perspectives in the Social Sciences." Reflecting on more recent history, the term "originating intellectual movements" included the penetration of Christian Seminaries. Most Seminaries utilize Talmudic Rabbis to teach many aspects of the Old Testament. By doing this the seminaries teach biological perspectives from the Talmudic

position which makes the Apostles Paul's words , "*Be ye separate,*" to be evil in modern society.

The intellectual community, which will be discussed in more detail, consists of people like college professors, scientists, engineers, social workers, lawyers, judges, congressmen, senators, the executive branch and even school teachers at all levels. All of these people are directly involved in the system of law. This is because each of these professions is called upon from time to time to speak before Congressional Committees for the purpose of advising Congress in matters of making law. How these people think, based on what they themselves learned in their colleges, and their Judeo-Christian Churches, forms their opinions. As this issue shows, all of that is modified by the efforts of those who demand that this nation have cultural diversity. There is no question but what the average Judeo-Christian Church teaches cultural diversity. It is even more than simply teaching it. It is being forced on the congregations which, in turn, have caused splits in many churches of today. Every time there is a church split, the overall influence of Christianity at the seats of government is diminished.

Because of that fact, it has now become imperative that the Body of Christ be considered in terms other than the organizations called churches. There are more Christians who are not going to churches today than ever before. These are people who have an extremely strong belief and ethic in Christian Principles. But they cannot force themselves to be a part of the destruction of the American Epic. Thus, other forms of "networking" among believers is in the process of being born. **Christianity will survive this onslaught against it!**

Professor MacDonald's paper shows the direct connection between a change in the Social Science of Anthropology and that of unrestricted immigration of non-European peoples into the United States. Whereas his discussion is primarily concerned with the United States, it applies directly to all of the Western nations of Christianity.

In his introduction he writes, "Ethnic conflict is of obvious importance for understanding critical aspects of American history, and not only for understanding Black/White ethnic conflict or the fate of Native Americans, Immigration policy is a paradigmatic example of conflict of interest between ethnic groups because immigration policy influences the future demographic composition of the nation. Ethnic groups unable to influence immigration policy in their own interests will eventually be displaced or reduced in relative numbers by groups able to accomplish this goal."

He used the word "paradigmatic." The dictionary definition which is most widely used is, "an example of excellence." Another meaning which is now rare is, "in Church history, a writer of the memoirs of religious persons, as examples of Christian excellence." Even the definition of that word shows the decline of Western Christian influence.

Dr. MacDonald goes on to show the long-standing ethnic conflict between Jews and Gentiles. He points out that these battles have resulted from Jewish upward mobility and the quotas of Jewish representation in the elite schools of America. This conflict began in the nineteenth century and peaked in the 1920's and 1930's. The conflict was publically represented in the anti-Communist crusade during the years following World War II. The major media following that war unfavorably discussed topics which were of concern to those of our Christian culture. There were extensive reports on Henry Ford's writings on the Protocols and Senator Joseph McCarthy's works on exposing Communism in the United States. These were topics of extreme concern to Western European culture but the media very obviously slanted the coverage to side with the arguments of Boas. The powerful tool of the media was as responsible for the decline of the American Epic as men such as Boas.

Again, and not to be redundant, the major tool which the Talmudic community used to fight this conflict was the age-old "buzz-word" of anti-Semitism. This, of course, was before the book [\*The Thirteenth Tribe\*](#) by Authur Kessler became a best seller. Kessler himself was Jewish. Many other well educated Jewish writers such as Alfred M. Lilienthal, who wrote *The Zionist Connection*, have described who is a Semite and who is not. Zionism is the key word and as we shall see in this issue, that political concept has been used for the main thrust to change the importance of race in a nation. Douglas Reed's book *The Controversy of Zion* also proves that this entire conflict is not the ramblings of racial hate-mongers. All of these authors show that the conflict is simply between genuine Christianity and Talmudism. Each of these religions is directly related to race. Which will it be?

Professor MacDonald shows that another one of the purposes for the Jewish desire for a change in the immigration policies is to provide a safe-haven for Jews fleeing outbreaks of anti-Semitism in foreign countries. This, in turn, would automatically provide a mechanism to ensure that this country would be a pluralistic rather than a unitary, homogeneous society. When we couple that action by the Jews with the cultural desire of our people for fairness and the abiding sense of reciprocity which Jared Taylor wrote about in the last issue, the results are disasterous. Mr. Taylor discussed that, too, didn't he?

The reason for a pluralistic society in the minds of the Jewish intellectuals involves the current trend towards the legitimization of minority group ethnocentrism (the concept where a minority race considers their own as being superior). This creates a national situation where the Jewish community is just one of many ethnic groups. This, in turn, results in the blending of ethnic groups in such a way that it is difficult, if not impossible, to develop a unified opposition to Judaism or Zionism by any singular ethnic group. There is the old military maxim, "Divide and Conquer."

Mr. MacDonald points out that Jewish intellectuals have been at the forefront in changing the United States into a culturally and ethnically pluralistic society. Jewish intellectuals such as Horace Kallen combined his own personal ideologies of cultural pluralism with extensive Jewish history and his commitment to Zionism. The psychology here is to penetrate the average American's sensitivities to foreign problems of the Jews such as the pogroms of Russia and the Inquisitions of Europe. Of course, nowhere does Kallen speak of the conditions in Europe which always led up to those circumstances.

Kallen wrote with the concept that the United States should be organized as a set of ethnic and cultural groups. He wrote that relationships between these ethnic groups would always be benign and groups would cooperate with each other. History proves that Kallen's concepts have never, never worked. Horace Kallen was a prominent member of the American Jewish Congress at a time when that organization demanded proportional political representation as well as the ability to organize their own communities and preserve their own Jewish culture. In other words, "Don't do as I do, do as I say!"

Concurrently with Kallen's writings, the doctrine of dual-loyalty was developed by Moritz Lazarus. This is the concept where all Jewish people of the world are allowed to have dual citizenship with their resident country and the newly founded country of Israel. This, too, is now universal throughout the world. Again, "Don't do as I do, do as I say!"

The Gentile intellectual John Dewey pushed Kallen's concept of cultural pluralism. In return, the Jewish intellectuals promoted John Dewey, who was ostensibly a Protestant of the Congregationalist persuasion. Thus, it was Dewey, with the help of all of the Jewish intellectuals, who penetrated the conservative Protestant Movement in America.

If we will remember, John Dewey was very influential in many Communist Front activities. He was a part of the entire Humanist Manifesto program. In all of this we see a

huge networking between the academia, the churches, humanism, Communism and Zionism.

Another very powerful American Zionist was the Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis. Past lessons showed that it was Cyrus I. Scofield (the *Scofield Bible*) and the Zionist George Untermyer who placed Brandeis in that post. Scofield and Untermyer knew of the indiscretions of the then President Woodrow Wilson. When they presented Wilson with those facts, they were able to persuade him to name Louis Brandeis to the Supreme Court--the first Jew!

Brandeis also was a champion for cultural diversity in America. He viewed America as composed of different nationalities whose free development would spiritually enrich the United States and would make it a democracy *par excellence*. It was the views of Brandeis which became a hall-mark of Zionism in this country. This includes secular and religious Jewish people as well as Christian Zionists.

The Zionist community realized that the United States is, or was, predominantly a European-derived Protestant Christian nation. They also realized that the Protestant culture had a greater wealth and social standing than the then Catholic Christians. Also, they realized that the Protestant community possessed greater technical skill in the intellectual quarter. Thus it was most important that they direct their efforts mainly towards the Protestants. It is a truism that when anyone wants to influence a nation, all efforts must be directed toward those who are capable of receiving and understanding the message.

Professor MacDonald points out that the Zionist's success in influencing the immigration policy of the United States was entirely analogous to their success in influencing the secularization of American culture. It had to be done mainly within the Protestant community because that was where the power and influence was.

This is not a new phenomena. Jesus addresses this problem in [Matthew 23](#). The entire chapter is dedicated to this problem. Also, in [II Peter 2](#), we read this, "*But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of.*" ([II Peter 2: 1-2](#)).

Another product of the thinking of Boas and his colleagues was that of changing the Western European communitie's concept of the importance of the Intelligence Quotient (I.Q.). The classical Anthropologists recognized and measured the intelligence quotient of the various races of the world. This was accomplished for the purpose of understanding that measurement for its importance in the cultural composition of a nation.

Madison Grant, in his book *The Passing of the Great Race*, argued that the American colonial stock was derived from the superior Nordic intelligence capabilities and that any immigration of other races would lower the competence level of the nation. This, according to Grant would threaten the Democratic and Republican Institutions of America. We can now realize that what Grant stated has actually come to fruition. We discussed this point in the three issues of The Intelligence Newsletter which showed the current evils of the political parties in this country.

Madison Grant was even asked to come before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization during the 1924 discussion on the Immigration Laws of the United States. He presented himself for the purpose of defending the arguments of the many immigration restrictionists who were there to defend more restrictive immigration quotas..

The debate over the differences in I.Q. was directly tied to the immigration issue. There were many, highly qualified, scientists and educators who presented themselves to Congress for the purpose of supporting Madison Grant's arguments. The anthropologist C.C. Brigham discussed the differences in IQ within the United States Army and the need to maintain an army of men with the proper mental capacities for modern warfare. Brigham also said that it behooves us to consider the reliability and meaning of the intelligence quotient, for not one of us as a citizen can afford to ignore the menace of race deterioration or the evident relation of immigration to national progress and welfare.

The Harvard psychologist Robert M. Yerkes defended Brigham's works by stating that his efforts presented not theories but facts. This conflict between the two definitions of Anthropology was of tremendous consequences. Yet, the American people weren't aware of what was going on in their own Capitol. Those involved in the restriction of the immigration policies of this country knew that it was the Jewish community who was at the forefront of forcing open the borders to others besides Western Europeans. Prescott Hall, who was then secretary of the Immigration Restriction League, wrote to Madison Grant for help in convincing Congress to continue the restrictionist policy. The restrictionists perceived themselves to be under attack from Jewish intellectuals and he wanted genuine Anthropologists to discuss the plight with Congress. Grant himself believed that Zionist Jews were engaged in a campaign to discredit racial research. He complained that it is well-nigh impossible to publish in the American newspapers any reflection upon certain religions or races which are hysterically sensitive even when not mentioned by name. The underlying idea, to Grant, seemed to be that if publications can be suppressed, the facts themselves will ultimately disappear. Of course, he was referring to the works of Franz Boas.

Boas and his students at Columbia were intensely concerned with pushing an ideological agenda within the American Anthropological profession. But this was not made known to the American people until after the fight was over. This has been revealed by Degler in 1991, Freeman in 1991 and Torrey in 1992. They all reported that Boas and his associates had a much more highly developed sense of group identity, a commitment to a common viewpoint, and an agenda to dominate the institutional structure of Anthropology than did their opponents.

What that tells us is that the American people of Western European culture did not have group unity or identity. We were not totally committed to our cause of preserving the culture as our forefathers developed it. In talking to many, many people today, this writer has concluded that most Americans today could care less! Sad, isn't it? Again, we say, read Deuteronomy, Chapter 28 from beginning to end!

Professor Kevin MacDonald wrote, "By 1915 the followers of Franz Boas controlled the American Anthropological Association and held a two-thirds majority on the Executive Board of that Association. By 1926, every major Department of Anthropology in the United States was headed by a student of Boas, the majority of whom were Jewish."

Boas' most influential students were Ruth Benedict, Alexander Goldenweiser, Melville Herskovits, Alfred Kroeber, Robert Lowie, Margaret Mead, Paul Radin, Edward Sapir, and Leslie Spear. All of this small, compact group of scholars, who gathered around their leader, were Jews with the exception of Kroeber, Benedict and Mead. Margaret Mead was even required to use deception to obtain a position near this "masterful" leader. When she was looking for a way to persuade Boas to let her pursue her research she hit upon a sure way of getting him to change his mind about permitting her to be a part of his team. MacDonald wrote, "She knew that there was one thing that mattered more to Boas than the direction taken by Anthropological research. That was that she should behave like a liberal, democratic, modern person, not like a Prussian autocrat! The ploy worked because she had

indeed uncovered the heart of his personal values." Boas' life-long dream was to destroy Teutonic man, the seminal start of the Western Europeans. That fight has never ended. There have been wars, revolutions and famines attempted but with no success. Boas and his followers think they may have the solution to their life-long dream. Destroy them by immigration and forced mingling. It is a promise of God that it won't happen. John the Revelator tells us, *"And when the thousand years are expired, Satan (the Adversary) shall be loosed out of his prison, And shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city, and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them."* ([Rev. 20:7-9](#)).

In 1924, Congress prevailed in the attempt to maintain some sense of race in the Immigration Laws of this country. A battle had been won by the actions of Congress in 1924 but the war was not yet over.

The Congress was repeatedly forced to listen to the charismatic pressures of the masters of intrigue. Pressure was being applied from all quarters. As an example of the efforts of these masters of intrigue, the book *You Gentiles* (1924) by the well-known Zionist author Maurice Samuels stated this on page 215: "If, then, the struggle between us (Jews and Gentiles) is ever to be lifted beyond the physical, your democracies will have to alter their demands for racial, spiritual and cultural homogeneity with the State. But it would be foolish to regard this as a possibility, for the tendency of this civilization is in the opposite direction. There is a steady approach toward the identification of government with race, instead of with the political State...If America had any meaning at all, it lay in the peculiar attempt to rise above the trend of our present civilization the identification of race with State. ...America was therefore the New World in this vital respect that the State was purely an ideal, and nationality was identical only with acceptance of the ideal. But it seems now that the entire point of view was a mistaken one, that America was incapable of rising above her origins, and the semblance of an ideal-nationalism was only a stage in the proper development of the universal Gentile spirit...Today, with race triumphant over ideal, anti-Semitism uncovers its fangs, and to the heartless refusal of the most elementary human right, the right of asylum, is added cowardly insult. We are not only excluded, but we are told, in the unmistakable language of the immigration laws, that we are an inferior people. Without the moral courage to stand up squarely to its evil instincts, the country prepared itself, through its journalists, by a long draught of vilification of the Jew, and, when sufficiently inspired by the popular and scientific potions, committed the act." (pages 215, 218-220).

Do you see the psychology used by this well-known master of intrigue? First stating the need for cultural diversity, he then makes the calculated argument, "But you won't do that because you're bigots!"

The dialectics has been played on the American mind for the greater part of a century. Other peoples know more than we do about the consideration for others that runs deep in our being. Again, not to be redundant but because it is of foremost importance, we need to reiterate what Jared Taylor was expressing in his essay as was reported in the September-October issue. As he pointed out, "I believe our present weakness is a perversion of what, in the past, were our strengths. The very traits that distinguished the West and made it great have now become the seeds of our own destruction. There is, after all, a common thread to the characteristics of modern European man, and he carries these characteristics wherever he migrates. That common thread is an abiding sense of reciprocity, a conviction that others have rights that must be respected. This conviction is at the heart of the

institutions that are common to all Western societies and absent from virtually every other: democracy, free speech, and the rule of law."

With that in mind, it becomes easy to see why the Western European-derived nations have become subject to the thinking of another people, a people who ("say they are Jews, and are not") are capable of understanding the democratic processes of our minds. For example, does one really believe that there are the same "abiding sense of reciprocity, a conviction that others have rights that must be respected" in the modern state of Israel?

During the great depression of the 30's Social Scientists had been essentially convinced that Boas' concept of cultural determination of human behavior was correct. The racial aspect of Anthropology was no longer a consideration. The idea of racial equality was an important weapon on behalf of opening immigration up to all human groups. To "rub salt into the wounds," the American Jewish Congress stated to Congress during the Joint Hearings before the Subcommittees of the Committees on the Judiciary, 82nd Congress, first session April, 1951, "The findings of science must force even the most prejudiced among us to accept, as unqualifiedly as we do the law of gravity, that intelligence, morality and character, bear no relationship whatever to geography or place of birth."

In 1953, Margaret Mead, taught well by her mentor Boas, made this statement in a testimony before the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization: "That all human beings from all groups of people have the same potentialities...Our best anthropological evidence today suggests that the people of every group have about the same distribution of potentialities." Another witness then stated that the executive board of the American Anthropological Association had unanimously endorsed the proposition that all scientific evidence indicates that all peoples are inherently capable of acquiring or adapting to our civilization.

Professor Kevin MacDonald continues, "By 1965 Senator Jacob Javits (Cong. Rec., 111, 1965, p.24469) confidently announced to the Senate during the debate on the immigration bill that both the dictates of our consciences as well as the precepts of sociologists tell us that immigration, as it exists in the national origins quota system, is wrong, and without any basis in reason or fact for we know better than to say that one man is better than another because of the color of his skin. The intellectual revolution and its translation into public policy had been completed."

Another individual who has been boastful regarding the total change in the immigration laws is the Social Scientist and political activist Earl Raab. Mr. Raab is associated with the [ADL](#) and is executive director emeritus of the Perlmutter Institute for Jewish Advocacy at Brandeis University. He also co-authored the book *The Politics of Unreason: Right Wing-Extremism in America*. According to MacDonald, Raab comments on the success of American immigration policy in altering the ethnic composition of United States since 1965. Raab also notes that the Jewish community has taken a leadership role in changing the Northwestern European bias of American immigration policy. He has also maintained that one factor inhibiting anti-Semitism in the contemporary United States is that an increasing ethnic heterogeneity, as a result of immigration, has made it even more difficult for a political party or mass movement of bigotry to develop. Raab made this statement, "The Census Bureau has just reported that about half of the American population will soon be non-white or non-European. And they will all be American citizens. We have tipped beyond the point where a Nazi-Aryan party will not be able to prevail in this country."

This is all a ruse, or a strategum, which should be recognized by any thinking person so equipped mentally. There have been no scientific studies made that any true Anthropologist worth the name would consider valid. The entire program of changing the definition and

scope of the science of Anthropology has been through the dreams and efforts of one man and his backers. The entire scam has been a political mission.

The purpose of this political maneuver has been twofold: first, to exterminate Western European man and his culture from the face of the earth by the cruelist of all genocides. That is by the mixing of the races. This is in direct contradiction to the mandates of God.

The second purpose can best be said by the words of the author Maurice Samuels in his book *You Gentiles*. He writes, "We Jews, we, the destroyers, will remain the destroyers for ever. Nothing that you will do will meet our needs and demands. We will for ever destroy because we need a world of our own." (Page 155).

The "Doubting Thomases" of this country, and the rest of Western European culture, should take a serious look at the conspiracy theory. Isn't there a conspiracy? You be the judge.

Some of our greatest men in the history of this nation believed that there was a massive conspiracy. Thomas Jefferson said this many years ago, during the very start of this once great Teutonic Christian nation: **"Single acts of tyranny may be ascribed to the accidental opinion of a day, but a series of oppressions begun at a distinguished period, unalterable through every change of ministers, to plainly prove a deliberate systematic plan of reducing us to slavery."**

The only problem everyone has is, who are the conspirators? Perhaps the Bible will answer that for us:

*"I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God beside me: I girded thee, though thou hast not known me: That they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none beside me. I am the Lord, and there is none else. **I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I the Lord do all these things.**"* ([Isaiah 45: 5-7](#)).

How about this one? *"Shall a trumpet be blown in the city, and the people not be afraid? **shall there be evil in a city, and the Lord hath not done it? Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets.**"* ([Amos 3: 6-7](#)).

When, we as a people, started failing God and his Laws (including those of race mixing), He caused those who have evil intentions to possess the power to make life for His people to be nearly unbearable. But take heart. God will not allow a so-called One World Order. As the song says, "Our God Reigns. Our God Reigns."